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INTRODUCTION

According to Perry (1977) the years from birth to seven years of age are critical because they lay the foundation for all the development and learning to follow. Likewise, Lasky and Mukerji (1980) urge their readers to realize that great strides of growth and development occur during the early years of childhood. This is the time when integrated learning takes place in which a child uses the sense of touch, smell, sight, sound, and taste to form perceptions of the world while also making necessary connections and relationships with what is perceived. While integrated learning naturally occurs, it is necessary for adults to contribute to this process. One mode that can be used to enhance integrated learning is through art. “Art must be acknowledged as basic to individual development and must, therefore, be taught effectively beginning in the early years” (Lasky & Mukerji, 1980, p.2).

It is through this mode of learning that the child often utilizes scribbling, drawing, block building, and clay modelling in order to make concrete statements about the world. Such activities come naturally to the child and satisfy his curiosity.

“He need not be urged to try them or shown how they are done. He seems to discover them for himself and to derive pleasure from carrying them out” (Lewis, 1977, p.5).
Not only do art activities offer pleasurable experiences for children, they also nurture motor, effective, perceptual, cognitive, and aesthetic development (Lewis, 1977; Young, 1977). All of these are essential to prepare children for learning in school.

Clare Cherry (1972) asserts that art activities in the early years can enhance the child's general overall development. If given ample time to progress from one phase of development to another at his own pace, self esteem and self confidence can be nurtured.

Yet, despite the benefits, the public school art teacher is often placed in jeopardy due to the lack of art supplies; the trimming off of extra classes from the curriculum such as the kindergarten due to the insufficient hours in a school day; the absence of funds; the dearth of extra art teachers to carry the load; and budget cuts that lead to the exclusion of art education altogether from the school curriculum.

"What makes these conditions demoralizing for teachers of the arts is not just the inherent difficulty of providing a sound educational program; it is being placed in a position of maintaining the pretence of doing so in the absence of proper support" (Chapman, 1982,p.12).

Clearly, art teachers need more than supplies; they need the support of powerful advocates who are likely to be listened to by others. According to the Minnesota Alliance for the Arts (1983), the essence of advocacy is,

"...reaching the decision makers with as much clout as possible. It means establishing a power base, getting people on our side, and tapping their resources" (1983,p.3).
Parent groups might carry such clout. In the past, they have have been responsible for many of the necessary revisions to the public school curriculum. Pressure from such groups has the potential to change the often demeaning status of art in the public schools. But, are there parents who appreciate art education? Are there means to identify these parents? A review of the literature reveals a dearth of information on this subject.

Many art advocates make note of the importance of soliciting parents to support art education. Suggestions are often made as to how this may be accomplished, e.g., radio and television announcements (Chapman, 1982) and educational workshops for kindergarten parents (Cherry, 1972; Lasky, 1980). Yet, little research can be found where such programs have actually been developed and assessed for their effectiveness.

While the previously mentioned advocacy approaches suggest means for changing values and attitudes of parents, they do not mention how initial attitudes and values would be assessed. Research to determine the basis for attitudes of parents and their effects on determining the status of art education needs to be conducted before strategy building can take place. Lacking such information, any form of solicitation or persuasive communication might well prove ineffectual. Therefore, there is a need for an instrument to initially determine the nature of these attitudes and values that can ultimately determine who these parent advocates are. This would simplify the advocate's task as persuasive messages could be tailored toward this particular parent group. This group could, in turn, serve as potential advocates to solicit other parents
who lack art advocacy characteristics. In other words, values and attitudes should be assessed before programs are developed to achieve maximum effects in the area of advocacy.

Rokeach (1980) and Fishbein (1980) both have indicated that values and attitudes respectively determine overt actions and intentions to act. In addition to these factors, Fishbein also considers beliefs. Bearing this in mind, potential parent supporters can be identified through the examination of their values, which manifest themselves in their attitudes and beliefs. These variables, in turn, could be the operational predictors of art advocacy intentions.

Additional demographic variables may also be related to the aforementioned variables. Demographic variables that need to be explored in relation to advocacy intentions include: gender of the parent; socio-economic status; art education background; and gender of the kindergarten child. All of these factors, while only peripheral to the problem at hand, could play a major role in affecting overall values embraced by parents, which in turn affect attitudes and beliefs toward art education advocacy intentions.

What is of further interest here, is how these variables interact or affect one another. While Fishbein is a firm believer that attitudes affect intentions to behave in certain ways, Rokeach (1980) argues that it is values that are ultimately the major determinants of overt actions, not attitudes. Fishbein (1980) also notes that demographic variables are only indirectly related to attitudes, while being more directly related to beliefs. Therefore, these factors are peripheral in nature. Within art
education, there has been a lack of effort directed toward the consideration of all of these variables (i.e., demographic, values, beliefs, and attitudes) and how they interact with one another as well as how they affect intentions to behave.

In essence then, the preceding account suggests that art education is often overlooked in early childhood and needs the support of parents as viable advocates. In order that these parents can be identified, there needs to be an assessment of their values, attitudes, beliefs and intentions, as well as the relationship among these variables. Other demographic factors that may be active in an advocacy situation must be examined as well in terms of how they may be related to values, attitudes, beliefs, and intentions. Once this information is gathered, it might serve as a feasible means of understanding and identifying those parents who choose to advocate or not to advocate art education. Such information would be most helpful in initiating an advocacy campaign for those children who are entering the public school for the first time - at the kindergarten level.
The Importance of Art Education

In essence, art serves as a mirror to reflect who we are. It is one of the means by which we document our existence in this world. Through art, we can gain insight into the customs, culture, and political climate of past and present societies. For what is created through art is indicative of human states of mind and value systems. Art objects (including paintings, as well as sculpture, pottery, glassware, architecture, textiles, etc.) are an extension of ourselves and what we feel about our environment. How we feel and the values we hold, manifest themselves in the material chosen, as well as the graphic symbols used to convey a message via the art object.

Thus, art gives form to the human experience and is communicated to others through a visual rather than a verbal mode. This avenue of communication allows a person to think in terms of images as well as words, consequently expanding his perception of the environment.

This multi-faceted view of the importance of art in education is held by many current art theorists and educators such as McFee (1977), Chapman (1978), and Chalmers (1981). All would further agree that it is the visual arts that determine the quality of our environment. Many of
our simple everyday decisions are aesthetic ones based on our own personal artistic awareness. We make such decisions when we choose our wardrobe for the day, the appropriate hairstyle to wear, the kind of car we want to drive, the type of house we wish to dwell in, the kind of dinnerware we like to eat from, and many more of such daily encounters. "Such choices make visual statements about who we are and the kind of world we like to see around us" (Preble, 1985, p.26).

These important choices that we make are influenced by the way we perceive our world, which in turn determines how we live. "Developing awareness and becoming personally involved in shaping our surroundings can lead to an improved quality of life" (Preble, 1985, p.8).

This improved quality of life makes life worthwhile and will manifest itself in our children's lives as well. Consequently, one avenue of nurturance for these vital aesthetic decisions is through art education offered in the public school curriculum in order to sustain aesthetic judgments and choices, while teaching children to use visual as well as verbal modes of communication. This kind of learning should be initiated in the kindergarten.

Yet, this form of learning is so often neglected in the public schools, thus shortchanging our children of a richer learning experience. What develops into a paradoxical situation is that children naturally communicate through graphic images, especially at the kindergarten level. Thoughts and ideas are expressed in their drawings long before they develop the conventional means of expression through words (Young, 1977).
Although many of these renderings are unrecognizable to adult observers, it is these younger children that engage in graphic renderings who create meaning for themselves about their environment. Just as ancient cultures have recorded their past and present perceptions of the world in visual terms, so too, the art products of today's young children provide a visual record of past experiences and act as a springboard for new learnings. Such activities provide the child with opportunities to expand and invent new symbols similar to those that they will utilize in reading, writing, and mathematics. It is a way "...of recording his impressions, his questions or of supporting and clarifying his subjective feelings and nonverbal ideas about his family, his friends, his security and insecurity and himself" (Young, 1977, p.79). As these experiences are expressed in original visual symbols, the child is thereby increasing his potential to communicate in another mode.

Dennis Wolf (1983) further adds that art activities can provide children with aesthetic experiences by exercising their imagination; teaching them to be original thinkers; and as already noted, helping them to be more aware of their environment. Through art activities, the child also engages in the planning process, the execution of the art piece and its refinement. He too learns to be critical of his own work and benefits from mistakes made in the process. These are important skills that can be translated into other areas throughout one's life.

Art can also provide the young child with a cultural awareness. That is to say, tastes and values reflected in art objects from various
cultures serve as aids to show children the different ways people perceive their world.

The contribution that art education offers can be categorized into three major components: producing art; appreciating art; and evaluating art (Chapman, 1978). Producing art provides children with opportunities to heighten their perceptual powers by attending to the diversity and variety in the visual world. Children come to terms with their environment by documenting ideas and emotions in a tangible form. The product is less important to the young child, while the process of making art utilizes problem solving skills and the ability to make discriminating choices.

In appreciating art, children learn about previous as well as present cultures and societies and shares to some degree their visions of the world. Through comparisons of present and past art forms, they gain an understanding of how humans have coped with their environment. This can assist them in studying the alternatives of coming to terms with the present environment. Art appreciation can provide an added dimension to the learning of history as children note artist's responses to major happenings as reflected in their art work. An example is the architect's solution to the overcrowded city by designing the skyscraper.

A well rounded education in art also provides the dimension of evaluation. Through this component, children develop criteria for judging a work of art. This requires critical thinking skills as children examines various avenues to defend his judgements.
These three components of art education provide children with some of the necessary skills to function as adults in our society. It is not that art educators wish to produce artists, but more importantly, to make adults who will assume more responsibility for making decisions to modify our environment when the need arises. No time in the history of human existence has there been so many problems threatening our very existence (Preble, 1985). These problems urgently demand solutions that can come only from resourceful and imaginative minds - minds that enjoy manipulating what is with what might be. Art education can provide such skills and therefore, children should not be shortchanged of this privilege. Art education should be provided when the child initially enters the public school system, in the kindergarten. It is here where qualified art instruction must begin and should continue throughout the child's public school career.

**Why Art Education is Lacking in the Public Schools**

Despite the inherent benefits that art education can provide, its status is a vulnerable one. For example, the national Parent Teacher Association (1984) notes that, "In a good school, the curriculum includes both core academic subjects and arts and life skill classes" (1984, p.5).

This suggests that the development of programs involving art education have been detached from those in the general public school education. And once again, the arts are on the periphery of basic education (Quinn, 1977).
In conjunction with the PTA's position, a survey conducted at the 1977 National School Boards Association Convention in Houston, respondents were asked which subjects they regarded as basic for every child. "Only one school board member in four (24%) put art on their list of basics" (NSBA, 1978, p.5).

While the NSBA panel generally supports art and recognizes that the arts are flourishing in America, they also note that, "Art education is struggling for its life" (1978, p.4). In support of this contention, the Arts, Education and Americans Panel found that,

"The fundamental temper of the country is conservative. The arts spell trouble because they encourage people to think originally, and outside conventional norms. Many parents are afraid that their children are going to think things that they can't comprehend, that they will be drawn away from the line of thinking that what they have been taught is right" (Quinn, 1977, p.53).

Similar contentions can be found in a chorus of surveys conducted by Louis Harris Associates in 1980 which revealed that, "...75% of the public have the opinion that a person does not need to study or learn about art in order to understand or enjoy art" (Chapman from Harris, 1982, p.4).

What the survey concluded is that the adult population is not completely sold on the idea that education and training is mandatory for one's future encounters with art. Although it appears that parents accept the addition of art courses as part of the regular school curriculum, the general consensus leans toward the notion that art education is a nice compliment to the curriculum, but not a basic necessity.
Further findings of the Harris survey indicated that there is general support for the belief that talent as opposed to training is more important as a factor for those who wish to produce fine art, and that anyone is capable of producing craft items without additional training. It is these basic conceptions that cause the general public (including parents) to conclude that education in art is not necessary.

Additional surveys reveal somewhat similar findings. When parents were asked which subjects should be required for those planning to go to college, art received only 24% of parental support compared to 96% who indicated mathematics to be a requirement (Gallup, 1984, p.30). This data is the result of a 1984 annual Gallup poll concerning public attitudes toward public schools. This trend has remained relatively consistent in the past three years. In 1981, art was supported as a requirement by 28% of the public, while mathematics received 94%. In 1983, art received 19% of public support, while mathematics, once again, received the highest amount of support, 92% (Gallup, 1984, p.30).

This 1984 Gallup poll also indicated that the ability to speak and write correctly was cited as one of the major goals of education. It received 68% (the highest) of public support. To develop an appreciation for and participation in the arts was ranked second to last as an important goal of education. It received only 35% of public support.

But such results are open to speculation here. One must ask, do most people feel that the arts are less important because they actually are of little importance in our society, or is it because of the way they are taught in the schools. For example, how many programs actually present
the arts as a serious form of study? It could be argued that the frill status has been earned by the lack of substantive content.

Perhaps the frill status of art has likewise resulted in the lack of financial support. For example, the average school district in America allots only two percent of its total budget to art programs, while 25 percent of the nation's school districts provide finances for a centralized art supervisor or consultant (McNealey, 1982).

The message that seems to be voiced through verbal as well as nonverbal cues is, "Art is a "frill" unworthy of being included in the regular curriculum, and hence of marginal importance in adult life" (Chapman, 1982, p.2). Unfortunately, this view could be the cause of, "Eighty percent of our nation's youth graduating from high school with little or no instruction in art" (Chapman, 1982, p.1).

In a recent report prepared by Evaluation Technologies Incorporated, 36 percent of high school students sampled had enrolled in fine arts classes before graduation (1984). And, as of 1986, 26 states require art for high school graduation (Mills & Thompson, 1986). While things continue to improve somewhat, there is still work to be done in this area. Most notably, finding out why the other 24 states do not require art for graduation.

Chapman conjectures that,

"Typical practices in our schools prevent the majority of our youth from receiving a basic education in the arts, either by restricting access to instruction so that only the most determined and talented can obtain it, or by so narrowly representing the world of art that
youngsters are ill prepared to appreciate it unless or until they go to college" (1982, p.11).

While the previous studies and speculations refer to public school art education in general, Hardiman and Johnson (1983) focus specifically on art in the elementary school. In comparing their 1981 survey results with the NEA 1963 survey assessing the condition of elementary art education in this country found that,

"Of the overwhelming majority of art instruction, about 90% was provided by regular classroom teachers with little or no training in art. Districts responding to the 1981 survey reported that only 25% of the art instruction at this level was provided by art teachers" (1983, p.24).

Conditions have improved somewhat at the elementary level. As of 1986, a ten percent increase where 35% of art instruction was provided by art specialists, while 61% was provided by the classroom teacher (Mills & Thompson, 1986). It is likewise common practice in the kindergarten for the classroom teacher to assume the responsibility for teaching art. Consequently, Hardiman and Johnson caution that the commitment made by elementary schools toward art education has been very limited. Therefore, if progress is measured by the addition of professional art teachers to each elementary school, then we have stood still.

Addressing this same issue, Chapman (1982) notes that,

"Early and continuous education during the elementary years is just as vital in art as in any other subject. However, it is during these years that many youngsters receive poor art instruction which impairs the growth of their interest, knowledge, and skill in art" (p.52).
Chapman (1982) further stresses that,

"...the quality of instruction must be questioned, for in two thirds of our elementary schools, art is taught for less than an hour per week, and in about 40% of the schools the principal will admit that no objectives or curriculum for art have been identified...specialist art teachers are employed in some (35%) of our elementary schools, but few have been given a teaching schedule that permits anything more than "instant" art instruction for large numbers of children. Art teachers may be assigned to teach 500 to 1,500 youngsters. A typical class schedule only permits children to have about one art lesson every other week, or about 15 lessons per year" (p.53).

In accordance, the National Art Education Association recommends that art be taught by a specialist, with each child receiving a minimum of 100 minutes per week in a specially equipped art room, plus supplementary experiences in the regular classroom. This includes the kindergarten as well.

Despite the seemingly unpopular nature of art in public school education, other surveys by Harris have uncovered additional information that provides a glimmer of hope. It was found that a segment of the adult population (the cultural elite) who support art, are the ones who took art appreciation in college; attended museums often when young; and had teachers who stimulated an interest in art (Chapman from Harris, 1982, p.172). "Their confidence in art had been cultivated both through formal and through a social climate that encouraged them to study art" (Chapman, 1982, p.3).
While it is these elitists who favor children participating in art activities, they do not see the public school as the agent to provide this opportunity. Instead, they look to private enterprises to provide these experiences. Thus, a paradoxical situation develops. What these adults have failed to realize is how important a part art education has played in their own personal encounters with art. It can therefore be speculated that this situation exists because the public schools have failed to provide an adequate job in this area.

Although this seems a further threat to the status of art education in the school curriculum, it can actually be an advantage. Because of the importance education has played in reinforcing the participation of the cultural elite in art, this lends support to the claim that art education (as defined by the National Art Education Association) should be included in the public school curriculum so that all (and not a choice few) can have the same opportunity. "The public school is best suited for implementing the goals of art education because it reaches the largest number of individuals" (Woodward, 1978, p.82-83). Chapman(1982) and Eisner (1984) likewise recognize the task of public schools as the dispenser of art education to the masses.

The data presented thus far attests to the fact that the present and perhaps future status of art education in American schools is unsteady. While art education has had some support from spotlight figures such as Senator Edward Kennedy (1975) and Senator Strom Thurmond (1975), their well intended messages of support to include art in school get
side-tracked by the whims of the political and economic tides of the day (Mahlam, 1980).

So, while the arts appear to be flourishing in America, art education in the public schools is struggling to be noticed. Although attitudes toward art are basically positive, it does not necessarily follow that such attitudes guarantee support. It can be speculated that the cause of this perplexing phenomenon is that the perspective from which we view the assumed attitude-behavior relationship in this situation is out of focus. That is to say, it might well be that this relationship (art attitudes and support for art education) is non-existent or that it is weak, in which case the expected predictive value of art attitudes is ineffectual.

These mere speculations have blatently introduced themselves in McNealey's (1982) investigation. While he found the attitudes of principals to be generally supportive of art education, their behavioral intentions reflected an unwillingness to include art into the curriculum when other "necessary" subjects have to be omitted.

Since these administrators play an important part in determining the destiny of art education, it is they who must be persuaded to include art into the main core of the public school curriculum. Until this is done, the problem is likely to persist.

In concurrence with this, Laura Chapman (1982) notes that, "...many of the attitudes that cause art to be neglected in our schools are reinforced within the educational establishment - in college departments where teachers are trained, where the leadership is prepared for school administration, curriculum design, research, and
teacher education. It is here where the trouble begins for arts education. It begins when knowledge about the role of art in human experience is virtually ignored in the training of public school administrators and other educational leaders; neither are classroom teachers and art teachers as well trained as they should be" (p.10).

But, perhaps scrutinizing the problem even further, some answers may become more apparent. A brief look at history suggests the low status of art comes from adult’s past experiences in their own school days, where the importance of reading, writing, and math were stressed. Art was given little time in school then, and when it was taught, it was a time of fun and relaxation (Doerr, 1980). This supports the claim made earlier that art is often thought of as relaxation. Most of today’s parents received their elementary education in the 1950’s and 1960’s. Art education in those eras emphasized the “free expression” of the child and experimentation with art materials (Saunders, 1971). Art behavior was characterized by novelty of response (Lanier, 1981). Perhaps too many of these children were left to wallow in an unrestrained atmosphere when they really needed some guidance. Situations such as these have left their stigma which has failed to disappear. Perhaps it is these past situations that have left their scars on the complexion of art education. And thus, it is that which must be contended with today.

As these past students have matured into the parents of today, they demand a quality education for their own children, similar to the one they had when they were students. Since art was a form of relaxation then, they expect it to be today. Therefore, problems encountered by art education become a vicious cycle that eventually develops into conventions (McNealey, 1982). As a result, today’s parents, including
administrators still continue to place little value on art.

But, probing the problem even deeper, it may clarify matters to identify the components that serve as a foundation for these prevailing attitudes. Values underpin attitudes (Bem, 1970; Rokeach, 1973). Although values tend to be more broad based, attitudes are more specific. Both attitudes and values are evaluative in nature, but again their differences lie in their specificity. It is values, while being very broadbased in nature, that influence attitudes. And, it is attitudes that influence intentions to behave.

The precursors of values range from cultural to psychological. While the consensus seems to be that values stem from culture, Morris (1956) has also recognized the importance of biology and ecology. Pepper (1959) has referred to these antecedents as well. While the other theorists have alluded to these determinants, their emphasis has been placed on cultural influences (Rokeach, 1973; Bem, 1970; Kluckhohn, 1952).

These authors would further agree that values are learned. It is not something that one is inherently born with, but acquires through daily life encounters with people and events. It is attitudes that are likewise learned through actual experiences with an object, person or event, or by way of the actions or spoken words of someone that is respected (Bem, 1970).

While attitudes and values concerning a particular subject may vary for each individual because of differing experiences, the previous review suggests that there are relationships between these two factors. Such relationships have been further discussed by theorists who tend to agree
that there is an action commitment as a result of values and attitudes (Bem, 1970; Rokeach, 1973; Kluckhohn, 1952; Handy, 1969). In reference to attitudes toward art education by present day parents, their past encounters with art in the public school (direct experience) seem to have determined their prevailing attitudes toward art education today. But values, although more general in nature, seem to have been affected as well. If this is the case, then the prevalent lack of support for art education (an action) is ultimately a result of values, which in turn affect attitudes.

While it appears that today's parents seem to be operating within this framework concerning the status of art education, those in control of public school education likewise do so. But, many of these administrators are now parents as well. What is unfortunate is that these educational controllers hold the position to perpetuate these traditional values, attitudes and beliefs, which further reinforces the low status of art in education. In reference to this situation, Seymour Yesner, consultant for English and Humanities in the Minneapolis public schools, notes that,

"The possessors of power within the school structure typify the values and background of the servants of industry who regard the schools as training grounds not for the rich, sensitive life, but for the workaday world. As long as the educational establishment and the public it serves persist in clinging to the belief that the arts are not basic, this problem will continue" (Quinn, 1977, p. 163).
What Can Be Done to Improve the Position of Art Education

Despite the uncomfortable situation in which the field presently finds itself, advocacy appears to have the potential of becoming a means to improve the fortunes of art education. McNealey (1982) defines art advocacy as, "The process of using information and persuasion in support of the arts in education" (p.2).

The Minnesota Alliance for the Arts notes advocacy to be:

"Reaching the decision makers with as much clout as possible. It means establishing a power base, getting people on our side, and tapping their resources" (1980, p.3).

Art advocates have wrongly alluded to the contention that if information is provided to the public about art education, it will result in attitudinal changes toward the field. "The implication is that favorable dispositions toward art education will translate into positive action relative to it" (McNealey, 1982, p.10).

But much depends on what the public is actually told. If messages focus on the wrong attitude object, then attitudes will not be swayed. And furthermore, Fishbein asserts that a favorable attitude toward an object, in this case art education, does not necessarily result in a positive action toward it. Studies by Fishbein (1982) have indicated that attitudes only directed toward a specific behavior are predicting factors in resulting overt acts or behavior.

While advocacy for art education is almost non-existent, persons who do advocate art education have directed their persuasive communications toward elected and appointed officials in education, as well as in the
government. Those who lead the advocates are usually members of art education associations and subsidiary groups. Thus far, these voices have failed to be heard. It can be conjectured that such failures are most likely due to the discord between attitudes and the attitude object as previously noted by Fishbein. That is to say, these persuasive messages are addressed toward changing attitudes toward art education instead of attitudes toward supporting art education. Therefore, instead of awakening the citizens and administrators of school districts to the fact that art is an important part of the curriculum menu that needs support, it appears that the way art educators have manipulated the volume and intensity of their advocacy tune has lulled many to sleep.

In addition to the mis-alignment between attitudes and the attitude object, McNealey (1982) claims that the failure of advocacy can be attributed to a lack of several other additional factors: (1) research on the relationship of attitudes and behavior toward art; (2) an organized system for generating claims of the art professions; (3) a workable advocacy model; (4) community support for art education; and (5) professional advocates.

Hatfield (1983) sees additional weaknesses. He claims that advocacy has failed due to unclear objectives.

"If art educators do not have a clear idea of what they want, it will be three times as difficult to communicate their objectives to others. Success is dependent upon a central sense of direction, clear objectives and priorities that are realistic" (p.62).

Hatfield likewise notes that art advocacy groups neglect to give attention to planning and to the use of appropriate techniques. "Many
groups fail because they do nothing rather than because they do something wrong" (p.63).

He further contends that the failure of these groups is due to the utilization of people in the wrong way. "People with particular skills should be matched with the skills needed for a particular task" (p.63).

To remedy the situation, other avenues of advocacy have been proposed. For example, Laura Chapman (1982), suggests that a change in attitude toward art education can be brought about by reforming the curriculum and soliciting qualified as well as quality full-time art teachers. John Goodlad (1977) emphasizes that,

"...improvement can come only if an attack is made simultaneously on three levels: first, achieving commitment from lay citizens; second, establishing the arts as central within the local school; and third, winning acceptance of the arts by teachers and administrators, including their acquiring the skills necessary to carry out a comprehensive arts program" (Quinn, 1977, p.216).

Similarly, Kathryn Bloom, director of the Arts in Education program of the JDR 3rd Fund, suggests that,

"...for the majority of people, active involvement in the arts has not been a significant part of their education. If the role of the arts is to be changed, educational decision makers must have a rationale that explains not only the value of the arts for their own sake, but equally important, how these subjects can meet broad educational goals" (Quinn, 1977, p.212).

Other art advocacy plans also make note of the importance of soliciting parents to support art education. Suggestions are often made as to how this may be accomplished, i.e., radio and television announcements (Chapman, 1982), and educational workshops for
kindergarten parents (Cherry, 1972; Lasky, 1980). Yet, little research can be found where such plans have been developed, or in assessing the effectiveness of such plans.

It is evident that attitudes must be changed and new advocacy avenues cannot be suggested until these attitudes and underlying beliefs and values have been assessed. Yet, the previous suggestions seem to skirt this issue.

Although Goodlad (1977) has suggested that we need to solicit support for our cause from citizens and teachers, he does not offer a strategy as to how this is to be accomplished. Bloom (1977) likewise offers no viable means of changing decision maker's attitudes. While she suggests that a rationale in support of the arts must be directed to these persons, the message presented will be ineffectual if it is not directed toward those underlying beliefs and values that are manifested in the attitudes of decision makers (Fishbein, 1982).

While Hatfield (1983) suggests that we must look at beliefs and attitudes, he fails to recognize the importance of identifying the specific relationship between attitudes and the attitude object as Fishbein does. Therefore, attitudes toward art education or art will not tell us if citizens will support art, but assessing attitudes toward supporting art education will provide art educators with viable information to utilize. Like Goodlad, the importance of soliciting the support of the public to serve as advocates is recognized by Andrew Heiskell (1984) chairperson of the President's Committee on the Arts and the Humanities. He states that, "The leadership and active involvement of
the private sector is critical to achieving these goals" (p.2).

This involvement can be achieved by appropriately assessing attitudes of this private sector toward advocacy for the arts. This private sector includes parents of children who are of school age. As already indicated by previous studies, parents are not immune to the prevailing attitudes toward the status of art education. And likewise, parents as a group are subjected to attitude trends as much as anyone else; their values are not always consistent and could just as well work against art programs as for them. Parents pushed for school reform in one decade and back to basics in another. Yet, nevertheless, once parents underlying beliefs toward art education have been tapped they can be persuaded to serve as a viable support group.

A study done by Thomas Wolfe in 1984 indicated that parental involvement was conducive to the survival of the art program. In addition, data from this study indicated that,

"A strong connection existed between parental support and overall excellence. Parents can be a decisive factor if they believe a program is important, their children perform better, and the institution takes notice" (p.36).

There is further support in the literature that recognizes the importance parents play in determining the status of art education in the schools. Laura Chapman (1982) states:

"Parents and other support groups in the community have a role to play in assisting art teachers not only by finding out what children are being taught and why, but by influencing school policies" (p.153).

embrace similar views. Elaine Stienkemeyer (1984) and Thomas (1980) are sympathetic with this view as well.

There is support for parent involvement at the government level as well. In the Summer of 1984, the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate had approved a resolution in support of art in education. “We recognize the important contribution of the arts to a complete education and urge all citizens to support efforts which strengthen artistic training and appreciation within our nation’s schools” (98th Congress from AEA Communique, 1984, p.3).

President Reagan, who recently told the National Forum on Excellence in Education, likewise recognizes that, "Americans must restore to parents and state and local governments their rightful place in the educational process as decision makers on matters such as school discipline, curriculum, and academic standards” (Stienkemeyer, 1984, p.3).

The governing bodies of each school system, including school boards, administrative staff, and principals, play an important and decisive part in determining the content of general education and the status of art in the curriculum. "But also, these (administrative bodies) are governed by policy-making processes which provide opportunities for citizen participation” (Quinn & Hanks, 1977, p.236-9). It can therefore be gleaned from the previous passage that school boards and administration owe allegiance directly to the citizens (including parents) rather than the local government. "And in fact many school boards do respond to the people, expediting their preferences and demands” (Quinn & Hanks, 1977,
p.245). In accordance with this position, Wolfe (1983) notes that school boards are accountable to parents and other voters and must be sensitive to public opinion. In a 1984 Gallop poll, it was indicated that parents and school boards should have the greatest influence in deciding what is taught in the public schools. Teachers, students, state and federal government should have little to say in the matter.

Pressure by parents of school children toward the administrative bodies of the public school have often brought about change. Such a change was brought about by Public Law 94-142 which requires individualized education programs tailored to the needs of special education students (Berger, 1981). Such a law was passed due to enormous parental pressure. Pressure by parents also changed the requirement of black children conforming to standard English language to a greater use of ghetto grammar (Zaltman, Florio, and Sikorski, 1977).

The PTA has likewise been an effective support group for education on the local and national level. One of the functions of the PTA is to serve as advocates for children and education. Contacts with officials or school administrators are made in order to promote specific programs requesting change. Meeting with neighbors and community groups to rally support for programs is also an essential duty of the PTA.

But, the past is also witness to how strong a voice parents have had in demanding change in education.

"the demands that the destitute Jewish immigrants made on New York City's schools in the first quarter of the century have been described often. What is rarely realized is that these demands transformed what, before 1890 or 1900, had been a lackluster or even inferior
school system into the educational pressure cooker described so vividly in the memories of the New York Jewish Writers" (Drucker, July 19, 1983 p.26).

Similar pressures from parents had been placed on schools in Iowa and Minnesota as well.

Stress on quality education has ebbed in the past fifty years as it did not bring the materialistic gratification to one's life as anticipated.

"...the blue collar worker saw that his son who worked as a machine operator in a glass plant, earned just as much as the youngest son who graduated from the state university and earned it a good deal sooner" (Drucker, July 19, 1983, p.26).

Yet, once again, the times are subject to mercurial changes as we now embark on an age of new technologies. This will inevitably mean that, "...productivity will increasingly be determined by the knowledge and skill workers put into their task" (Drucker, July 19, 1983, p. 26).

American parents are once again demanding changes in the public school that include stricter standards, more "basics" in the curriculum, an extended school day and increased salaries that will attract "quality" teachers. These reports are based on observations in the classroom, as well as interviews with school personnel (Ordovensky, September 13, 1983, p.2A).

As parents grow more and more concerned that their children receive a quality education, the times are fertile for the seeds of art advocacy to be planted. The seedlings can take root with parents of children who are school age. But in particular, with parents of kindergarten children. A report recently released by the U.S. Bureau of the Census shows that,
"A wave of preschoolers is heading toward the elementary grades. Although elementary school enrollment is still declining - 27.2 million elementary students in 1983 compared to 27.4 in 1982 - the telling statistic is the one year growth of 330,000 four to five year olds who will be next year's kindergarteners and first graders" (Clancy, 1984, p.1-2D).

Therefore, the logical place to instill such parental support for art education is when the child first becomes ensconced into the public school system - in the kindergarten. Early childhood experiences are important for the acquisition of cultural values. "Art experiences which begin in early childhood will contribute to the individual's understanding of the visual aspect of his environment, and they should lead to a desire on his part to improve and protect them" (Herberholz & Hanson, 1985, p.5-6). A recent investigation by Clive (1983) also stresses the importance of art experiences in early childhood.

If art education in early childhood is so important to the child, then the inclusion of art in the school curriculum at this level is vital to future growth and development. In order to make sure that art education is given equal status in the public school curriculum, parents can serve as a viable support group.

Since advocacy messages voiced by a chorus of persons instead of a solo performance is potentially more effective, it is this large group of kindergarten parents who can serve as possible supporters of art education not only in the kindergarten, but throughout their children's public school careers as well. It is this group that also has the potential
of altering those parental attitudes that are not supportive of art education.

Yet, despite the promise that parental advocates hold for art education, it is such a group that is virtually non-existent in our American schools, especially at the kindergarten level. It is such a group that could demand the inclusion of quality art education in the curriculum (Chapman, 1982). It can be speculated that the seemingly non-compliant attitudes exhibited by parents of the school community may and do influence the status of art in the public school. And, as has already been noted, modifications to the public school curriculum have already been made due to parental pressure.

But, research to determine the basis for attitudes of parents and their effects on the status of kindergarten art education needs to be conducted before any strategy building toward advocacy takes place. Lacking such information, it would seem that any form of persuasive communication could be ineffectual. Therefore, there is a need for an instrument to initially determine what these attitudes and values are. This information would be beneficial in tailoring persuasive messages to this particular group. Once these parents are swayed into becoming advocates for art education, this group could in turn solicit other parents. In other words, values and attitudes should be assessed before programs are developed to achieve maximum effects in the area of art advocacy.
One traditional theory in changing attitudes emphasizes the meaning that the persuasive communication has for the subject. Asch (1948) suggests that the actual meaning of a statement is determined by who says it. In applying this theory to the use of parents as art advocates, Tom Hatfield (1983) has indicated:

"Even when art educators are successful, a high degree of information about art education does not guarantee parental attitudes will be favorable. Parents get most of their information about schools from their fellow citizens" (p.125).

Marburger (1980) follows suit by noting that "While the local newspaper is still considered the best single source of information about the schools, 98% of the parents with children in public schools named word of mouth and personal involvement as the best sources of information" (p.13). These citizens unknowingly serve as advocates for or against educational practices in the school system. If this is the case, kindergarten parent advocates hold a strategic position in soliciting those parents who stubbornly cling to neutral or negative attitudes and values toward art education. In addition, this group can persuade administrative bodies to change the status of art as part of public school curriculum. Instead of the art teacher standing alone for a cause, a parent group can provide much needed clout. It is pertinent to reiterate the meaning of advocacy here:

"As soon as several of the inhabitants of the United States have taken up an opinion or feeling which they wish to promote in the world, they look around for mutual assistance and as soon as they have found each
other out they combine. From that moment, they are no longer isolated men but a power from afar whose actions serve for an example and whose language is listened to" (Burton from Tocqueville, 1975, p.34).

The Exploration of Values, Attitudes and Beliefs

As previously noted, attitudes, values and beliefs must be assessed in order to identify those parents who are most likely to serve as art advocates. These same variables will likewise give us a clearer picture as to why parents are neutral or do not intend to serve as advocates. While there are many theorists who have examined various combinations of these factors, three of them are very pertinent to this investigation: Fishbein, Ajzen, and Rokeach. Fishbein and Ajzen have developed a "Theory of Reasoned Action" (1980).

The theorists make the assumption that persons are rational and systematic in the use of information made available to them. In other words, it is argued that the implications of actions are contemplated prior to the decision to partake or not to partake in a specific behavior.

In order that one might predict and understand the behavior of an individual, the behavior of interest must be initially determined and measured. Once this task is accomplished, the determinants of the behavior need to be identified. While previous theorists have asserted that attitudes are reliable predictors of behaviors, Fishbein and Ajzen (1980) have stringently examined this variable and argue that a relationship between attitude and behavior can exist only as long as the behavior in question is consistent with the stated attitude. Instead, what
does immediately precede behavior is intention. An individual's intention not to perform or to perform a behavior serves as an immediate determinant of the action. Therefore, intention to behave is a vital component of their predictive model.

The theory proceeds to go a step further in predicting the determinants of intentions to behave. These are comprised of: a person's attitude toward a behavior (a judgment specifying that he is in favor of or not in favor of performing the behavior); and subjective norm (a person's perception of the social pressures put on him to perform or not to perform the behavior). In order to establish which of these components is stronger in determining intention to behave in a specified manner, the relative weights of the attitudinal and normative factors must also be specified.

In addressing the attitude component, Fishbein and Ajzen have stressed that if the behavior is general, then the attitude toward the behavior must be stated in general terms as well. If the behavior is specific, then the stated attitude toward the behavior must also be specific. Consistency is a pertinent ingredient of the attitude-behavior relationship. In order to strengthen this relationship, Fishbein and Ajzen further stress that attitude and behavior statements must include consistently specific action, target, context, and time elements. That is to say, if one is interested in the intentions of a person to vote in the November election of this year, then the attitude statement toward this
behavior must be stated in exactly those terms to achieve a consistent relationship.

The theory continues to investigate the underpinnings of attitudes and subjective norms. Underlying attitudes are behavioral beliefs (beliefs that performing a given behavior will lead to positive or negative outcomes). Subjective norms are a function of normative beliefs (beliefs that specific individuals think one should or should not perform the behavior in question.

All of these components play a part in determining intentions to behave in a specified manner. According to Fishbein and Ajzen, values are considered to be external variables and only indirectly affect behavior. That is to say that in this case, the extraneous variables (values), while not influencing intentions to behave directly, can directly influence salient beliefs and salient normative beliefs. Values that do influence any one of these components could, in turn, influence intentions and behavior.

The relationship of the various facets of the model (diagrammed in Figure 1 below) has been demonstrated across a diverse range of behavioral areas. Validity was supported with regard to voting in U.S. elections (Fishbein, Ajzen and Hinkle, 1976), altruistic behavior (Pomazal & Jaccard, 1976), family planning (Davidson & Jaccard, 1975), and donating blood (Burnkrant & Page, 1982). McNealey (1982) has likewise concluded from his investigation that the Fishbein Behavioral Intentions Model is a viable research tool for art education advocacy, as he explored
the beliefs, attitudes and intentions of principals to include art in the public school curriculum.

FISHBEIN BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS MODEL (Fishbein, 1980)

Figure 1

The Relationship of Demographic Variables to Values

In addition to the previous mentioned variables, demographic factors were examined in order to monitor their affects on values, attitudes and beliefs. The demographic variables examined here include:
socio-economic status; sex of parent; sex of kindergarten child; and art education background. These particular variables were found to influence values in various investigations (Rokeach, 1980, 1973; Kohn, 1969; Beech, 1973; and Getzels & Csikszentmihalyi, 1962). Therefore, this is why they were chosen for further examination in the present investigation.

The Relationship of Attitudes Toward Art and Art Advocacy Intentions

Art attitudes in general and their relationship to intentions toward advocating kindergarten art education was likewise investigated. However, this variable will not be included in the proposed model. While it is of interest, it is only a variable that is of moderate consideration for this investigation.

As noted previously, the Fishbein theory posits that attitudes toward the object (in this case, kindergarten art education) are ineffective predictors of behavior (in this case, art education advocacy). It is intentions to behave that is the immediate precursor of behavioral acts. Therefore, one of the purposes of this investigation is to test this theory in the kindergarten art advocacy arena. Attitudes toward kindergarten art education versus attitudes toward advocating kindergarten art education will be examined in terms of which of these two variables is the better predictor of intentions.
The Problem Statement

The marketing arena utilizes various strategies to modify attitudes in order to influence purchasing behavior. The basic principle underlying such strategies is that information bolstering attitudes is utilized in advertising campaigns in order to change attitudes, which in turn alter purchasing behavior. The content of these oral and written communications, as well as who should deliver such advertising campaigns is determined by information underlying attitudes.

Utilizing such a strategy in the art advocacy arena has shown some promise in the recent research executed by McNealey (1982) who sought to understand the attitudes that decision makers (high school principals) bring to bear on the arts in the public high schools. He found that principals are basically neutral when faced with the decision to include art when other subjects have to be dropped from the curriculum. Other findings show that attitudes toward including art in the curriculum correlate stronger with behavioral intentions than with attitudes toward art education. These findings lend support for the need to further examine the use of McNealey's strategy in other realms of art advocacy in public school education.

While previous studies have alluded to the weak relationship between attitudes and behavior (Deutscher in King, 1975; Wicker, 1969), Fishbein (1980) has purported that the lack of a relationship between attitude and behavior was due to the fact that attitude is often measured toward the wrong stimulus and that the particular behavior under investigation may
be unrelated to attitude. What is important, notes Fishbein, is that the action, the target of the action, the context of the action, and the time of the action are the entities that must correspond in the attitude and behavior measurements.

Upon developing the Behavioral Intentions Model (1980), Fishbein took these components into consideration while also utilizing a more specific attitude measure, attitude toward performing a specific act rather than a general attitude toward an object. A normative component is likewise added. The following multiple regression equation expresses the Fishbein Behavioral Intentions Model in algebraic terms:

\[ B^{*}B_I = A_{act}w_1 + SNw_2 \]

\[ \text{EQUATION 1 (Fishbein, 1980)} \]

Where:
- \( B \) = behavior
- \( B_I \) = behavior intention
- \( A_{act} \) = attitude toward the act
- \( SN \) = subjective norm
- \( w_1 \) = beta weight
- \( w_2 \) = beta weight

The model can also be represented schematically.
The sum of beliefs about outcomes times the evaluation of those outcomes.

\[ A_{act} = B_{l} \times B \]

Perception of references beliefs times the motivation to comply.

**BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS MODEL (Fishbein, 1980)**

The Behavioral Intentions Model has been tested in various arenas and there is evidence of its validity (King, 1975; Wilson, Mathews & Harvey, 1975; Sperber, Fishbein & Ajzen, 1980; Schwartz & Tessler, 1972; Lutz, 1975; Davidson & Jaccard, 1975; Fishbein, Ajzen & Hinkle, 1976; Pomazal & Jaccard, 1976). The model, with the inclusion of external variables, was also tested and found to be valid. However, the external variables did little to improve the prediction of intention, in this case voting behavior (Fishbein, Ajzen & McArdle, 1980).

Because the model has addressed a wide variety of issues, including high school art advocacy, it was believed that the model, with the inclusion of external variables, can also be utilized in a kindergarten art
advocacy situation. Despite the failure of external variables to provide adequate information in the study previously noted, it was believed that the inclusion of such variables would provide very useful information in the art advocacy arena. Therefore, the fundamental question to be answered in this research study is whether or not the Fishbein Behavioral Intentions Model, with the inclusion of external variables (sex of parent, sex of child, socio-economic status, art education background, and values), is a feasible tool to be utilized in attitude behavior research in kindergarten art advocacy. Other research questions include the following:

1.) Does the Fishbein Model predict beliefs which underlie attitudes toward performing specific advocacy acts regarding art education?

The following hypotheses will be tested with regard to kindergarten parents performing each of these specific advocacy behaviors (petition the neighborhood, provide research material, write a letter to the school board, and write a letter to the principal):

1.) The linear combination of parent's attitudes toward performing an advocacy activity (AA) and their subjective norm regarding the act (SN) will predict their behavioral intention regarding the act (BI).

2.) Attitude toward the act does significantly effect behavioral intention.

3.) Subjective norm does significantly effect behavioral intention.

4.) There will be a significant positive correlation between attitude toward the act and behavioral intention.
5.) There will be a significant positive correlation between subjective norm and behavioral intention.

6.) Attitude toward the act provides a stronger relationship with behavioral intention than subjective norm.

7.) The sum of parent’s beliefs about outcomes accruing from performing the act times (X) the evaluation of those beliefs will correlate significantly with attitude toward kindergarten art advocacy intentions.

8.) The sum of parent’s perception of beliefs of important others regarding performance of the act times (X) the motivation to comply with those referents will correlate significantly with subjective norm.

9.) There will be a positive relationship between value rankings on the Rokeach Scale and normative beliefs as well as behavioral beliefs.

10.) There will be a positive relationship between value rankings on the Rokeach Scale and behavioral intentions.

11.) Parents of different sexes who also have kindergarten children of different sexes, varying in socio-economic status as well as art education background, will differ in their scores on behavioral beliefs and normative beliefs.

12.) The Behavioral Intentions Model will fit the data.

13.) Attitude toward the act correlates more strongly with behavioral intention than general attitudes toward kindergarten art education.
Purpose of the Study

The study was conducted to obtain two types of information (art and non-art) from parents for the purpose of understanding what may influence parents to intend or not to intend to advocate kindergarten art education.

1. Non-art information was obtained by:

a.) Using the Rokeach Value Survey (1967) to assess parental values. This instrument utilizes 36 values that were alphabetically listed. Respondents were to arrange them in order of importance as guiding principles of their life. Values that were important to kindergarten parents were determined by those that were ranked the highest.

b.) Using the Hollingshead Scale (1975) to determine socio-economic status. This two-factor index utilizes education and occupation. The factors were scaled and weighted individually, and a single score was obtained. This score indicates one's socio-economic status.

c.) Collecting demographic data in the following categories: sex of parent; sex of child; and art education background.

2. Art Information was obtained by:

a.) Developing an instrument to assess attitudes, beliefs, normative concerns, and intentions toward art advocacy according to Fishbein (1980) guidelines. This instrument is called The Kindergarten Art Advocacy Intentions Measure.

b.) The Kindergarten Art Advocacy Intentions Measure was used to collect data on attitudes, beliefs, normative concerns, and intention toward kindergarten art education advocacy.

c.) Utilizing the Art Attitude Scale (Stuckhardt & Morris, 1980). This
instrument assessed attitudes toward art education in general, and not art education advocacy.

3. Utilizing the data gathered by the Rokeach instrument, the Hollingshead scale, demographic information, the Stuckhardt and Morris (1980) instrument, and the Kindergarten Art Advocacy Intentions Measure, the major characteristics of kindergarten parents who are potential candidates for advocating art education were identified.

4. A Predictive model was tested. The components of this model include: demographic data; values; beliefs (behavioral and normative); outcome evaluations; motivations to comply; attitude toward the act; subjective norm; and Intentions to advocate kindergarten art education. These components were tested to see how they affect one another in terms of predicting advocacy intentions.

5. Testing the Fishbein theory that attitude toward the act is a better predictor of intentions than attitude toward the object.

Definition of Terms

Attitude Toward Art Education Advocacy - a subject's favorableness or unfavorableness toward kindergarten art advocacy intentions.

Attitudes toward kindergarten art advocacy intentions was reflected by scores on a bi-polar scale ranging from "good" to "bad"; "foolish" to "wise"; "pleasant" to "unpleasant". The response to each scale was scored from 1 to 6 and the sum of these scores was used as the attitude measure for art advocacy. Attitude in this case will be identified as attitude toward the act.
Attitude Toward Kindergarten Art Education - attitudes were also defined as a subject's favorableness or unfavorableness toward art education in general. These attitudes were reflected by scores on a bi-polar scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". The response to each scale was scored from 1 to 6 and the sum of these scores was used as the attitude measure toward art education. Attitude in this case was identified as attitude toward the object.

Behavioral Belief - The likelihood that performing a behavior will result in a given outcome or is associated with some other attribute. Each belief was assessed along with the strength of the belief, using scores on a bi-polar scale measuring each. Each belief score was then multiplied by the corresponding belief strength score and then summed. The sum indicates the respondents behavioral belief.

Kindergarten Art Education Advocacy Intentions - scores on a bi-polar scale that measure this variable. Those subjects responding to the "Extremely" and "Quite Likely" categories were identified as demonstrating art advocacy intentions. Those subjects responding to "extremely" and "quite unlikely" categories were considered to not have advocacy intentions. Subjects responding to "Slightly Likely" and "Unlikely" were considered to have neutral attitudes.

Normative Beliefs - a subject's belief that the referent thinks he should perform a specific behavior. Each normative belief was assessed along with motivations to comply, using scores on a bi-polar scale measuring each. Each normative belief score was multiplied by the
corresponding motivations to comply score and then summed. This sum indicates the respondents normative belief.

Parent - a person who acts as a guardian and assumes the responsibility and care of a kindergarten child. In this study, the child does not have to be the offspring of the parent.

Socio-economic Status - scores on the Hollingshead (1975) Scale stratified the accessible population of kindergarten parents into lower, lower middle, middle, upper middle, and upper class.

Subjective Norm - a person's perception that important others desire the performance or nonperformance of a specific behavior. Subjective norm was reflected by scores on a bi-polar scale ranging from "I should" to "I should not" perform kindergarten art advocacy behaviors in relation to what most people who are important to me think. The responses to this scale were scored from 1 to 6 in order to indicate a respondent's subjective norm.

Values - determined by responses to the Rokeach Value Survey (1967) where 36 values were ranked in order of importance. The values of parents were determined by those that are given the highest rank. For example, if the value, "A World of Beauty" is ranked as number one out of the 36 values, then this would be an indication that such a value was important to this particular parent.
Limitations

The researcher realized the problem of frame error and tried to alleviate the problem by purging the list of kindergarten parents to check for duplications or omissions.

The researcher realized the problem of non-response. A sample was randomly selected from the non-respondents who were asked to complete the survey instruments in a modified form. The results were then generalized to the total group of non-respondents.

The researcher had no control over the conditions of testing as each respondent operated in his or her own environment with various influences.

This study was limited to a population of kindergarten parents in the Derry Area Public Schools of Derry, Pennsylvania.

This study was limited to assessing parent's values by using the Rokeach Value Survey (1967) and the attitude-intention relationship toward kindergarten art education advocacy was assessed by using the Kindergarten Art Advocacy Intentions Measure for kindergarten parent's in the previous mentioned area. Parent's attitudes toward art education in general were also assessed in this study utilizing the Stuckhardt and Morris (1980) instrument.

This study will be limited to these demographic variables of kindergarten parents: sex of parent; sex of kindergarten child; art education background; and socioeconomic status.
Assumptions

The time interval between measurement of intention and the observation of behavior must be small to obtain high correlations.

Unanticipated behavioral consequences and/or normative expectations may lower correlations between behavior and behavioral intentions.

Execution of the intended behavior is under the volitional control of the subject.
CHAPTER II
 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The present chapter provides a review of the literature on advocacy for the purpose of distinguishing between advocacy as public relations and as political action. It then looks at the history of advocacy within the kindergarten movement during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Subsequent sections deal with instruments used by researchers to measure attitudes and behavioral intentions. They will be reviewed both to clarify the theoretical groundwork of the present study and to justify the nature of the survey instrument prepared for it.

Advocacy as Public Relations

Warwick (1972) views advocacy as public relations. In his view, art education does not hold an exalted status in the public school curriculum because, "Art teachers fail to blow their own bugle and therefore shouldn't expect applause from a tone deaf audience" (p.20). Therefore, the state of the field will remain as it is unless art educators promote their own programs. According to Warwick, failure to promote is due to lack of public relation skills.
Warwick contrasts two schools and the effectiveness of their art educators to make their presence known. The various modes of public relations includes offering workshops and lectures to the community; displaying art works in administrative offices; and writing special invitations to art shows for parents and the community.

In essence, Warwick views advocacy as exposure to the right people - those who make decisions and determine the status of art education. The art educator is seen as the advocate, while the recipient of the persuasive messages are parents and administrative bodies.

Like Warwick, Hatfield (1979) views art advocacy as public relations, but examines the strategy components more stringently. He contends that art advocacy is composed of publicity, publications, and promotion. Publicity and publication are similar in that they serve as vehicles to support awareness and understanding about art education. He stresses that while important, these two components are not always responsible for changing behavior. Publicity and publication should be strategically directed toward decision makers - namely, administrators and parents who are taxpayers as well as voters. Promotion, according to Hatfield, is "Orchestrating all school/community relations, publicity and advertising activities in a systematic way throughout the year to build support and gain visibility, create images and recognition, and encourage positive values to and in winning approval for the art program" (p. 16).
One or two exposures is not enough. It must be systematically planned throughout the year.

"Art educators must understand that publicity and advertising about art education programs do not always change behaviors or policy for art programs. That has to be done with the plan itself and the salesmanship that goes with presenting it" (p. 17).

In reference to Hatfield’s concern with the amount of exposure to a persuasive message, marketing theorists, Blackwell and Engel (1982) caution that while the repetition of a message is valuable, one must be careful of burnout (boredom or loss of attention by the receivers of the message). “The best strategy is to repeat the basic theme with variation so that the reward level can remain high” (p. 485). Hatfield has failed to recognize this in his advocacy plan as he stresses the importance of repeating a message, but does not mention variation. He summarizes his position by stating that our success will be measured by an effective communication that emphasizes the benefits of the art program and how it will meet the needs of the school system. Like Warwick suggests, this communication is once again delivered by the art educator.

Warwick and Hatfield have thus far suggested that the art teacher serve as an advocate. Upon assuming this responsibility, one of the most frequently cited modes of advocacy is the deliverance of persuasive messages in verbal or written form. According to current persuasive communication theorists, three characteristics are responsible for the impact of a persuasive message: the credibility of the source; its
attractiveness; and its power (Petty, Ostrom & Brock, 1981). It is believed that each of these characteristics is a determining factor for attitude change. The characteristic focused upon by Hatfield and Warwick is credibility.

Hass (1981) observes that,

"The credibility of the source refers both to the source's expertise on the topic and trustworthiness as a communicator - in other words, the extent to which the source is perceived to know the "correct" position on the issue and the extent to which she or he is motivated to communicate that position" (Hass, 1981, p. 143).

Research in social psychology has been consistent in finding that sources high in credibility are more persuasive than those low in these qualities (Insko, 1967; McGuire, 1969).

Applying this to the advocacy strategies of Warwick and Hatfield, the art educator is viewed as the most credible source to deliver persuasive messages concerning art education to various target groups. Yet, persuasive communication theorists also argue that consideration of the target group (those receiving persuasive messages) is just as important as the source of the message. Conforming to this theory, Hatfield (1979) in another article, suggests that the advocate (teacher) direct messages to a specific target - the principal. Various procedures to be implemented by the art teacher are: acquiring a sensitivity to the principal's schedule; being organized in order to be effective; and becoming a part of the main functioning of the school. All of these suggestions are entrenched in the public relations vein of art advocacy.
Another art advocacy strategist, Thompson (1979), in accordance with Hatfield and Warwick, views the art teacher as a public relations person as well. In her view, "The survival of art programs in these times of economic cuts depends on communities knowing that the art program is worth continued support" (p. 12). Thompson suggests the art advocate's task is to appeal to a broad audience. While including the principal and the school board members, the P.T.A. and the general community is considered as well. She notes that the best way to promote a quality program is by emphasizing student success through the display of their art work. Exhibits, she suggests, should not be confined to the school, but should include downtown areas and professional business buildings in order to increase exposure.

Con contradictory to Thompson's view, Baker (1979) criticizes the practice of exhibiting student art work, as well as the use of promotional devices such as bumper stickers, tote bags and T-shirts. He believes that these practices will not assist in modifying perceptions about the value and function of art education.

Baker aligns himself with Hatfield when he suggests that art teachers must communicate the kind and quality of their program in a clear and informed manner. These promotional statements should be supported with exemplary curriculum practices. It is this strategy, Baker notes, that will determine the level of community support.
While Baker recognizes that message content is an important tool for the advocate to utilize, noted theorists, Fishbein and Ajzen (1981) likewise claim that,

"...a message will be relatively ineffective if it includes evidence unrelated to the arguments, or arguments unrelated to the primary beliefs underlying the dependent variable...Whether one type of appeal is more or less persuasive than another will depend primarily on the content of the messages employed" (p.357).

Baker only alludes to these suggestions in his attempt to define what the art advocate's task is.

Houston (1981), another art advocacy strategist, joins Hatfield in claiming that the art advocate’s job is one of appealing to the school administrator. While Hatfield emphasizes effective communication between advocate and principal through organization, proper oratory skills and adjusting to various time frames, Houston sees another dimension. He views the successful advocate as one who attends to the self preservation needs of the administrator which includes: concerns with parental pressure; back to the basics movement; money concerns; law and order; and public confidence. If advocates can strategically sell their product while meeting these needs, then they will be successful in gaining support for art education, Houston claims.

Houston aligns himself with those persuasive communication theorists who advocate the importance of recipient characteristics. More specifically, Houston takes into account various situations or social contexts encountered by the school principal. Persuasive communication
theorists suggest that situational variables such as message features, the message source, and the communication context, are effective in causing alterations in attitudes (Eagly & Himmelfarb, 1978; McGuire, 1969). While these theorists strongly urge taking into account recipient characteristics and situational variables, research has been somewhat inconsistent in how effective these variables are in a persuasive context. Although this area is new and shows promise as a variable to consider, further investigation is needed.

Saunders (1979), in agreement with the previous art advocacy theorists (Thompson, 1979; Baker, 1979; and Houston, 1981), also sees advocacy as the duty of the art teacher. Included in the advocate's audience are the campus community comprised of teachers; students and principals; administrative bodies; and the community at large. She suggests that in order for advocacy to be successful, the art teacher must (1) keep abreast of current practices in the field; (2) provide support for other areas in the total curriculum; (3) sponsor co-curricular activities with the arts as the core; (4) invite members of the campus community into the art area to share films, speakers and displays; (5) tap current art students to serve as art advocates; (6) maintain an ongoing dialogue with school administrators by presenting a rationale for the art program; (7) and finally to inform the school community (including parents) of the purposes and benefits of art education.
In accordance with Hatfield, Thomas Wolf (1983) advocates the importance of publicity to generate interest and support in an art program.

"Public information should be a vital piece in the life of any arts in education program. For most people in the broader community, the program will not exist until it has been written about in a newspaper, has been filmed and shown on T.V. or has been the subject of a public service announcement on the radio. Public information increases support for any program, it involves more people in the activities, and it introduces the community to the uniqueness of the work" (p.75-76).

In order to be effective, Wolf cautions that any publicity message must be tailored to a particular audience by first assessing their needs. While seemingly a viable solution, he fails to specifically define what those needs might be, and further only alludes to the consideration of underlying values and beliefs. As previously mentioned, Fishbein and Ajzen consider these to be very important variables to consider when planning and delivering a persuasive communication.

Other suggested art advocacy strategies used to support public relations include one presented by the Alliance of Independent Colleges of Art (hereafter referred to as A.I.A.). In their recent conference, the top priority of their strategy for action included local and national advocacy for art education. Each branch of advocacy includes: "Increasing public awareness and understanding; making the case for art education; awarding teachers, programs, schools and students; assessing local needs and resources; and using professional art schools for advocacy centers" (Gellner, 1984, p.35). Again, needs are seen as important when
considering an advocacy strategy. But, like Houston, these needs are not clearly defined. Likewise, beliefs and attitudes are not even considered here as variables that influence these needs.

**Art Advocacy as Political Action**

While the previous art advocacy strategists viewed advocacy as public relations, Burton (1975) sees it as political action. He proposes a seven part strategy for the art advocate to implement. This includes: 1.) identifying one's allies; 2.) appealing to the self interest of decision makers who will affect the destiny of the art program; 3.) identifying decision makers who affect the art program; 4.) adapting persuasive arguments to the situations and personalities involved; 5.) having an organized plan; 6.) identifying antagonists and utilizing ways to neutralize them; and 7.) refraining from isolating oneself from the community as the support of this group can prove to be beneficial. As can be noted, Burton, while viewing advocacy somewhat differently, does agree with many of the specific practices as suggested by Hatfield, Saunders and Warwick.

In alignment with Burton, Goldfarb (1979) also views art advocacy as political action. He stresses that advocacy cannot be successful if one lacks a working knowledge of how our political and legislative sectors operate. Ingredients for a successful advocate include knowledge and skills of the subject at hand; means and methods of presentation; and the
identification of individuals and organizations who are the targets of the advocacy.

Hinchey and Russey (1979) view art advocacy as both public relations and political action in their outline of advocacy efforts of the Dade County school system in Florida. Public relations workshops for art teachers in methods of promoting art have proven to be helpful. Community involvement was achieved by local exhibitions of student art work as well as the involvement of art educators in community institutions. Supportive parents wrote letters to state officials stressing the importance of art in the curriculum. As a supportive measure, children's art work was sent to these officials as well. Additional parent support was achieved by the attendance of art teachers to P.T.A. meetings, where parents and school officials were acquainted with the needs of art education. Appearances before school boards by parent and teacher groups also proved to be beneficial. As a result of many years of hard work, parents, teachers, community members and even some board members presented a united front in support of art education.

The utilization of parents, students and teachers as art advocates has been addressed by various persuasive communication theorists. They have noted that,

"Another characteristic that has been found to affect persuasion is the perceived similarity between the source and the recipient. There is considerable evidence that individuals are more likely to be influenced by a persuasive message to the extent that they perceive
it as coming from a source similar to themselves... The perceived similarity of the source and the recipient can increase the persuasiveness of a message by making the source seem more attractive to the recipient and or by conferring a type of credibility on the source" (Hass, 1981, p.151).

Applying this to the art advocacy situation, Hinchey and Russey have utilized parents to inform other parents, teachers other teachers, etc. These communication links have proven to be successful in their advocacy strategy.

While the art advocacy strategists previously mentioned define advocacy in somewhat different terms, political action vs. public relations, there is a general consensus on the target audience and the various modes of advocacy behavior. School administrators, parents and the community comprise the group of decision makers who are the recipients of the advocate's message. It has been suggested in all of the previous cases that the art teacher should assume the sole responsibility as advocate. Saunders, Hinchey, Russey and Wolf, however, did note that students, parents and teachers could perform this role effectively as well. While display of student art works and offering workshops were the advocacy actions generally agreed upon, it was also noted that clear and concise statements emphasizing the benefits of the art program should be voiced as well.

Although these authors offer useful advocacy strategies, they fail to mention the importance of looking at values and beliefs of their target audiences. While the needs of the audience were taken into consideration, there was no attempt in defining what specific needs should be
addressed. While the source (one who advocates) and the receiver factor (audience) were taken into consideration, Fishbein and Ajzen (1981) contend that these variables,

"...will influence the effectiveness of a given message only if it affects the extent to which the message exerts direct or indirect effects on primary beliefs" (p.355).

However, the content of persuasive communications is not adequately addressed by these authors. This content must attend to underlying attitudes, beliefs and values. It is the underlying beliefs and values that manifest themselves in attitudes. Merely trimming bad weeds in a garden does not solve the problem. One must pull them out by the roots in order to clear the way for growing plants. Likewise, the roots of attitudes must be dealt with in a similar fashion. Neglect of these roots (beliefs and values) could cause many of the above mentioned advocacy strategies to be ineffectual. A successful advocacy strategy must be carefully tailored to the underlying beliefs and values of the target audience.

Hatfield has alluded to the importance of looking at beliefs and values in "An Art Teacher in Every School", yet he fails to recognize the importance of being specific. Although he suggests looking at attitudes toward art education, he does not look at attitudes toward supporting art education in the school. These are two very different arenas. The former case focuses on art education in general (attitude toward the object), and the latter looks at the attitude toward a behavior (support of art education). While a person may have favorable attitudes toward art education, the same person may not have favorable attitudes toward
supporting art education. This was found to be the case in McNealey’s (1982) study of school principals. While many had positive attitudes toward art education, they were not willing to include it in the curriculum when other subjects have to be dropped. Therefore, if it is the advocate’s task to solicit support for art education, which the aforementioned literature review suggests, then attitudes toward supporting art education must be considered instead of attitudes toward art education.

The point to be made here is that if advocacy strategies are going to be offered as viable solutions for improving the status of art education, then attention must first be directed toward specific attitudes and their underlying beliefs and values held by the target audience. The aforementioned authors have neglected to take these variables into consideration.

A concluding remark concerns the advocate. While some authors have recognized that the art teacher does not have to play a solitary role as advocate, more recognition is needed for parents to serve as viable supporters of art. Thomas Wolf (1983) cautions one to,

"Never underestimate the power of parents. Make it a point to invite them to events. Solicit their support in having the program continue" (p.84).

The strategic role of parents as advocates can be seen throughout the history of the development of the kindergarten.
Kindergarten Advocacy

Current approaches to advocacy do not differ much from those utilized by individuals who established the kindergarten movement over 100 years ago. What assisted in helping the kindergarten take root in American soil were German students schooled in Froebelian methods who were able to explain and demonstrate the various procedures (Weber, 1969).

In London, the International Exhibit of Educational Systems of 1854 also served as a means to advocate the kindergarten. Madame Bertha Ronge was in charge of the kindergarten display at the Exhibit which was attended by Henry Barnard. It was through him that the kindergarten concept reached America. He reported his experiences to the governor of Connecticut as well as in several public speeches. In order to further disseminate Froebelian methods to the Americans, he compiled a collection of writings on the subject which was later published under the title of "Kindergarten and Child Culture Papers". Articles submitted to the publication were from prominent leaders in the field such as Elizabeth Peabody and Susan Blow.

Later, as a Commissioner of Education for the United States, Barnard continued to lend support to the kindergarten movement. A report that was submitted to the United States Senate in 1868 stressed that,

"As the great formative period of the human being precedes the age at which children now attend the public school, it is necessary that by some formal arrangement, public or private, the age of impression should not be lost for the best purposes...I know of no agency so
philosophical and so attractive to their purposes as the kindergarten of Froebel" (1890, p.370).

The influential status of Barnard, as well as his publications served as the impetus to include the kindergarten in American education.

Here it can be seen that the credentials of the advocate, in this case Bernard, Peabody and Blow, were utilized to buttress the persuasive communication.

"People place greater confidence in a trustworthy source and hence are more receptive to what is said, even when there is a substantial deviation from their own position" (Blackwell & Eng, 1981).

As previously noted, Bernard used his influential status while communicating his persuasive messages.

John Kraus and Marla Kraus-Boelet also served as advocates for the kindergarten by publishing books and articles on the subject, delivering speeches and establishing a training school which was located in New York.

The first kindergartens were private ones supported by the wealthy. As the happiness of children in their learning environments became evident, then philanthropic women supported kindergartens in poverty areas as well (Harrison, 1929).

The Women's Christian Temperance Union likewise gave their support to the cause.

"Through an interest in the young children of a family they could gain the cooperation of the parents and thereby influence the latter in their home life and their ideals" (Harrison, 1924, p.10).

Likewise, trained kindergarteners served as advocates while they often
visited the homes of mothers in order to persuade them to bring their children to kindergarten on a regular basis.

"The social-settlement workers were quick to see the value of the welcome which the visiting kindergarteners received in needy homes, and in a short time many churches and Sunday schools supported regular kindergarteners" (Harrison, 1924, p.22).

Public lectures were often presented to the National Education Association. Manual training departments saw the value of such activities as clay work, painting, and using scissors as ways to develop the children's dexterity. Science departments gave their support as they saw the care of gardens and animals by kindergarten children to be beneficial. Art departments followed suit as they approved of the picture collections illustrating children and their surroundings.

At one of the National Education Association conventions, Dr. A.S. Draper strongly urged the inclusion of the kindergarten in all school systems. The suggestion was unanimously accepted. "This was the Association's greatest contributions to the early spread of the kindergarten" (Harrison, 1924, p.14). Here an advocacy method suggested by Hinchey and Russey, that of teachers influencing other teachers, has been utilized. As likewise suggested by these authors, this method is successful because of the similarity between the source and the recipient.

The National Education Association also lent its support to the kindergarten movement through the publication of articles educating people on the kindergarten concept.
"It was the first body to petition for the addition of a kindergarten department to the Bureau of Education, and assisted materially in establishing kindergarten laws in various states" (Harrison, 1924, p.14).

But, despite the efforts of various groups and individuals in support of the kindergarten, the success of the kindergarten in America can be attributed to the efforts of one courageous woman – Elizabeth Palmer Peabody. Because of the idealistic foundation of the kindergarten, it was readily embraced by Peabody as well as by William Torrey, Harris and Blow. Here, it can be seen how one's personal values and beliefs make one more receptive to ideologies containing similar elements. That is to say that had the kindergarten not had an idealistic foundation, perhaps Peabody, Harris and Blow would not have anxiously served as advocates for the cause.

In order to gain support for the kindergarten, Elizabeth Peabody (1972) mailed circulars that described the kindergarten to professionals and her influential friends as well. Most were receptive and gave their support, while others voiced puritan attitudes toward children – "Train the child in the way he should go, the way of hard work, and do not spare the rod" (1972, p.42). Had Peabody taken these into consideration, perhaps persuasive communication tailored to these attitudes would have been more effective.

Other forms of promoting the kindergarten included organizing unions and lecturing. Peabody provided assistance to the English in organizing a Froebel Union. She also welded the bond of friendship with Baroness Von
Marenholtz-Buelow, who was a prestigious leader in the kindergarten world. As a lecturer, she spoke around the country. At the New York City College, the influence of her lectures resulted in the establishment of a kindergarten and kindergarten training department at this institution (Snyder, 1972).

In the mid-west, Peabody lectured in such places as Cleveland, Chicago and Detroit. In a lecture to principals and superintendents in Chicago, one listener, Alice Putman, was so taken by the kindergarten concept that she became a student and studied under Susan Blow. She then shared her experiences with mother’s clubs, and then gathered enough support to form kindergarten associations, kindergartens and training centers for potential kindergarten teachers. Here, parents have played a significant role in the establishment of the kindergarten.

Peabody also reached one prominent superintendent in St. Louis, William Harris. Her advocacy strategy included a series of letters introducing him to new kindergarten publications, newly established kindergartens and other kindergarten activities. As a result, several years later, William Harris, along with Susan Blow, opened the first public school kindergarten in St. Louis. Both Harris and Blow became strong forces in the kindergarten movement as well.

Kate Douglas Wiggins was also influenced by Elizabeth Peabody. After consultation with her, Kate became director of the Silver Street Kindergarten in Los Angeles which spread the movement on the west coast.
Elizabeth Peabody also took advantage of the Philadelphia Exposition of 1876 where she planned an educational exhibit of the kindergarten with accompanying lectures. As a result, the kindergarten became established there as well. "The demonstration at the Exposition gave a powerful boost to the development of kindergartens in the U.S" (p.51).

Peabody also utilized voluntary organizations in forming a united front. As a result, the American Froebel Union was established with Peabody as president.

The minority kindergarten children were also recognized by Peabody as she published a statement for the "Journal of Education" in support of all American kindergarten children. Black women were schooled in the kindergarten method and when adequately prepared, set out to teach.

American Indian children were serviced by the kindergarten as well. Peabody was able to provide financial support so a school could be built and supplies bought.

It can be seen that past advocates employed similar methods for their cause. While most of the advocacy took the form of public relations, Barnard utilized political action as Commissioner of Education. Other advocacy efforts that served as public relations utilized lecturers, communication emphasizing benefits of the kindergarten, exhibits of the International Exhibit of Educational Systems in London and the Philadelphia Exposition of 1876. Messages were directed to parents, administrators, teachers and the general public. Those who did the advocating were kindergarten teachers themselves or organizations that
supported the cause, including parents. What can therefore be gleaned from this discussion is that modes of advocacy utilized in the past are still prevalent today.

Yet, as has already been pointed out, had the persuasive messages been tailored to the attitudes, beliefs, and values of the message recipients, perhaps it would not have taken one hundred years to securely implant the kindergarten on American soil.

**Attitudes and Behavioral Intentions**

"Attitudes are affective evaluative concepts which give rise to motivated behavior" (Stuckhardt & Morris, 1978, p.21-28). Such a definition is accepted by Allport (1935), Bem (1970), and Fishbein (1967).

The term attitude can be divided into three major components: affective, cognitive, and behavioral. Affect can be defined as one's general feelings about a stimulus. An individual's thoughts, ideas, associations, and images in reference to an object determines the cognitive aspects of attitude. The behavioral/conative component refers to one's behavioral responses that are generated by an object. The objects toward which attitudes are directed may be personal, abstract, or concrete.

While Bem (1970) considers all of these three components as comprising an attitude, he fails to include all of them in his definition, which is restricted to the affective component. "They are our affinities
for and our aversions to situations, objects, persons, groups, or any other identifiable aspects of our environment, including abstract ideas and social policies" (1970, p.14).

Thurstone (1931) and Likert (1932) concentrate on the affective component in their definitions of attitude. Osgood (1967) and Allport (1935) align their definitions with the behavioral category, as attitude is defined as a readiness for response.

While these numerous past theorists have experimented with measuring these various dimensions of attitudes, there is a trend back toward the utilization of one aspect of attitude, the affective one. And, this is how attitude is usually measured.

While all of these theorists concur that attitudes are learned from experience, Allport (1935) notes that trauma and imitation of authority figures can be considered as well. Likert (1932) has alluded to the fact that while some attitudes are learned, others may be a result of innate tendencies. Bem (1970) considers the cognitive, social, and behavioral foundations of attitudes. Fishbein and Ajzen (1980) insist that such variables are not directly involved with attitudes.

Although previous investigators have defined attitude utilizing its various components, Fishbein and Ajzen (1980) take a more streamlined approach as they define an attitude as one's general feeling of favorableness for that concept.

Upon measuring the attitude concept, many theorists employ evaluative scales which results in a single score that represents one's
general evaluation or overall feeling of favorableness or unfavorableness toward the behavior or object in question. Yet, utilizing such bipolar scales to measure the evaluative component of the attitude concept fails to capture its full complexity. However, Fishbein and Ajzen note that, "...there is widespread agreement that evaluation is the most essential part of attitude and our definition therefore does justice to the attitude concept" (1980, p.55).

In further defense of their position, Fishbein and Ajzen note that while attitudes are viewed as a complex of feelings, beliefs, motivations, perceptions, and intentions, in their attempt to measure attitudes with these various dimensions, much of this information has proven to be of little significance when compared to the evaluative dimension (1980).

While many past theorists thought attitudes to be directly related to behaviors, Fishbein and Ajzen (1977) contest this theory. In their 1977 review of attitude-behavior research, they found that attitudes are not very reliable predictors of behaviors. "Attitude is a predictor of the range of behaviors relevant to that attitude, but may not be predictive of a specific behavior within that range" (McNealey, 1982, p.61). Fishbein and Ajzen have therefore asserted that a relationship between attitude and behavior can only exist as long as the behavior in question is consistent with the stated attitude, which they call attitude toward the act. But, they have also strongly argued that behavioral intention is the immediate antecedent of behavior, and not attitude. Therefore, while
attitude may predict behavior under the restrictions noted above, behavioral intention serves as an even stronger and more reliable predictor. As a result, attitude toward the act influences intentions, and not behavior directly.

But, Fishbein and Ajzen even further modify the previous noted theories, by adding a component that parallels attitude. This is identified as subjective norm (what important others think). And, what underlies attitudes and subjective norm are beliefs, of which there are two kinds: behavioral beliefs and normative beliefs. Normative beliefs are what a subject believes that a referent thinks about the performance of a specific behavior, while behavioral beliefs concern the likelihood that performing a behavior will result in a given outcome.

Also at variance with other theorists, Fishbein and Ajzen note that experience, which is ultimately conditioned by demographic variables such as sex, age, social class and race, intelligence, etc. have very little direct affect on attitudes and therefore cannot be direct precursors. However, these variables do affect attitude indirectly via underlying beliefs.

Attitude-Behavior Relationship

While many of the previous mentioned theorists have claimed that attitudes are the determinants of overt acts, there are also those that have only alluded to this. However, the first theorists to make the connection between attitudes and behavior were Thomas and Znaniecki
(1918) who defined attitudes as cognitive processes that ultimately determine one's behavior. As a result, social theorists made the assumption that attitudes could be utilized to explain overt actions. Therefore, various measures of attitude came into vogue within the social science community. The contribution of such instruments were made by such persons as Thurstone, Guttman, Osgood, and Likert. Such scales result in a single score that represents the degree to which a person is favorable or unfavorable toward an object. In addition, it was believed that such an attitude score could mirror various patterns of beliefs, intentions and actions.

With the availability of such instruments, they came into widespread use. While these instruments claimed to measure the affective aspect of attitudes, Gordon Allport strongly argued that the attitude concept is much more complex and has more than one dimension. Yet, despite this contention, early research seems to support the validity of such scales measuring only the affective domain of attitudes. Such investigations found that pacifists have more negative attitudes toward war than do nonpacifists, and northerners have more favorable dispositions toward blacks when compared to southerners.

Such findings, Fishbein (1980) contends, can be attributed to loosely defined behaviors.

"...the "behavioral" criterion in these studies can best be viewed as a behavioral syndrome rather than as a specific behavior toward the stimulus object. The finding that groups known to differ in their behaviors also differ in their measured attitudes never the less was
taken as evidence confirming the assumption of a close link between attitude and behavior" (p.17).

Yet, investigators continued to explore the relationship between attitudes and behavior. The best known study by LaPiere (1934) investigated racial prejudice in the United States. He traveled extensively across the country with a Chinese couple. Out of all the restaurants and hotels visited, they were refused admittance to only one. After the tour, LaPiere distributed questionnaires to all of the restaurants visited, asking them if they would refuse service to Chinese persons. The general consensus of replies stated that they would. One is reminded here of the old adage that needs some modification here - "People do not always practice what they preach."

Such findings raised serious doubts about the attitude behavior relationship. Other investigations likewise found very poor or no relationship at all between attitude and behavior. Corey (1937) found an inconsistency in students attitudes toward cheating and actual cheating behavior. What seems to be the case for each of these situations is that attitudes are not reliable predictors of behaviors. As a result, some theorists argued that the same attitude can be expressed in different actions (Doob, 1947). Thurstone (1948) posits this same view.

Yet, there were those investigators who refused to abandon ship. It was Allport who provided an alternative explanation for attitude-behavior relationships. He stressed that attitudes are complex concepts that cannot exist within the confines of unidimensional framework. Such notions were elaborated upon by Rosenberg and Hovland
(1960) who posited the theory that attitudes consist of three dimensions: affect, cognition, and conation. It was therefore contended that the poor relations between attitude and behavior was due to the measurement of the affective dimension with neglect of cognition and conation.

Yet, Fishbein argues that,

"...the multicomponent view of attitude cannot provide an adequate explanation of the low attitude-behavior relation...Thurstone and Likert scales rely on beliefs or intentions (i.e. cognition or conation) to infer a person's attitude. This implies that in providing a measure of affect the standard scaling procedures already take into account cognitions, conations, or both. Whether our measures are based on statements concerning beliefs, feelings, intentions, or behaviors, the results will be much the same. It follows that separate assessment of all three components is unlikely to lead to improved behavioral predictions" (1980, p.21).

An investigation by Ostrom (1969) supports this claim. His assessment of cognition, affect and conation with respect to the church did nothing to improve the prediction of a variety of religious behaviors. Additional work done by D.T. Campbell (1947), Bettelheim and Janowitz (1950) and Fishbein (1964) have indicated that the cognitive, affective, and conative dimensions of attitude are highly interrelated.

Fishbein and Ajzen (1980) therefore restricted their definition of attitude to the affective domain due to the aforementioned findings. They define attitude as, "A person's evaluation of any psychological object" (p.27).
These theorists have further examined the problem and have concluded that a relationship between attitude and behavior can exist as long as the behavior in question is consistent with the stated attitude. That is to say, one should be measuring attitudes toward behavioral intentions and not simply attitudes, if a relationship between attitude and behavior is to be found. They have strongly suggested that intention is the immediate antecedent of behavior and not attitude. Herein lies the problem of previous research. Fishbein and Ajzen also point out that if the behavior of interest is general, then the attitude toward the behavior must be couched in general terms as well. If the behavior is specific, then the stated attitude toward the behavior must also be specific. Consistency is a pertinent ingredient of attitude-behavior relationships. In order to strengthen this relationship, Fishbein and Ajzen further stress that attitude and behavior statements must include consistently specific action, target, context, and time elements. That is to say, if one is interested in the intentions of a person to vote in the November election of this year, then the attitude statement toward this behavior must be stated in exactly those terms to achieve a consistent relationship. A review of the attitude behavior literature supports this position (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977).

Art Attitude Surveys -Doctoral Dissertations

McNealey (1982) employed the Fishbein model used in marketing to address the attitude/behavior relationship, in order to test marketing
technology for art education. In testing the model, school principals were surveyed to indicate their general attitude toward art education by utilizing the Art Attitude Scale (Stuckhardt & Morris, 1980) and their attitudes toward including art in the curriculum by utilizing the Fishbein instrument. It was found that while they had positive attitudes toward art education, they lacked enthusiasm toward including it in the curriculum. It was found that decision makers do not arrive at decisions which impact art education on the basis of their attitudes toward art education, but rather on the basis of their primary beliefs which mediate that behavior. It is on these beliefs that the strategy of art advocacy should be built. McNealey further suggests that action changes are needed where a target audience is provided information on which to take specific action to support art and to counter long held beliefs that are negative toward art education. The Fishbein instrument was chosen for the present investigation to measure attitudes toward advocating kindergarten art education. However, due to its extreme length, it was not chosen to assess general attitudes toward art. The use of the Art Attitude Scale (Stuckhardt & Morris, 1980) in conjunction with the Fishbein instrument for this investigation, gives further support for the use of both instruments in the present study.

Theorists in the Realm of Values and Their Measurement

Values are defined differently by the various theorists. Morris (1956) and Bem (1970) define them as preferences. Kluckhohn (1952) does so as
well, but also notes that they are also standards and desires. We find the words preferences and standards in Kohn's (1969) definition as well, as he defines values as standards of desirability or a criteria of preference. Pepper's (1959) definition is more broad based as he notes values to be anything that is good or bad. Handy, on the other hand, defines values as that which satisfies a need. Both he and Pepper, in contrast to the others, also view values as object oriented instead of person oriented. Morris (1956) tends to see it both ways. Rokeach (1973) defines values as a single belief of a very specific kind. "It concerns a desirable mode of behavior or end-state that has a transcendental quality to it, guiding actions, attitudes, judgements and comparisons across specific objects and situations and beyond immediate goals to move ultimate goals" (p.16).

The precursors of values range from cultural to psychological underpinnings. While the consensus seems to be that values stem from culture (Bem, et al.), Morris has also recognized the importance of biological, psychological, and ecological factors. Pepper has referred to these antecedents as well. While the other theorists have alluded to these determinants, their emphasis has been placed on cultural.

What can also be included here is that values underpin attitudes and beliefs. While values tend to be more broad based, attitudes and beliefs are more specific. "Attitudes are thought of as pertaining to a single object, even though that object may be an abstract one, while value systems are orientations toward whole classes of objects" (Secord &
Backman, 1964, p.99). And further, value systems are usually comprised of individual attitudes.

While attitudes and values tend to be evaluative in nature, again their differences lie in their specificity. But most theorists would tend to agree that there is an action commitment for values and attitudes, but not for beliefs (Bem, et. al.).

Behavioral Intentions Models

While the previous literature review examined the direct relationship between attitude and overt behavior, there are other theorists who focus on attitudes and intentions to behave. The investigation of such relationships is most useful in marketing where consumer behavior can be predicted. Such predictions can assist major corporations in their decisions of how to sell a product. Therefore, various theorists have offered a selection of behavioral intentions models that purport to predict behavior. These models include: Sheth, Rosenberg, Warshaw, Miniard-Cohen, and Fishbein.

Sheth's (1980) model was constructed specifically for product purchase situations. He examines four variables which include: measurement of one's perception of the object and its ability to satisfy a need; perception of social connotations that the object possesses; past satisfaction from behavior which results from the object; and situational influences that one expects will occur around the time the behavior is performed.
Sheth's model has been criticized due to its measurement of "consideration" instead of "intent", leading theorists to argue that if an option is seriously considered, it doesn't follow that one intends to utilize it. (Warshaw 1980) Another criticism is the use of "evaluation of brand "y" instead of "evaluation of buying brand y". Therefore, attitude toward the object is measured as opposed to attitude toward purchasing the product, which is a more specifically defined measure. As Fishbein and Ajzen (1977) have already indicated, attitude toward the object fails as a satisfactory predictor of behavior.

The Rosenberg (1981) model posits that an attitude toward a particular object is a function of: the probability that the object leads to good or bad consequences; and the degree of satisfaction or dissatisfaction expected from these consequences.

Rosenberg aligns himself with Rokeach (1979) in his consideration of values and their importance in affecting attitudes, thus resulting in a structural relationship. "Attitudes stand in an "instrumental" relationship to values in that the attitude can be perceived as either facilitating or interfering with the attainment of those values" (Brock from Rosenberg, 1981, p.324).

Unlike Rokeach, Rosenberg looks at another variable which he identifies as "perceived instyrumentality." This variable measures the degree to which one embraces a point of view that engaging in a behavior will enhance or block the attainment of a value.
In utilizing this model, Rosenberg has successfully predicted various modes of travel, menu items, choices in restaurants, etc. As a result of his investigations, he found that the two variables – value importance and perceived instrumentality – are independent factors. That is to say, if these variables are utilized separately, they will not adequately predict response.

Warshaw’s predictive model has been developed specifically for product purchase behaviors. The model focuses on the immediate antecedent of behavior which is behavioral intentions. Behavioral intention is then a function of motivation and capability. His model is built on the assumption that the intent of performing a specific behavior is contingent upon the formation of more global intentions. For example, purchasing Tide is a specific intention while purchasing laundry detergent is a more global intention.

Warshaw’s model has been found to be highly predictive of intended purchasing behaviors. While reliability was relatively high (.92), there is incomplete evidence of convergent validity of the proposed intention measure. However, the model was shown to have superior cross-validity in that it yields stable predictions over different samples from the same population and is extremely predictive.

A major weakness in Warshaw’s model lies in the corresponding questionnaire items where wording needs to be refined and double questions need to be made into two separate questions, thus resulting in
less difficulty in answering them. Such weaknesses in the survey instrument utilized in the Warshaw investigation could result in data that is worthless and therefore, the validity must be called into question.

The Miniard-Cohen model (1983) is most closely associated with that of Fishbein, the one utilized in the present study. Therefore, a more in depth review will be presented here. These theorists have made some minor alterations to the Fishbein model due to what they consider to be inadequacies of the behavioral belief component. They stress that Fishbein has failed to separate personal and normative influences on one's attitude toward a given object. Instead, they note that Fishbein "...attempts to separate beliefs regarding all evaluatively salient outcomes from one's perceptions of what others believe one should do" (1983, p.169). Because of this, Miniard and Cohen fear of double counting due to the normative component which also includes those forms of social influences whose impact is likely to be reflected in the attitude component as well. For example, suppose an expert advises you to sell your T-Bills because economic conditions warrant such an action. Assuming you perceive this person to be knowledgeable, his influence would be reflected in your beliefs about such an action and these in turn would affect your attitude. Likewise, the normative component would also reflect this information in that you would want to do what the expert has advocated. Such influences result in double counting in both
the attitude and normative components. Thus, there is no real discrimination between personal versus social reasons for engaging in a behavior. Therefore, Miniard and Cohen's model examines three variables that they feel influence behavioral intentions: attitudes toward the behavior; personal reasons for engaging in a behavior; and social reasons for engaging in a behavior.

Upon testing this model, which included the examination of consumer's intentions to purchase different brands of products within various consumption situations, Miniard and Cohen manipulated personal and normative influences. Results indicated that these two measures were successful in separating personal and normative components.

The proposed model has had very limited use in research, but, nevertheless has done well in predicting behavioral intentions. However, the Fishbein model has consistently provided stronger predictions.

Due to the nature of the investigation, that of separating personal from normative influences, very lengthy instructions had to be presented to the research subjects. Due to the extreme length of such an instrument, an overabundance of extra reading material (in the form of instructions) might very well hamper the response rate in a mailed questionnaire situation. Miniard and Cohen have recognized this problem and note there is a need to reduce the length of instructions as well as to refine the proposed measures of personal and normative influences.
The theory posited by Fishbein claims that intention, the immediate antecedent of behavior, is a function of an attitudinal component and a normative component (1980). The basic formula can be expressed as follows.

\[ B^* \cdot B_1 \cdot w_1 (A_b) + w_2 (S_N) \]

Equation 2 (Fishbein, 1980)

Where:
- \( B \) = Behavior
- \( B_1 \) = Behavioral intention to perform behavior \( B \).
- \( A_b \) = Attitude toward performing behavior \( B \).
- \( S_N \) = Subjective Norm
- \( w_1 \) and \( w_2 \) = Empirically determined weights that represent the components importance in determining intent.

The \( A_b \) component, which is one's attitude toward performing a specific behavior under certain circumstances is defined as:
\[ Ab = \sum_{i=1}^{n} b_i e_i \]

Equation 3 (Fishbein, 1980)

Where:
- \( b \) = The belief that performing a specific behavior (B) leads to certain outcomes \( i \).
- \( e \) = One's evaluation of the outcomes \( i \) associated with performing the specific behavior.
- \( n \) = Number of salient beliefs.

\( SN \), the additional component, is one's perception of whether or not important others think one should partake in a specified behavior. This component is identified as:

\[ SN = \sum_{j=1}^{n} NB_j MC_j \]

Equation 4 (Fishbein, 1980)

Where:
- \( NB \) = Normative belief or one's belief that a reference group or an individual thinks one should or should not engage in the specified behavior.
- \( MC \) = One's motivation to comply with the referent \( j \).
- \( j \) = Number of relevant referents.
Differing from other behavioral intentions models, the Fishbein model embraces all major variables that directly influence overt behavior. Instead of focusing on general attitudes and their related behaviors, the variables explored within the model are expressed in specific terms related to the behavior of interest.

The basic assumptions that are indigenous to this model include: 1.) the immediate precursor of overt behavior is behavioral intention; 2.) the direct antecedents of intention are attitude towards the act and subjective norm; 3.) variables such as socio-economic status, age, sex, etc., only indirectly affect behavioral intentions by directly affecting behavioral or normative beliefs; 4.) in order to obtain high correlations between intention and observed behavior, the time interval between measurement and observation must be small; 5.) unexpected occurrences may interfere with correlations between observed behavior and intentions; 6.) performance of the overt action is under the volitional control of the individual (1980).

Despite the fact that the Fishbein model has been used in a variety of contexts and has proved to be valid due to its good performance in predicting behavioral intentions, it has had some criticisms. One of the major criticisms advanced by various theorists (Miniard & Cohen, 1983; Warshaw, 1980) is that there is no clear distinction between personal and normative reasons for performing an action. Thus the measures are not independent, but instead overlapping, which could result in
multicollinearity. Having tested this, Miniard and Cohen (1979) found that subject’s responses to the attitudinal as well as normative components were affected when only the attitudinal component was manipulated. There were similar results when only the SN component was manipulated.

Fishbein and Ajzen’s answer to such findings is that, "...attitudes and subjective norms are highly predictive of Intentions and they correlate more strongly with the criterion than with each other" (1979, p.341). In defending Fishbein, Johnson (1963, 1972) also notes that multicollinearity only becomes a serious problem when two predictors are very highly correlated. Investigations by Bowman and Fishbein (1978) and Jaccard and Davidson (1972) support this contention as well. Therefore, Fishbein and Ajzen (1979) further claims that such findings are incongruent with the claim that attitude and normative measures mirror the same underlying variable.

"It is also found that the regression weights of the two components vary predictably with the behavior context and that these weights determine, as they should, the extent to which manipulations of attitudes or subjective norms influence behavioral intentions" (1979, p.341).

In reference to the same subject, Miniard and Cohen’s theory will be reviewed on this point. Their theory is based on Kelman’s (1961) processes of social influence which include compliance, identification, and internalization. Thus, it is their contention that normative
Influences may be subconsciously yielded to and therefore become a part of attitudinal structures. For example, if one formed a belief that a broker thinks I should sell my T-Bills, this belief should contribute to the attitude and not to the normative component. But, Fishbein takes issue with this position as he accuses Miniard and Cohen of failing to provide a clear, conceptual rationale for distinguishing between normative and behavioral beliefs. It is his contention that behavioral and normative beliefs differ in important ways. For example, I may believe that my broker thinks I should sell my T-Bills, is a normative belief. But, the belief that not doing so would please my broker is a behavioral belief. Here, attitudes and subjective norms would be differentially affected. Miniard and Cohen have failed to recognize this. What is basically at issue here is two philosophical points of view. While Miniard and Cohen take a more rationalistic approach when they claim that a referent loses all normative influences as soon as one internalizes the information provided by the referent. Fishbein and Ajzen take a more empirical point of view when they disregard such contentions. It is therefore a matter of how the terms personal and social influences are defined, and in this case, the terms are defined differently by each theorist. Despite such differences of opinion, the Fishbein model provides evidence for the predictive validity of the posited theory.

An investigation by Fishbein and Ajzen (1972) indicated manipulating the attitudinal component had a strong effect on the attitudinal
measures with no significant effect on the normative measure. Due to the inconsistency of these results with what Miniard and Cohen had found to be the case, Fishbein posits the claim that the problem is one of "...identifying factors, or designing manipulations that may reasonably be expected to have predictably different effects on the two components" (1972, p.341). Fishbein claims that Miniard and Cohen utilized overlapping manipulations of attitude and normative components, and therefore their results are highly questionable.

The Fishbein model has also been challenged in reference to its motivation to comply component. Miniard and Cohen (1979) point out that this measure is couched in general terms and is therefore inconsistent with the posited theory that there be correspondence between predictors and criteria. Correspondence, as defined by the Fishbein theory, is the extent to which a predictor and criterion focus upon the same action, target, context, and time elements of a behavior.

"...motivation to comply, like evaluation of outcomes, is conceptualized as independent of the behavior in question. That is, we assume that a given outcome is positively or negatively evaluated irrespective of the behavior that led to the outcome. Similarly, we assume that a person's general motivation to comply with a given referent...is also independent of any particular behavior" (1979, p.345).

Therefore, it is Fishbein's contention that measuring outcome evaluations and motivation to comply independent of behavior is not being inconsistent with the requirement of correspondence between
predictors and criteria. Outcome evaluations and motivations to comply are not utilized as direct predictors of intention. They do however modify the behavioral beliefs and normative beliefs that are assessed in terms specific to the behavior of interest. If motivations to comply were couched in terms specific to the behavior of interest, it would then become a direct correlate of intention. That is to say, if one embraces the belief that an important other thinks he should perform a behavior, the motivation to comply (stated in behavior specific terms) will increase with one's intention to execute the behavior. Alternately, if one believes that an important other does not condone the behavior, then motivation to comply will decrease in accordance with intention to perform the act.

Fishbein (1979) further contends that,

"...although a behavior specific measure of motivation to comply should predict intention better than a general or behavioral domain, the specific measure contributes little to our understanding of the intentions determinants" (p.345).

In an investigation by Schwartz and Tessler (1972), they have likewise challenged the model due to its inability to mediate external variables as well as its ability to predict behavior. One viable reason for the low correspondence between intention and behavior was the considerable time lapse between these two measures. In addition, a variable measuring moral obligation was included in the investigation. While this variable was found to be the best predictor of intention, the
behavior of interest dealt with life and death situations (organ donation activities). Therefore, moral obligation may have played an inordinate role in prediction. Therefore, due to the fact that the Schwartz and Tessler investigation dealt with a behavior that may have had undue influence on their results as well as the considerable time lapse between the intention and behavior measurements, the results of this investigation are highly questionable.

Warshaw (1980) criticized the Fishbein model for its ability to widely predict varying behaviors and that it was not tailored to purchasing contexts. He has further noted that when the model was utilized in such situations, it was found that the normative components added little predictive power to the attitudinal component. This could be attributed to the fact that most behavior is directed by attitudinal rather than normative considerations. Fishbein and Ajzen say that such results are indigenous to each unique situation and it should not be considered a weakness in the model (1980). Since the present investigation is not concerned with purchasing behaviors, Warshaw’s arguments are irrelevant here.

Due to the inadequacies as well as the inappropriateness of the previous mentioned models, the Fishbein model was chosen as a viable instrument for the present investigation of art advocacy intentions. Sheth (1980) and Warshaw’s (1980) models were designed specifically for purchase situations. Therefore, questionnaire items are couched in
these terms. An additional problem with the Warshaw model includes questionnaire statements that are unclear and need further refinement. Sheth measures attitude toward the object instead of attitude toward the act which has been proven by Fishbein to be an unreliable predictor of intentions and behavior.

The Rosenberg model (1956), although found to be highly predictive, fails to include a normative component which is important in the present investigation. Miniard and Cohen's (1983) instrument has had very limited use, and while found to provide good predictions, the instrument is still not as highly predictive as the Fishbein model. There is also a need to refine the measures utilized in the instrument as well as editing the quite lengthy instructions.

While some of the aforementioned models have examined beliefs and attitudes toward behavioral intentions, with the exclusion of values, others have examined values at the exclusion of attitudes and beliefs. None of these proposed models have combined all of these variables - values, attitudes, beliefs, and intentions - to see how they interact with one another.

In addition, none of these models have been utilized in the public schools with respect to art education due to the fact that most of them have been tailored to marketing situations. The Fishbein model is the only exception, and has proven to be a viable instrument to be utilized in an art advocacy situation (McNealey, 1982).
In addition, the model provides a normative measurement which is of interest to this investigation. In terms of educational practices within the school, the best source of information is through fellow citizens and parents of school children (Marburger 1981; Hatfield 1983). The normative component of the Fishbein model can verify this claim as well as introduce other potential normative sources. Sources that are believed to have the most impact can be utilized in advocacy strategies to change those parent's attitudes who are not inclined to support kindergarten art education advocacy. Therefore, the normative component is of particular interest in this study.

Underlying beliefs, which the model also measures, is likewise of interest here due to the beneficial information that such a component can provide in developing strategies to alter negative and neutral attitudes. And finally, since it is one of the purposes of this investigation to develop an instrument that will predict who those parents are that are most likely and least likely to advocate art, the Fishbein instrument has proven to be highly predictive in numerous behavioral situations, and therefore promises to be a viable tool for the art educator to utilize.
In direct conflict with the Fishbein, Ajzen theory, Milton Rokeach (1980) argues that it is values and not attitudes that should be considered when examining behaviors. He supports this view with three reasons.

"First, values seem to be a more dynamic concept since it has a strong motivational component as well as cognitive, affective and behavioral components. Second, while attitude and value are both widely assumed to be determinants of social behavior, value is a determinant of attitude as well as of behavior. Third, if we further assume that a person possesses considerably fewer values than attitudes, then the value concept provides us with a more economic analytic tool for describing and explaining similarities and differences between persons, groups, nations and cultures" (1975, p.158).

In accordance with Fishbein and Ajzen, Rokeach defines attitude as an organization of beliefs targeted toward a specific object or situation and predisposing one to behave in a certain way. Values, Rokeach further defines, as "Modes of conduct and endstates of existence" (1975, p.159).

Values are enduring beliefs that certain actions or behaviors and endstates of existence are preferable as opposed to alternative ones. "Once a value is internalized it becomes, consciously or unconsciously, a standard or criterion for guiding action" (1975, p.160).

Rokeach stresses that values differ from attitudes. Attitudes represent various beliefs that are focused on a specific object or situation while a value is a single belief that guides actions and
judgements"...across specific objects and situations, and beyond immediate goals to more ultimate endstates of existence" (1975, p.160).

Unlike attitudes, values serve as a standard to guide actions. Therefore, while Fishbein and Ajzen view values as working through beliefs and attitudes, they argue that values are still only peripheral to actions and intentions, and influence these variables only indirectly. Rokeach, on the other hand, while noting that values work through attitudes, also notes that they are more directly responsible for behavior than Fishbein and Ajzen give them credit for.

Rokeach contends that his model or system contains several components. First, there are several organized beliefs that form a single attitude that is targeted toward a specific object or situation. Two or more attitudes may also be organized together to form a larger attitudinal system. Likewise, values may be organized to form a value system. Rokeach further notes that a person's commitment to behavior plays an important part in this system. Here, he agrees with Fishbein, as commitment to behavior can be construed to mean intentions to behave. But, he still fails to place the importance of this factor on behavior as Fishbein and Ajzen do.

Rokeach also stresses the importance of the behavior of significant others. Here again, there is a similarity to the "Theory of Reasoned Action". While the three theorists note the importance of significant others, Fishbein and Ajzen look at what significant others think about
one's action or intentions to act, while Rokeach looks at the influence of how significant others behave.

Rokeach further contends that behavior is a function of two attitudes - attitude toward the object and attitude toward the situation within which the object is encountered. Here again, similarities and differences with the theory posited by Fishbein and Ajzen manifest themselves. While they contend that it is intention to behave that directly influences behavior and not attitude, they do recognize that the situation or context is vital in predicting behavior, and therefore must be taken into consideration. This is why they have stressed that attitudes and intentions must parallel each other in terms of specificity.

Rokeach's model can be summarized as thus: when one encounters an object, two attitudes are activated - attitude toward the object and attitude toward the situation within which the object is encountered. Each of these attitudes, in turn, activates values. Behavior will therefore be resultant of the relative importance of the two activated attitudes which are likewise a function of values. The diagram below illustrates this process.
As can be seen, the Rokeach model is similar to the Fishbein and Ajzen model, but lacks one important component. Where Rokeach sees attitudes directly influencing behavior, Fishbein and Ajzen contend that intentions intervene attitudes and behavior.

While values were found to be stable, their stability is contingent upon the salient issues confronting individuals at a particular point in time. Thus, changes in values often results in changes in behavior. This value-behavior relationship is supported by research. One investigation concluded that college students make occupational choices consistent with their values and change their occupational choices in directions consistent with their values as expressed in an earlier time (Goldsen,
Rosenberg, Suchman & Williams, 1960). Church attendance was found to be highly predictive as a result of the rank ordering of "salvation" in a set of twelve values (Rokeach, 1968). Changes in values indexed by the Allport-Vernon Scale were found to be a function of changes in vocational choices that were recorded six years after a training program (Kemo, 1960). Differences in values have been found to be associated with: differences in public interracial behavior (Rokeach, 1973); choice of friends (Williams, 1959; Beech, 1966); cheating on examinations (Henshel, 1969); and participation in civil rights activities (Rokeach, 1973).

In addition to the findings concerning the relationship between behavior and values, consistent findings have also indicated that there is a relationship between parental values and child rearing practices (Kohn, 1969).

As previously discussed, the Rokeach theory posits the importance of values and their relationship to overt behavior. In the various studies that have tested this theory, three variables have usually been measured: values, behavior, and an additional factor such as socio-economic status, political affiliation, race, education, etc. While Rokeach recognizes that attitudes and beliefs intervene values and behavior, he has failed to measure them in his investigations.

Fishbein and Ajzen can be criticized for similar shortcomings. While it is identified that values play some part in influencing intentions and behavior, this variable has failed to be measured in conjunction with
attitudes and beliefs. Other behavioral intention models in the marketing literature can be criticized for similar weaknesses. They can be basically divided into two categories: those that examine beliefs and attitudes toward behavioral intentions with the exclusion of values (Miniard & Cohen, 1983; Warshaw 1980; and Sheth, 1975); and those that have examined values with the exclusion of attitudes and beliefs (Rosenberg, 1956; Rokeach, 1973). None of these models have combined all of these variables - values, beliefs, attitudes, and intentions - to examine how they interact with one another. In addition, these models have failed to be utilized in the public schools with respect to predicting art advocacy intentions. The Fishbein model is the only exception and has proven to be a viable instrument for use in art education advocacy (McNealey, 1982).

Therefore, it is precisely the purpose of this investigation to utilize the Fishbein model in a modified form to determine if there is any relationship between values, beliefs, subjective norm, attitudes, and intentions. While values influence both normative and behavioral beliefs, as Fishbein alludes to, a direct relationship between values and intentions will also be examined, as researched by Rokeach. The diagram below illustrates the modified Fishbein model.
If a relationship is found, this component (values) will provide important descriptive information in identifying potential parent art advocates.

The Relationship of Demographic Variables to Values

In addition to the previous mentioned variables, demographic factors will be examined in order to monitor their affects on values, attitudes and beliefs. Fishbein and Ajzen stress that there is no necessary relation between any external variables such as demographic ones, and behavior.
Their model demonstrates this in Figure 4. While these variables are said not to influence intentions or behavior directly, it is conjectured that they do directly influence normative and behavioral beliefs, as Figure 5 illustrates. But, many demographic variables were found to influence values in other investigations (Rokeach, 1980, 1973; Kohn, 1969; Beech, 1973; and Getzels & Csikszentmihalyi, 1962). Therefore, there is an additional modification to the Fishbein model. That is, demographic variables influence values, which in turn influence beliefs. The demographic variables to be examined here include: socio-economic status; sex of the parent; sex of the kindergarten child; and art education background. Figure 6 demonstrates the proposed relationship between demographic variables, values, beliefs, attitudes and intentions.
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Introduction

The present chapter will review of methods utilized during the present investigation. Subjects who participated in the survey will be described along with the various instruments utilized to collect the data. The development of the Kindergarten Art Advocacy Intentions Model will be discussed according to Fishbein's (1980) guidelines. The scoring for this instrument along with the Rokeach Value Scale will then be reviewed. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of scoring procedures for the following demographic variables: socio-economic status; sex of parent; sex of child; and art education background.

Subjects

The selected research site was the Derry Area School District. It is a rural one which is approximately 75 miles from the nearest metropolis. The school district operates three elementary schools, all of which include kindergartens. Art instruction, provided by a certified art teacher, is taught two times a week, 50 minutes per session. This biweekly instruction includes visits to the kindergarten as well.
The target population for this investigation consisted of 242 kindergarten parents from the Derry Area School District. Because of the small number comprising this group and the number of variables being investigated, the entire population was used for this investigation instead of a randomly selected portion of them. Of the 242 kindergarten parents in this school district, 183 responded to the questionnaires distributed throughout this investigation, a response rate of 75%.

The major occupations of these parents included factory workers, coal miners, and truck drivers (about 55%), while a small portion (20%) included professionals and semi-professionals, such as doctors, nurses, teachers, and engineers. There were also those who were unemployed and presently on welfare (25%).

The average amount of education completed by this group of kindergarten parent respondents was the completion of four years of high school (70%). A small portion (5%) of these parents had achieved graduate degrees, while others had very little or no formal education at all (25%).

These two variables, occupation and education, were utilized to determine the socio-economic status of each parent respondent. There were five socio-economic classes: Upper; Upper Middle; Middle; Lower Middle; and Lower. These were designated by utilizing the Hollingshead Social Class Index (1979). Of these five classes, the highest percentage of kindergarten parent respondents comprised the Lower Middle Class, 33%, followed by twenty five percent making up the Lower Class. Middle Class kindergarten parents constitute 22% of the entire group of respondents, while the Upper Middle Class was made up of fifteen
percent. This leaves 5% of kindergarten parents belonging to the Upper Class.

While being categorized into socio-economic classes, these kindergarten parent respondents can also be described in terms of gender, which included 11% males and 89% females. While female respondents outnumbered the males, the reverse is true when considering the sex of their offspring who attend kindergarten. This includes 52% male and 48% female.

Almost all kindergarten parent respondents had received some art education background during public school, except for 2% who had received none. Of those taking art classes only in kindergarten, there were .5%, while 6.6% received art instruction only in elementary school (1–6) excluding kindergarten. Both kindergarten and elementary art education were received by 2.2% of kindergarten parent respondents. Parents taking art education in the secondary school, including grades seven through twelve, made up 7.7% of the total group of respondents. The largest portion of parents, 81% had received art instruction in both elementary and secondary school, excluding the kindergarten.

**Procedures**

The design of this study consisted of the distribution of survey instruments. Due to the extreme length of the initial questionnaire which might have hindered response rates, it was divided into three separate sections and distributed at different times during a two month time span.
Section One of the questionnaire included 20 questions concerning the general attitudes of kindergarten parents toward art education. This was adapted from the Art Attitude Scale (Stuckhardt and Morris 1980). This section also included questions concerning demographic information such as: sex of the parent respondent; sex of the kindergarten child; art education background; general education background; and occupation. An example of this instrument is exhibited in Appendix A. This portion of the questionnaire was distributed to all kindergarten parents (242) of the Derry Area School District in the middle of April 1985.

All questionnaires for this investigation were given to each kindergarten teacher, who later distributed them to the children. Each child took the survey home for parents to complete. Upon completion, the child returned the instrument to the kindergarten teacher, who in turn gave them to the researcher.

After two weeks, Section One was collected. The response rate for this portion of the questionnaire was 199 or 82%. The remaining two portions of the questionnaires, Form A and Form B, were then distributed to all of the kindergarten parents in the same school district. Instead of parents receiving both Forms A and B, they were randomly divided into two groups where one received Form A and the other received Form B. A record was kept of who received which form of the questionnaire.

Both forms included the Rokeach Value Survey (1967), which consists of two groups of eighteen values that must be ranked by the respondent according to importance. In addition, Form A also included questions addressing two advocacy situations; (1) petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education in the event that it is threatened to
be dropped from the kindergarten curriculum; (2) and providing research material in support of kindergarten art education in the event that it is threatened to be dropped from the kindergarten curriculum.

In addition to the Rokeach Value Survey (1967), Form B addressed two different advocacy situations from Form A: (1) sending a letter to the school board and administration in the event that the art teacher fails to teach the kindergarten; (2) and sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and principal in the event that the art teacher fails to teach the kindergarten.

It was necessary to include all four advocacy situations (two for each form of the questionnaire) because pre-pilot investigations indicated that kindergarten parents were equally divided on these issues. For example, those kindergarten parents who would petition the neighborhood in the event that art education were threatened to be dropped from the kindergarten curriculum, would not provide research material in support of kindergarten art education in the event that it is threatened to be dropped from the kindergarten curriculum, and vice versa. This will be more fully explained later in the chapter.

Both Forms A and B were developed according to Fishbein guidelines (1980) and included questions concerning behavioral beliefs, subjective norms, attitudes, and normative beliefs concerning each advocacy situation already described. Both forms utilized a bi-polar scale that ranged from "Extremely Likely" to "Extremely Unlikely", and were given scale values of one to six respectively. Forms A and B are presented in Appendix B and C respectively.
All questionnaires, Section 1, Form A and Form B were distributed to the classroom teacher who then gave them to each child for transportation home to their respective parents. Since Forms A and B would later be combined with Section 1 (which included questions concerning demographic information as well as general attitudes toward kindergarten art education) for the data analysis, it was of vital importance to know which parents answered Section 1 and which answered Forms A and B. Therefore, they were number coded.

A week after the first distribution of Forms A and B, the responses were collected. The return rate for this first distribution was 156 or 64%. Therefore, a second distribution took place for those who did not respond. Also at this time, those who failed to respond to Section 1 were also given another opportunity to answer this portion of the questionnaire.

A week later, all returned questionnaires were collected. The total return rate for Section 1 was then revised to 219 or 90%. Since this is considered to be an acceptable response rate, there was no other distribution of this portion of the questionnaire. The total return rate for Forms A and B after the second distribution, was 188 or 78%. Since this was not an acceptable return rate, 26 kindergarten parents were randomly chosen from the 53 that did not respond. A condensed version of Forms A and B were distributed to this group in the same manner as all other questionnaires. This condensed version only included questions concerning attitudes and intentions toward the four advocacy behaviors previously mentioned. It did not include questions concerning behavioral
and normative beliefs. These modified versions of Forms A and B are presented in Appendices E and F respectively.

All questionnaires for this investigation were accompanied by a small gift such as refrigerator magnets, bookmarks, pencils, candy, or packets of coffee. Also included (only with Forms A and B) were raffle tickets for a baseball game. These were coded with numbers corresponding to each questionnaire and were to be returned with the completed survey instrument for the drawing of the winning number. These were included to help escalate the response rate.

**Scoring Procedure for the Attitude Towards Art Education Scale**

This instrument assessed attitudes toward kindergarten art education in general, and not kindergarten art education advocacy. Responses to the questionnaire items were on bipolar adjective and Likert type scales. There were a total of 20 items. The spaces along the bipolar Likert scales were labeled: Extremely Agree; Quite Agree; Slightly Agree; Slightly Disagree; Quite Disagree; and Extremely Disagree. Items were coded from one to three for those worded positively, and four to six for those items worded negatively. A sum of all 20 items resulted in a single score which indicated one's attitude toward arts education. A sample of the instrument is in Appendix A.

**Scoring the Rokeach Scale**

This instrument utilizes 36 values that were alphabetically listed. Respondents were to arrange them in order of importance as guiding
principles of their life. Values that were important to kindergarten parents were determined by those that were ranked the highest. As previously indicated, the list of values were presented to respondents in two lists of 18 values each. The ranking of each set of values is indigenous to each individual as each one chooses the order of importance that applies to them. These value rankings serve as the scores for each person. The Rokeach Value Scale is presented in Appendix G.

**Pilot Study for the Kindergarten Art Advocacy Intentions Instrument**

In accordance with Fishbein's "Theory of Reasoned Action", the necessary steps for developing the instrument to predict the intentions of kindergarten parents to serve as art education advocates follows. In compliance with each step, a questionnaire was sent to kindergarten parents via their child and were returned in the same manner. Small gifts accompanied the questionnaires in order to enhance a good return rate. The parents participating in this portion of the research project were not from the Derry Area School District, but were from a neighboring town, Ligonier Valley. There were four kindergarten classes which were identified as A, B, C, D. Since classes were small, the entire population of parents was used instead of a random sample. All classes did not answer all of the questionnaires, but were instead rotated. For example, the questionnaire for Step One was only given to class A; the questionnaire for Step Two was only given to class B, and so on. It was believed that rotating classes would alleviate the problem of irate
parents who were being bombarded by five different questionnaires within a two month time frame. The exploratory research began in November of 1984 and commenced in January of 1985. The following account provides the specific measures taken in the exploratory research.

**Step One:** The behavior of interest in terms of action, target, context, and time elements was defined. The target for this investigation was kindergarten art education, and the action was advocacy. In order to gain a sense of the variety of contexts in which kindergarten art advocacy would take place, kindergarten parents in the Ligonier Valley School District were asked to list the contexts in which they would intend to serve as kindergarten art advocates. A sample of the questionnaire utilized to collect such information can be found in Appendix H. This questionnaire was distributed to thirty parents and twenty six were returned. The contexts provided by this group were as follows:

1. Art education is threatened to be dropped from the kindergarten curriculum.

2. The art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten.

3. The kindergarten class would need certain supplies for an art project.

4. The kindergarten art program was very weak and needed extra help.

5. The teacher was not interested in developing the children's creativity.

6. The teacher felt it worthwhile.
7. The art program could be incorporated into other subjects without taking away from the essential skills being taught.

8. The art program is denied inclusion into the kindergarten curriculum by the board of education.

9. There is a cut in the budget which causes the lack of funds for kindergarten art education.

10. There is a change in the curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education.

11. The existing kindergarten art program consists of activities such as coloring books, cutting out shapes that are pre-drawn by the teacher, and producing art works that all look the same.

12. There is too much teacher influence on creativity.

Step Two: The contexts elicited from this group were then placed into a questionnaire format. The questionnaire was given to another group of kindergarten parents in the Ligonier Valley School District (group B). Parents responded to each context on a bi-polar scale, stating if they were "Extremely Likely" or "Unlikely" to advocate art education under the suggested circumstances. A sample of this questionnaire is in Appendix I. Twenty four parents were given the instrument with seventeen responding. It was decided that those who responded to the "Extremely" and "Quite Likely" categories did intend to advocate art in the posited context and Y for yes was used to designate this group. Those who responded to the "Slightly", "Quite", and "Extremely Unlikely" categories as well as the "Slightly Likely" category did not intend to advocate art in the presented context. N for no was used to designate this group.
Advocacy situations were then paired to see if there were parents who were equally divided on the contexts. By equally divided, it is meant that those who would advocate one situation, but at the same time not advocating another. Therefore, each question was paired with another and placed on a matrix to determine if parents were equally divided on the contexts. Matrices utilized to analyze the collected data are shown in Appendix J.

Diagonals were then checked for a tie in numbers and as can be seen in Appendix J, parents were equally divided on context three and context four. Through this analysis, eleven paired situations were found to discriminate between parent groups. These pairs were as follows: context 3 and 4; 7 and 8; 2 and 5; 2 and 7; 2 and 8; 2 and 10; 5 and 7; 5 and 8; 7 and 8; 7 and 9; 7 and 10. These numbers correspond to the listed contexts on the previous page.

Using all of the pairs would have made the final questionnaire extremely long. Therefore, each paired context was written on a slip of paper, placed in a hat, and then one was randomly selected. The paired contexts chosen by this process were:

1. Art education is threatened to be dropped from the kindergarten curriculum.

2. The art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten.

**Step Three:** Following the identification of the contexts in which art advocacy is to take place, the term art advocacy was then more explicitly defined as it embraces a variety of behaviors. Therefore, a set of single advocacy actions needed to be determined. To obtain an
adequate measure of the behavioral category of art advocacy, another group (group C) of kindergarten parents were asked to list the specific art advocacy behaviors they would perform in a particular context. Here the selected contexts (as decided upon by the procedure above) were used. A sample of this questionnaire is in Appendix K. The specific art advocacy behaviors suggested by this group for each advocacy situation is as follows.

In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, I would serve as an advocate by:

1. Calling the school board members and persuading them to change the policy concerning kindergarten art education.

2. Sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education.

3. Sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education.

4. Allowing my children to become their own advocates for kindergarten art education.

5. Asking that lesson plans prepared by the art teacher be available for the kindergarten teacher to use.

6. Talking with school supervisors about their actions concerning kindergarten art education.

7. Coming to school to assist the kindergarten teacher with art activities during the holidays.

In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, I would...
serve as an advocate by:

8. Writing a letter to the school board concerning the matter.

9. Petition the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board.

10. Getting an independent teacher for kindergarten art and having parents share the expense of a salary for this person.

11. Providing research material in support of kindergarten art education to school board members.

12. Contacting elementary school supervisors in art at local colleges to give school supervisors their opinions concerning kindergarten art education.

13. Talking with the kindergarten teacher about the use of art activities in teaching the academic subjects such as drawing pictures to illustrate a story read by the class.

14. Organizing parents to demonstrate.

15. Talking to other parents about the importance of art activities (especially to improve coordination and fine motor skills).

16. Coming to school to hear reasons why the school was dropping art education in the kindergarten.

17. Speaking to school board members about the matter.

**Step Four:** The art advocacy behaviors collected from this group were then compiled into a questionnaire. Another group (D) of thirty kindergarten parents in Ligonier were asked to respond to each specific behavior on a bi-polar scale, stating whether they were "Extremely Likely” or “Unlikely” to perform the suggested kindergarten art advocacy
behavior. This questionnaire is presented in Appendix L.

Those twenty four parents responding in the "Extremely" and "Quite Likely" categories were considered to be willing to perform the specific advocacy behavior. Those answering in these categories were coded Y (yes). Those parents responding to the "Slightly Likely" and "Slightly", "Quite", and "Extremely Unlikely" categories were considered not to be willing to perform the specific advocacy behavior. Those answering in these categories were coded N (no). It was once again necessary to see if parents were equally divided on the various advocacy behaviors. Therefore, behaviors were paired and examined to see how parents responded to each. The matrix procedures as utilized in Step Two was again needed here. All matrices are presented in Appendix M. Again, there were several situations where parents were equally divided on paired advocacy behaviors. These were the following: behavior number 2 and 3; 5 and 7; 9 and 11; 10 and 14; 12 and 14; 13 and 17. These pairs were written on individual pieces of paper, put in a hat and one was randomly drawn. The pair chosen for the context where there is a change in the curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education were:

1. Petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board.

2. Providing research material in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, etc.

Those advocacy behaviors chosen in the context where the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten were:
1. Sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education.

2. Sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal for the inclusion of kindergarten art education.

All of the data thus far provides adequate information to develop the Behavioral Intention component in terms of action, target, and context. Due to the equal division of parents on action and target, there are four different Behavioral Intention Measures, which are as follows:

1. In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, I intend to petition the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and send the petition to the school board.

2. In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, I intend to provide research material in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, PTO, and school principals.

3. In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, I intend to send a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education.

4. In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, I intend to send a letter to the kindergarten teacher and their school principal for the inclusion of kindergarten art education.

Because of the four different Behavioral Intention Measures, there are also four different attitudinal measures as well as Normative Measures. Because all information thus far was ample for these two measures, additional information from parents concerning these variables (attitude
and subjective norm) was not needed.

According to Fishbein, the previous steps allow prediction and explanation of art advocacy behavior at a general level. In order to determine the cognitive foundation underlying the behavior, the following steps were taken.

**Step Five:** Salient Outcomes are the immediate determinants of a person's attitude. In order to understand why a person holds a certain attitude, it is necessary to assess his salient beliefs (beliefs that certain behaviors will result in certain outcomes). Salient referents are a person's beliefs that a specific referent thinks he should perform the behavior. Both of these components were assessed. In order to determine what this data consists of, two different groups of kindergarten parents in the Ligonier Valley School District were given different questionnaires to elicit such information. Both questionnaires are on display in Appendices N and O. Two different questionnaires were distributed due to the extreme length of both if they were combined into one instrument. It was feared this might affect the response rate. Also, since all four classrooms had parents who had received at least one questionnaire thus far, it was necessary to begin the cycle once again and distribute the last round of surveys to Groups A and B.

From the thirty kindergarten parents in each group that were given questionnaires, twenty six responded in the first and twenty three in the second. The following list provides behavioral and normative beliefs elicited for each advocacy situation.

In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, my
petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board would:

1. Help save the kindergarten art program.

2. Be beneficial to the kindergarten child.

3. Cause the neighbors to take a negative attitude toward the idea because of my doing it since I have a kindergarten child.

4. Cause members of the neighborhood who have no vested interest in education to jump on the bandwagon to simply save the taxpayers.

5. Provide the school board with a better understanding of how taxpayers feel about such a move.

6. Provide the school board with a better understanding of how parents feel about such a move.

7. Make parents of kindergarten children aware of the change.

8. Give parents the opportunity to support or not to support the change.

9. Cause them to feel that art isn’t a necessity since their children will be receiving art in the elementary grades.

10. Cause them to be aware of the situation.

Normative referents in relationship to this same advocacy situation are the following:

1. Kindergarten teachers

2. Elementary art teachers

3. Local artists
4. Concerned parents

5. Teacher's union

6. PTO

7. Local newspaper

8. Teachers

9. Women's organizations

10. Taxpayer's without children

In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, my providing research materials in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, PTO, and school principal would:

1. Raise their awareness of the advantages of the kindergarten art program.

2. Cause them to feel that kindergarten art education is not necessary.

3. Cause them to be aware of how much I care about the change.

4. Save the art program if these people are made aware of its importance.

Normative Referents for the same advocacy behavior include:

1. Kindergarten teachers

2. Elementary art teachers

3. Local artists
4. Concerned parents

5. College elementary education department

6. Teacher's union

7. P.T.O.

8. Local newspaper

9. Teachers

10. Taxpayers without children

In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, my sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education would:

1. Bring the matter to their attention.

2. Make the desires of the parents known.

3. Prompt the school board to take action.


5. Provide the board with information on which to make a decision.

6. Cause more emphasis to be placed on creativity in my child's education.

7. Let the school board know that art is needed in the curriculum.

8. Possibly be difficult due to a school board that is sometimes difficult to get along with.
Normative Referents concerning this same advocacy behavior are:

1. Other parents
2. Kindergarten teachers
3. People interested in lowering the school tax.
4. Parents
5. The school board

In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, my sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal would:

1. Instigate the coordination of schedules and time slots to ascertain the feasibility of the inclusion of kindergarten art education by these two people.

2. Motivate them to be advocates for the kindergarten art program.

3. Cause the kindergarten teacher to include art along with other subjects while teaching.

4. Make my opinion known to them.

5. Give the board of education information on which to make a decision.

6. Cause more emphasis to be placed on creativeness in my child's education.

7. Cause the kindergarten teacher to take it as a personal insult that she was not adequately handling art education.

8. Let them know that art education is needed.

9. Let them know that parents think art education is needed.
10. Cause these two individuals to do their best to include such a program.

Normative Referents for this same advocacy behavior include:

1. Kindergarten parents
2. Kindergarten teachers
3. Parents
4. School board

All Behavioral and Normative Beliefs elicited from parents concerning the four different advocacy situations were utilized in the final questionnaire. As already previously noted, due to the extreme length of the final questionnaire, it was necessary to divide the instrument in half, thus making two different survey instruments. These are on display in Appendix B and C.

To address the research questions and test the hypotheses previously noted, the final draft of the questionnaire required the following measurements: 1.) behavioral intention; 2.) a direct measure of attitude toward the act; 3.) beliefs about the outcomes resulting from engaging in the behavior; 4.) evaluation of those outcomes; 5.) perception of referent’s beliefs about whether or not the behavior in question should be performed; 6.) motivation to comply with the referents; 7.) a direct measurement of subjective norm; 8.) beliefs about art education comprising a Likert attitude instrument; and 9.) a measurement of attitude toward art education.

Bipolar adjective and Likert type scales were utilized to elicit responses on the questionnaire. The following are examples.
1.) Behavioral Intention

In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, how likely are you to send a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?

LIKELY: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____UNLIKELY

2.) Attitude Toward the Act

My sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten is:

GOOD: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____BAD

3.) Beliefs About Outcomes

In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, my sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education would prompt the school board to take action.

LIKELY: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____UNLIKELY

4.) Evaluation of Outcomes

Prompting the school board to take action is

GOOD: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____BAD
5.) Subjective Norm

Most people who are important to me think I should send a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education, in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten.

LIKELY: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___UNLIKELY

6.) Perception of Referent's Beliefs

Other parents would want me to send a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education, in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten.

LIKELY: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___UNLIKELY

7.) Motivation to Comply

Generally speaking, I want to do what other parents think I should do.

LIKELY: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___UNLIKELY

8.) Beliefs About the Object

Art education enhances knowledge of our cultural heritage.

STRONGLY AGREE: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___STRONGLY DISAGREE
9.) Attitude Toward the Object

Please place an X in the area which most closely represents your general attitude toward art education.

FAVORABLE____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____UNFAVORABLE

Scoring of the Kindergarten Art Advocacy Intentions Measure

As the scoring procedure varies from one component of the instrument to the other, each will be discussed separately. Behavioral Intentions was measured along a bipolar semantic differential scale. Spaces along this scale were labeled: Extremely Likely; Quite Likely; Slightly Likely; Slightly Unlikely; Quite Unlikely; and Extremely Unlikely. Items worded positively were coded one to three, and four to six for items worded negatively. It was decided that those who intended to perform the specified advocacy behavior would respond in the first and second space of the scale. Those who had neutral intentions to perform the advocacy behavior responded in the third and fourth space of the scale, and those who did not intend to perform the specified advocacy behavior would respond in the fifth and sixth space of the scale.

Like Behavioral Intentions, Attitude Toward the Act was scored on a bipolar semantic differential scale ranging from "Extremely Likely" to "Extremely Unlikely" with scale values from one to six respectively. Each attitude component contained three scales scored in the manner previously mentioned with a score of one to two representing a positive attitude, three to four representing a neutral attitude, and five to six a negative attitude. These scores were then summed. This single score was
indicative of the attitude measure. Possible total scores ranged from three to eighteen. Those having scores of three to seven were considered to have favorable attitudes toward the specified advocacy behavior. Those having scores of eight to twelve were considered to have neutral attitudes toward the specified advocacy activity, and those having scores of thirteen to eighteen were considered to have negative attitudes toward the specified behavior.

Subjective Norm was likewise measured on the same bipolar semantic differential scale. One scale was used. Those persons having scores of one to two considered other's opinions important in relation to their intentions to perform the specified advocacy behavior. Those having scores of three to four considered other's opinions of neutral importance in relation to their intentions to perform the specified advocacy behavior. Those having scores of five to six considered other's opinions of no importance in relation to their intending to perform the specified advocacy behavior.

Each of these components, Attitude and Subjective Norm were then given a weight reflecting its relative importance as a determinant of the intention of art advocacy. To obtain these weights, estimates of multiple regression analysis were done where the standardized regression coefficients served as estimates of the weights for Attitudes and Subjective Norm.

Behavioral Beliefs and Outcome Evaluations were measured on bipolar semantic differential scales in the same manner as previously mentioned with scores of one and two representing supportive beliefs, three and four neutral beliefs, and five and six representing negative beliefs.
According to the Fishbein Theory (1980), a person's attitude toward an action can be predicted by multiplying the evaluation of each of the Outcome Evaluations by the strength of the beliefs that performing the behavior will lead to that consequence. This was done, then the products were summed for the total set of beliefs for each person, thus resulting in a single score for each respondent. Since there were four different advocacy intentions, there were also four different sets of Behavioral Beliefs and Outcome Evaluations. Therefore, the range of scores differed for each set. In reference to intentions to petition the neighborhood, there were 10 scales to measure the belief component and 10 to measure Outcome Evaluations. Total scores ranged from 10 to 360. Those having scores of 10 to 116 were considered to have favorable beliefs toward petitioning the neighborhood. Those with scores of 117 to 232 were considered to have neutral beliefs toward the same advocacy activity. Those having unfavorable beliefs toward petitioning the neighborhood had scores of 233 to 360.

In reference to intentions toward providing research material, there were 4 scales to measure the belief component and 4 to measure Outcome Evaluations. Scores ranged from 4 to 144. Those having scores of 4 to 46 were considered to have favorable beliefs toward this advocacy behavior. Those with scores of 47 to 92 were considered to have neutral beliefs toward providing research material. Those considered to have unfavorable beliefs toward this advocacy behavior had scores of 93 to 144.

In reference to intentions toward sending a letter to the school board, etc., there were 8 scales to measure beliefs and 8 to measure Outcome
Evaluations. Scores ranged from 8 to 288. Those having scores of 8 to 93 were considered to have favorable beliefs toward this activity. Those having scores of 94 to 186 were considered to have neutral beliefs toward sending a letter to the school board. Those considered to have negative beliefs toward this advocacy behavior had scores of 187 to 288.

In reference to sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and principal, there were 10 scales to measure beliefs and 10 to measure outcome evaluations. Scores ranged from 10 to 360. Those having scores of 10 to 116 were considered to have favorable beliefs toward advocacy behavior. Those having scores of 117 to 232 were considered to have neutral beliefs toward sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher. Those considered to have unfavorable beliefs toward this advocacy behavior had scores of 233 to 360.

Normative Beliefs and Motivations to Comply were both measured on a bipolar semantic differential scale with scores of 1 and 2 indicating positive beliefs; 3 and 4 indicating neutral beliefs; and scores of 5 to 6 negative beliefs. Each Normative Belief was then multiplied by the corresponding motivation to comply. The products were then summed for the total set of beliefs for each person, thus resulting in a single score. Once again, due to the fact that there were four different advocacy intentions, there were also 4 corresponding sets of Normative Beliefs and Motivations to Comply. Therefore, the range of scores differed for each. In reference to intentions to petition the neighborhood, there were 10 scales in the Normative Belief component as well as the corresponding Motivations to Comply. Scores ranged from 10 to 360. Those having scores of 10 to 116 were considered to be influenced by
normative referents in relationship to their intentions to petition the neighborhood. Those having scores of 117 to 232 were considered to regard their normative referents as having neutral influence on their intentions to perform the specified advocacy act. Those who were considered not to be influenced by normative referents in relationship to their intentions to petition the neighborhood had scores of 233 to 360.

In reference to providing research material, there were 10 scales to measure normative beliefs as well as motivations to comply. Scores ranged from 10 to 360. Those persons having scores of 10 to 116 were considered to be influenced by normative referents with respect to this advocacy behavior. Those with scores of 117 to 232 were considered to regard the normative referents to have neutral importance concerning their intentions to provide research material. Those considered not to be influenced by normative referents in regards to this advocacy behavior had scores of 233 to 360.

In reference to sending a letter to the school board, there were 5 scales measuring Normative Beliefs and Motivations to Comply. Scores ranged from 5 to 180. Those having scores of 5 to 57 were considered to be influenced by the normative referents in regards to their intentions to perform this advocacy act. Those with scores of 58 to 115 were considered to regard the normative referents to have neutral importance concerning their intentions to send a letter to the school board. Those considered not to be influenced by normative referents in relation to intending to perform this advocacy activity, had scores of 116 to 180.

In reference to sending a letter to the school principal and kindergarten teacher, there were 4 scales to measure Normative Beliefs
and the corresponding Motivations to Comply. Scores ranged from 4 to 144. Those having scores of 4 to 46 were considered to be influenced by normative referents in regards to their intentions to perform this advocacy act. Those with scores of 47 to 93 were considered to regard the normative referents to have neutral importance concerning their intentions to send a letter to the school principal and kindergarten teacher. Those considered not to be influenced by normative referents in regards to their intentions to perform this advocacy activity, had scores of 94 to 144.

**Socioeconomic Status and Scoring Procedures**

A portion of the questionnaire asks parent respondents to indicate their highest level of education achieved as well as to specifically identify their occupation. Various levels of education were listed and respondents were to indicate their level with an X. An example of the questionnaire is on display in Appendix A as a component of the first questionnaire distributed to parents.

These two variables were then utilized to determine the socio-economic status of each respondent, according to Hollingshead's Two-Factor Index of Social Position (1975). These variables were scaled and weighted individually, and a single score was obtained. The educational scale is based upon the years of school completed by the head of the household. Hollingshead notes the scale values to be as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of School Completed</th>
<th>Scale Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional (M.S., M.A., M.E., M.D., Ph.D.)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four years of college (A.B., B.S., B.M.)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years of college (also business school)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12 years of school (part high school)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9 years of school</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 7 years of school</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The occupational scale is more extensive and only will be outlined here. It is divided into seven categories, each containing specifically defined occupations. The categories are as follows. The number corresponding to each category indicates the scale value.

1 Higher Executives, Proprietors of Large Concerns, and Major Professionals

2 Business Managers, Proprietors of Medium Sized Businesses, and Minor Professionals

3 Administrative personnel, Small Independent Businesses, and Minor Professionals

4 Clerical and Sales Workers, Technicians, and Owners of Little Businesses

5 Skilled Manual Employees

6 Machine Operators and Semi-Skilled Employees

7 Unskilled Employees

According to previous research done by Hollingshead, it has been determined that occupational position has a factor weight of 7, while
educational background has a factor weight of 4. These weights were then multiplied by the scale score for education and occupation of each individual or head of household. The resulting weight score suggests the approximate position of the family on an overall scale. After the calculation of this score, individuals are stratified into a class. These classes are as follows:

- Upper Class I: 11-17
- Upper Middle Class II: 18-31
- Middle Class III: 32-47
- Lower Middle Class IV: 48-63
- Lower Class V: 64-77

**Sex of Respondent and Scoring Procedure**

Respondents were asked to indicate their gender by placing an X beside male or female. These were then scored accordingly: males were given a score of 1 and females a score of 2. An example of this portion of the questionnaire is in Appendix A.

**Sex of Kindergarten Child and Scoring Procedure**

Respondents were asked to indicate the gender of their kindergarten child by placing an X beside male or female. They were then scored in the same manner as previously described for sex of parent respondent. Appendix A displays this portion of the initial questionnaire.
Art Education Background and Scoring Procedure

Respondents were asked to indicate where they had received art education during their public school career. Since the nature of this study is concerned with soliciting art advocates for the public school, other sources of art education outside of the public school were not considered. Respondents were to indicate having had art at each grade level by placing an X next to it. These were scored accordingly. Those having had no art experiences in public school were given a score of 0. Those having had art experiences in the kindergarten only were given a score of 1. Those having art experiences only in elementary school (1-6) were given a score of 2. Kindergarten and elementary art experiences were scored 3. Secondary school (junior high and high school) with elementary (1-6) art experiences were scored 4. Those having only secondary art experiences and not elementary or kindergarten were given a score of 5. An example of this portion of the questionnaire is on display in Appendix A.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS AND RESULTS OF THE DATA

Introduction

In order to test the theory postulated by the Fishbein Model, measurements were taken of: Normative Beliefs and Motivation to Comply; Behavioral Beliefs and Evaluation Outcomes; Attitude Toward the Act; Subjective Norm; and Behavioral Intentions.

Measures were also taken of beliefs about kindergarten art education; attitudes toward kindergarten art education; and values. Demographic measures included sex of the parent respondent; sex of the kindergarten child; socio-economic status; and art education background (AEB).

Fishbein and Ajzen (1980) suggest that the statistical tool to be utilized for these variables is the correlation coefficient in order to measure the strength of the relationship among the variables. In addition they note that,

"Empirical tests of our theory require...an index of the degree to which we can predict one variable (the intention) from a simultaneous consideration of two other variables (attitude toward the behavior and subjective norm). Such an index is provided by the multiple correlation coefficient (R)" (1980).

In conjunction with the use of correlations and multiple correlations, other statistical tools utilized to answer the hypotheses posited in this
study include analysis of variance; multiple regression; and path analysis.

Testing of the Hypotheses

The Effect of Subjective Norm and Attitudes Toward Advocacy on Behavioral Intentions. The first hypothesis in this study concerns the prediction of behavioral intention with the linear combination of parent's attitudes toward performing an advocacy activity and their subjective norm regarding the act. The second and third hypotheses address the significant effect of attitude toward advocacy and subjective norm separately on advocacy intentions. The data in Table 1 support these hypotheses. When subjective norm and attitude towards advocacy were regressed on intentions to petition the neighborhood, a multiple correlation (R) of .75 (p<.05) was obtained. Therefore, 57% of the variance in intentions to petition the neighborhood was accounted for by attitude towards advocacy and subjective norm. This finding was statistically significant, where (F=56.35, p<.05).

When testing the regression coefficient for attitudes toward petitioning the neighborhood, it was found to be statistically significant at the .05 level with 87df, where (t=9.28). With 95% confidence, the parameter lies within the range of +.2513<β<+.3895.

The regression coefficient for subjective norm failed to reach significance at the .05 level with 87df, (t=1.62). The parameter lies within the range of +.0267<β<+.2545.
Regressing attitudes toward advocacy and subjective norm on intentions to provide research material, produced $R=.74$ ($p<.05$), with attitudes toward advocacy and subjective norm explaining 55% of the variance. This finding is statistically significant at the .05 level, where $(F=52.71, p<.05)$.

When testing the regression coefficient for attitudes toward providing research material, it was found to be statistically significant ($t=4.47, p<.05$), 87df. With 95% confidence, the parameter lies within the range of $+.1145 < \beta < .2998$.

The regression coefficient for subjective norm likewise reached statistical significance, ($t=3.12, p<.05$) with 87df. With 95% confidence, the parameter lies within the range of $+.1229 < \beta < .5616$.

When attitudes toward advocacy intentions and subjective norm were regressed on intentions to write a letter to the school board, a multiple correlation ($R$) of .65 ($p<.05$) was obtained. Subjective norms and attitudes toward advocacy account for 42% of the variance in intentions to write a letter to the school board, and this finding is statistically significant $(F=32.62, p<.05)$ with 90df.

When testing each regression coefficient, both were statistically significant. Subjective norm $(t=2.09, p<.05)$ with 90df; attitudes toward advocacy $(t=4.65, p<.05)$ with 90df. The parameter for subjective norms lies within the range of $+.010268 < \beta < .478832$. The parameter for attitude towards advocacy lies within the range of $+.1098 < \beta < .2758$.

Regressing attitude toward advocacy and subjective norm on intentions to write a letter to the principal produced $R=.66$, $p<.05$. Attitudes toward advocacy and subjective norm explained 43% of the
variance in intentions to write a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher, and this finding is statistically significant at the .05 level, where (F=34.12).

Each regression coefficient was tested separately and found to be statistically significant. Subjective norm (t=2.37, p<.05) with 90df; attitudes toward advocacy (t=5.39, p<.05) with 90df. The parameter for subjective norm lies within the range of +.03500 <β< +.4094. The parameter for attitude toward writing a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher lies within the range of +.1316 <β< +.2868.

In all advocacy situations, the data strongly supports the hypothesis that a linear combination of attitudes toward advocacy and subjective norm predicts advocacy intentions. The data also strongly support the hypothesis that attitude towards advocacy intentions does significantly affect advocacy intentions in all cases. Likewise, subjective norm significantly affects advocacy intentions, with the exception of intentions to petition the neighborhood. It is possible that subjective norm failed to reach due to possible multicollinearity or perhaps error in measurement both of which cause the underestimation of B (Pedhazur, 1982).
TABLE 1

SUMMARY DATA TABLE OF ATTITUDE TOWARD THE ACT (AA) AND SUBJECTIVE NORM (SN): CORRELATIONS WITH BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS (BI), SUM OF SQUARES, MULTIPLE CORRELATION (R), R², F VALUES FOR R², STANDARDIZED REGRESSION COEFFICIENTS, t VALUES FOR b.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Intention</th>
<th>Correlation with BI</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BI1**</td>
<td>AA1</td>
<td>.7751*</td>
<td>96.4517</td>
<td>.7084*</td>
<td>9.28*</td>
<td>.7512*</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>.3709*</td>
<td>2.3017</td>
<td>.1220*</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI2</td>
<td>AA2</td>
<td>.6718*</td>
<td>99.2492</td>
<td>.5073*</td>
<td>4.47*</td>
<td>.7402*</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>.6649*</td>
<td>10.1023</td>
<td>.3542*</td>
<td>3.12*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI3</td>
<td>AA3</td>
<td>.6268*</td>
<td>74.1885</td>
<td>.4864*</td>
<td>4.65*</td>
<td>.6483*</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN3</td>
<td>.5235*</td>
<td>5.3116</td>
<td>.2186*</td>
<td>2.09*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI4</td>
<td>AA4</td>
<td>1.0000*</td>
<td>55.0833</td>
<td>.5090*</td>
<td>5.39*</td>
<td>.6567*</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN4</td>
<td>.4928*</td>
<td>4.9584</td>
<td>.2237*</td>
<td>2.37*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05
**BI1-intentions to petition the neighborhood.
BI2-intentions to provide research material.
BI3-intentions to write a letter to the school board.
BI4-intentions to write a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher.
The Relationship of Attitudes Toward Advocacy and Advocacy Intentions. The fourth hypothesis, that attitude toward kindergarten art education advocacy will provide a significant positive correlation with advocacy intentions, was supported by the data, (See Table 1). In reference to petitioning the neighborhood, attitudes toward advocacy intentions correlated with intentions to petition the neighborhood with an r of .76 (p<.05) and was statistically significant. Attitudes toward advocacy explains 58% of the variance of intentions to petition the neighborhood. The approximate interval estimates at the 95% level of confidence are from +.60 to +.79.

There was a significant positive correlation between attitudes toward advocacy intentions and intentions to provide research material, where r was .6718 (p<.05). In addition, attitudes toward advocacy explains 45% of the variance of intentions to provide research material. With 95% confidence, the approximate interval estimates are from +.58 to +.78.

Attitudes toward advocacy correlated significantly with intentions to write a letter to the school board with an r of .6268 (p<.05). Thirty nine percent of the variance of intentions to write a letter to the school board is explained by attitudes toward advocacy intentions. The approximate interval estimates at the 95% level of confidence are from +.52 to +.73.

There was a significant positive correlation between attitudes toward advocacy intentions and intentions to write a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher, where r was 1.00 (p<.05). Attitudes toward advocacy explain 100% of the variance of intentions to write a
letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher.

In all cases, the findings confirmed the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between the attitudinal component and behavioral intentions. While all correlations were relatively similar, attitudes toward advocacy and intentions of writing a letter to the principal provided the strongest relationship.

The Relationship of Subjective Norms and Advocacy Intentions. The fifth hypothesis, that subjective norm will provide a significant positive correlation with advocacy intentions, was also supported by the data, (See Table 1). Subjective norms correlated with intentions to petition the neighborhood with an $r$ of .3709 ($p<.05$) and was statistically significant. Subjective norm explains 14% of the variance of intentions to petition the neighborhood. The approximate interval estimates at the 95% level of confidence were from +.20 to +.53.

There was a significant positive correlation between subjective norms and intentions to provide research material, where $r$ was .6649 ($p<.05$). Subjective norms explains 44% of the variance of intentions to provide research material. With 95% confidence, the approximate interval estimates were from +.58 to +.78.

Subjective norms correlated significantly with intentions to write a letter to the school board with an $r$ of .5235 ($p<.05$). Twenty seven percent of the variance of intentions to write a letter to the school board is explained by subjective norms. The approximate interval estimates at the 95% level of confidence were from +.38 to +.67.
There was a significant positive correlation between subjective norms and intentions to write a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher, where $r = .4928$ ($p < .05$). Subjective norms explains $24\%$ of the variance of intentions to write a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher. The approximate interval estimates were from $+.33$ to $+.63$.

In all cases, the findings confirmed the hypothesis that there is a positive relationship between subjective norm and behavioral intentions. While all correlations were relatively similar, subjective norms and intentions to provide research material provided the strongest relationship, while the weakest relationship was found between subjective norms and intentions to petition the neighborhood.

The Effect of Attitudes Toward Advocacy Intentions and Advocacy Intentions. Hypothesis six states that the attitudinal component provides a stronger effect on advocacy intentions than the normative component. Knowledge of the two components led to highly accurate predictions of intentions for all four advocacy situations (See Table 1). $R = .75$ for intentions to petition the neighborhood; $R = .74$ for intentions to provide research materials; $R = .65$ for intentions to write a letter to the board; $R = .66$ for intentions to write a letter to the principal. As seen in Table 1, all of these multiple correlations were significant at the .05 level. $R$ squares were likewise significant ($p < .05$).

When examining the effect of each of these variables (attitudes and subjective norm) separately, attitudes toward advocacy have consistently higher regression coefficients than subjective norm, and all were significant ($p < .05$). This provides evidence that the attitudinal component has a stronger effect on advocacy intentions than the
normative component.

The picture becomes even more clear when $r^2$ for each variable is examined, as well as the increment in variance due to each. The unique contribution of each variable (attitudes and subjective norm) to advocacy intentions is presented in Table 2.

In reference to the advocacy behavior of petitioning the neighborhood, $r^2$ for subjective norm was .14, while the unique contribution of subjective norm to behavioral intention was 4%. The $r^2$ for attitudes toward petitioning the neighborhood was .60, while the increment was 43%. Both increments were significant at the .05 level.

"Because of the incomparability of b's, researchers who wish to speak of relative importance of variables resort to comparison's among B's, as they are based on standard scores." (Pedhazur, 1973, p.64) Therefore, in comparing the standardized regression coefficients for each of these variables, as displayed in Table 1, the effect of attitude toward the act ($B=.7084$) was more than 5.5 times as great as the effect of subjective norm ($B=.1220$) on behavioral intentions. While both coefficients are significant ($p<.05$), $AA_1$ has a greater effect on $Bl_1$ than $SN_1$.

In reference to providing research material, the increment in the proportion of variance accounted for by subjective norm was 10%, while $r^2$ was 44%. Attitudes toward providing research material had an increment of 11% and an $r^2$ of 45%. Both increments were statistically significant at the .05 level. While both standardized regression coefficients were significant ($p<.05$), the effect of attitudes ($B=.5073$) was more than 1.2 times as great as the effect of subjective norm ($B=.3542$) on the intention to provide research materials.
The unique contribution of subjective norm in reference to writing a letter to the school board was 3% with an r2 of 27%. Attitude toward the act had an increment of 15% with an r2 of 39%. Both increments were statistically significant (p<.05). Standardized regression coefficients were likewise significant (p<.05). However, the effect of attitudes (B=.4864) was more than 2.1 times as great as the effect of subjective norms (B=.2186) on intentions to write a letter to the school board.

In reference to the advocacy behavior of writing a letter to the principal, the increment in proportion of variance accounted for by subjective norm was .19%, with an r2 of 24%. Attitude toward the act had an increment of 57% with an r2 of 100%. Both increments were significant (p<.05), as well as the standardized regression coefficients (p<.05). The effect of attitudes (B=.5090) was more than 2.2 times as great as the effect of subjective norms (B=.2237) on intentions to write a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher.

While all standardized regression coefficients, as well as r2 for these variables, were statistically significant, in all cases, attitude toward the act carried more weight as a predictor of advocacy intentions, than subjective norm. Therefore, the hypothesis is supported.
### TABLE 2

**INCREMENTS IN VARIANCE DUE TO SUBJECTIVE NORM (SN) AND ATTITUDE TOWARD THE ACT (AA) AND rSQUARE FOR EACH OF THESE VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advocacy Intentions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Increment Due to Subjective Norm r2 (SN)</th>
<th>Increment Due to Attitude r2(AA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BI1**</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.0374*</td>
<td>.4267*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.0966*</td>
<td>.1058*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.0273*</td>
<td>.1461*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.1883*</td>
<td>.5687*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05  
**BI1—intentions to petition the neighborhood.  
BI2—intentions to provide research material.  
BI3—intentions to write a letter to the school board.  
BI4—intentions to write a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher.

The Relationship of Behavioral and Normative Beliefs to Attitudes Toward Advocacy and Subjective Norms. Hypothesis seven and eight pertain to the relationship of behavioral and normative beliefs to attitude toward the act and subjective norm respectively. It should be noted here that in the "Theory of Reasoned Action", behavioral beliefs consist of the sums of parent's beliefs about outcomes resulting from a specific advocacy activity times the evaluation of those beliefs. Likewise, normative beliefs consist of the sum of parent's perceptions of
the beliefs of "important others" regarding the act, times motivation to comply.

Since these hypotheses involve a question of inference about association between behavioral beliefs and attitude, as well as normative beliefs and subjective norm, Pearson Correlation Coefficients were computed and then tested for significance (See Table 3). Table 4 illustrates means and standard deviations for these variables.

For Form 1 of the questionnaire where advocacy intentions concerned petitioning the neighborhood, the correlation coefficient for attitudes toward advocacy and behavioral beliefs was calculated to be $r=0.4381$, where $n=90$. This was a significant positive correlation where $p<0.05$. The approximate interval estimates at the 95% level of confidence for $r=0.4381$ were from +0.25 to +0.58.

The correlation coefficient for subjective norms and normative beliefs concerning petitioning the neighborhood, was calculated to be $r=0.2438$, where $n=90$. The $r^2=0.0594$, where 6% of the variation of subjective norm is accounted for by normative beliefs. This was a significant positive correlation where $p<0.05$. The approximate interval estimates at the 95% level of confidence for $r=0.2438$ was from +0.08 to +0.45.

For Form 1 of the questionnaire, attitudes toward advocacy and behavioral beliefs concerning intentions to provide research material correlated with an $r=0.42809$, where $n=90$. The $r^2=0.1833$, where 18% of the variance in attitudes toward advocacy is accounted for by behavioral beliefs. This significant positive correlation ($p<0.05$) had a 95% confidence limit from +0.24 to +0.54.
Concerning intentions to provide research material, subjective norms and normative beliefs correlated with an $r = .44196$, where $n=90$. The $r^2 = .1953$, where 20% of the variation in subjective norms was accounted for by normative beliefs. This was a significant positive correlation ($p < .05$) where the approximate interval estimate at 95% confidence level were from $.30$ to $.60$.

For Form Two of the questionnaire where intentions concerned writing a letter to the school board, the correlation coefficient for attitudes toward advocacy and behavioral beliefs was calculated to be $r = .56103$, where $n=93$. The $r^2 = .31475$, where 31% of the variance of attitudes toward intentions to write a letter to the school board was accounted for by behavioral beliefs. The positive correlation was significant ($p < .05$). The 95% confidence limits was from $.40$ to $.68$.

Concerning the same advocacy intention, the correlation coefficient for subjective norm and normative beliefs was $r = .42947$, where $n=93$. This positive correlation was significant at the ($p < .05$). The approximate interval estimates at the 95% level of confidence were from $.28$ to $.58$. The $r^2 = .1844$, where 18% of the variation of subjective norm was accounted for by normative beliefs.

For Form Two of the questionnaire where the advocacy intention concerned writing a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher, attitude toward advocacy and behavioral beliefs correlated with an $r = .47999$, where $n=93$. This correlation was positive and significant at ($p < .05$). The 95% confidence limits was from $.34$ to $.63$. The $r^2 = .2304$, where 23% of the variance of attitudes toward writing a letter to the
principal and kindergarten teacher was accounted for by behavioral beliefs.

Concerning the same advocacy intention, subjective norm and normative beliefs correlated with an $r = .52617$, where $n = 90$. This was a positive significant correlation ($p < .05$), where the interval estimates were from $.40$ to $.68$ with 95% confidence. The $r^2 = .27685$, where 28% of the variation in subjective norms was accounted for by normative beliefs.

In the examination of this data, the following guidelines set by Fishbein and Ajzen (1980) were followed.

"Although it is an arbitrary decision to term a correlation "weak" or "strong", some general guidelines can be suggested. In the social sciences, correlations around .30 have been considered satisfactory and, consistent with this practice, we would suggest that correlations below this level are usually of little practical value even if they are statistically significant." (p. 77).

All correlations in Table 3 follow these guidelines, with the exception of the relationship between normative beliefs and subjective norms concerning intentions to write to the school board. While this correlation was statistically significant, and confirms the hypothesis that normative beliefs do positively affect subjective norm, it has little value for this study due to the weak relationship. While all other correlations between normative beliefs and subjective norm confirmed the hypothesis, normative beliefs and subjective norm concerning intentions to write a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher provided the strongest relationship, $r = .5262$. 
In all cases, the findings likewise confirmed the hypothesis that behavioral beliefs do positively affect attitudes. While all correlations were relatively similar, behavioral beliefs and attitudes toward intentions to write a letter to the school board provided the strongest relationship between behavioral beliefs and attitude toward the act, $r=.56103$.

**TABLE 3**

RELATIONSHIPS OF BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS (BB) TO ATTITUDE TOWARD THE ACT (AA) AND NORMATIVE BELIEFS (NB) TO SUBJECTIVE NORM (SN) FOR EACH BEHAVIORAL INTENTION (BI).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Intentions</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>BB-AA $r$</th>
<th>BB-AA $r^2$</th>
<th>NB-SN $r$</th>
<th>NB-SN $r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BI1**</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.43810*</td>
<td>.1919</td>
<td>.2438*</td>
<td>.0594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>.42809*</td>
<td>.1833</td>
<td>.4419*</td>
<td>.1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.56103*</td>
<td>.3147</td>
<td>.4295*</td>
<td>.1844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.47999*</td>
<td>.2304</td>
<td>.5262*</td>
<td>.2768</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  
**BI1-intentions to petition the neighborhood.  
BI2-intentions to provide research material.  
BI3-intentions to write a letter to the school board.  
BI4-intentions to write a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher.
TABLE 4

MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR ATTITUDES (AA1, AA2, AA3, AA4), BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS (BB1, BB2, BB3, BB4), SUBJECTIVE NORM (SN1, SN2, SN3, SN4), and NORMATIVE BELIEFS (NB1, NB2, NB3, NB4) FOR EACH ADVOCACY SITUATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA1**</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8.2111</td>
<td>3.0629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>58.2777</td>
<td>28.2739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
<td>1.5050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>105.9444</td>
<td>52.7183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8.8888</td>
<td>3.3835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>23.8444</td>
<td>15.4169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>1.4300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB2</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>118.0333</td>
<td>72.7841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>8.1290</td>
<td>3.6152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43.8172</td>
<td>23.4307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.8924</td>
<td>1.2808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>52.0752</td>
<td>23.3714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7.5806</td>
<td>2.9902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>55.8709</td>
<td>25.7704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.8279</td>
<td>1.2391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NB4</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>35.0752</td>
<td>16.5754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AA1; BB1; SN1; NB1-intentions to petition the neighborhood  
AA2; BB2; SN2; NB2-intentions to provide research material  
AA3; BB3; SN3; NB3-intentions to write to school board  
AA4; BB4; SN4; NB4-intentions to write to principal
The Relationship of Values to Normative and Behavioral Beliefs

Hypothesis nine addresses the positive relationship between value rankings on the Rokeach Scale and beliefs (normative and behavioral). Values provided no significant positive relationships with behavioral beliefs and normative beliefs, therefore the hypothesis was rejected. Hypothesis ten addressed the positive relationship between values and behavioral intentions. Again, values provided no significant positive relationships with behavioral intentions, therefore hypothesis ten was rejected as well. Tables 5, 6, and 7 provide all of the Spearman Correlation Coefficients for each group of values.
TABLE 5

SPEARMAN CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR VALUES (V1L1 to V1L18) AND (V2L1 to V2L18) AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO NORMATIVE BELIEFS (NB1 and NB2) AS WELL AS BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS (BB1 and BB2) WHERE N=90.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>NB1</th>
<th>NB2</th>
<th>BB1</th>
<th>BB2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1L1</td>
<td>.06023</td>
<td>.08834</td>
<td>.11443</td>
<td>.12970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L2</td>
<td>.15605</td>
<td>.07415</td>
<td>.08594</td>
<td>.14313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L3</td>
<td>.15659</td>
<td>.03115</td>
<td>.04049</td>
<td>.12879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L4</td>
<td>.18627</td>
<td>.10755</td>
<td>.09687</td>
<td>.20241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L5</td>
<td>.16547</td>
<td>.02567</td>
<td>.13822</td>
<td>.05901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L6</td>
<td>.05589</td>
<td>.14242</td>
<td>.15637</td>
<td>.01283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L7</td>
<td>.02726</td>
<td>.05972</td>
<td>.09071</td>
<td>.07866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L8</td>
<td>.07116</td>
<td>.02905</td>
<td>.09685</td>
<td>.01291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L9</td>
<td>.05820</td>
<td>.0196</td>
<td>.09015</td>
<td>.13821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L10</td>
<td>.08021</td>
<td>.18498</td>
<td>.13140</td>
<td>.15363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L11</td>
<td>.15172</td>
<td>.10852</td>
<td>.11620</td>
<td>.05901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L12</td>
<td>.08321</td>
<td>.15454</td>
<td>.17454</td>
<td>.04051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L13</td>
<td>.06408</td>
<td>.02073</td>
<td>.13821</td>
<td>.09687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L14</td>
<td>.07952</td>
<td>.17721</td>
<td>.11443</td>
<td>.12258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L15</td>
<td>.11290</td>
<td>.10382</td>
<td>.13597</td>
<td>.04901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L16</td>
<td>.09090</td>
<td>.19283</td>
<td>.09687</td>
<td>.14313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L17</td>
<td>.01499</td>
<td>.00283</td>
<td>.13535</td>
<td>.12879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L18</td>
<td>.08849</td>
<td>.09965</td>
<td>.04051</td>
<td>.13821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L1</td>
<td>.18471</td>
<td>.17814</td>
<td>.15363</td>
<td>.00767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L2</td>
<td>.14577</td>
<td>.11324</td>
<td>.12815</td>
<td>.01668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L3</td>
<td>.01951</td>
<td>.03545</td>
<td>.09015</td>
<td>.15363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L4</td>
<td>.05402</td>
<td>.13345</td>
<td>.01291</td>
<td>.01668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L5</td>
<td>.16210</td>
<td>.05619</td>
<td>.17454</td>
<td>.11162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L6</td>
<td>.11807</td>
<td>.19886</td>
<td>.00767</td>
<td>.04051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L7</td>
<td>.04953</td>
<td>.03837</td>
<td>.09221</td>
<td>.12806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L8</td>
<td>.13480</td>
<td>.04230</td>
<td>.06737</td>
<td>.04186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L9</td>
<td>.09221</td>
<td>.01754</td>
<td>.11332</td>
<td>.05627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L10</td>
<td>.15229</td>
<td>.18976</td>
<td>.10124</td>
<td>.15229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L11</td>
<td>.17896</td>
<td>.12806</td>
<td>.15487</td>
<td>.11332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L12</td>
<td>.12789</td>
<td>.02024</td>
<td>.05627</td>
<td>.04230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 5 (Cont.'t.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>NB1</th>
<th>NB2</th>
<th>BB1</th>
<th>BB2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V2L13</td>
<td>.02987</td>
<td>.17018</td>
<td>.11324</td>
<td>.17814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L14</td>
<td>.10095</td>
<td>.06737</td>
<td>.18471</td>
<td>.04230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L15</td>
<td>.04186</td>
<td>.04914</td>
<td>.12765</td>
<td>.12806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L16</td>
<td>.15387</td>
<td>.15987</td>
<td>.10124</td>
<td>.02987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L17</td>
<td>.10124</td>
<td>.11332</td>
<td>.12508</td>
<td>.00719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L18</td>
<td>.01072</td>
<td>.05627</td>
<td>.05261</td>
<td>.12298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05*

*NB1, BB1-referes to intentions to petition neighborhood*

*NB2, BB2-refers to intentions to provide research material*

### TABLE 6

SPEARMAN CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR VALUES (V1L1 to V1L18 and V2L1 to V2L18) AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO NORMATIVE BELIEFS (NB3 and NB4) AND BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS (BB3 and BB4) WHERE N=93.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>NB3</th>
<th>NB4</th>
<th>BB3</th>
<th>BB4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1L1</td>
<td>.15637</td>
<td>.11443</td>
<td>.06023</td>
<td>.03115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L2</td>
<td>.17454</td>
<td>.09854</td>
<td>.10755</td>
<td>.09687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L3</td>
<td>.01283</td>
<td>.04477</td>
<td>.12567</td>
<td>.14242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L4</td>
<td>.12815</td>
<td>.13535</td>
<td>.05867</td>
<td>.02736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L5</td>
<td>.09071</td>
<td>.12970</td>
<td>.05810</td>
<td>.18497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L6</td>
<td>.07866</td>
<td>.04051</td>
<td>.15172</td>
<td>.10852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L7</td>
<td>.12588</td>
<td>.08594</td>
<td>.06408</td>
<td>.02073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L8</td>
<td>.09685</td>
<td>.04255</td>
<td>.11620</td>
<td>.05910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L9</td>
<td>.14638</td>
<td>.14313</td>
<td>.07416</td>
<td>.10757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L10</td>
<td>.01291</td>
<td>.04049</td>
<td>.14243</td>
<td>.05588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L11</td>
<td>.01668</td>
<td>.09359</td>
<td>.07117</td>
<td>.05821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALUES</td>
<td>NB3</td>
<td>NB4</td>
<td>BB3</td>
<td>BB4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L12</td>
<td>0.09015</td>
<td>0.12879</td>
<td>0.08022</td>
<td>0.10853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L13</td>
<td>0.00867</td>
<td>0.09687</td>
<td>0.15455</td>
<td>0.08322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L14</td>
<td>0.13821</td>
<td>0.12258</td>
<td>0.02074</td>
<td>0.13822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L15</td>
<td>0.13140</td>
<td>0.14236</td>
<td>0.07867</td>
<td>0.15364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L16</td>
<td>0.15363</td>
<td>0.13597</td>
<td>0.09688</td>
<td>0.14314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L17</td>
<td>0.00767</td>
<td>0.13822</td>
<td>0.11444</td>
<td>0.08835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L18</td>
<td>0.11162</td>
<td>0.05901</td>
<td>0.08596</td>
<td>0.14312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L1</td>
<td>0.11497</td>
<td>0.06299</td>
<td>0.01286</td>
<td>0.13824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L2</td>
<td>0.06452</td>
<td>0.06177</td>
<td>0.05910</td>
<td>0.13643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L3</td>
<td>0.07008</td>
<td>0.02952</td>
<td>0.09855</td>
<td>0.17455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L4</td>
<td>0.13035</td>
<td>0.01694</td>
<td>0.15173</td>
<td>0.04052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L5</td>
<td>0.07856</td>
<td>0.01345</td>
<td>0.07867</td>
<td>0.04256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L6</td>
<td>0.02192</td>
<td>0.04862</td>
<td>0.14314</td>
<td>0.09358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L7</td>
<td>0.02391</td>
<td>0.07869</td>
<td>0.08024</td>
<td>0.13823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L8</td>
<td>0.12621</td>
<td>0.12508</td>
<td>0.09689</td>
<td>0.08485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L9</td>
<td>0.08481</td>
<td>0.05947</td>
<td>0.08597</td>
<td>0.13825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L10</td>
<td>0.04188</td>
<td>0.00719</td>
<td>0.12817</td>
<td>0.09074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L11</td>
<td>0.04788</td>
<td>0.06729</td>
<td>0.09688</td>
<td>0.01667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L12</td>
<td>0.02379</td>
<td>0.04688</td>
<td>0.00866</td>
<td>0.13823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L13</td>
<td>0.14283</td>
<td>0.06851</td>
<td>0.15364</td>
<td>0.13597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L14</td>
<td>0.03908</td>
<td>0.06288</td>
<td>0.05903</td>
<td>0.06297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L15</td>
<td>0.01357</td>
<td>0.00245</td>
<td>0.11164</td>
<td>0.06187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L16</td>
<td>0.07064</td>
<td>0.15476</td>
<td>0.07118</td>
<td>0.08323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L17</td>
<td>0.08268</td>
<td>0.03525</td>
<td>0.14315</td>
<td>0.08846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L18</td>
<td>0.05261</td>
<td>0.12298</td>
<td>0.13826</td>
<td>0.03116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

*NB3, BB3—refers to intention to write to school board
*NB4, BB4—refers to intentions to write to principal
TABLE 7
SPEARMAN CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS FOR VALUES (V1L1 to V1L18 and V2L1 to V2L18) AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS (B11, B12, B13, B14).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>B11</th>
<th>B12</th>
<th>B13</th>
<th>B14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1L1</td>
<td>.12588</td>
<td>.15364</td>
<td>.01273</td>
<td>.14242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L2</td>
<td>.14243</td>
<td>.11444</td>
<td>.14312</td>
<td>.04256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L3</td>
<td>.13822</td>
<td>.00767</td>
<td>.06299</td>
<td>.08835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L4</td>
<td>.07867</td>
<td>.01694</td>
<td>.11162</td>
<td>.07117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L5</td>
<td>.08594</td>
<td>.05588</td>
<td>.07866</td>
<td>.06023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L6</td>
<td>.17018</td>
<td>.00719</td>
<td>.12806</td>
<td>.22813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L7</td>
<td>.04186</td>
<td>.11332</td>
<td>.05261</td>
<td>.09965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L8</td>
<td>.11332</td>
<td>.10095</td>
<td>.22568</td>
<td>.01291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L9</td>
<td>.15363</td>
<td>.07866</td>
<td>.09015</td>
<td>.15454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L10</td>
<td>.13545</td>
<td>.09172</td>
<td>.08888</td>
<td>.06034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L11</td>
<td>.11434</td>
<td>.09076</td>
<td>.01424</td>
<td>.12897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L12</td>
<td>.05902</td>
<td>.18498</td>
<td>.15627</td>
<td>.09745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L13</td>
<td>.15437</td>
<td>.06754</td>
<td>.08012</td>
<td>.17564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L14</td>
<td>.04351</td>
<td>.15467</td>
<td>.09872</td>
<td>.07568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L15</td>
<td>.12567</td>
<td>.11446</td>
<td>.09652</td>
<td>.32876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L16</td>
<td>.18592</td>
<td>.12378</td>
<td>.02345</td>
<td>.17842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L17</td>
<td>.02986</td>
<td>.11356</td>
<td>.00764</td>
<td>.12824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1L18</td>
<td>.12297</td>
<td>.15386</td>
<td>.11325</td>
<td>.04187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L1</td>
<td>.13825</td>
<td>.14367</td>
<td>.07118</td>
<td>.09754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L2</td>
<td>.09163</td>
<td>.18863</td>
<td>.06408</td>
<td>.12785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L3</td>
<td>.11472</td>
<td>.13897</td>
<td>.06408</td>
<td>.14327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L4</td>
<td>.07824</td>
<td>.13897</td>
<td>.07864</td>
<td>.11621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L5</td>
<td>.07854</td>
<td>.13643</td>
<td>.10757</td>
<td>.09687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L6</td>
<td>.01291</td>
<td>.12876</td>
<td>.07875</td>
<td>.06024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L7</td>
<td>.05902</td>
<td>.14256</td>
<td>.08475</td>
<td>.03114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L8</td>
<td>.07515</td>
<td>.04263</td>
<td>.05870</td>
<td>.04535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L9</td>
<td>.13632</td>
<td>.12257</td>
<td>.05822</td>
<td>.13821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L10</td>
<td>.17523</td>
<td>.13870</td>
<td>.03112</td>
<td>.05642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L11</td>
<td>.03117</td>
<td>.09678</td>
<td>.09345</td>
<td>.04863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L12</td>
<td>.05272</td>
<td>.13764</td>
<td>.00863</td>
<td>.13764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2L13</td>
<td>.09763</td>
<td>.07867</td>
<td>.14237</td>
<td>.02134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Effects of Demographic Variables on Behavioral and Normative Beliefs

Hypothesis eleven states that female parents and their male counterparts, who are from various socio-economic backgrounds with differing art education levels, who also have male or female kindergarten children, will differ in their scores on behavioral beliefs and normative beliefs. Because the demographic variables are categorical, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was employed for the data analysis. Tables 8 through 15 present the partition of sums of squares and degrees of freedom for behavioral and normative beliefs concerning each advocacy intention. Tables 16 through 23 illustrate the mean square, sum of squares, degrees of freedom, and F ratios for each main effect and interaction of these demographic variables for both forms of the questionnaire. Table 24 summarizes all significant variables for both forms of the questionnaire as well. The two forms of the questionnaire
will be dealt with separately in the following discussion, beginning with Form 1.

For Form 1 of the questionnaire, the following main effects, as indicated in Table 16, were not statistically significant for behavioral beliefs concerning petitioning the neighborhood: Sex of Parent - \( F(1,62)=.68, p<.05 \); Socio-economic Status - \( F(4,62)=.76, p<.05 \); Art Education Background - \( F(5,62)=1.36, p<.05 \); Sex of Child - \( F(1,62)=.85, p<.05 \). The following two way interactions were not statistically significant for BB1: Sex of Parent X Socio-economic Status - \( F(1,62)=.23, p<.05 \); Socio-economic Status x Art Education Background - \( F(6,62)=.41, p<.05 \); Sex of Child X Socio-economic Status - \( F(3,62)=.56, p<.05 \); Art Education Background X Sex of Child - \( F(2,62)=.22, p<.05 \). The two way interaction of Sex of Parent and Art Education Background was statistically significant, \( F(1,62)=3.48, p<.05 \).

Table 25 presents a 2x5 ANOVA with the mean scores of behavioral beliefs (BB1), while taking into consideration the factors of Sex of Parent and Art Education Background.
TABLE 25

MEAN SCORES OF BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS (CONCERNING PETITIONING THE NEIGHBORHOOD) WITH THE FACTORS OF SEX OF PARENT AND ART EDUCATION BACKGROUND.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Parent</th>
<th>Art Education Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*0- No art during school career
1- Art in kindergarten only
2- Art in elementary school (1-6)
3- Art in kindergarten and elementary
4- Art in grades 1 to 12
5- Art in grades 7 to 12

Higher mean scores indicate less favorable beliefs held toward art education advocacy, which in this case concerns petitioning the neighborhood. Lower scores indicate more favorable beliefs. The regression lines for these two variables, Sex of Parent and Art Education Background, are plotted in Figure 7.
Art Education Background

0- No art experience in school
1- Art in kindergarten only
2- Art in elementary school (1-6)
3- Art in kindergarten and elementary
4- Art in grades 1 to 12
5- Art in grades 7 to 12

BB1 - behavioral beliefs concerning intentions to petition neighborhood

FIGURE 7
INTERACTION OF ART EDUCATION BACKGROUND AND SEX OF PARENT
For Form 1 of the questionnaire, where intentions concerned providing research material and the dependent variable was behavioral beliefs, Table 17 indicates that the main effect of Sex of Parent was not statistically significant for behavioral beliefs, $F(1,62) = .14, p<.05$; the main effect of Socio-economic Status was not statistically significant for behavioral beliefs, $F(4,62) = .52, p<.05$; the main effect of Art Education Background was not statistically significant for behavioral beliefs, $F(5,62) = 1.89, p<.05$; the main effect of Sex of Child was not statistically significant for behavioral beliefs, $F(1,62) = .27, p<.05$; the two way interaction of Sex of Parent and Socio-economic Status was not statistically significant for behavioral beliefs, $F(1,62) = .44, p<.05$; the two way interaction of Socio-economic Status and Art Education Background was not statistically significant for behavioral beliefs, $F(6,62) = .45, p<.05$; the two way interaction of Sex of Child and Socio-economic Status was not statistically significant for behavioral beliefs, $F(3,62) = .59, p<.05$; the two way interaction of Art Education Background and Sex of Child was not statistically significant for behavioral beliefs, $F(2,62) = .31, p<.05$; the two way interaction of Sex of Parent and Art Education Background was statistically significant for behavioral beliefs, $F(1,62) = 4.98, p<.05$.

Table 26 presents the mean scores of behavioral beliefs, while taking into consideration the Sex of Parent and Art Education Background for those parents responding to Form 1 of the questionnaire.
TABLE 26

GROUP MEANS FOR BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS CONCERNING PROVIDING RESEARCH MATERIAL

n=90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Parent</th>
<th>Art Education Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0- No art during public school career
1- Art in kindergarten only
2- Art in elementary school (1-6)
3- Art in kindergarten and elementary
4- Art in grades 1 to 12
5- Art in grades 7 to 12

Higher mean scores indicate less favorable beliefs held toward providing research material, while lower scores indicate more favorable beliefs.

The regression lines for these two variables are plotted in Figure 8.
For Form 1 of the questionnaire where intentions concerned petitioning the neighborhood and the dependent variable was normative beliefs, Table 18 indicates that the main effect of Sex of Parent was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, $F(1,62)=.23$, $p<.05$; the main effect of Socio-economic Status was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, $F(4,62)=.27$, $p<.05$; the main effect of Art...
Education Background was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(2,62)=.41, p<.05; the main effect of Sex of Child was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(1,62)=.44, p<.05; the two way interaction for Sex of Parent and Socio-economic Status was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(1,62)=.41, p<.05; the two way interaction of Sex of Parent and Art Education Background was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(1,62)=.36, p<.05; the two way interaction for Socio-economic Status and Art Education Background was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(6,62)=.59, p<.05; the two way interaction of Socio-economic Status and Sex of Child was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(3,62)=.14, p<.05; the two way interaction of Art Education Background and Sex of Child was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(2,62)=1.09, p<.05. No three and four way interactions were significant at p<.05.

For Form 1 of the questionnaire where intentions concern providing research material and the dependent variable was normative beliefs, Table 19 indicates that the main effect of Sex of Parent was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(1,62)=.28, p<.05; the main effect of Socio-economic Status was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(4,62)=1.21, p<.05; the main effect of Art Education Background was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(5,62)=2.34, p<.05; the main effect of Sex of Child was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(1,62)=.02, p<.05; the two way interaction of Sex of Parent and Socio-economic Status was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(2,62)=.55, p<.05; the
two way interaction of Sex of Parent and Art Education Background was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(1,62)=.12, p<.05; the two way interaction of Socio-economic Background and Art Education Background was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(6,62)=1.18, p<.05; the two way interaction of Socio-economic Status and Sex of Child was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(3,62)=.42, p<.05; the two way interaction of Art Education Background and Sex of Child was not statistically significant for normative beliefs, F(2,62)=.28, p<.05. No three and four way interactions were statistically significant.

For Form 2 of the questionnaire where intentions concern writing a letter to the school board, Table 20 indicates that these main effects were not statistically significant: Sex of Parent - F(1,65)=.58, p<.05; Socio-economic Status - F(4,65)=.73; Art Education Background - F(3,65)=.23, p<.05; Sex of Child - F(1,65)=.65, p<.05. These two way interactions were not statistically significant: Sex of Parent X Socio-economic Status - F(4,65)=.79, p<.05; Socio-economic Status X Art Education Background - F(7,65)=.80, p<.05; Sex of Parent X Sex of Child - F(1,65)=.25, p<.05; Socio-economic Status and Sex of Child - F(3,65)=1.76, p<.05; Art Education Background X Sex of Child - F(2,65)=1.04, p<.05. There were no statistically significant three and four way interactions.

For Form 2 of the questionnaire where intentions concern writing a letter to the principal and the dependent variable was behavioral beliefs, Table 21 indicates that these main effects were not statistically significant: Sex of Parent - F(1,65)=.58, p<.05; Socio-economic Status -
F(4,65)=1.16, p<.05; Art Education Background - F(3,65)=1.89, p<.05. The main effect of Sex of Child was statistically significant for behavioral beliefs, F(1,65)=4.73, p<.05. The two way interaction of Sex of Parent X Sex of Child was also statistically significant for behavioral beliefs, F(1,65)=4.38, p<.05. Table 27 presents the mean scores of Behavioral Beliefs, while taking into consideration the two factors of Sex of Parent and Sex of Child.

**TABLE 27**

GROUP MEANS FOR BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS CONCERNING WRITING A LETTER TO THE PRINCIPAL AND KINDERGARTEN TEACHER

\[ n=93 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex of Parent</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>58.50</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.40</td>
<td>57.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Higher mean scores indicate less favorable beliefs held toward writing a letter to the principal, while lower scores indicate more favorable beliefs. Parents with sons had behavioral belief scores that averaged to 56.60. Parents with daughters had behavioral belief scores that averaged to 53.19. Therefore, parents of males have higher behavioral belief scores than parents of females, and therefore would not be likely to write a letter to the principal. The regression lines for these two variables are plotted in Figure 9.
FIGURE 9

MAIN EFFECT OF SEX OF CHILD AND INTERACTION OF SEX OF PARENT AND SEX OF CHILD ON BEHAVIORAL BELIEF SCORES CONCERNING WRITING A LETTER TO THE PRINCIPAL AND KINDERGARTEN TEACHER.
Other two way interactions were not statistically significant: Sex of Parent and Socio-economic Status - $F(4,65)=1.85$, $p<.05$; Socio-economic Status and Art Education Background - $F(7,65)=1.19$, $p<.05$; Socio-economic Status and Sex of Child - $F(3,65)=2.45$, $p<.05$; Art Education Background and Sex of Child - $F(2,65)=1.68$, $p<.05$. Three and four way interactions were also not statistically significant.

For Form 2 of the questionnaire where intentions concern writing a letter to the school board and the dependent variable is normative beliefs, Table 22 indicates that the following main effects were not statistically significant: Sex of Parent - $F(1,65)=.29$, $p<.05$; Socio-economic Status - $F(4,65)=.60$, $p<.05$; Sex of Child - $F(1,65)=.85$, $p<.05$. The main effect of Art Education Background was statistically significant for NB3 - $F(3,65)=4.05$, $p<.05$. Table 28 presents the mean scores of normative beliefs as they are affected by Art Education Background.
TABLE 28

GROUP MEANS FOR NORMATIVE BELIEFS CONCERNING WRITING A LETTER TO THE SCHOOL BOARD

n=93

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art Education Background</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118.00</td>
<td>64.43</td>
<td>50.77</td>
<td>44.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0-No art during public school career
1-Art in kindergarten only
2-Art in elementary school (1-6)
3-Art in kindergarten and elementary
4-Art in grades 1 to 12
5-Art in grades 7 to 12

Other two way interactions that were not statistically significant include: Sex of Parent and Socio-economic Status - F(4,65)=1.01, p<.05; Socio-economic Status and Art Education Background - F(7,65)=.59, p<.05; Sex of Parent and Sex of Child - p<.05; Socio-economic Status and Sex of Child-F(3,65)=.15, p<.05; Art Education Background and Sex of Child-F(2,65)=0, p<.05. Three and four way interactions were not statistically significant.

For Form 2 of the questionnaire, where intentions concerned writing a letter to the principal and the dependent variable was normative beliefs, Table 23 indicates that the following main effects were not statistically significant: Sex of Parent-F(1,65)=.47, p<.05;
Socio-economic Status-\(F(4,65)=25, p<.05\); Sex of Child-\(F(1,65)=1.80, p<.05\). The main effect of Art Education Background was again statistically significant for normative beliefs, \(F(3,65)=4.41, p<.05\). Table 29 presents the mean scores of the normative beliefs as they are affected by Art Education Background.
### TABLE 29

**GROUP MEANS FOR NORMATIVE BELIEFS (NB4)**

*n=93*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art Education Background</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>45.71</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34.57</td>
<td>33.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0-No art during public school career  
1-Art in kindergarten only  
2-Art in elementary school (1-6)  
3-Art in kindergarten and elementary  
4-Art in grades 1 to 12  
5-Art in grades 7 to 12

Lower scores on NB4 indicate that parents are influenced by other people when considering writing a letter to principals. Higher scores indicate less influence of others when considering this action. As grade level of art education experience increases, scores on NB4 decrease.

Other two way interactions that were not statistically significant include: Sex of Parent and Socio-economic Status – F(4,65)=.63, p<.05; Socio-economic Status and Art Education Background – F(7,65)=.80, p<.05; Sex of Parent and Sex of Child – F(1,65)=2.48, p<.05; Socio-economic Status and Sex of Child – F(3,65)=.99, p<.05; Art Education Background and Sex of Child – F(2,65)=.75, p<.05. Three and four way interactions were not statistically significant.
Table 24 summarizes all significant main effects and interactions of the demographic variables in relation to behavioral beliefs (BB) and normative beliefs (NB). The demographic variables that did effect behavioral and normative beliefs are sex of parent, sex of child, and art education background. Socio-economic status was found not have an effect in this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15947.24</td>
<td>590.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>55200.82</td>
<td>890.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>71148.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DF-Degrees of Freedom
SS-Sums of Squares
MS-Mean Square
### TABLE 9

**TABLE OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, SHOWING PARTITION OF SUMS OF SQUARES AND DEGREES OF FREEDOM FOR BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS THAT DETERMINE THE ADVOCACY INTENTION OF PROVIDING RESEARCH MATERIAL.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5506.29</td>
<td>203.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>15647.54</td>
<td>252.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21153.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DF-Degrees of Freedom  
SS-Sums of Squares  
MS-Mean Square

### TABLE 10

**TABLE OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, SHOWING PARTITION OF SUMS OF SQUARES AND DEGREES OF FREEDOM FOR NORMATIVE BELIEFS THAT DETERMINE THE ADVOCACY INTENTION OF PETITIONING THE NEIGHBORHOOD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68818.45</td>
<td>2548.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>178490.27</td>
<td>2878.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>247308.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DF-Degrees of Freedom  
SS-Sums of Squares  
MS-Mean Square
TABLE 11

TABLE OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, SHOWING PARTITION OF SUMS OF SQUARES AND DEGREES OF FREEDOM FOR NORMATIVE BELIEFS THAT DETERMINE THE ADVOCACY INTENTION OF PROVIDING RESEARCH MATERIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>150842.53</td>
<td>5586.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>320638.37</td>
<td>5171.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>471480.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DF—Degrees of Freedom
SS—Sums of Squares
MS—Mean Square

TABLE 12

TABLE OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, SHOWING PARTITION OF SUMS OF SQUARES AND DEGREES OF FREEDOM FOR BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS THAT DETERMINE THE ADVOCACY INTENTION OF WRITING A LETTER TO THE SCHOOL BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12680.10</td>
<td>469.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>37827.79</td>
<td>581.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>50507.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DF—Degrees of Freedom
SS—Sums of Squares
MS—Mean Square
### TABLE 13

TABLE OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, SHOWING PARTITION OF SUMS OF SQUARES AND DEGREES OF FREEDOM FOR BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS THAT DETERMINE THE ADVOCACY INTENTION OF WRITING TO THE PRINCIPAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21031.56</td>
<td>778.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>40066.89</td>
<td>616.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>61098.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DF—Degrees of Freedom  
SS—Sums of Squares  
MS—Mean Square

### TABLE 14

TABLE OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, SHOWING PARTITION OF SUMS OF SQUARES AND DEGREES OF FREEDOM FOR NORMATIVE BELIEFS THAT DETERMINE THE ADVOCACY INTENTION OF WRITING TO THE SCHOOL BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15287.37</td>
<td>566.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34965.10</td>
<td>537.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>50252.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DF—Degrees of Freedom  
SS—Sums of Squares  
MS—Mean Square
TABLE 15

TABLE OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE, SHOWING PARTITION OF SUMS OF SQUARES AND DEGREES OF FREEDOM FOR NORMATIVE BELIEFS THAT DETERMINE THE ADVOCACY BEHAVIOR OF WRITING A LETTER TO THE PRINCIPAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Among Groups</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8090.29</td>
<td>299.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17186.18</td>
<td>264.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25276.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DF-Degrees of Freedom  
SS-Sums of Squares  
MS-Mean Square
TABLE 16
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY FOR ALL DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ACCORDING TO BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS CONCERNING PETITIONING THE NEIGHBORHOOD

\( n = 90 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F(p,.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SexP**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>601.21</td>
<td>601.21</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2702.65</td>
<td>675.66</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6061.81</td>
<td>1212.36</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>758.01</td>
<td>758.01</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3094.12</td>
<td>3094.12</td>
<td>3.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2203.00</td>
<td>367.17</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X SexC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1495.90</td>
<td>498.63</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB X SexC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>386.40</td>
<td>193.20</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant (p<.05)

**SexP-Sex of Parent

SexC-Sex of Child

AEB-Art Education Background

SES-Socio-economic Status
TABLE 17

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY FOR ALL DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
ACCORDING TO BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS CONCERNING INTENTIONS TO
PROVIDE RESEARCH MATERIAL

n=90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F(p&lt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SexP**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.56</td>
<td>34.56</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>527.41</td>
<td>131.85</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2386.84</td>
<td>477.37</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67.16</td>
<td>67.16</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111.66</td>
<td>111.66</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1257.24</td>
<td>1257.24</td>
<td>4.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SexC</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>681.96</td>
<td>113.66</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB X SexC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>449.83</td>
<td>149.94</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>157.60</td>
<td>78.80</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant (p<.05)

AEB - Art Education Background

** SexP - Sex of Parent
SES - Socio-economic Status
SexC - Sex of Kindergarten Child
TABLE 18

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ALL DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ACCORDING TO NORMATIVE BELIEFS CONCERNING PETITIONING THE NEIGHBORHOOD
n=90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F(p&lt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SexP**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>659.95</td>
<td>659.95</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3097.25</td>
<td>774.31</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23780.09</td>
<td>4756.02</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1279.94</td>
<td>1279.94</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1023.14</td>
<td>1023.14</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10152.34</td>
<td>1692.06</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X SexC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1244.09</td>
<td>414.70</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB X SexC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6280.23</td>
<td>3140.12</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant (p<.05)
**SexP-Sex of Parent
SES-Socio-economic Status
SexC-Sex of Kindergarten Child
AEB-Art Education Background
### TABLE 19

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY FOR ALL DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ACCORDING TO NORMATIVE BELIEFS CONCERNING INTENTIONS TO PROVIDE RESEARCH MATERIAL**

\( n=90 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F(p&lt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SexP**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1434.94</td>
<td>1434.94</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25043.83</td>
<td>6260.96</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62805.58</td>
<td>12561.12</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>91.43</td>
<td>91.43</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>638.27</td>
<td>638.27</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36762.79</td>
<td>6127.13</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X SexC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6517.79</td>
<td>2172.60</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB X SexC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2893.61</td>
<td>1446.81</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2833.67</td>
<td>2833.67</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant (p<.05)

**SexP—Sex of Parent
SES—Socio-economic Status
SexC—Sex of Child
AEB—Art Education Background
TABLE 20

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR ALL DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ACCORDING TO BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS CONCERNING WRITING A LETTER TO SCHOOL BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F(p&lt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SexP***</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>337.96</td>
<td>337.96</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1710.04</td>
<td>427.51</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>405.35</td>
<td>135.12</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>379.52</td>
<td>379.52</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1841.64</td>
<td>460.41</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>148.35</td>
<td>148.35</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X SexC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3255.14</td>
<td>465.02</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB X SexC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3065.89</td>
<td>1021.96</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1211.87</td>
<td>605.94</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>108.49</td>
<td>108.49</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant (p<.05)

**SexP-Sex of Parent

SES-Socio-economic Status

SexC-Sex of Kindergarten Child

AEB-Art Education Background
TABLE 21

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY FOR ALL DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ACCORDING TO BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS CONCERNING WRITING A LETTER TO THE PRINCIPAL AND KINDERGARTEN TEACHER

n=93

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F(p&lt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SexP**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>354.90</td>
<td>354.90</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2864.18</td>
<td>716.05</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3499.84</td>
<td>1166.61</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2916.10</td>
<td>2916.10</td>
<td>4.73*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4573.73</td>
<td>1143.43</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2698.77</td>
<td>2698.77</td>
<td>4.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X SexC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5129.06</td>
<td>732.72</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB X SexC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4521.68</td>
<td>1507.23</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2069.23</td>
<td>1034.62</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant
**SexP-Sex of Parent  SexC-Sex of Child
SES-Socio-economic Status  AEB-Art Education Background
TABLE 22

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY FOR ALL DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ACCORDING TO NORMATIVE BELIEFS CONCERNING WRITING A LETTER TO THE SCHOOL BOARD

n=93

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F(p&lt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SexP**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>154.83</td>
<td>154.83</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1280.90</td>
<td>320.23</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6542.38</td>
<td>2180.80</td>
<td>4.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>455.25</td>
<td>455.25</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2183.43</td>
<td>545.88</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>823.20</td>
<td>823.20</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X SexC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2226.64</td>
<td>318.09</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB X SexC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>244.55</td>
<td>81.52</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>138.30</td>
<td>138.30</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant
**SexP-Sex of Parent
SES-Socio-economic Status
SexC-Sex of Child
AEB-Art Education Background
**TABLE 23**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY FOR ALL DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES ACCORDING TO NORMATIVE BELIEFS CONCERNING WRITING A LETTER TO THE PRINCIPAL AND KINDERGARTEN TEACHER**

\[ n = 93 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F(p&lt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SexP**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>123.06</td>
<td>123.06</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>265.92</td>
<td>66.48</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3500.82</td>
<td>1166.94</td>
<td>4.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>476.97</td>
<td>476.97</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>664.51</td>
<td>165.88</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>654.58</td>
<td>654.58</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X SexC</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1478.78</td>
<td>211.21</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB X SexC</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>787.63</td>
<td>262.54</td>
<td>.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>395.75</td>
<td>197.88</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X SexC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SES X AEB X SexC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant  
**SexP-Sex of Parent  
SES-Socio-economic Status  
SexC-Sex of Child  
AEB-Art Education Background
TABLE 24

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SUMMARY FOR ALL SIGNIFICANT DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FOR EACH BEHAVIORAL INTENTION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F(p&lt;.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB</td>
<td>BB1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3094.12</td>
<td>890.34</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X AEB</td>
<td>BB2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1257.23</td>
<td>252.37</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB</td>
<td>NB3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6542.38</td>
<td>537.92</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexC</td>
<td>BB4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2916.10</td>
<td>616.41</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SexP X SexC</td>
<td>BB4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2698.77</td>
<td>616.41</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEB</td>
<td>NB4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3500.82</td>
<td>264.40</td>
<td>4.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SexP—Sex of Parent
AEB—Art Education Background
SexC—Sex of Child
BB—Behavioral Beliefs
NB—Normative Beliefs
BB1—Behavioral Beliefs concerning petitioning the neighborhood
BB2—Behavioral Beliefs concerning providing research material
NB3—Normative Beliefs concerning writing to school board
BB4—Behavioral Beliefs concerning writing to principal
NB4—Normative Beliefs concerning writing to principal
The Test of the Causal Models. Hypothesis twelve concerns the goodness of fit of the Kindergarten Art Advocacy Intentions Model to the data. Since there are four behavioral intentions, there will be four separate models, beginning with Model One (See Figure 10). According to this model, as well as the three remaining models, Art Education Background (AEB) does not affect Behavioral Intentions (BI) - which is in this case petitioning the neighborhood) directly, nor does it directly affect Advocacy Attitudes (AA) or Subjective Norm (SN). Art Education Background, however, directly affects Behavioral Beliefs (BB) and Normative Beliefs (NB), which in turn affects Advocacy Attitudes (AA) and Subjective Norm (SN) respectively. Subjective Norm and Advocacy Attitudes directly affect Behavioral Intentions (BI).

Likewise, Sex of Parent (SexP) does not affect Behavioral Intentions (BI) directly, nor does it directly affect Advocacy Attitudes (AA) or Subjective Norm (SN). Sex of Parent (SexP) does, however, directly affect Behavioral Beliefs (BB) and Normative Beliefs (NB), which in turn affects Advocacy Attitudes (AA) and Subjective Norm (SN) respectively. Subjective Norm and Advocacy Attitudes directly affect Behavioral Intentions (BI).

For Model One, Regressed 1 and 2 on 3, obtained $p_{31} = B_{31.2} = .016$; $p_{32} = B_{32.1} = -.12$; $e_1 = \sqrt{1 - R^2_{31.2}} = .99$. Regressed 1 and 2 on 4, obtained $p_{41} = B_{41.2} = .219$; $p_{42} = B_{42.1} = .058$; $e_2 = \sqrt{1 - R^2_{41.2}} = .976$; $p_{64} = r_{64} = .244$; $e_4 = \sqrt{1 - .244^2} = .970$; $p_{53} = r_{53} = .438$; $e_3 = \sqrt{1 - .438^2} = .89$. Regressed 7 on 5 and 6, obtained $p_{75} = B_{75.6} = .700$; $p_{76} = B_{76.5} = .122$; $e_5 = \sqrt{1 - R^2_{7.56}} = .660$. 
Since the model is overidentified (due to the very low p's for p31, p32, p41, and p42) indicating that these variables - Art Education Background (AEB) and Sex of Parent (SexP) are not yielding much information, a statistic analogous to R2m was calculated where the paths in question (p31, p32, p41, p42) were deleted from the calculations. The model was then tested for goodness of fit. The following calculations were executed in order to test this model.

\[ R^2m = 0.747449 \] (for the fully recursive model)

\[ M = 0.7316968 \] (with the deletion of p31, p32, p41, p42)

\[ Q = 0.94128 \] (goodness of fit)

Then Q was tested for significance where \( W = 5.20 \). Therefore, \( X^2 = 5.20 \) with 4df. This \( X^2 \) is between the following two tabled \( X^2 \) values with 4df: 4.878p = .30 and 5.989p = .20. It is concluded, therefore, that Model One fits the data with the exclusion of the demographic variables. Therefore, p31 = 0; p32 = 0; p41 = 0; and p42 = 0.

The paths for Model Two are the same as for the previous one (See Figure 11). Therefore, a description of how these paths relate to one another will be dispensed with here. For Model Two, 1 and 2 were regressed on 3, p31 = B31.2 = 0.108 was obtained; p32 = B32.1 = -0.182; e1 = \( \sqrt{1-R^2} \) 3.12 = 0.974. 1 and 2 were regressed on 4, p41 = B41.2 = 0.163 was obtained; p42 = B42.1 = 0.003; e2 = \( \sqrt{1-R^2} \) 4.12 = 0.987; p32 = r32 = -0.182; e1 = \( \sqrt{1-R^2} \) = 0.974; p42 = r42 = 0.003; e2 = \( \sqrt{1-R^2} \) = 0.987; p64 = r64 = 0.442; e4 = \( \sqrt{1-R^2} \) = 0.897; p53 = r53 = 0.428; e3 = \( \sqrt{1-R^2} \) = 0.90; regressed 5 and 6 on 7, p75 = B75.6 = 0.468; p76 = B76.5 = 0.327; e5 = \( \sqrt{1-R^2} \) 7.56 = 0.672.

Due to the very low p's for p31, p32, p41, p42, the model was considered to be overidentified, and these paths were deleted. The
following calculations were executed in order to test the model.

\[ R^2_m = 0.7267641 \] (for the fully recursive model)
\[ M = 0.7037053 \] (with the deletion of p31, p32, p41, p42)
\[ Q = 0.9221761 \] (goodness of fit)

Q was then tested for significance, where \( W = 6.96 \). Therefore, \( X^2 = 6.96 \) with 4df. This \( X^2 \) is between the following two tabled \( X^2 \) values with 4df: 5.99 \( p = 0.20 \) and 7.78 \( p = 0.10 \). It is concluded that Model Two fits the data with the exclusion of demographic variables. Therefore, \( p42 = 0; p31 = 0; p41 = 0; p32 = 0 \).

According to Model Three, Art Education Background (AEB) does not affect Behavioral Intentions (BI - which in this case concerns writing a letter to the board of education) directly, nor does it directly affect Advocacy Attitudes (AA) or Subjective Norm (SN). Art Education Background does, however, directly affect Behavioral Beliefs (BB) and Normative Beliefs (NB), which in turn affects Advocacy Attitudes (AA) and Subjective Norm (SN) respectively. Subjective Norm and Advocacy Attitudes directly affect Behavioral Intentions (BI).

For Model Three, 1 was regressed on 2 and 3, \( p21 = B21.3 = -0.098 \) was obtained; \( p32 = B31.2 = -0.262; e1 = \sqrt{1 - R_{2.13}^2} = 0.993; e2 = \sqrt{1 - R_{3.12}^2} = 0.964; p53 = r53 = 0.429; e4 = \sqrt{1 - r_{4.29}^2} = 0.903; p42 = r42 = 0.561; e3 = \sqrt{1 - r_{5.61}^2} = 0.828; \) 6 regressed on 4 and 5, \( p64 = B64.5 = -0.486 \) was obtained; \( p65 = B65.4 = -0.218; e5 = \sqrt{1 - R_{6.54}^2} = 0.761 \). See Figure 12.

Due to the very low p's for \( p21 \) and \( p31 \), the model was considered to be overidentified, and these paths were deleted. With this in mind, the model was tested for significance following these calculations.
\[ R^2_m = 0.7033407 \] (explained variance for fully recursive model)
\[ M = 0.6762532 \] (explained variance with deletion of p31, p21)
\[ Q = 0.9163312 \] (goodness of fit)

\( Q \) was then tested for significance, where \( W = 7.776 \). Therefore, \( X^2 = 7.776 \) with 4 df. This \( X^2 \) is between the following two tabled \( X^2 \) values with 4 df: 5.99 p = 0.20 and 7.78 p = 0.10. It is concluded that Model Three fits the data with the exclusion of demographic variables. Therefore, \( p42 = 0; p31 = 0; p41 = 0; \) and \( p32 = 0 \).

According to Model Four, Sex of Child (SexC) does not affect Behavioral Intentions (Bi — which in this case concerns writing a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher) directly, nor does it directly affect Advocacy Attitudes (AA) or Subjective Norm (SN). Sex of Child does, however, directly affect Behavioral Beliefs (BB) and Normative Beliefs (NB), which in turn affects Advocacy Attitudes (AA) and Subjective Norm (SN) respectively. Subjective Norm and Advocacy Attitudes directly affect Behavioral Intentions (Bi).

Likewise, Sex of Parent (SexP) does not affect Behavioral Intentions (Bi) directly, nor does it directly affect Advocacy Attitudes (AA) or Subjective Norm (SN). Sex of Parent (SexP) does, however, directly affect Behavioral Beliefs (BB) and Normative Beliefs (NB), which in turn affects Advocacy Attitudes (AA) and Subjective Norm (SN) respectively. Subjective Norm and Advocacy Attitudes directly affect Behavioral Intentions (Bi).

For Model Four, 1 and 2 were regressed on 3, where \( p31 = B31.2 = -0.216 \) was obtained; \( p32 = B32.1 = -0.011 \); \( e1 = 1 - R = 0.977 \). One and 2 were regressed
on 4, where $p_{41} = B_{41.2} = -.283$ was obtained; $p_{42} = B_{42.1} = .035$; $e^2 = \sqrt{1 - R^2} = .968$; $p_{64} = r_{64} = .526$; $e_4 = \sqrt{1 - .526^2} = .850$; $p_{53} = r_{53} = .480$; $e_3 = \sqrt{1 - .480^2} = .877$; seven regressed on 5 and 6, where $p_{75} = B_{75.6} = .509$ was obtained; $p_{76} = B_{76.5} = .224$; $e_5 = \sqrt{1 - 7.56^2} = .754$. See Figure 13.

Due to the very low p's for $p_{31}$, $p_{32}$, $p_{41}$, and $p_{42}$, the model was considered to be overidentified and these paths were deleted. With this in mind, Model Four was tested for significance following these calculations.

$$R^2_m = .7174344$$ (explained variance of the fully recursive model)

$$M = .6840782$$ (explained variance with the deletion of $p_{31}$, $p_{32}$, $p_{41}$, and $p_{42}$)

$$Q = .8944162$$ (goodness of fit)

$Q$ was then tested for significance where $W = 9.94$. Therefore, $X^2 = 9.94$ with 4df. This $X^2$ is between the following two tabled $X^2$ values with 4df: $9.49p = .05$ and $11.67p = .02$. It is therefore concluded that Model Four fits the data with the exclusion of the demographic variables. Therefore, $p_{42} = 0$; $p_{31} = 0$; $p_{41} = 0$ and $p_{32} = 0$. Table 30 summarizes Models One through Four.
TABLE 30

GENERALIZED SQUARED MULTIPLE CORRELATIONS FOR FULLY RECURSIVE MODEL (R2m); GENERALIZED SQUARED MULTIPLE CORRELATIONS FOR OVERIDENTIFIED MODELS (M); MEASURE OF GOODNESS OF FIT (Q) AND CHI SQUARE (W).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R2M</td>
<td>.747449</td>
<td>.7267641</td>
<td>.7033407</td>
<td>.7174344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>.7316968</td>
<td>.7037053</td>
<td>.6762532</td>
<td>.6840782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>.94128</td>
<td>.9221761</td>
<td>.9163312</td>
<td>.8944162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>5.20*</td>
<td>6.96*</td>
<td>7.78*</td>
<td>9.93*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* not significant; model fits the data

Model 1; p<.20
Model 2; p<.10
Model 3; p<.10
Model 4; p<.02
FIGURE 10
MODEL 1

PATH DIAGRAM OF KINDERGARTEN ART ADVOCACY INTENTIONS
CONCERNING PETITIONING THE NEIGHBORHOOD

*Path regression coefficients or unstandardized path coefficients are
given in the parenthesis.

AEB—Art Education Background
SexP—Sex of Parent
BB—Behavioral Beliefs
AA—Attitude Toward Advocacy
SN—Subjective Norm
BI—Behavioral Intention
e—error
*Path regression coefficients or unstandardized path coefficients are given in the parenthesis.

AEB—Art Education Background
SexP—Sex of Parent
BB—Behavioral Beliefs
NB—Normative Beliefs
AA—Attitude Toward Advocacy
SN—Subjective Norm

FIGURE 11

MODÈL 2
PATH DIAGRAM OF KINDERGARTEN ART ADVOCACY INTENTIONS OF PROVIDING RESEARCH MATERIAL
FIGURE 12

MODEL 3
PATH DIAGRAM OF KINDERGARTEN ART ADVOCACY INTENTIONS OF WRITING A LETTER TO THE SCHOOL BOARD

*Path regression coefficients or unstandardized path coefficients are given in the parenthesis.

AEB—Art Education Background
SexP—Sex of Parent
BB—Behavioral Beliefs
NB—Normative Beliefs
AA—Attitudes toward Advocacy
SN—Subjective Norm
BI—Behavioral Intention
e—error
*Path regression coefficients or unstandardized path coefficients are given in the parenthesis.

SexC-Sex of Child  
SexP-Sex of Parent  
BB-Behavioral Beliefs  
NB-Normative Beliefs  
AA-Attitude toward Advocacy  
SN-Subjective Norm  
BI-Behavioral Intention  
e-error
The Relationship of General Attitudes Toward Kindergarten Art Education and Advocacy Intentions. The thirteenth hypothesis derived from the Fishbein Model is that the Attitude Toward Art Advocacy would correlate more strongly than general Attitudes Toward Art with Behavioral Intentions. This was supported by the data.

As can be seen in Table 31, simple correlations between attitudes toward advocacy and advocacy intentions as well as general art attitudes and advocacy intentions were statistically significant using one tail tests. This indicates that there is a positive relationship between these variables.

General attitudes correlated with intentions to petition the neighborhood with an $r=.4345$ ($p<.05$), while attitudes toward petitioning the neighborhood correlated with intentions to petition the neighborhood with an $r=.78$ ($p<.05$). Attitudes toward petitioning the neighborhood explained 60% of the variance in intentions to petition the neighborhood while general art attitudes explained only 19% of the variance.

General attitudes correlated with intentions to provide research material with an $r=.35$ ($p<.05$), while attitudes toward providing research material correlated with intentions to provide research material with an $r=.67$ ($p<.05$). Attitudes toward intentions to provide research material explained 45 percent of the variance in intentions to perform this act, while general attitudes explained only 12 percent.

The magnitude of the correlation between general attitudes and intentions to write a letter to the school board was $r=.33$ and the
significance was \( p<.05 \). Attitudes toward writing a letter to the school board correlated with intentions to write a letter to the school board with \( r=0.63 \) \( p<.05 \). Thirty nine percent of the variance in this advocacy intention was explained by attitude toward writing a letter to the school board, while 11% of the variance in this advocacy intention was explained by general art attitudes.

An \( r=0.37 \) was the correlation between general attitudes and intentions to write a letter to the principal with a significance of \( p<.05 \). The relationship between attitudes toward writing a letter to the principal and intentions to write a letter to the principal was demonstrated with an \( r=1.0 \) \( p<.05 \). While attitudes toward this advocacy intention explained all of the variance of intentions to write a letter to the principal, general art attitudes explained only 14%.

In all cases, the hypothesis was supported by the difference in magnitude of the correlations. Therefore, attitudes towards advocacy intentions had a stronger relation with advocacy intentions than general attitudes toward art education.
TABLE 31

CORRELATIONS OF ATTITUDE TOWARD THE ACT (AA) AND GENERAL ART ATTITUDES (GA) ON BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS (BI).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Intention</th>
<th>AA</th>
<th>GA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BI1</td>
<td>.7751*</td>
<td>.4345*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI2</td>
<td>.6718*</td>
<td>.3492*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI3</td>
<td>.6268*</td>
<td>.3301*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI4</td>
<td>1.0000*</td>
<td>.3689*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant (p<.05)
BI1-intentions to petition the neighborhood
BI2-intentions to provide research material
BI3-intentions to write to the school board
BI4-intentions to write to principal

Informational Analysis

The Fishbein Model is built upon the assumption that Attitudes are a function of Behavioral Beliefs and Subjective Norms are a function of Normative Beliefs. Because the findings in this study indicate that Behavioral Intentions are more strongly influenced by Attitudes than by Subjective Norms, the focus here will only be on Attitudes and their underlying beliefs.

For Form One of the questionnaire, where Behavioral Intention concerned petitioning the neighborhood, the two belief/evaluations that had the lowest correlation with Attitude were BE3 - petitioning the
neighborhood would cause the neighbors to take a negative attitude toward the idea because of my doing so since I have a kindergarten child; and BE4 - petitioning the neighborhood would cause members of the neighborhood who have no vested interest in education to jump on the bandwagon to simply save the taxpayers. BE3 had a correlation of .04 (p<.05) with Attitude, while BE4 had a correlation of .008 (p<.05). The belief/evaluation that "...petitioning the neighborhood would be beneficial to the kindergarten child (BE2) was the most predictive attitudinal belief with a correlation of r=.56 (p<.05).

The relationships shown in Table 32 may be due to the Belief (B) or the Evaluation (E) elements, or both. In order to determine which element was most important, correlations with each element and attitude were examined separately. In all cases, Beliefs correlated more strongly with Attitude than the Evaluation component (See Tables 33 and 34).
TABLE 32

BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ATTITUDE TOWARD PETITIONING THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS TIMES THEIR EVALUATIONS (BE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Petitioning the Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant, p<.05.

BE1-"...would help save the kindergarten art program."
BE2-"...would be beneficial to the kindergarten child."
BE3-"...would cause the neighbors to take a negative attitude toward the idea because of my doing it since I have a kindergarten child.
BE4-"...would cause members of the neighborhood who have no vested interest in education to jump on the bandwagon to save the taxpayers."
BE5-"...would provide the school board with a better understanding of how taxpayers feel about it."
BE6-"...would make parents of kindergarten children aware of the change."
BE7-"...would give parents the opportunity to or not to support the change."
BE8-"...would cause them to feel that art isn't a necessity since their children will be receiving art in elementary grades."
BE9-"...would cause them to be aware of the situation."
BE10-"...would cause the school board to be influenced by the number of signatures on the petition."
TABLE 33

CORRELATIONS OF BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS (B) WITH ATTITUDES TOWARD PETITIONING THE NEIGHBORHOOD (AA1) AND INTENTIONS TO PETITION THE NEIGHBORHOOD (B11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA1</th>
<th>B11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>.32*</td>
<td>.31*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant, p<.05.
In reference to Table 4, the mean for attitude toward petitioning the neighborhood was 8.21 (3 would indicate favorable attitudes and 18 would indicate unfavorable attitudes) which suggests that there is room for this group of parents to be swayed in a more positive direction. The strong correlation of BE2 with attitude suggests that messages reinforcing the belief that art can be beneficial to the kindergarten child would help garner support from apathetic parents to petition the neighborhood.

For Form One of the questionnaire, where the Behavioral Intention concerned providing research material, the one belief/evaluation that had the lowest correlation with Attitude (See Table 35) was BE2 -
...providing research material would cause the board of education to feel that kindergarten art education is not necessary", which had a correlation of .26 (p<.05) with Attitude. The Belief/Evaluations that, "providing research material would raise the board of education's awareness of the advantages of the kindergarten art program"(BE1), and "would save the art program if the board of education is made aware of its importance"(BE4), were the most predictive Attitudinal Beliefs with correlations of r=.45 (p<.05).

**TABLE 35**

**BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ATTITUDE TOWARD PROVIDING RESEARCH MATERIAL (AA2) AND BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS TIMES THEIR EVALUATIONS (BE2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward Providing Research Material</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE1</td>
<td>.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE2</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE3</td>
<td>.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE4</td>
<td>.45*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant (p<.05)

BE1-“Providing research material...would raise their awareness of the advantages of the kindergarten art program.”
BE2-“Providing research material...would cause them to feel that kindergarten art education is not necessary.”
BE3-“Providing research material...would cause them to be aware of how much I care about the change.”
BE4-“Providing research material...would save the art program.”
Correlations of each element (Belief and Outcome Evaluation) with Attitude were also examined separately. In all cases, Beliefs correlated more strongly with Attitude than Evaluation (See Tables 36 and 37).

According to Table 4, the mean for attitude toward providing research material was 8.88 (3 would indicate favorable attitudes, 18 would indicate unfavorable ones). This suggests that there is room for change. The strong correlations of BE1 and BE4 with Attitudes suggests that messages emphasizing that providing research material would raise awareness, etc. and would save the art program, etc. would help elicit support from neutral parents to participate in providing research materials.

**TABLE 36**

**CORRELATIONS OF BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS (B) WITH ATTITUDES TOWARD PROVIDING RESEARCH MATERIAL (AA2) AND INTENTIONS TO PROVIDE RESEARCH MATERIAL (BI2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA2</th>
<th>BI2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant, p<.05.
TABLE 37

CORRELATIONS OF EVALUATION OUTCOMES (EV) AND ATTITUDE TOWARD PROVIDING RESEARCH MATERIAL (AA2) AND INTENTIONS TO PROVIDE RESEARCH MATERIAL (BI2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA2</th>
<th>BI2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EV1</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV2</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV3</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV4</td>
<td>.42*</td>
<td>.41*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant, p<.05.

For Form Two of the questionnaire, where the Behavioral Intention concerned writing a letter to the school board, the one belief/evaluation (BE8 - writing a letter to the school board would possibly be difficult due to a school board that is sometimes difficult to get along with) that had the lowest correlation with Attitude (See Table 38) was BE8 which had a correlation of r=.06 (p<.05) with Attitude. The belief/evaluation that "Writing a letter to the school board...would make my opinion known," (BE4) was the most predictive Attitudinal Belief with a correlation of r=.57 (p<.05).

When correlations with each element (Belief and Outcome Evaluation) and Attitude were examined separately, Beliefs were found to correlate more strongly with Attitudes in all cases (See Tables 39 and 40).

In reference to Table 4, the mean for attitude toward writing a letter to the school board was 8.129 (3 would indicate favorable attitudes, 18
would indicate unfavorable attitudes). The strong correlation of BE4 with attitude suggests that messages to these neutral or negative parents which note that writing a letter to the school board would make their opinion known, might sway these parents toward more positive attitudes toward performing such an advocacy act.
TABLE 38

BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARD Writing a LETTER TO THE SCHOOL BOARD (AA3) AND BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS TIMES THEIR EVALUATIONS (BE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward the Act</th>
<th>BE1</th>
<th>BE2</th>
<th>BE3</th>
<th>BE4</th>
<th>BE5</th>
<th>BE6</th>
<th>BE7</th>
<th>BE8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE1</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE2</td>
<td>.53*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE3</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE4</td>
<td>.57*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE5</td>
<td>.49*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE6</td>
<td>.46*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE7</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE8</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant, p<.05.

BE1—"Writing to the school board...would bring the matter to their attention."
BE2—"Writing to the school board...would make the desires of parents known."
BE3—"Writing to the school board...would prompt the school board to take action."
BE4—"Writing to the school board...would make my opinion known."
BE5—"Writing to the school board...would provide the board with information on which to make a decision."
BE6—"Writing to the school board...would cause more emphasis to be placed on creativity in my child's education."
BE7—"Writing to the school board...would let the school board know that art is needed in the curriculum."
BE8—"Writing to the school board...would possibly be difficult due to a school board that is sometimes difficult to get along with."
TABLE 39

CORRELATIONS OF BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS (B) WITH ATTITUDES TOWARD WRITING A LETTER TO THE SCHOOL BOARD (AA3) AND BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS (BI3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA3</th>
<th>BI3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>.47*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>.81*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>.65*</td>
<td>.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant, p<.05.
TABLE 40

CORRELATIONS OF EVALUATION OUTCOMES (EV) AND ATTITUDES TOWARD WRITING A LETTER TO THE SCHOOL BOARD (AA3) AND BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS (BI3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA3</th>
<th>BI3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EV1</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV2</td>
<td>.37*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV3</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV4</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV5</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV6</td>
<td>.35*</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV7</td>
<td>.38*</td>
<td>.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EV8</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.0010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant p<.05.

For Form Two of the questionnaire, where the Behavioral Intention concerned writing a letter to the principal, the two belief/evaluations (BE3 - writing a letter to the principal would cause the kindergarten teacher to include art along with other subjects while teaching; BE7 - would cause the kindergarten teacher to take it as a personal insult that she/he was not adequately handling art education) had the lowest correlations with attitude (See Table 41). BE3 had a correlation of r=.12 (p<.05) and BE7 had a correlation of r=.09 (p<.05). The most predictive attitudinal belief with a correlation of r=.56 (p<.05) was BE8 (writing a letter to the principal would let him/her know that art education is needed).
When correlations of each element (Belief and Outcome Evaluation) with Attitude were examined separately, Beliefs were found to correlate more strongly with Attitudes in all cases (See Tables 42 and 43).

In reference to Table 4, the mean for attitude toward writing a letter to the principal was 7.58 (3 would indicate favorable attitudes, 18 would indicate unfavorable attitudes) indicating that there is room for improving these neutral attitudes into more positive ones. The strong correlation of BE8 indicates that messages projected to this group of parents which informs them that writing a letter to the principal would let them know that art education is needed, would assist in moving their neutral attitudes in a more positive direction.
TABLE 41

BIVARIATE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN ATTITUDES TOWARD WRITING A LETTER TO THE PRINCIPAL (AA4) AND BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS TIMES THEIR EVALUATIONS (BE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward the Act</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BE1</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE2</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE3</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE4</td>
<td>.46*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE5</td>
<td>.32*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE6</td>
<td>.38*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE7</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE8</td>
<td>.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE9</td>
<td>.48*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE10</td>
<td>.55*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant, p<.05.

BE1-"...would instigate the coordination of schedules and time slots to ascertain the feasibility of the inclusion of kindergarten art education by these two people."

BE2-"...would motivate him to be advocates for the kindergarten art program."

BE3-"...would cause the kindergarten teacher to include art along with other subjects while teaching."

BE4-"...would make my opinion known."

BE5-"...would give the board information on which to make a decision."

BE6-"...would cause more emphasis to be placed on creativeness."

BE7-"...would cause the kindergarten teacher to take it as a personal insult."

BE8-"...would let him know that art education is needed."

BE9-"...would let him know how parents feel about the issue."

BE10-"...would cause him to try to include such a program."
TABLE 42

CORRELATIONS OF BEHAVIORAL BELIEFS (B) WITH ATTITUDES TOWARD WRITING A LETTER TO THE PRINCIPAL (AA4) AND BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS (BI4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AA4</th>
<th>BI4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>.41*</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>.51*</td>
<td>.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>.36*</td>
<td>.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.47*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>.43*</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant, P<05.
### Summary

The previous analysis in this study indicates that the attitudinal component of the model was the strongest (when attitudes toward advocacy intentions and subjective norm were regressed on intentions to advocate, attitude had higher beta weights) thus making it the most important predictor of Behavioral Intentions. Underlying Behavioral Beliefs (B) correlated with attitudes toward advocacy consistently higher than Evaluation Outcomes (EV) alone,
indicating that this portion of Behavioral Beliefs (BB) was the strongest element.

Correlations between behavioral beliefs and attitude toward advocacy ranged from r's of .43 to .56 (p<.05) for all four models. The direct measure of attitude toward advocacy correlated with intentions to advocate resulted in r's ranging from .62 to 1.00 (p<.05). It was further found that sex of parent, art education background, and sex of child also affect behavioral beliefs, and therefore the attitudinal component.

It can be concluded that the attitudinal component, by examining beliefs, should provide information for understanding the intentions of kindergarten parents to advocate art in the kindergarten. It should also be mentioned at this point that correlations between these variables, behavioral beliefs and attitudes toward advocacy as well as attitudes toward advocacy and intentions to advocate lends support for the construct validity of the model (Ary, Jacobs and Razavieh 1979). Fishbein (1980) purports in his theory that such relationships between these variables do exist. The data in this investigation supports this contention, and is therefore evidence of the model's construct validity.

Respondents and Nonrespondents

The response rate for this study was approximately 80%. Babbi (1973) notes that,

"...a response rate of at least 50 percent is adequate for analysis and reporting. A response rate of at least 60 percent is good. And a response rate of 70 percent or more is very good" (p.165).
Dillman (1978) also says that, "...each 10 percent increase in response rate decreases by 10 percentage points the range by which the distribution could be affected by refusals if the actual feelings of nonrespondents are extreme in either direction" (p.52). In this case, with an 80% response rate, the range of possible effects refusals could ever have on the results is approximately 20%, which is relatively small.

The differences between respondents and nonrespondents in this study are noted in Tables 44 to 46. Although these differences confirm that some bias is generated by refusals, the differences were basically not large enough to be of much concern. Reviewing the data for both forms of the questionnaire combined (n=183 for respondents and n=24 for non-respondents), differences in demographic variables were relatively small. (See Table 44)

When the data is further broken down into the two separate forms of the questionnaire, there are other differences. For Form One (respondents n=90; non-respondents n=12), there is only one instance where the difference is quite large between respondents and nonrespondents. For AA2, the response choice of "Extremely Bad" had a difference that was 49% between respondents and nonrespondents. This being the only instance of such a large difference should not reflect that much bias on the entire study. (See Table 45)

Form Two of the questionnaire presents some problems, however. There are more frequent large differences between respondents and nonrespondents, as noted in Table 46. These differences include Social Class (Lower Middle had a 26.9% difference); Behavioral Intentions (Quite Likely to write a letter to the board had a difference of 33.3%; AA3
(Slightly Punishing had a difference of 51.8%). It is therefore believed by this researcher that results on Form Two of the questionnaire might be slightly biased and should be taken with caution.

### TABLE 44

**OVERALL SUMMARY DATA OF RESPONDENTS AND NONRESPONDENTS ON DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES FOR BOTH FORMS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Nonrespondents</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=183</td>
<td>n=24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex of Parent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>95.8%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>.55%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1 to 6</td>
<td>6.56%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>1.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades K to 6</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1 to 12</td>
<td>80.87%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>6.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7 to 12</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex of Child</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.91%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.09%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 45

SUMMARY DATA OF RESPONDENTS AND NONRESPONDENTS ON DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES, BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS (BI), ATTITUDES TOWARD ADVOCACY (AA), FOR FORM ONE OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Nonrespondents</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=90</td>
<td>n=12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex of Parent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>91.1%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1 to 6</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades K to 6</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1 to 12</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>83.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7 to 12</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex of Child</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BI (Petition Neighbors)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Likely</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Likely</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Likely</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unlikely</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Unlikely</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Unlikely</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents</td>
<td>Nonrespondents</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AA1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Good</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Bad</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Bad</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Bad</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Rewarding</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Rewarding</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Rewarding</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Punishing</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Punishing</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Punishing</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Unpleasant</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unpleasant</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Pleasant</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BI2 (Provide Research Material)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Likely</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Likely</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Likely</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unlikely</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Unlikely</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Unlikely</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AA2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Good</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Bad</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Bad</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Bad</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA2 (con't.)</td>
<td>Respondents n=90</td>
<td>Nonrespondents n=12</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Rewarding</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Rewarding</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Rewarding</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Punishing</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Punishing</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Punishing</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Unpleasant</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Unpleasant</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unpleasant</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Pleasant</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 46

SUMMARY DATA OF RESPONDENTS AND NONRESPONDENTS ON DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES, BEHAVIORAL INTENTIONS (BI), ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ACT (AA), FOR FORM TWO OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Nonrespondents</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=93</td>
<td>n=12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Parent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1 to 6</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 1 to 12</td>
<td>83.9%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 7 to 12</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of Child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI3 (Write letter to board)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Likely</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Likely</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Likely</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unlikely</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Unlikely</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Unlikely</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents n=93</td>
<td>Nonrespondents n=12</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AA3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Good</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Bad</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Bad</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Bad</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Rewarding</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Rewarding</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Rewarding</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Punishing</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>51.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Punishing</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Punishing</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Unpleasant</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Unpleasant</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unpleasant</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Pleasant</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BI4</strong> (Writing to principal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Likely</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Likely</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Likely</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unlikely</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Unlikely</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Unlikely</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AA4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Good</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Good</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Bad</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Bad</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Bad</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA4</td>
<td>Respondents n=93</td>
<td>Nonrespondents n=12</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Rewarding</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Rewarding</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Rewarding</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Punishing</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Punishing</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Punishing</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Unpleasant</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite Unpleasant</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unpleasant</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Pleasant</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

This chapter will discuss the results of the analysis of the data as presented in Chapter IV. The discussion will proceed with the findings and results of each hypothesis. The chapter will then conclude with a brief summary of the findings in this research.

Predicting Advocacy Intentions From Attitudes Toward Advocacy Intentions and Subjective Norm

According to Fishbein and Ajzen (1980), two factors predict behavioral intentions: (1) an attitudinal component; and (2) a normative component. (See Figures 14 to 17) The results of this investigation are consistent with their theory. According to the test of R2, which "...refers to the question of whether one or more of the regression coefficients are significantly different from zero against the hypothesis that all of them are equal to zero" (Pedhazur, 1982, p.243). attitudes toward advocating kindergarten art along with normative considerations were predictive of each specific advocacy intention (i.e., petitioning the neighborhood; providing research material; writing a letter to the school board; and writing a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher).
"The test of a single regression coefficient refers to the question of whether it differs from zero, while partitioning out all the other variables" (Pedhazur, 1982, p.243). Therefore, when attitudes toward each advocacy situation and subjective norms were examined separately, each was also found to be a factor in determining intentions to petition the neighborhood; provide research material; write a letter to the school board; and write a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher. However, there was only one exception. Subjective norm was not found to determine intentions to petition the neighborhood. Therefore, the attitude component is the only one to be considered in this specific advocacy behavior.
RELATIONSHIP AMONG DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES, BELIEFS, ATTITUDES, SUBJECTIVE NORM, AND ADVOCACY INTENTIONS TO PETITION THE NEIGHBORHOOD
FIGURE 15
RELATIONSHIP AMONG DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES, BELIEFS, ATTITUDES, SUBJECTIVE NORM, AND ADVOCACY INTENTIONS TO PROVIDE RESEARCH MATERIAL
FIGURE 16
RELATIONSHIP AMONG DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES, BELIEFS, ATTITUDE, SUBJECTIVE NORM, AND ADVOCACY INTENTIONS TO WRITE A LETTER TO THE SCHOOL BOARD
RELATIONSHIP AMONG DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES, BELIEFS, ATTITUDES, SUBJECTIVE NORM, AND ADVOCACY INTENTIONS TO WRITE A LETTER TO THE PRINCIPAL AND KINDERGARTEN TEACHER
Why were both the attitudinal and normative components found to be significant when tested together (the test of R2) for petitioning the neighborhood, but the normative component failed to reach significance when it was examined separately? Pedhazur (1982) points out that, "...when the independent variables are highly intercorrelated, it may turn out that none of the b's is statistically significant when each is tested separately" (p.5). Therefore, the findings in this investigation suggest that subjective norms and attitudes toward petitioning the neighborhood might be highly related to one another.

When considering the relative weights (b's) of each of these factors (attitude toward advocacy intentions and subjective norm), and their influence on advocacy intentions, Fishbein (1980) notes that,

"For some behaviors, normative considerations (the perceived prescriptions of important others) are more important in determining behavioral intentions than are attitudinal considerations (the person's favorable or unfavorable evaluation of his performing the behavior). For others, the reverse is true...variations in any of the four elements defining the behavior (i.e., action, target, context, and time) may influence the relative importance of the attitudinal and normative components" (p.58).

In this research, as previously pointed out, attitudes (toward petitioning the neighborhood; providing research material; writing a letter to the school board; and writing a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher) carried more weight as a predictor of advocacy intentions and is therefore more important than normative
considerations. It should be pointed out that, "attitudinal considerations are more important for competitive behaviors than for cooperative behaviors, while normative considerations are more important for cooperative than for competitive actions" (Fishbein, 1980, p.58).

While the advocacy behaviors in this study seem to be cooperative in nature (especially petitioning the neighborhood), which suggests that the normative component should carry more influence on advocacy intentions, it can also be argued that these specific advocacy behaviors are competitive against school administrators who perpetuate a situation (in this case, when the art teacher does not visit the kindergarten or when art is not included in the kindergarten curriculum) within the public school system. Thus, the attitudinal component should carry more weight, which it did in this investigation.

Once again, this portion of the data analysis (testing of increments in variance and r² for each variable) also suggests multicollinearity. The data presented in Table 2 (page 144) illustrates a reduction of r² to the increment of each variable, which strongly suggests that subjective norm and attitudes toward advocacy intentions are intercorrelated.

"High multicollinearity leads to imprecise estimations of regression coefficients...High multicollinearity has extreme adverse effects on the standard errors of the regression coefficients, hence on tests of their statistical significance and their confidence intervals" (Pedhazur, 1982, p.235).

This therefore indicates that the results in this study should be taken with caution.
The Relationship of Attitudes Toward Advocacy Intention and Subjective Norm to Advocacy Intentions

In addition to considering the importance of the attitudinal component, the normative component, and their effect on advocacy intentions, Fishbein (1980) points out that the degree of association between these variables will influence prediction of intentions (in this case, advocacy intentions). Therefore, the greater the degree of association between the attitudinal component and each specific advocacy intention, as well as the normative component and each advocacy intention, the more accurate the prediction of petitioning the neighborhood, providing research material, writing a letter to the school board, writing a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher.

Fishbein (1980) further notes that correlations below .30 are not acceptable in the social sciences. Associations between attitude toward advocacy intentions and each specific advocacy intention produced correlation coefficients that were higher than .30. Correlations between subjective norm and each specific advocacy intention likewise produced coefficients higher than .30. These correlations were positive, indicating that the more supportive one's attitudes are toward petitioning the neighborhood, providing research material, writing a letter to the school board, and writing a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher, the more likely it is that one will intend to perform these advocacy behaviors. Likewise, the less supportive one's attitudes are, the less likely one will intend to perform these advocacy behaviors. Correlations between subjective norm and each advocacy intention were also positive indicating that the more one takes into consideration the opinion of
others, the more likely one will intend to petition the neighborhood, provide research material, write a letter to the school board, or write a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher. The reverse would be true if one were less likely to take into consideration the opinion of others.

The Relationship of Behavioral Beliefs and Attitudes toward Advocacy Intentions as well as Normative Beliefs and Subjective Norm

Fishbein (1980) theorizes that,

"...a person's attitude toward a behavior is determined by his salient beliefs that performing the behavior leads to certain outcomes and by his evaluation of those outcomes. Similarly, a person's subjective norm is determined by his beliefs that specific salient referents think he should (or should not) perform a given behavior and by his motivations to comply with those referents" (p.77).

The data in this research supports this theory. It was found that there was a positive correlation between behavioral beliefs and attitudes toward advocacy intentions. This suggests that as beliefs are more positive toward advocacy intentions, attitudes toward advocacy intentions will likewise be positive. The reverse would be true if beliefs were negative.

Similarly, the positive correlations between normative beliefs and subjective norms suggests that the more likely one believes that specific others condone the performance of an advocacy behavior, the more likely one will take into consideration general social influences. The reverse would be true if one believes that specific others do not condone the performance of an advocacy behavior.
Relationships Between Values and Normative as well as Behavioral Beliefs

The degree of association between values and normative as well as behavioral beliefs was small, with correlation coefficients below .30 which also failed to reach statistical significance. As already pointed out by Fishbein (1980), correlations below .30 have little meaning in the social sciences. Therefore, the data in this research suggests that there is no association between values and normative as well as behavioral beliefs.

Some speculations as to why values failed to have any effect on behavioral and normative beliefs follow. The sample size may have been too small to produce larger coefficients. Other studies utilizing the Rokeach instrument for instance, includes samples of one thousand or more (compared to sample sizes of 90 and 93 in this investigation). In such cases, correlation coefficients were larger and significant. In addition, Clark and Minium (1982) note that the larger the sample size, the smaller the sampling error. And,

"For moderate sized or small samples, $r$ may be far from the population value; sampling error should be accounted for by constructing an interval estimate instead of relying on a point estimate...A considerable sampling error is reflected in wide range confidence limits which reflects the small sample size" (p.301-302).

But, the size of the coefficient, more than its significance, should be considered when interpreting sample correlations. In this study, correlations between values and behavioral beliefs and normative beliefs were not significant and small ranging from .01 to .19. The magnitude of the correlation coefficient also depends upon the degree of variability.
characterizing the two variables, as well as on the fundamental relationship present. Perhaps it is this fundamental relationship that is questionable. General life leading values as stated in the Rokeach Value Survey are very different from specifically defined behavioral and normative beliefs. But, variability needs to be examined here as well. "The greater the variability among the observations, the greater the value of r" (Hopkins & Glass, 1978, p. 139). Since the coefficients were very small (between values and normative as well as behavioral beliefs) for this study, it can be conjectured that scores on behavioral and normative beliefs were homogeneous. However, when we examine the range of scores for these variables discussed on p.128-132, as well as the standard deviation in Table 4 on page 149, it appears that the scores tend to be more heterogeneous than homogeneous. Therefore, variability does not appear to be a factor here in explaining the low correlation coefficients.

The only other probable cause that might have influenced these results is measurement error. "The greater the measurement error in X or Y, the lower will be the obtained r; the less the measurement error, the higher will be the value of r" (Hopkins & Glass, 1978, p.139). Respondents here may have provided erroneous information as the values on the Rokeach survey are subject to individual interpretation. Or, the setting in which respondents completed the survey may likewise be a probable factor that caused measurement errors. To alleviate such problems, perhaps a more controlled environment would be conducive in decreasing measurement errors. Also, a test-retest could be done to insure satisfactory reliability, especially with the Kindergarten Art Education
Advocacy Intentions Measure (since extensive reliability investigations have already been performed with the Rokeach (1973) measure.)

The Effects of Demographic Variables on Behavioral and Normative Beliefs

While the "Theory of Reasoned Action" (1980) purports that demographic variables, such as values and socio-economic status, are sometimes indirectly related to the behavior of interest, (as is the case for Sex of Parent, Sex of Child, and Art Education Background for this study), in most cases there will be no relationship at all. Although Fishbein and Ajzen recognize that demographic variables are important, these factors do not constitute an integral part of their theory. Nevertheless, demographic variables were investigated in the present study because it was believed that they would enhance our understanding of advocacy behaviors.

The important point to be made here is that,

"There is no necessary relation between any given variable and behavior. Some external variables may bear a relation to the behavior under investigation, while others may not, and even when a relationship is discovered, it may change over time and from one population to another" (Fishbein, 1980, p.9).

What the "Theory of Reasoned Action" also purports is that demographic variables will influence behavior or intentions only via the underlying determinants of that intention, which include normative and behavioral beliefs. This is the case for the variables of Sex of Parent; Sex of Child; and Art Education Background as noted in Figures 14 to 17.
The fact that values and socio-economic status do not effect behavioral beliefs as well as normative beliefs does not invalidate the theory. "The theory's validity depends not on support for hypotheses concerning the effects of external variables, but on empirical support for the relationships specified" (Fishbein, 1980, p.9). See Figures 14 to 17 for a demonstration of these relationships.

The following discussion will focus on interactions and main effects of the demographic variables (sex of parent, sex of child, art education background) and behavioral as well as normative beliefs. When considering the intention of petitioning the neighborhood, differences attributable to behavioral belief scores are not the same for Art Education Background or Sex of Parent (See Table 25). There is a significant effect of Sex of Parent on the mean of behavioral beliefs, and this effect changes depending on Art Education Background. The biggest difference can be seen (See Figure 7 on page 158) where male parents with elementary and high school art education background score higher on BB1 (indicating unfavorable beliefs toward petitioning the neighborhood) than do females with the same art education background. The difference in mean scores between males and females who have had art in grades 7-12 is only slight, with females having the higher mean score. This indicates that females in this sample who have had art in grades 7-12 have less favorable beliefs toward petitioning the neighborhood. This difference might be attributed to such a small sample of men (11%) in this study. Another possibility is that females tend to be more involved in education than men. We only need to look at the
kindergarten advocacy movement (discussed in the literature review) to see evidence of this.

The plot in Figure 7 also indicates that females with kindergarten art education only, scored the lowest on behavioral beliefs. This indicates that their beliefs are more supportive of petitioning the neighborhood perhaps due to the fact that these parents did have art in kindergarten and see the need for art education to be offered in the kindergarten curriculum.

When considering the advocacy intention of providing research material, once again, differences attributable to Art Education Background are not the same for Sex of Parent. And, there is a significant effect of Sex of Parent on the mean of behavioral belief scores. This effect changes depending on Art Education Background.

According to Figure 8 on page 161, the biggest difference can be seen where males with elementary and high school art education background score higher on behavioral beliefs (indicating unfavorable beliefs toward providing research material) than females with the same art background. The plot also indicates that females with kindergarten art education only, scored lower on behavioral beliefs, which indicates that their beliefs are more supportive of providing research material. While scores were lower on BB2 for both sexes having 7-12 years experience in art education, the lowest scores once again remain to be those of females with kindergarten art education only.

When considering the advocacy intention of writing a letter to the kindergarten teacher and principal, differences attributed to Sex of Child are not the same for Sex of Parent. There is a significant effect of Sex of
Parent on the mean of behavioral belief scores, and this effect changes, depending on the Sex of Child. The biggest difference can be seen where male parents with sons score higher on behavioral belief scores than male parents with daughters (See Table 27 on page 164). This indicates that male parents with daughters hold more favorable beliefs toward writing letters to the principal than do male parents with sons. There was also a difference (although not as great) for female parents. Those with daughters also scored only slightly lower on behavioral belief scores than those having sons. Therefore, females having daughters hold more favorable beliefs toward writing a letter to the principal than do females with sons. But again, it must be kept in mind that male parents hold less favorable attitudes for doing so than female parents. While there were differences for females with different sexed children, these differences were not as great as they were for male parents (See Figure 9 on page 166). It can also be seen from the graph that male parents with daughters have much lower scores on behavioral beliefs than do female parents with daughters. This supports research that fathers are more concerned with sex-role aquisition than mothers (Aberle & Naegele, 1952; Block, 1973; Goodenough, 1957; Lansky, 1967; Margolin & Patterson, 1975; Tasch, 1952) since art is often considered to have feminine qualities. This research suggests that male parents with daughters might be more likely to write letters to the principal than female parents with daughters.

The main effect indicates that parents with males have higher behavioral belief scores than parents with daughters indicating that parents with sons have less favorable attitudes toward writing a letter
to the principal than parents with daughters.

When considering the advocacy behavior of writing a letter to the school board, lower scores on normative beliefs indicate that parents are influenced by other persons when considering performing this advocacy behavior. Higher scores indicate less influence of others when considering this action. As grade level of art education background increases, scores on normative beliefs decrease.

Table 28, on page 168, indicates that the lowest score on normative beliefs corresponds to art experiences only in grades 7 to 12. Therefore, those parents with this amount of art education background are more influenced (than other parents) by other's opinions when considering writing a letter to the school board. It can be speculated that the absence of art education in the lower grades (K-5) for these parents, may account for their intentions to write a letter to the school to include art at the kindergarten level.

The highest score on normative beliefs (118.00) corresponds to no experience at all with art in the public school. This indicates that those parents having had no art experience in school, are not influenced by what others think when considering writing a letter to the school board, nor are they likely to perform such an act due to such a high score.

When considering writing a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher, lower scores on normative beliefs indicate that parents are influenced by other people when considering performing this advocacy behavior. Higher scores indicate less influence of others when considering this action. As grade level of art education experience increases, scores on normative beliefs decrease. Table 29, on page 170,
indicates that the lowest score on normative beliefs once again corresponds to art experiences in grade 7 to 12. Therefore, those parents with this amount of art education background are more influenced (than other parents) by other's opinions when considering writing a letter to the principal.

The highest score on normative beliefs (84.00) corresponds to no art experience at all in the public schools. This indicates that those parents having had no art experience in school are not influenced by what others think when considering writing a letter to the principal, nor are they likely to perform such an act.

Table 24, on page 184, summarizes all significant main effects and interactions of the demographic variables in relation to behavioral beliefs (BB) and normative beliefs (NB). In summary, male parents with both elementary and high school art education experience hold more unfavorable beliefs toward petitioning the neighborhood than do their female counterparts with the same amount of art education. In addition, female parents with kindergarten art education experiences embraced more supportive beliefs toward the intention to petition the neighborhood. Similar results were obtained for the intention to provide research material. When considering the intention of writing a letter to the principal, parents with males hold less supportive beliefs toward writing to the principal than parents with females. Male parents with daughters hold more favorable beliefs toward this act. Female parents with daughters are also inclined to have more favorable beliefs toward writing a letter to the principal, but their beliefs are not as strong toward this activity as male parents.
Parents who have had art experiences in grades 7 through 12 tend to be more influenced by other person's opinions when considering writing a letter to the school board. The influence of others is not considered by parents with no art experiences in school, nor are they likely to intend to write a letter to the school board.

There is one final point to be made concerning socio-economic status. This variable may have failed to have an effect on behavioral and normative beliefs due to the fact that there was insufficient and unequal representation within each status group (33%—Lower Middle; 25%—Lower; 22%—Middle; 15%—Upper Middle; 5%—Upper). Therefore, if future research desires to further investigate this variable, it is recommended that stratified random sampling be utilized in order to insure equal and adequate representation for each socio-economic level.

While the other demographic variables (Art Education Background; Sex of Child; Sex of Parent) did have an effect on normative and behavioral beliefs, it is important to point out here that these variables will only effect advocacy intentions if they influence the determinants of the attitudinal component. It will be recalled that in all four advocacy situations, the attitude component assumed the larger beta weights when compared to subjective norm (See Figures 14 to 17). ANOVA indicated that these demographic variables did have an effect on behavioral beliefs which influence attitudes that underly advocacy intentions. However, art education background was found to also have an effect on normative beliefs concerning writing a letter to the school board and also writing a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher. These variables, which are ultimately related to subjective norm, are
consequently not related to advocacy intentions, because intention in this investigation is primarily under the control of attitude. Therefore, art education background will not influence intentions to write a letter to the school board or to write a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher.

Table 24 indicates that various combinations of demographic variables influence all advocacy intentions via behavioral beliefs, with the exception of behavioral beliefs concerning writing a letter to the school board as well as writing a letter to the principal. Why were the results concerning demographic variables so inconsistent among these four advocacy intentions? As the “Theory of Reasoned Action” points out, external variables are not expected to have consistent effects as suggested by the broken lines in Figure 5 on page 100.

Also, “...just because some external variable is found to be related to one behavior does not mean that it has to be related to another behavior, even if the behaviors appear similar” (Fishbein, 1980, p.85). This applies to intentions as well. While all of the intentions in this investigation address art advocacy behaviors and appear to be similar, they are all different and are defined in specific terms. Therefore, this could account for the inconsistent effects of the demographic variables on the underlying determinants of behavioral intentions.

Testing the Causal Models

According to Fishbein (1980), attitudes toward behavioral intentions and subjective norms are the determinants of behavioral intentions. Behavioral and normative beliefs are the precursors of the attitudinal
and normative components, respectively. And, demographic variables will affect behavioral and normative beliefs. The results of this investigation are consistent with such conclusions.

Path coefficients for the just identified models were calculated. Those that did not meet the criteria of meaningfulness were deleted from the model. These paths included Art Education Background to Behavioral Beliefs; Art Education Background to Normative Beliefs; Sex of Parent to Behavioral Beliefs; Sex of Parent to Normative Beliefs; Sex of Child to Behavioral Beliefs; Sex of Child to Normative Beliefs. All over-identified models were tested for significance. All four models were found not to be significant, with the exclusion of demographic variables, therefore indicating that all four models fit the data and are therefore valid (Pedhazur 1982). This study indicates that there are relationships among behavioral beliefs, normative beliefs, attitudes toward advocacy intentions, subjective norm, and advocacy intentions as hypothesized by Fishbein (1980). Therefore, behavioral beliefs and normative beliefs are the determinants of attitudes toward advocacy intentions and subjective norm, respectively. And, advocacy intentions are a function of attitudes toward advocacy intentions and subjective norm.

If the four models with the prescribed relationships are valid, it follows that they are reliable as well.

"The validity of a causal model is essentially assessed in the light of its efficiency to reproduce, or closely approximate, the correlations among the variables (R)...And, it is only in overidentified models that one may use the reproduction of R for the purpose of assessing the validity of a causal model" (Pedhazur,1982, p.597-616).
These conclusions can be buttressed with the following arguments.

"The closer \( Q \) is to one, the better the fit of the model to the data" (Pedhazur, 1982, p.623). In all four models, \( Q \)'s ranged from .89 to .93, indicating a relatively good fit of the models to the data.

In addition, "The smaller \( M \) is in relation to \( R^2_m \), the poorer the fit of the overidentified model" (Pedhazur, 1982, p.619). Again, in all four models, differences between \( R^2_m \) and \( M \) ranged from .0215 to .03334 and thus were relatively small.

Large \( X^2 \) compared to its df should be taken as an indication that the model does not fit the data. Once again, in all four models, \( X^2 \) and df's were close with differences ranging from 1 to 5. All of these arguments lend further support to the claim that the models fit the data, and therefore, all four models are valid, as well as reliable.

The Relationship of General Art Attitudes and Advocacy Intentions

Fishbein (1980) theorizes that attitudes toward the act (in this case, kindergarten art advocacy) will have stronger correlations with behavioral intentions than attitudes toward the object (in this case, kindergarten art education). The results of this investigation support this claim, where the magnitude of the correlation between attitudes toward advocacy intentions and advocacy intentions were larger than the correlation between general attitudes toward kindergarten art education and advocacy intentions. Therefore, attitudes toward advocacy intentions as opposed to general attitudes toward kindergarten art education is a better predictor of intentions to petition the neighborhood, provide research material, write a letter to the school board, and write a letter
to the principal and kindergarten teacher.

**Informational Analysis**

Previous analysis in this study indicates that the attitudinal component of the model was the strongest (when attitudes toward advocacy intentions and subjective norm were regressed on intentions to advocate, attitude had higher beta weights) thus making it the most important predictor of Behavioral Intentions.

Underlying Behavioral Beliefs (B) correlated with attitudes toward advocacy consistently higher than Evaluation Outcomes (EV) alone, indicating that this portion of Behavioral Beliefs (BB) was the strongest element.

Correlations between behavioral beliefs and attitude toward advocacy ranged from r's of .43 to .56 (p<.05) for all four models. The direct measure of attitude toward advocacy correlated with intentions to advocate resulted in r's ranging from .62 to 1.00 (p<.05).

It can be concluded that the attitudinal component where examining beliefs should provide information for understanding the intentions of kindergarten parents to advocate art in the kindergarten. It should also be mentioned at this point that correlations between these variables, behavioral beliefs and attitudes toward advocacy as well as attitudes toward advocacy and intentions to advocate lends support for the construct validity of the model (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1979). Fishbein (1980) purports in his theory that such relationships between these variables do exist. The data in this investigation supports this contention, and is therefore evidence of the model's construct validity.
Summary and Discussion

This study has indicated that the Fishbein Model (for this study identified as the Kindergarten Art Advocacy Model) is a viable tool to be utilized for advocacy situations in the kindergarten art program. The data was supportive of the model's assumptions. One such assumption was that a linear combination of attitudes towards advocacy and subjective norm would predict advocacy intentions. In support of this assumption, R's ranged from .64 to .75 for all four models, when attitudes towards advocacy and subjective norm were regressed on advocacy intentions. This data also indicated that attitudes toward the act was more dominant in influencing advocacy intentions than subjective norm. Beta weights for these variables included: attitudes toward petitioning the neighborhood (.7084); and their accompanying subjective norms (.1220); attitudes toward providing research material (.5073); and their accompanying subjective norms (.3542); attitudes toward writing to the school board (.4864); and their accompanying subjective norms (.2186); attitudes toward writing to the principal (.5090); and their accompanying subjective norms (.2237).

Other assumptions of the model concerned the correlations between behavioral beliefs and attitudes toward advocacy, as well as normative beliefs and subjective norm. All correlations were above .30 and were significant, p<.05, suggesting that there are relationships between these variables.

The inclusion of values in the model, and their relationship with Behavioral and Normative Beliefs produced unsatisfactory relationships.
All correlations were very low and insignificant. Values and their relationship to Behavioral Intentions also produced very low correlations. It can only be speculated here that the values on the Rokeach instrument were too broad, whereas the data collected by the Fishbein instrument was more specific in nature. Such inconsistencies might have resulted in the low correlations. Perhaps another value instrument might have provided more satisfactory results.

Demographic variables provided some useful information. Of all four of these variables, three (Sex of Parent, Sex of Child, and Art Education Background) were found to affect Behavioral Beliefs (BB) and Normative Beliefs (NB). When considering behavioral beliefs concerning petitioning the neighborhood and behavioral beliefs concerning providing research material, there were interactions between Sex of Parent and Art Education Background F-(3.48, p<.05) and F-(4.48, p<.05) respectively. Main effects for normative beliefs concerning writing a letter to the school board and normative beliefs concerning writing a letter to the principal, included Art Education Background with F-(4.05, p<.05) and F-(4.41, p<.05) respectively. Behavioral beliefs concerning writing a letter to the principal had one main effect, Sex of Child F-(4.73, p<.05) and an interaction between Sex of Parent and Sex of Child F-(4.38, p<.05).

When these demographic variables were included in the path analysis, they provided very little useful information and were therefore excluded from all four final models. With this exclusion, the models were all found to "Fit the Data" and were therefore valid.

The assumption that attitudes towards advocacy was a better predictor of advocacy intentions than general attitudes towards art
education was tested and supported by the data. Attitudes toward advocacy and advocacy intentions correlated with r's ranging from .62 to 1.0 on all four models, whereas general attitudes toward art education and advocacy intentions correlated with r's ranging from .33 to .43 on all four models (p<.05).

The model's ability to provide an understanding of beliefs that underlie attitudes and advocacy intentions proved to be very insightful and offered useful information for soliciting advocates for kindergarten art education. Mean scores for advocacy intentions offered further information when considering soliciting advocates from kindergarten parents in this group. Mean scores ranged from 2.48 to 3.60 (1 would indicate that one was extremely likely to participate in advocacy activities) thus suggesting that this group of parents were neutral in their advocacy intentions. Attitudes toward advocacy behaviors followed a similar pattern. Mean scores ranged from 7.58 to 8.88 (3 would indicate extremely favorable attitudes). Such information indicates that there is considerable room for improvement in these variables. The strategy to employ in this case would be to consider providing messages to these kindergarten parents that include Behavioral Beliefs which underlie Attitudes.
CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The present research stems from a recent study conducted by McNealey (1982), who investigated the use of a marketing strategy for art advocacy with public high school principals. Because the model utilized in that research showed promise as a viable tool for art education advocacy at the high school level, it was believed that such a strategy could likewise bolster art education advocacy activities at the kindergarten level.

Despite recommendations from the National Art Education Association, it is at the kindergarten level where we frequently find that 65% of art instruction is taught by classroom teachers instead of art specialists, with children receiving less than an hour per week of "quality" art instruction (Chapman, 1982). While 78% of the states require art instruction at the elementary level (Mills & Thompson, 1986) it does not necessarily mean that this instruction is provided by an art specialist, or that it is quality art instruction. Quality art education consists of a balanced curriculum of producing as well as appreciating and evaluating art (Chapman 1978). Only 9 states require that art be
taught by a specialist at the elementary level including kindergarten (Dunn, 1986).

In order to change such a condition, as well as similar ones regarding the status of art education, an art advocacy strategy is needed. Such a strategy, once proven effective, could be utilized not only at the kindergarten level, but can be tailored for implementation in the first through twelfth grades as well.

The theory that underpins McNealey's advocacy strategy, as well as the present one, is taken from the marketing theory of Martin Fishbein and Icek Ajzen (1980). The "Theory of Reasoned Action" as they call it, alleges that intention, not attitude, is the immediate antecedent of behavior; attitudinal and normative components are then the precursors of intention; beliefs underlie attitude and perception of norms; and demographic or external variables underlie beliefs (See Figure 5, p.100).

For the present inquiry, the Fishbein (1980) model, as well as its causal relationships, was tested in a kindergarten art advocacy arena via the implementation of a survey instrument. The four advocacy behaviors at issue in this investigation included: petitioning the neighborhood and providing research material; both of which would be performed if art was not taught at all at the kindergarten level. Writing a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher; and writing a letter to the school board, both of which would be performed if an art specialist would not visit the kindergarten.
Summary of Findings

In conjunction with the McNealey study, this investigation demonstrated that the posited relationships within the model were supported by the data, with the exception of two external variables, values and socio-economic status, which will be discussed later. (See Figures 14 to 17) Regression analysis indicated that attitude toward advocacy intentions and subjective norm were predictors of intentions to advocate kindergarten art, and that attitude toward advocacy intentions was a stronger predictor due to its larger beta weights in all four advocacy situations.

The data also suggested multicollinearity between the attitudinal and normative components, as there was a reduction of $r^2$ to the increment of each of these variables. This can lead to the underestimation of $B$ (Pedhazur, 1982), which could effect the findings in this investigation. It will be recalled in the review of the literature that multicollinearity was also found between subjective norm and attitudes by Miniard and Cohen (1982), who tried to alleviate the problem by redefining these variables. Another viable solution as Pedhazur (1982) suggests is that more data need to be collected in future research, "...in the hope that this may ameliorate the condition of high multicollinearity" (p.246).

Behavioral and normative beliefs provided significant correlations with attitude and subjective norm respectively. Demographic or external variables, which included sex of parent, sex of child and art education background did effect both normative and behavioral beliefs.

In all four advocacy situations, values were found not to have any significant relationship with Behavioral and Normative Beliefs. The
Rokeach Value Survey has been criticized because it is an ipsative measure and therefore doesn't measure the intensity of values held (Cohen, 1964). One person may be more value conscious than another, and this would therefore not be reflected in the mere ranking of values. Measurement error is also a factor here due to the fact that the values in the Rokeach measure are open to interpretation, despite short explanations of the meaning of each.

A viable option for future investigation would be to utilize another value instrument. One likely candidate is the Tower (1980) survey. The values included in this instrument appear to be more aligned to advocacy behaviors such as resourcefulness, enthusiasm, creativity, energetic, reliability, helpfulness. All of these in some way could be characteristic of a potential advocate. Further support for future use of the Tower Value Instrument is its reliability and validity. Also, while not as widely used as the Rokeach instrument, it has been designed and utilized with kindergarten parent respondents.

The data also indicated that socio-economic status failed to have an effect on normative and behavioral beliefs. Such a result could be due to unequal representation within each social class (i.e., 35% in the lower middle class as compared to 5% in the upper class). Therefore, it is strongly advised that future research stratify the sample so that social classes are equally represented. It is also suggested that the sample be stratified on the other demographic variables of sex of parent, sex of child, and art education background to insure more accurate comparisons among these groups.
When the entire model was tested, it was found to "Fit the Data" for all four advocacy situations, but only with the exclusion of demographic variables (See Figures 10-13). Once again, there is support for Fishbein's theory. Although consideration of the demographic variables may help to enhance our understanding of advocacy intentions, they are not necessary to predict these intentions. The variables that are the predictors of advocacy intentions are subjective norm, attitude towards advocacy intentions, behavioral beliefs, and normative beliefs.

Additional findings indicated that attitude toward engaging in a specific advocacy activity is a better predictor of advocacy intentions than general attitudes toward kindergarten art. It was therefore concluded that the Fishbein Model (Kindergarten Art Education Advocacy Intentions Model) is a viable tool to be utilized for kindergarten art advocacy.

General Attitudes, as indicated by their means, were very positive, while intentions to advocate art were more neutral. The data clearly indicates that there is an inconsistency between highly favorable attitudes toward kindergarten art education and the reluctance to serve as an advocate to support kindergarten art education. Any persuasive messages tailored toward changing the general attitudes toward kindergarten art education in order to garner supporters for kindergarten art education would be ineffectual. Yet, this is the strategy that has been proposed most recently by Tom Hatfield (1984), who notes that decision makers within the public schools have positive attitudes toward art, but fails to recognize attitudes toward support for art education. Phillip Dunn (1987) likewise addresses attitudes toward the visual arts instead
of attitudes toward advocacy when suggestions are made for the content of persuasive messages.

"...Such a message may be quite effective in changing the receiver's attitude toward the target because the argument it contains constitute the primary beliefs for this variable, but it is unlikely to have the desired effect on behavior...to produce a change in behavior or behavioral intention, the primary beliefs that have to be attacked are beliefs about the performance of the behavior. It follows that the arguments included in the message must be statements about the likely consequences of the behavior - and not about the attributes of the target of the behavior" (Fishbein in Brock, 1981, p.349).

General Attitudes Toward Advocacy Intentions

It is Fishbein (1980) who also postulates that any correlations, if they exist, between General Attitudes and Behavioral Intentions will be very weak. The present study likewise supports this claim. What can therefore be elicited from this information is that the currently proposed art advocacy strategies might tend to be ineffectual due to inappropriately focusing promotional messages on attitudes toward art education, instead of attitudes toward specific supportive activities.

Behavioral Beliefs and The Content of Persuasive Appeals

What should be the specific content of a persuasive appeal as it applies to this investigation? "...to produce a change in behavior or behavioral intention, the arguments included in the message must attack primary beliefs about the performance of the behavior" (Fishbein, 1980, p.227). See Figure 18.
The person's beliefs that the behavior leads to certain outcomes and his evaluation of these outcomes

The person's beliefs that specific individuals or groups think he should or should not perform the behavior and his motivation to comply with the specific referents
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FIGURE 18

SCHEMATIC PRESENTATION OF CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE PREDICTION OF INTENTIONS AND BEHAVIOR.
Examining Behavioral Beliefs as they pertain to the specific advocacy behavior of petitioning the neighborhood, eight beliefs were positive. They include the following: petitioning the neighborhood would help save the kindergarten art program (highest correlation); would be beneficial to the kindergarten child (second highest correlation); would provide the school board with a better understanding of how taxpayers feel about such a move; would make parents of kindergarten children aware of the change; would give parents the opportunity to support or not to support the change; would cause them (neighborhood) to be aware of the situation; would cause the school board to be influenced by the number of signatures on the petition. Any messages geared toward provoking such beliefs, instead of increasing the strength of them, may be ineffectual because kindergarten parents (in this case) are being told what they already believe, although not strongly enough to effect attitudes toward petitioning the neighborhood. Therefore, such arguments (in this case, the set of salient beliefs) should be supported by factual evidence. For example, if evidence can be found where petitioning the neighborhood helped to save an art program, or for that matter, any public school program, it should be included in the persuasive appeal. When addressing the argument concerning petitioning the neighborhood if art is excluded from the kindergarten curriculum, would be beneficial to the kindergarten child, a list of how art can be beneficial (such as increasing perceptual powers, utilization of problem solving skills, learning to appreciate works of art executed by others, learning about the history through art, etc.).
The three negative beliefs when considering petitioning the neighborhood if art was not taught at the kindergarten level, included: would cause the neighbors to take a negative attitude toward the idea because of my doing it since I have a kindergarten child (very low correlation); would cause members of the neighborhood who have no vested interest in education to jump on the bandwagon to simply save the taxpayers (very low correlation); would cause them (neighborhood) to feel that art isn't a necessity since their children will be receiving art in the elementary grades.

It is the last belief that is of concern for the art educator. While children do receive art in the elementary grades from an art specialist in some cases, quite often they don't have the specialist in the kindergarten. Therefore, teaching art is the responsibility of the kindergarten teacher who may not have the time or qualifications to teach it properly. Consequently, messages must include reasons why it is important that kindergarten children have art, and that it be taught by a qualified art teacher.

While the remaining three advocacy intentions had underlying positive behavioral beliefs which need to be included in persuasive communications with supportive arguments, the focus will be on the negative beliefs as they might pose more of a problem when constructing persuasive appeals.

The other negative beliefs included the following. When considering the advocacy behavior of providing research material if art was not taught in the kindergarten, such an act would cause the school board to feel that art education is not a necessity. When considering writing a
letter to the school board when the art teacher doesn't visit the kindergarten, the one negative belief was that it would be possibly difficult due to a school board that is sometimes difficult to get along with. When considering writing a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher when the art teacher doesn't visit the kindergarten, the one negative belief was that it would cause the kindergarten teacher to take it as a personal insult that she was not adequately handling art education.

Any persuasive messages to parents that solicit their services as an advocate to provide research material, should contain information on why the school board would feel that art is a necessity if such an act were performed. For example, other examples can be cited where research material was provided to school boards and they in turn acted favorably toward the necessity of a particular subject added to the curriculum.

Any messages to parents, when considering their service as advocates to write a letter to the school board, should contain information on why the board would be easy to get along with. For example, one could cite various instances where the school board was happy to comply with one's wishes. Or, parents who personally know board members could be used to help support this argument.

Messages to parents who are considering writing a letter to the principal and kindergarten teacher should include reasons why the kindergarten teacher will not be insulted. For instance, it might be pointed out that the kindergarten teacher cannot be expected to be knowledgeable in all areas; that she is a specialist for kindergarten
children, but not necessarily a specialist in art; the weekly visit by a qualified art instructor would provide the kindergarten teacher planning time in order to concentrate on other curriculum areas. Perhaps even bringing in the kindergarten teacher to speak to parents concerning the importance of having a specialized art teacher would be beneficial.

It is important to note that any persuasive messages should contain all of the salient beliefs, both positive and negative, that underlie attitude (in this study) or subjective norm, depending on which has the higher beta weight. This is important because,

"Only when the message brings about a shift in the summed products across the total set of underlying beliefs can it be expected to influence attitudes or subjective norms and, hence, intentions and behaviors" (Fishbein in Brock, 1981, p.344).

Therefore, messages which contain arguments that are unrelated to salient beliefs regarding the attitude toward a specific behavior will be ineffective.

The means of the summed products across the total set of underlying behavioral beliefs for each advocacy intention in this research indicates that parents hold rather favorable beliefs toward each advocacy behavior, they obviously are not strong enough to influence attitudes, which in turn influence intentions (both of which were neutral in this investigation. Therefore, there is a need for improvement via the use of persuasive communications.

It is important to point out that these neutral attitudes and intentions might be a result of parent's concern for education not becoming really focused until after kindergarten, or more importantly,
how art education is perceived by each parent. Despite the inclusion of a definition of art education in the survey instrument used for this research, it may not have truly reflected parent's definition of art education. This would therefore result in measurement error. Future research should focus on eliciting parent's definitions of art education and examine how these definitions determine intentions to advocate kindergarten art education.

**Conditions Affecting the Reception of a Persuasive Message**

Whether or not parents will be receptive to these persuasive messages is beyond the scope of the present investigation, but some groundwork can be primed for future inquiry. Fishbein and Ajzen (1980) refer to three conditions that are present during the reception of a verbal or written persuasive communication. They include acceptance, yielding, and impact. Acceptance refers to the fact that a person strongly believes in a behavior and its consequences. These are persons who are already sympathetic to the views of the message. Parents as a group in the present inquiry fall into the category of Acceptance (with basically positive belief scores). But, these beliefs were not strong enough to influence attitudes and intentions which were neutral. It is therefore believed that persuasive messages will alter these beliefs into even more positive ones that will in turn positively influence attitudes and intentions.

Yielding refers to the "Change in acceptance of the belief statement resulting from exposure to the message" (Fishbein in Brock, 1981, p.350). It is this person who generally holds more neutral beliefs. It is persons
falling into this neutral category who change their beliefs more favorably as a result of exposure to persuasive messages.

Impact is the final condition. It refers to the instance where "Presentation of an argument may have indirect effects; that is, it may have impact effects on one or more other beliefs that were not explicitly mentioned" (Fishbein in Brock, 1981, p.350). These effects are more difficult to measure, as well as being beyond the scope of the present investigation. But future research should be aware of these possible effects.

As previously indicated, a persuasive communication should provide arguments buttressed by supporting factual evidence. In order for the message to be effective, it must influence the salient beliefs that underlie attitudes (in this particular investigation) toward a specified behavior. The effects of such a message can produce acceptance of or yielding to the points stressed in the message, but likewise it may have indirect effects on beliefs that were not specifically mentioned in the persuasive communication.

Fishbein and Ajzen further note that,

"...our analysis suggests that reception may not even be a necessary condition for change. What determines change in a target variable is the extent to which the message influences the primary beliefs relevant to that variable. Receivers may fail to pay attention to a message; they may misperceive it or misunderstand it and still display change in primary beliefs...all a message may do is stimulate receivers to think about the issue under consideration, and this may be sufficient to bring about change in some of the primary beliefs and hence in the dependent variable" (Fishbein in Brock, 1981, p.355).
The Consideration of Other Factors Concerning Persuasive Messages

While the content of the message is extremely important in altering attitudes that influence behavior, there are additional factors that the advocate should consider. But, Fishbein and Ajzen (1980) caution that these are only secondary in nature. One of them is the source of the communication. Whoever is chosen as the spokesperson to present persuasive messages in order to solicit kindergarten parents as art advocates should possess an appealing personality.

"...an appealing personality is a major asset in securing the acceptance of an idea, whether new or old. A good half of salesmanship lies not in knowing what you are selling or in selling a desirable thing, nor yet in believing what you are saying, but simply in being an engaging person" (Barnett, 1953, p.321).

To supplement an engaging personality, the communicator should likewise be credible and prestigious.

"Attributing the message to sources of varying credibility might very well influence the amount of attitude change produced. Factual evidence presented by an expert may be more accepted and yielded to than the same factual evidence provided by a nonexpert" (Fishbein in Brock, 1981, p.355).

Despite the fact that normative considerations (important others) were not a strong influence in this study, the appearance of multicollinearity between attitudes and subjective norm (which results in the underestimation of B) suggests that normative influences should not be completely ignored. One normative referent that reappeared in all four advocacy situations was the kindergarten teacher. Therefore, the kindergarten teacher might be best suited for this role of persuasive
communicator when considering the present investigation.

Yet even though an effective and prestigious communicator is chosen to deliver persuasive messages, the results may not be satisfactory. It is therefore important to keep in mind that "...the effects of source credibility on the amount of change (in beliefs) will depend on the content of the message employed" (Fishbein in Brock, 1981 p.358). Future research needs to investigate the amount of change, if any, in beliefs as a result of persuasive messages that include behavioral beliefs.

Once parent's beliefs are swayed into a more favorable direction toward serving as advocates for kindergarten art education through the strategies noted above, the art teacher no longer works in isolation for the cause. This has been a problem in the past (Dunn, 1987). "When the teacher is engaged in an innovative activity, the need for understanding and support is even more apparent" (G.W. Basset, 1970, p.124-125). Therefore, it is such a group of parent advocates that can amplify a persuasive communication.

"...the support of a majority is an asset to an advocate. In actual numbers the supporters of a new idea need not constitute a majority or even approximate it. They need only give the impression that they are or must inevitably become the majority. Their advocacy is strengthened by their making it seem that opposition to their idea is futile, unreasonable or stubborn. The technique of the advocate is to overwhelm the objector by summoning a mass verdict the logic of which, just because it is a consensus, is alleged to be irresistible...if nothing else, mass advocacy is intimidating...in short, many people accept a new idea because everybody else is doing so. The multitude must be right; even if it is not, there is no use contending with it" (Barnett, 1953, p.327-328).
Mackenzie's (1964) investigations have indicated that parental groups can indeed be a powerful group to be reckoned with.

Once this parent group of advocates is successfully formed, it is pertinent to proceed through the appropriate administrative channels (See Figure 19) in order to achieve the desired curricular changes, which in this case would be the addition of art and a specialized art instructor to the kindergarten curriculum.
FIGURE 19

ADMINISTRATIVE CHANNELS FOR THE POTENTIAL ART ADVOCATE TO PROCEED THROUGH IN ORDER TO ACHIEVE DESIRED GOALS
"A thorough knowledge of how your districts are organized provides you with many of the tools that are necessary to virtually insure the support of the educational decision makers who will make the decisions that determine whether your program prospers, stagnates or dies" (Dunn, 1987, p.15).

One appropriate measure that might be taken is to discuss the cause, as a group, with the school principal. Mackenzie (1964) has found in his investigations that "...principals were found to be very influential participants in changing the determiners of curriculum content" (p.410-411).

Superintendents would be the next strategic contact. It is this person who is one of the most powerful participants in the curricular change procedure. Mackenzie (1964) found that it was often this individual who solicited support from parents to barter for monetary funding needed for special instruction, or additional staff members. Developing such a relationship would be an asset to the art advocate.

While the principal and superintendents hold important positions within the administrative bodies of the public school, it is the board of education that really holds the clout. Not only does this educational body have the power to order changes despite the objections of the professional staff, and influence "The general climate within which education goes forward" (Mackenzie 1964, p.412). It possesses the purchasing power to fund art programs (Dunn 1987).

While the federal government is the main provider of funding for public school education, it is each individual state that determines how this funding is spent. In turn, the state disperses monies to the local school boards who are ultimately given the power to spend these federal
dollars in any fashion they wish (Dunn, 1987).

Therefore, it is the board of education who has the financial, as well as the decision making control over each public school system. A 1984 Gallop poll has also indicated that parents and school boards should have the greatest influence in deciding what is taught in school. Therefore, it is this body who should be the ultimate target for parent art education advocates.

How are parent advocates going to alter the board of education's beliefs in order for them to see things their way? Future research must assess the attitudes and underlying beliefs of board of education members regarding their support for kindergarten art education. In continuation of the present investigation, attitudes and beliefs of board members should be assessed concerning the provision of a specialized art educator in the kindergarten, as well as including art in the kindergarten curriculum.

Once underlying beliefs have been identified, and significant correlations with attitudes and subjective norms have been established, these beliefs can then be utilized as arguments with supportive factual evidence in persuasive communications to alter board member's views toward supporting kindergarten art education. Such an approach can likewise be utilized to solicit support from principals and superintendents, but it is the school board who is the ultimate power to be dealt with here.
Dear Parents:

I am a doctoral student at Ohio State University. As part of my studies at this institution, I am obligated to complete a major research project. This research consists of offering a strategy for the art teacher to implement should the kindergarten art program be placed in jeopardy. In order to offer such a strategy, the teacher must have some idea of how parents feel about the status of kindergarten art education as parents can serve as an important support group for the art teacher. This is why any opinions that you may have concerning kindergarten art education is so vital.

Please understand that your school art program is not experiencing any difficulty at the present time. However, should any problems arise in the future with the art program, information and opinions expressed by you could prove to be very beneficial in solving the problem. Your school was chosen because it was more convenient for me to distribute questionnaires. You will be receiving two different questionnaires. The first one is attached to this letter. It is more general in nature in that the questions asked do not specifically focus on kindergarten art. They are general questions concerning your education, occupation, and how you feel about art education in general. The second questionnaire will be sent to you in the next few weeks. It is very important that you answer both questionnaires. Please answer all questions honestly. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. When you have completed the questions, would you please enclose them in the envelope provided and return it via your child to the classroom teacher no later than tomorrow.

Most Sincerely Yours,

[Signature]
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Please answer the following questions as accurately as possible. All must be answered.

1. Your Gender: _____Male _____Female

2. Are you employed outside the home? _____ If your answer is "yes", please circle "Parttime" or "Fulltime".

3. Your Occupation (Be specific): ________________________________

4. Is your spouse employed outside the home? _____ If your answer is "yes", please circle "Parttime" or "Fulltime".

5. Your Spouse's Occupation (Be specific): _______________________

6. Highest Level of Education Completed (Check one by placing an "X").

YOU

_____Graduate Degree
_____Four Year College Degree
_____Two Year College
_____Partial College Training
_____High School/Trade School
_____Some High School (no diploma)
_____Junior High School (7-9)
_____Elementary School (1-6; you may check here even though you may not have completed all six grades)

YOUR SPOUSE

_____Graduate Degree
_____Four Year College Degree
_____Two Year College
_____Partial College Training
_____High School/Trade School
_____Some High School (no diploma)
_____Junior High School (7-9)
_____Elementary School (1-6)
7. Places where you and your spouse have received art education:

Art education is that part of the school curriculum that exposes one to: (1) the making of art works with various materials and processes, such as tempera painting, making clay objects, or weaving with natural fibers; (2) an appreciation of the environment as well as art objects in relation to one’s culture as well as those of others. Check the places where you have received art education. Also check those for your spouse. You may check more than one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>You</th>
<th>Your Spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___ Kindergarten</td>
<td>___ Kindergarten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Elementary School</td>
<td>___ Elementary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Junior High School</td>
<td>___ Junior High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ High School</td>
<td>___ High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ College</td>
<td>___ College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Graduate School</td>
<td>___ Graduate School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___ Other (Please Specify)</td>
<td>___ Other (Please Specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Number of children that you have in kindergarten. (Circle one)

0  1  2  3  4  5  more than 5

9. The gender of your kindergarten child. (Circle One)

Male  Female
The following statements are belief statements about art education. Please indicate your opinion by marking an X in the appropriate space.

1.) Art education can enhance cognitive learning in the classroom.
   Agree _____: _____: _____: ______: ______: ______ Disagree extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

2.) Art education has a unique contribution to make to the total education of each student.
   Agree _____: _____: _____: ______: ______: ______ Disagree extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

3.) Art education should be reserved for only those students who excel in the arts.
   Agree _____: _____: _____: ______: ______: ______ Disagree extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

4.) Students become more self-actualized through art education.
   Agree _____: _____: _____: ______: ______: ______ Disagree extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

5.) Art education enhances a student's awareness of the environment.
   Agree _____: _____: _____: ______: ______: ______ Disagree extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

6.) Art education is an educational frill.
   Agree _____: _____: _____: ______: ______: ______ Disagree
7.) Art education enhances knowledge of our cultural heritage.

Agree ______:_____:_____:_____:____:____:____ Disagree extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

8.) Art education benefits do not justify their cost.

Agree ______:_____:_____:_____:____:____:____ Disagree extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

9.) Art education offers little of importance in the education of youth today.

Agree ______:_____:_____:_____:____:____:____ Disagree extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

10.) Art education provides opportunities for achieving personal fulfillment.

Agree ______:_____:_____:_____:____:____:____ Disagree extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

11.) Art education is too impractical.

Agree ______:_____:_____:_____:____:____:____ Disagree extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

12.) The expenditure of funds for art education is wasteful.

Agree ______:_____:_____:_____:____:____:____ Disagree extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

13.) Art education can enrich the process of teaching in areas outside of art.

Agree ______:_____:_____:_____:____:____:____ Disagree extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
14.) Art education undermines self-discipline.

Agree ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Disagree
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

15.) Art education does not interest the typical student.

Agree ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Disagree
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

16.) Art education has therapeutic value for students with special needs.

Agree ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Disagree
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

17.) Art education should not be the responsibility of schools.

Agree ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Disagree
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

18.) Creativity developed in art is transferrable to other areas.

Agree ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Disagree
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

19.) Please place an "X" in the area which most closely represents your general attitude toward art education.

Agree ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Disagree
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
Dear Parent:

Enclosed with this letter, you will find a second and final questionnaire to be completed. It concerns specific actions that you might take should the kindergarten art program experience any future difficulties. A very small portion of the questionnaire also deals with the things you value most in your life.

Please keep in mind that your school art program is not experiencing any difficulty at the present time. However, should any problem arise in the future with the art program, information and opinions expressed by you could prove to be very beneficial in solving the problem.

Upon answering the questionnaire, please make sure that all questions are completed so that the results will truly represent the thinking of parents at your school. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. When you have completed the questions, would you please enclose them in the envelope provided and return it via your child to the classroom teacher within the next three days.

As a token of thanks for your anticipated cooperation, a small gift is enclosed with the questionnaire, along with a raffle ticket for a Pirate Baseball Game in Pittsburgh. Keep the bottom portion of this ticket until the drawing on May 30, 1985. The winning number will be posted at your school where your tickets will be available. All questionnaires must be turned in no later than May 24th to qualify for the raffle.

Sincerely Yours,
Kathy Danko-McGhee
The statements in this questionnaire are belief statements regarding kindergarten art education advocacy. Kindergarten art education refers to the making, history and criticism of visual arts (painting, drawing, sculpture, etc.) in the school setting. Advocacy refers to using persuasive methods to change the attitudes of decision makers in the school system. In the questionnaire you are about to fill out, we ask questions which make use of rating scales with six places. For each scale you are to mark an X in the place that best describes your opinion. For example, if you think it is quite likely that art education builds creativity, your response should be made in the following manner:

Art education builds creativity.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

1.) In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, how likely are you to petition the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and send the petition to the school board?

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

2.) My petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board in the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education is:
Good extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

Rewarding extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

Unpleasant extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, my petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board would:

3.) Help save the kindergarten art program. 
Likely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

4.) Be beneficial to the kindergarten child. 
Likely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

5.) Cause the neighbors to take a negative attitude toward the idea because of my doing it since I have a kindergarten child. 
Likely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

6.) Cause members of the neighborhood who have no vested interest in education to jump on the bandwagon to simply save the taxpayers. 
Likely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
7.) Provide the school board with a better understanding of how taxpayers feel about such a move.

Likely ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

8.) Provide the school board with a better understanding of how parents feel about such a move.

Likely ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

9.) Make parents of kindergarten children aware of the change.

Likely ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

10.) Give parents the opportunity to support or not to support the change.

Likely ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

11.) Cause them to feel that art isn't a necessity since their children will be receiving art in the elementary grades.

Likely ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

12.) Cause them to be aware of the situation.

Likely ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
13.) Cause the school board to be influenced by the number of signatures on the petition.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

14.) Helping save the kindergarten art program is

Good ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Bad extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

15.) Doing something that is beneficial to the kindergarten child is

Good ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Bad extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

16.) Causing the neighbors to take a negative attitude toward the idea because of my doing it since I have a kindergarten child is

Good ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Bad extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

17.) Causing the members of the neighborhood who have no vested interest in education to jump on the bandwagon to simply save the taxpayer is

Good ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Bad extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

18.) Providing the school board with a better understanding of how taxpayers feel about such a move is

Good ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Bad extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
19.) Making parents of kindergarten children aware of the change is

Good ____: _____: _____: _____: _____: ____ Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

20.) Giving parents the opportunity to support or not to support the change is

Good _____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

21.) Causing the neighborhood to feel that art isn’t a necessity since their children will be receiving art in the elementary grades is

Good ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

22.) Causing the neighborhood to be aware of the situation is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: ____ Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

23.) Causing the school board to be influenced by the number of signatures on the petition is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: ____ Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

24.) Are there any other outcomes you would associate with petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board in the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education?
25.) Most people who are important to me think I should petition the neighborhood and send the petition to the school board in the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

How likely or unlikely are the following groups or individuals to voice their opinions about your petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board in the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education?

26.) Kindergarten teachers

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

27.) Elementary art teachers

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

28.) Local artists

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

29.) Concerned parents

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
30.) The teacher's union

Likely ____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
    extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

31.) The P.T.O.

Likely ____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
    extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

32.) Local newspaper

Likely ____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
    extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

33.) Teachers

Likely ____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
    extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

34.) Women's organizations

Likely ____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
    extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

35.) Taxpayers without children

Likely ____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
    extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

36.) Generally speaking, I want to do what other kindergarten parents think I should do.

Likely ____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
    extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
37.) Generally speaking, I want to do what elementary art teachers think I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

38.) Generally speaking, I want to do what local artists think I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

39.) Generally speaking, I want to do what concerned parents think I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

40.) Generally speaking, I want to do what the teacher's union thinks I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

41.) Generally speaking, I want to do what the P.T.O. thinks I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

42.) Generally speaking, I want to do what the local newspaper thinks I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
43.) Generally speaking, I want to do what teachers think I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

44.) Generally speaking, I want to do what the women's organization wants me to do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

45.) Generally speaking, I want to do what taxpayers without children think I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

46.) Are there other specific groups or individuals who would voice their opinions about your petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board in the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education?

47.) In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, how likely are you to provide research material in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, P.T.O. and school principals.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
48.) My providing research material in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, P.T.O. and the school principal in the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education is:

Good ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

Rewarding____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Punishing
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

Unpleasant____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Pleasant
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, my providing research materials in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, P.T.O. and the school principal would:

49.) Raise their awareness of the advantages of the kindergarten art program.
   Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely
       extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

50.) Cause them to feel that kindergarten art education is not necessary.
   Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely
       extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

51.) Cause them to be aware of how much I care about the change.
   Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely
       extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
52.) Save the art program if these people are made aware of its importance.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

53.) Raising the awareness of the school administration toward the advantages of the kindergarten art program is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

54.) Causing the school administration to feel that kindergarten art education is not necessary is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

55.) Causing the school administration to be aware of how much I care about change is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

56.) Saving the art program if the school administration is made aware of its importance is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

57.) Are there any other outcomes you would associate with providing research material in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, P.T.O. and the school principal in the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education?
58.) Most people who are important to me think I should provide research material in support of kindergarten art education to the school board members, the superintendent, P.T.O. and the school principal in the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education.

Likely ________: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

How likely or unlikely are the following groups or individuals to voice their opinions about your providing research materials in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, P.T.O. and the school principal, in the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education?

59.) Kindergarten teachers

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

60.) Elementary art teachers

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

61.) Local artists

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

62.) Concerned parents

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
63.) College elementary education departments

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

64.) Teacher's union

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

65.) P.T.O.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

66.) Local newspaper

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

67.) Teachers

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

68.) Taxpayers without children

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

69.) Generally speaking, I want to do what kindergarten teachers think I should do.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
70.) Generally speaking, I want to do what elementary art teachers think I should do.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

71.) Generally speaking, I want to do what local artists think I should do.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

72.) Generally speaking, I want to do what concerned parents think I should do.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

73.) Generally speaking, I want to do what college elementary education departments think I should do.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

74.) Generally speaking, I want to do what the teacher's union thinks I should do.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

75.) Generally speaking, I want to do what the P.T.O. thinks I should do.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
76.) Generally speaking, I want to do what the local newspaper thinks I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

77.) Generally speaking, I want to do what teachers think I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

78.) Generally speaking, I want to do what taxpayers without children think I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

79.) Are there other specific groups or individuals who would voice their opinions about your providing research materials in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, P.T.O. and the school principal, in the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education?
Dear Parent:

Enclosed with this letter, you will find a second and final questionnaire to be completed. It concerns specific actions that you might take should the kindergarten art program experience any future difficulties. A very small portion of the questionnaire also deals with the things you value most in your life.

Please keep in mind that your school art program is not experiencing any difficulty at the present time. However, should any problem arise in the future with the art program, information and opinions expressed by you could prove to be very beneficial in solving the problem.

Upon answering the questionnaire, please make sure that all questions are completed so that the results will truly represent the thinking of parents at your school. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. When you have completed the questions, would you please enclose them in the envelope provided and return it via your child to the classroom teacher within the next three days.

As a token of thanks for your anticipated cooperation, a small gift is enclosed with the questionnaire, along with a raffle ticket for a Pirate Baseball Game in Pittsburgh. Keep the bottom portion of this ticket until the drawing on May 30, 1985. The winning number will be posted at your school where your tickets will be available. All questionnaires must be turned in no later than May 24th to qualify for the raffle.

Sincerely Yours,
Kathy Banks-McGhee
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The statements in this questionnaire are belief statements regarding kindergarten art education advocacy. Kindergarten art education refers to the making, history and criticism of visual arts (painting, drawing, sculpture, etc.) in the school setting. Advocacy refers to using persuasive methods to change the attitudes of decision makers. In the questionnaire you are about to fill out, we ask questions which make use of rating scales with six places; for each scale, you are to mark an X in the place that best describes your opinion. For example, if you think it is quite likely that art education builds creativity, your response should be made in the following manner:

Art education builds creativity

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

1.) In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, how likely are you to send a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
2.) My sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good extremely</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rewarding extremely</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, my sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education would:

3.) Bring the matter to their attention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely extremely</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.) Make the desires of the parents known.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely extremely</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.) Prompt the school board to take action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely extremely</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.) Make my opinion known.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likely extremely</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>slightly</th>
<th>quite</th>
<th>extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.) Provide the board with information on which to make a decision.

Likely _____: _____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____. Unlikely
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

8.) Cause more emphasis to be placed on creativity in my child's education.

Likely _____: _____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____. Unlikely
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

9.) Let the school board know that art is needed in the curriculum.

Likely _____: _____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____. Unlikely
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

10.) Possibly be difficult due to a school board that is sometimes difficult to get along with.

Likely _____: _____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____. Unlikely
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

11.) Bringing the matter to the school board's attention is

Good _____: _____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____. Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

12.) Making the desires of parents known is

Good _____: _____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____. Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

13.) Prompting the school board to take action is

Good _____: _____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____. Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
14.) Making my opinion known is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

15.) Providing the board with information on which to make a decision is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

16.) Causing more emphasis to be placed on creativity in my child's education is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

17.) Letting the school board know that art is needed in the curriculum is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

18.) A school board that is sometimes difficult to get along with is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

19.) Are there any other outcomes you would associate with sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten?
20.) Most people who are important to me think I should send a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education, in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten.

Likely _____: ______: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

How likely or unlikely are the following groups or individuals to voice their opinion about sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education, in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one to six, excluding the kindergarten?

21.) Other parents

Likely _____: ______: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

22.) Kindergarten teachers

Likely _____: ______: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

23.) People interested in lowering the school tax

Likely _____: ______: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

24.) Parents

Likely _____: ______: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
25.) The school board

Likely _______ : ________ : ________ : ________ : ________ : ________ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

26.) Generally speaking, I want to do what other kindergarten parents think I should do.

Likely _______ : ________ : ________ : ________ : ________ : ________ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

27.) Generally speaking, I want to do what kindergarten teachers think I should do.

Likely _______ : ________ : ________ : ________ : ________ : ________ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

28.) Generally speaking, I want to do what people interested in lowering school tax think I should do.

Likely _______ : ________ : ________ : ________ : ________ : ________ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

29.) Generally speaking, I want to do what parents think I should do.

Likely _______ : ________ : ________ : ________ : ________ : ________ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

30.) Generally speaking, I want to do what the school board thinks I should do.

Likely _______ : ________ : ________ : ________ : ________ : ________ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
31.) Are there other specific groups or individuals who would voice their opinions about your sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten?

32.) In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, how likely are you to send a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

33.) My sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten is:

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Bad
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

Rewarding____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____Punishing
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

Unpleasant ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____Pleasant
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, my sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal would:
34.) Instigate the coordination of schedules and time slots to ascertain the feasibility of the inclusion of kindergarten art education by these two people.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

35.) Motivate them to be advocates for the kindergarten art program.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

36.) Cause the kindergarten teacher to include art along with other subjects while teaching.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

37.) Make my opinion known.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

38.) Give the board of education information on which to make a decision.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

39.) Cause more emphasis to be placed on creativeness in my child's education.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
40.) Cause the kindergarten teacher to take it as a personal insult that she was not adequately handling art education herself.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

41.) Let them know that art education is needed.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

42.) Let them know that parents think art education is needed.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

43.) Cause these two individuals to do their best to include such a program.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

44.) Instigating the coordination of schedules and time slots to ascertain the feasibility of the inclusion of kindergarten art education by the kindergarten teacher and school principal is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Bad extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

45.) Motivating the kindergarten teacher and the school principal to be advocates for the kindergarten art program is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Bad extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
46.) Causing the kindergarten teacher to include art along with other subjects while teaching is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

47.) Making my opinion known to the kindergarten teacher and school principal is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

48.) Giving the board of education information on which to make a decision is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

49.) Causing more emphasis to be placed on creativeness in my child's education is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

50.) Causing the kindergarten teacher to take it as a personal insult that she was not adequately handling art education herself is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

51.) Letting the kindergarten teacher and school principal know that art education is needed is

Good _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Bad
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
52.) Letting the kindergarten teacher and school principal know that parents think art education is needed is

Good ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Bad
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

53.) Causing the kindergarten teacher and school principal to do their best to include such a program is

Good ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Bad
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

54.) Are there other outcomes you would associate with sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten?

55.) Most people who are important to me think I should send a letter to the kindergarten teacher and school principal pleading for the inclusion of art education, in the event that the art teacher is assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

How likely or unlikely are the following groups or individuals to voice their opinions about your sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and school principal, in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten?
56.) Kindergarten parents

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

57.) Kindergarten teachers

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

58.) Parents

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

59.) The school board

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

60.) Generally speaking, I want to do what other kindergarten parents think I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

61.) Generally speaking, I want to do what kindergarten teachers think I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

62.) Generally speaking, I want to do what parents think I should do.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
63.) Generally speaking, I want to do what the school board thinks I should do.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

64.) Are there other specific groups or individuals who would voice their opinions about your sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten?
April 16, 1985

Dear Kindergarten Teacher:

I am a doctoral student at Ohio State University. As part of my studies at this institution, I am obligated to complete a major research project. This research consists of offering a strategy for the art teacher to implement should the kindergarten art program be placed in jeopardy. In order to offer such a strategy, the teacher must have some idea of how parents feel about the status of kindergarten art education. It is my feeling that parents play a vital role in their child's public school education. Parents can serve as an important support group for the art teacher. This is why any opinions that parents may have concerning kindergarten art education is so vital.

Please understand that your school art program is not experiencing any difficulty at the present time. However, should any problems arise in the future with the art program, information and opinions expressed by parents can prove to be very beneficial in solving the problem. Again, I emphasize that your school art program is not presently experiencing any difficulty. Your school was chosen for this study because it was more convenient for me to distribute questionnaires concerning the status of kindergarten art education.

In order for my research to be successful, I need your cooperation. You will be receiving two different sets of questionnaires. The first set accompanies this letter. These questionnaires are to be given to each child in your kindergarten class. All envelopes containing questionnaires are numbered in the bottom right corner. It is very
Important that upon the distribution of these, you provide each child with the envelope possessing the correct number. The process is very simple.

1.) Check your class roster.
2.) The number that corresponds to each child's name on your list will be that child's number for this research project. For example, if Mary Baker is number three on the list, then that will be her number.
3.) When you distribute the questionnaires, you should give the child the envelope with the correct number. For example, if Mary Baker is number three on your class roster, then you will give her the envelope with number three written on it.
4.) If you have both morning and afternoon sessions, the envelopes will specify each. For example, if Mary Baker is in your morning session, you will give her the envelope that reads 3-Morning. Be careful not to give her 3-Afternoon, as this error will invalidate the entire study.
5.) If you have children who have entered your class in the middle of the school year and have listed their name at the end of the class roster instead of in their alphabetical place, that is alright. Just give them a number that follows the last person on your list.
6.) If you have a child who has left your class and who will not be returning for the rest of the year, it is important that you fill that empty space with another child's name. For example, if Mary Baker who was number three on your list leaves for the school year, then you must place the listed person after her in that third position and those names that follow should move back one number as well.

Upon receiving the questionnaires, children are to take them home for their parents to complete. They are to be returned the following day, but we will extend this if necessary. Please put these returned questionnaires in the package provided. They will then be collected by Mr. Brewer or another representative. Children that were absent on the day that the questionnaires were distributed should be given one on their first day back to school.
A second questionnaire will be distributed in the next several weeks. You will be receiving this set in the near future. This will be the last questionnaire to be distributed. The procedure will be the same.

It is my intention to make this process as easy as possible for you. Once being an elementary teacher myself, I know how hectic those school days can be. I trust that you will follow the directions that I have provided for you. It is very important that they be followed. As a token of appreciation for your efforts, I am providing you with a small gift. I thank you in advance for your cooperation in this matter.

Most Sincerely Yours,

Kathy Danko-McGhee
Ph.D. Candidate
Ohio State University
Dear Parent:

We wrote to you a week ago concerning the action you might take should the kindergarten art program experience any future difficulties. We apologize for the unusual length of the questionnaire we sent you. However, it is an essential tool in our overall effort to understand how parents might behave in a situation where the kindergarten art program is threatened.

Again, we think that your insight regarding this matter would be most valuable. Please share that insight with us by completing the enclosed questionnaire at your earliest possible convenience. The questionnaire is much shorter this time and will only take fifteen minutes to complete.

Upon answering the questionnaire, please make sure that all questions are completed so that the results will truly represent the thinking of parents at your school. Please give your honest, candid opinion of each question asked. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. When you have completed the questions, would you please enclose them in the envelope provided and return it via your child to the classroom teacher within the next three days.

As a token of thanks for your anticipated cooperation, a packet of coffee is enclosed with the questionnaire. Enjoy a cup while you take the time to answer the questions.

Sincerely Yours,

Kathy Danko-McGhee
Ohio State University
The statements in this questionnaire are belief statements regarding kindergarten art education advocacy. Kindergarten art education refers to the making, history and criticism of visual arts (painting, drawing, sculpture, etc.) in the school setting. Advocacy refers to using persuasive methods to change the attitudes of decision makers in the school system. In the questionnaire you are about to fill out, we ask questions which make use of rating scales with six places. For each scale you are to mark an X in the place that best describes your opinion. For example, if you think it is quite likely that art education builds creativity, your response should be made in the following manner:

Art education builds creativity.

**Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ ** Unlikely
  extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

1.) In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, how likely are you to petition the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and send the petition to the school board?

**Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ ** Unlikely
  extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

2.) My petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board in the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education is:
3.) In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, how likely are you to provide research material in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, P.T.O. and school principals.

Likely ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

4.) My providing research material in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, P.T.O. and the school principal in the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education is:

Good ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Bad
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

Rewarding ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Punishing
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

Unpleasant ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Pleasant
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
APPENDIX F

MODIFIED VERSION OF FORM B OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE WITH THE COVER LETTER

Dear Parent:

We wrote to you a week ago concerning the action you might take should the kindergarten art program experience any future difficulties. We apologize for the unusual length of the questionnaire we sent you. However, it is an essential tool in our overall effort to understand how parents might behave in a situation where the kindergarten art program is threatened.

Again, we think that your insight regarding this matter would be most valuable. Please share that insight with us by completing the enclosed questionnaire at your earliest possible convenience. The questionnaire is much shorter this time and will only take fifteen minutes to complete.

Upon answering the questionnaire, please make sure that all questions are completed so that the results will truly represent the thinking of parents at your school. Please give your honest, candid opinion of each question asked. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. When you have completed the questions, would you please enclose them in the envelope provided and return it via your child to the classroom teacher within the next three days.

As a token of thanks for your anticipated cooperation, a packet of coffee is enclosed with the questionnaire. Enjoy a cup while you take the time to answer the questions.

Sincerely Yours,

Kathy Banko-McCree
Ohio State University
The statements in this questionnaire are belief statements regarding kindergarten art education advocacy. Kindergarten art education refers to the making, history and criticism of visual arts (painting, drawing, sculpture, etc.) in the school setting. Advocacy refers to using persuasive methods to change the attitudes of decision makers. In the questionnaire you are about to fill out, we ask questions which make use of rating scales with six places; for each scale, you are to mark an X in the place that best describes your opinion. For example, if you think it is quite likely that art education builds creativity, your response should be made in the following manner:

Art education builds creativity

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

1.) In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, how likely are you to send a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
2.) My sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten is:

Good ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Bad

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

Rewarding ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Punishing

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

Unpleasant ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Pleasant

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

3.) In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, how likely are you to send a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?

Likely ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unlikely

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

4.) My sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education in the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten is:

Good ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Bad

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

Rewarding ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Punishing

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

Unpleasant ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Pleasant

extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
APPENDIX G
VALUE SURVEY

INSTRUCTIONS
On the next page are 18 values listed in alphabetical order. Your task is to arrange them in order of their importance to you, as guiding principles in your life. Each value is printed on a gummed label which can be easily peeled off and pasted in the boxes on the left hand side of the page.

Study the list carefully and pick out the one value which is the most important to you. Peel it off and paste it in Box 1 on the left. Then pick out the value which is second most important for you. Peel it off and paste it in Box 2. Then do the same for each of the remaining values. The value which is least important goes in Box 18.

Work slowly and think carefully. If you change your mind, feel free to change your answers. The labels peel off easily and can be moved from place to place. The end result should truly show how you really feel.
1. A Comfortable Life
2. An Exciting Life
3. A Sense of Accomplishment
4. A World at Peace
5. A World of Beauty
6. Equality
7. Family Security
8. Freedom
9. Health
10. Inner Harmony
11. Mature Love
12. National Security
13. Pleasure
14. Salvation
15. Self Respect
16. Social Recognition
17. True Friendship
18. Wisdom
1. Ambitious
2. Broadminded
3. Capable
4. Clean
5. Courageous
6. Forgiving
7. Helpful
8. Honest
9. Imaginative
10. Independent
11. Intellectual
12. Logical
13. Loving
14. Loyal
15. Obedient
16. Polite
17. Responsible
18. Self Controlled
Dear Parent:

The maintenance of a balanced kindergarten curriculum is a difficult task. Quite often, educators are forced to select those subjects which should be given priority status, while others are moved to the periphery of the curriculum. It is important for parents to voice their concerns about the status of subjects taught within the school curriculum, as we all want our children to have the best education possible. It takes the cooperation of parents and the school staff to insure that this is possible.

While all subjects are important in providing your child a well rounded education, we are interested in your feelings toward the status of art education in the kindergarten curriculum. Please understand that our interest in art does not mean that we consider it to be more important or less important than other subjects. We are merely interested in your opinion of its status in the kindergarten curriculum. Such information will assist us in providing the best education possible for your child.

You are one of a small number of parents who are being asked to give their opinion on this matter. Questions are attached to this letter. In order that the results will truly represent the thinking of parents at Mellon Elementary School, it is important that each question be completed and returned. Please give your honest, candid opinion of each question asked. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. When you have completed the questions, would you please enclose them in the envelope provided and return it via your child to the classroom teacher no later than tomorrow.

Sincerely Yours,

[Signature]
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Please answer the following question by checking the box.

Suppose a situation arises in your kindergarten child's school which necessitates a plea from the teacher. He or she asks for help in promoting the kindergarten art program. Would you help?

Yes____ No____

Briefly describe the situation that would have to exist in order for you to serve as an advocate* for the kindergarten art program**. Use one or two sentences.

*Advocate - An advocate is one who pleads in favor of a cause. When one becomes an advocate, he or she uses persuasive methods in order to change the attitudes of decision makers. Specific persuasive methods that can be used are: writing letters stating how you feel about an issue; phoning a decision maker in order to express your feelings on an issue; conversing with principals, supervisors, and other decision makers about your concern.

**Art Program - That part of the school curriculum that exposes your child to: 1.) the making of art works with various materials and processes, such as tempera painting, making clay objects, and weaving with natural fibers; 2.) an appreciation of his or her environment as well as art objects in relation to the culture.
APPENDIX I

PRE-TEST QUESTIONNAIRE AND COVER LETTER: STEP TWO

Dear Parent:

The maintenance of a balanced kindergarten curriculum is a difficult task. Quite often, educators are forced to select those subjects which should be given priority status, while others are moved to the periphery of the curriculum. It is important for parents to voice their concerns about the status of subjects taught within the school curriculum, as we all want our children to have the best education possible. It takes the cooperation of parents and the school staff to insure that this is possible.

While all subjects are important in providing your child a well rounded education, we are interested in your feelings toward the status of art education in the kindergarten curriculum. Please understand that our interest in art does not mean that we consider it to be more important or less important than other subjects. We are merely interested in your opinion of its status in the kindergarten curriculum. Such information will assist us in providing the best education possible for your child.

You are one of a small number of parents who are being asked to give their opinion on this matter. Questions are attached to this letter. In order that the results will truly represent the thinking of parents at Mellon Elementary School, it is important that each question be completed and returned. Please give your honest, candid opinion of each question asked. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. When you have completed the questions, would you please enclose them in the envelope provided and return it via your child to the classroom teacher no later than tomorrow.

Sincerely Yours,

Kathy Danko-McGhee
Ohio State University
In the questionnaire you are about to fill out, we ask questions which make use of rating scales with six places; for each rating scale, you are to mark an X in the place that best describes your opinion. For example, if you think it is quite likely that art education builds creativity, your response should be made in the following manner:

Art education builds creativity

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:

Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

The following statements concern your opinion about advocating art education. We would like to know which of the following situations would cause you to serve as an advocate* for art education** in the kindergarten.

I intend to advocate art education when,

1.) Art education is threatened to be dropped from the kindergarten curriculum:

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:

Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

2.) The art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten:

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____:

Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
3.) The kindergarten class would need certain supplies for an art project:

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

4.) The kindergarten art program was very weak and needed extra help:

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

5.) The teacher was not interested in developing the children’s creativity:

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

6.) The teacher felt it was worthwhile:

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

7.) The art program could be incorporated into other subjects without taking away from the essential skills being taught:

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

8.) The art program is denied inclusion into the kindergarten curriculum by the board of education:

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
9.) There is a cut in the budget which causes the lack of funds for kindergarten art education:

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____
Unlikely extremely quite slightly fairly likely unlikely

10.) There is a change in the curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education:

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____
Unlikely extremely quite slightly fairly likely unlikely

11.) The existing kindergarten art program consists of activities such as coloring in coloring books, cutting out shapes that are pre-drawn by the teacher, and producing art works that all look the same:

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____
Unlikely extremely quite slightly fairly likely unlikely

12.) There is too much teacher influence on child creativity.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____
Unlikely extremely quite slightly fairly likely unlikely

*Advocate - An advocate is one who pleads in favor of a cause. When one becomes an advocate, he or she uses persuasive methods in order to change the attitudes of decision makers. Specific persuasive methods that can be used are: writing letters stating how you feel about an issue; phoning a decision maker in order to express your feelings on an issue; conversing with principals, supervisors, and other decision makers about your concern.

**Art Program - That part of the school curriculum that exposes your child to: 1.) the making of art works with various materials and processes, such as tempera painting, making clay objects, and weaving with natural fibers; 2.) an appreciation of his or her environment as well as art objects in relation to the culture.
APPENDIX J

MATRICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>Question Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6</th>
<th>Question 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>Question Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 10</th>
<th>Question 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>Question Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 11</td>
<td>Question 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> 8 5</td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> 3 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> 1 3</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> 0 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> 9 2</td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> 9 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> 4 2</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> 4 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 5</th>
<th>Question 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> 7 4</td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> 9 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> 4 2</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> 3 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7</th>
<th>Question 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong> 7 4</td>
<td><strong>Y</strong> 8 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong> 4 2</td>
<td><strong>N</strong> 3 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>Question 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y  N</td>
<td>Y  N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 3</td>
<td>10 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y  N</td>
<td>Y  N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 1 3</td>
<td>3 1 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 10</th>
<th>Question 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y  N</td>
<td>Y  N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 4</td>
<td>7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y  N</td>
<td>Y  N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 2 2</td>
<td>3 2 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 12</th>
<th>Question 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y  N</td>
<td>Y  N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 10</td>
<td>10 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y  N</td>
<td>Y  N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 0 4</td>
<td>4 1 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6</th>
<th>Question 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y  N</td>
<td>Y  N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 3</td>
<td>10 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y  N</td>
<td>Y  N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2</td>
<td>4 1 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Y</th>
<th>Question Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 1 3</td>
<td>3 1 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Y</th>
<th>Question Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 2 2</td>
<td>3 2 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Y</th>
<th>Question Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 0 4</td>
<td>4 1 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Y</th>
<th>Question Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 2 2</td>
<td>4 1 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td>Question 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 1</td>
<td>9 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 12</th>
<th>Question 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 9</td>
<td>9 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 5</td>
<td>2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 8</th>
<th>Question 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 4</td>
<td>9 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 3 2</td>
<td>6 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 10</th>
<th>Question 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 3</td>
<td>7 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 2 3</td>
<td>6 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 11</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 12</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 12</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 12</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Y-yes; N-no
Dear Parent:

The maintenance of a balanced kindergarten curriculum is a difficult task. Quite often, educators are forced to select those subjects which should be given priority status, while others are moved to the periphery of the curriculum. It is important for parents to voice their concerns about the status of subjects taught within the school curriculum, as we all want our children to have the best education possible. It takes the cooperation of parents and the school staff to insure that this is possible.

While all subjects are important in providing your child a well-rounded education, we are interested in your feelings toward the status of art education in the kindergarten curriculum. Please understand that our interest in art does not mean that we consider it to be more important or less important than other subjects. We are merely interested in your opinion of its status in the kindergarten curriculum. Such information will assist us in providing the best education possible for your child.

You are one of a small number of parents who are being asked to give their opinion on this matter. Questions are attached to this letter. In order that the results will truly represent the thinking of parents at Mellon Elementary School, it is important that each question be completed and returned. Please give your honest, candid opinion of each question asked. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. When you have completed the questions, would you please enclose them in the envelope provided and return it via your child to the classroom teacher no later than tomorrow.

Sincerely Yours,

Kathy Danko-McGhee
Ohio State University
For each situation listed below, please list specific advocacy* activities that you would perform if such a situation would arise in your school. List as many as you wish.

Note: The art program at Mellon Elementary School is not in any danger of being excluded from the kindergarten curriculum. The situations listed below are only hypothetical.

1.) In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, I would serve as an advocate by performing the following specific activities.

2.) In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, I would serve as an advocate by performing the following specific activities.

*Advocate - An advocate is one who pleads in favor of a cause. When one becomes an advocate, he or she uses persuasive methods in order to change the attitudes of decision makers.
APPENDIX L

PRE-TEST QUESTIONNAIRE AND SAMPLE LETTER: STEP FOUR

Dear Parent:

I am a doctoral student at Ohio State University. As part of my studies at this institution, I am obligated to complete a major research project. This research consists of offering a strategy for the art teacher to implement should the kindergarten art program be placed in jeopardy. In order to offer such a strategy, the teacher must have some idea of how parents feel about the status of kindergarten art education. It is my feeling that parents play a vital role in their child's public school education. Parents can serve as an important support group for the art teacher. This is why any opinions that you may have concerning kindergarten art education is so vital.

Please understand that the Mellon Elementary School art program is not experiencing any difficulty at the present time. However, should any problems arise in the future with the art program, information and opinions expressed by you could prove to be very beneficial in solving the problem. Your particular school was chosen because it was more convenient for me to distribute questionnaires concerning the status of kindergarten art education. A questionnaire is attached to this letter. It concerns specific actions that you might take should the kindergarten art program experience any future difficulties. In order that the results will truly represent the thinking of parents at Mellon Elementary School, it is important that each question be completed and returned. Please give your honest, candid opinion of each question asked. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. When you have completed the questionnaire, would you please enclose it in the envelope provided and return it via your child to the classroom teacher no later than tomorrow.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
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In the questionnaire you are about to fill out, we ask questions which make use of rating scales with six places; for each rating scale, you are to mark an X in the place that best describes your opinion. For example, if you think it is quite likely that art education builds creativity, your response should be made in the following manner:

Art education builds creativity

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

The following statements concern your opinion about advocating kindergarten art education.* We would like to know what specific advocacy action you would take in two different situations. It is important that you understand that the situations listed are only hypothetical. The art program at Mellon Elementary School is not in any danger of being excluded from the kindergarten curriculum.

In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, I would serve as an advocate** by:

1.) Calling the school board members and persuading them to change the policy concerning kindergarten art education.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

2.) Sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____ Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
3. Sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education:

Likely  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____Unlikely  
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

4. Allowing my children to become their own advocates for kindergarten art education.

Likely  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____Unlikely  
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

5. Asking that lesson plans prepared by the art teacher be available for the kindergarten teacher to use.

Likely  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____Unlikely  
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

6. Talking with school supervisors about their actions concerning kindergarten art education.

Likely  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____Unlikely  
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

7. Coming to school to assist the kindergarten teacher with art activities during the holidays.

Likely  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____:  _____Unlikely  
   extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

**************************************************************************************************************
In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to
push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, I would
serve as an advocate by:

8.) Writing a letter to the school board concerning the matter.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

9.) Petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education
and sending the petition to the school board.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

10.) Getting an independent teacher for kindergarten art and having
parents share the expense of a salary for this person.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

11.) Providing research material in support of kindergarten art
education to school board members, the superintendent, PTO and
school principals.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

12.) Contacting elementary school supervisors in art at local colleges
to give school supervisors their opinions concerning kindergarten
art education.

Likely ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______Unlikely
extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely
13.) Talking with the kindergarten teacher about the use of art activities in teaching the academic subjects such as drawing pictures to illustrate a story read by the class.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

14.) Organizing parents to demonstrate.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

15.) Talking to other parents about the importance of art activities especially to improve coordination and fine motor skills.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

16.) Coming to the school to hear reasons why the school was dropping art education in the kindergarten.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

17.) Speaking to school board members about the matter.

Likely _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unlikely extremely quite slightly slightly quite extremely

*Art Education - That part of the school curriculum that exposes your child to: (1) the making of art works with various materials and processes such as tempera painting, making clay objects, and weaving with natural fibers; (2) an appreciation of his or her environment as well as art objects in relation to the culture.

**Advocate - An advocate is one who pleads in favor of a cause. When one becomes an advocate, he or she uses persuasive methods in order to change the attitudes of decision makers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Question 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 4</th>
<th>Question 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6</th>
<th>Question 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
<td><strong>Y</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7</th>
<th>Question 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Y</th>
<th>Question Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6</th>
<th>Question 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Y</th>
<th>Question Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 6</th>
<th>Question 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Y</th>
<th>Question Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 7</th>
<th>Question 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Y</th>
<th>Question Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__</td>
<td>__</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td>Question 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y Y N N</td>
<td>Y Y N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 10</td>
<td>7 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Y</th>
<th>Question Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 10</td>
<td>8 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N N</td>
<td>N N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 12</th>
<th>Question 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y Y N N</td>
<td>Y Y N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 8</td>
<td>10 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Y</th>
<th>Question Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 10</td>
<td>8 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N N</td>
<td>N N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 15</th>
<th>Question 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y Y N N</td>
<td>Y Y N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 2</td>
<td>13 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Y</th>
<th>Question Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 7 3</td>
<td>8 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N N</td>
<td>N N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 17</th>
<th>Question 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y Y N N</td>
<td>Y Y N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 4</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Y</th>
<th>Question Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 9</td>
<td>9 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N N</td>
<td>N N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 11</td>
<td>Question 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4</td>
<td>3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>Question Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 3 13</td>
<td>9 2 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 13</th>
<th>Question 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 2</td>
<td>3 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>Question Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 6 10</td>
<td>9 1 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 15</th>
<th>Question 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 1</td>
<td>8 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>Question Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 8 8</td>
<td>9 13 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 17</th>
<th>Question 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y N</td>
<td>Y N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 3</td>
<td>3 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>Question Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 6 10</td>
<td>10 4 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 17</td>
<td>Question 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y   N</td>
<td>Y   N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4   1</td>
<td>3   9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>Question Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12  7  12</td>
<td>13  0  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 15</th>
<th>Question 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y   N</td>
<td>Y   N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9   3</td>
<td>11  1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>Question Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13  6  6</td>
<td>13  10  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 17</th>
<th>Question 15</th>
<th>Question 16</th>
<th>Question 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y   N</td>
<td>Y   N</td>
<td>Y   N</td>
<td>Y   N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7   5</td>
<td>4   1</td>
<td>3   1</td>
<td>1   3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>Question Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13  4  8</td>
<td>14  11  9</td>
<td>14  18  2</td>
<td>14  10  10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 16</td>
<td>Question 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td>Question Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Y-yes
N-no
Dear Parent:

I am a doctoral student at Ohio State University. As part of my studies at this institution, I am obligated to complete a major research project. This research consists of offering a strategy for the art teacher to implement should the kindergarten art program be placed in jeopardy. In order to offer such a strategy, the teacher must have some idea of how parents feel about the status of kindergarten art education. It is my feeling that parents play a vital role in their child's public school education. Parents can serve as an important support group for the art teacher. This is why any opinions that you may have concerning kindergarten art education is so vital.

Please understand that the Mellon Elementary School art program is not experiencing any difficulty at the present time. However, should any problems arise in the future with the art program, information and opinions expressed by you could prove to be very beneficial in solving the problem. Your particular school was chosen because it was more convenient for me to distribute questionnaires concerning the status of kindergarten art education. A questionnaire is attached to this letter. It concerns specific actions that you might take should the kindergarten art program experience any future difficulties. In order that the results will truly represent the thinking of parents at Mellon Elementary School, it is important that each question be completed and returned. Please give your honest, candid opinion of each question asked. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. When you have completed the questionnaire, would you please enclose it in the envelope provided and return it via your child to the classroom teacher no later than tomorrow.

Sincerely,

Kathy Banko-McGhee
For each situation listed below, please list the potential advantages and disadvantages of performing the specified advocacy activity. You may list as many as you wish.

In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten, what do you see as the:

1.) ...advantages of your sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?

2.) ...advantages of your sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?

3.) ...disadvantages of your sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?

4.) ...disadvantages of your sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?

5.) Is there anything else you associate with your sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?
6.) Is there anything else you associate with your sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and the school principal pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?

For each situation listed below, please list persons or groups of persons that come to mind if you would perform the specified advocacy activity.

In the event that the art teacher is only assigned to teach grades one through six, excluding the kindergarten:

7.) Are there any groups or people who would approve of your sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?

8.) Are there any groups or people who would approve of your sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and school principal pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?

9.) Are there any groups of people who would disapprove of your writing a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?
10.) Are there any groups or people who would disapprove of your writing a letter to the kindergarten teacher and school principal pleading for the inclusion of kindergarten art education?

11.) Are there any other groups or persons who come to mind when you think about sending a letter to the school board pleading for the inclusion of art education?

12.) Are there any other groups or persons who come to mind when you think about sending a letter to the kindergarten teacher and school principal pleading for the inclusion of art education?
Dear Parent:

I am a doctoral student at Ohio State University. As part of my studies at this institution, I am obligated to complete a major research project. This research consists of offering a strategy for the art teacher to implement should the kindergarten art program be placed in jeopardy. In order to offer such a strategy, the teacher must have some idea of how parents feel about the status of kindergarten art education. It is my feeling that parents play a vital role in their child's public school education. Parents can serve as an important support group for the art teacher. This is why any opinions that you may have concerning kindergarten art education is so vital.

Please understand that the Mellon Elementary School art program is not experiencing any difficulty at the present time. However, should any problems arise in the future with the art program, information and opinions expressed by you could prove to be very beneficial in solving the problem. Your particular school was chosen because it was more convenient for me to distribute questionnaires concerning the status of kindergarten art education. A questionnaire is attached to this letter. It concerns specific actions that you might take should the kindergarten art program experience any future difficulties. In order that the results will truly represent the thinking of parents at Mellon Elementary School, it is important that each question be completed and returned. Please give your honest, candid opinion of each question asked. You may be assured of complete confidentiality. When you have completed the questionnaire, would you please enclose it in the envelope provided and return it via your child to the classroom teacher no later than tomorrow.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
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For each situation listed below, please list the potential advantages and disadvantages of performing the specified advocacy activity. You may list as many as you wish.

In the event that there is a change in the kindergarten curriculum to push for the academic subjects with the lack of art education, what do you see as the:

1.) ... advantages of your petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board?

2.) ... advantages of your providing research material in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, PTO, and school principals?

3.) ... disadvantages of your petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board?

4.) ... disadvantages of your providing research material in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, PTO, and school principal?
5.) Is there anything else you associate with your petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board?

6.) Is there anything else you associate with your providing research material in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, PTO, and school principal?

For each situation listed below, please list persons or groups of persons that come to mind if you would perform the specified advocacy activity.

7.) Are there any groups or persons who would approve of your petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board?

8.) Are there any groups or persons who would approve of your providing research material in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, PTO, and school principals?

9.) Are there any groups or persons who would disapprove of your petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board?
10.) Are there any groups who would disapprove of your providing research materials in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendents, PTO, and school principals?

11.) Are there any other groups or persons who come to mind when you think about petitioning the neighborhood to support kindergarten art education and sending the petition to the school board?

12.) Are there any other groups or persons who come to mind when you think about providing research material in support of kindergarten art education to school board members, the superintendent, PTO, and school principals?
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