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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the attitudes of a sample of New Jersey public school Superintendents toward visual arts education and which variables, if any, most affected the participants' attitudes toward visual arts education. The methodology employed a non-experimental, survey approach. Guided by this thesis the researcher utilized a deductive approach toward analyzing the data. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze demographic and key study variables, accompanied by Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficients and multiple regression statistical analyses to answer the major research question and 6 subsidiary questions. The design of this cross-sectional study utilized nomothetic, quantitative, survey research. Data were collected using the Stuckhardt Art Attitude Scale (SAAS) a Likert-type questionnaire consisting of 30 discriminating items, along with a Personal History Statement. The Personal History Statement solicited information on age, gender, ethnicity, total school budget, visual art budget allocation, college major and years (K – 12) of formal visual art training. The data were analyzed using SPSS software to determine the relationships, if any, between the visual art attitudes of the sample, their background experiences in visual art, and other selected variables and the funds allocated for the visual art budget. The researcher was also interested in what selected variables, if any, may exert an influence on the Superintendent toward support or lack of support of the visual art program within their school district.
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Chapter I
INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Eisner (1985) stated the following:

For children and adolescents, schooling defines a major portion of their lives. Compelled by law to devote 40 or more weeks per year to school, children have available to them a culture of opportunities – or opportunities foregone. It is we, the adults, who created the policies that define the educational environment in which so much of their time is spent, who influence the kinds of minds children and adolescents will have an opportunity to develop. It is the curriculum of the school and the quality and amount of time devoted to its various parts that define the opportunities students will have to become “literate” in various fields that animate and give substance to our culture. (p.65)

When taught well the arts provide students with authentic learning experiences that engage their minds, hearts, and bodies. The learning is real and meaningful (Fiske, 1999). Art experiences require students to utilize their intellect to solve artistic problems, while simultaneously applying skills necessary to complete the artistic process, and thereby produce a finished product. Additionally, engagement in the reflective process of art criticism, the inquiry process of aesthetics, and art history help sharpen critical judgments, and provide a rich context for understanding the world.
A recent study by Catterall (2002) demonstrated that an arts-rich environment is associated with a host of positive educational measures. Students who are involved in the arts in middle and high school in the United States perform better than those who are not enrolled in an arts program on a variety of academic measures despite socioeconomic status.

According to a 1997 study of high school transcripts (HSTS) conducted by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) over half (52.7%) of the high school graduates in the United States earned credit in visual arts courses. The NCES researchers collected data from 24,218 transcripts of students who graduated in 1998 from a sample of 264 schools. The study provides information regarding current course offerings in visual arts and course-taking patterns in the nation’s secondary schools. Similar studies were conducted in 1982, 1987, 1999 and 1994. By SUBJECT: The percentage of high school graduates earning ‘any arts’ (music, dance, drama) credits increased from 55% in 1982 to 69% in 1998. By REGION: The percentage of high school students earning visual arts credits in the Northeast was 57% in 1998. By GENDER: The percentage of female graduates earning visual arts credits increased from 44% in 1982 to 52% in 1998. By SCHOOL TYPE: The percentage of public school graduates earning visual arts credits increased from 43% in 1982 to 51% in 1998. The percentage of non-public school graduates earning visual arts credits increased from 50% in 1982 to 61% in 1998. By COMMUNITY TYPE: The percentage of suburban school graduates earning visual arts credits was 56% in 1998. By RACE/ETHNICITY: The percentage of White school graduates earning visual arts credits was 51% in 1998. The percentage of Black school graduates earning visual arts credits was 46% in 1998. The percentage of Hispanic school graduates earning visual arts credits was 63% in 1998. The percentage of Asian/Pacific

Art education in America has been responsible for training artisans and draftsmen for business and industry, producing moral citizenry, and promoting creativity and self-expression. After the History of Art Education conference at the Pennsylvania State University Kern (1980) examined the purposes of art education in the United States between 1870 and 1980. He reviewed documents provided by 50 state education agencies that included courses of study, teacher certification requirements, and curriculum content. His research shed light on some of the changes in thought, and subsequent delivery of art programs over a 110 year time in our country.

Thirty years after the Boston schools had introduced vocal music to the curriculum, Horace Mann proposed that the subject of drawing be taught in the public schools, and to adults residing in towns with populations over 10,000. In 1870, drawing was mandated by law in the state of Massachusetts. This decision was the beginning of art education in the nation’s schools. Teaching art in the public schools was driven by economic competition and a perceived need to increase our exports by improving, not the manufacture, but the design of American products. This competition was viewed as the determining factor that drawing be taught in some schools. Charles Callahan Perkins was well acquainted with the European system of industrial art education. He recommended Walter Smith as the Director of Drawing for the Boston Public Schools in 1871. During Smith’s tenure, the political climate became charged with a debate as to whether the schools should educate individuals for social mobility, or equip them merely to meet the needs within their present
social class (Efland, 1985). The Panic of 1873 raised concerns about the costs of education, and initiated a wave of criticism across the country. Boston’s public schools were scrutinized for excessive spending, rigid bureaucracies, and for not producing quality graduates. Ultimately, in 1881, amidst this controversy, the Boston Public Schools dismissed Walter Smith, and his six assistants. According to Efland (1985) the industrial drawing movement, inspired by Perkins, Philbrick, and Smith became a casualty in the larger social drama that brought middle-class values into dominance in American education.

In 1900, the state of Vermont established weekly, 45 minute, time frames for instruction in drawing at the primary and grammar school levels. This 45 minute time frame remains a popular current practice in many schools today. Vermont public school documents indicated that “...rightly carried out drawing is a valuable moral training. The habit of earnestly trying to do a thing well means the development of character and talent” (Kern, 1985, p.41). The art education philosophies in schools in Vermont and Colorado echoed each other regarding the subject of drawing enabling higher goals. These state decisions/philosophies initiated the claim that through art, other educational aims could be achieved such as democratic behavior, creativity, social adjustment, emotional growth, and skills in reading and math.

During the 1900s the combination of art with other subjects spread to states such as Ohio and Oregon. Washington art educators promoted the method of teaching drawing through example, and in Utah, “the primary aim of the teaching of art was not to make pictures, but rather to develop the boy or girl” (Kern, 1985, p. 42).

In 1915, decision makers in Idaho introduced the term “art education” into curriculum documents which promoted three aims:
1. To discover, understand, and enjoy the beauty about us, whether found in
nature, in things constructed by man, or in the character of people.

2. To be able to express ourselves through the use of the principles of beauty in the
solution of school, home and social problems.

3. To discover and develop exceptional talent, so that gifted students may develop
their best potential. (Kern, 1985, p.43)

In Idaho, art education was taught via the *project method*, with each project focused
upon a specific problem. Drawing continued to be taught throughout the southern states,
while the teaching of art was fostered in the northern and western states during the 1920s
(Kern, 1985, p. 43). Utilitarian techniques, art appreciation, and the development of self-
expression continued to be emphasized throughout the 1920s. Significant to the research of
the time was the notion that the teaching of art did not require the skills of a trained art
teacher. Additionally, during these years themes aimed at character development were
recommended, and art images that exemplified each theme were selected for study. By
1929 the concept of creativity, still predominant in today's schools, made its way into the
public school art programs of Wisconsin and Pennsylvania.

During the 1930s, and throughout the 1940s, creative expression became a
dominant art education theme subjugating drawing, art appreciation, art history, art
criticism, and picture study to the back seat. Art education fostered experiences that
engaged students with art materials for creative and expressive purposes.

During the 1940s art for relaxation, enjoyment and therapy was promoted, while
some state leaders advocated for the combination of art with other subjects. Eventually, art
was integrated with other subjects, and endorsed because of the perceived contribution it
made to the development of the whole child; and specifically the intellectual, physiological,
social, emotional, moral, ethical, and spiritual arenas of democratic society (Kern, 1985, p.47).

By the 1950s drawing was noticeably absent from the school curriculum in favor of a focus on the creative development of children. Lowenfeld’s (1975) theories of creative, mental, and social growth of the child through art education were widely accepted during this time. Art was seen as providing an avenue for growth in ways that other subject matter areas could not. Classroom teachers were considered to have sufficient training to teach art since the experience emphasized guiding students in the exploration of materials, specifically at the elementary level. This method of instruction continues to be a favored method for teaching art even in 2004. During this time, art history, and art appreciation emerged as components of the secondary level curriculum.

Creativity, visual perception, art history, and art criticism emerged as dominant themes in art education during the 1960s, and continued throughout the 1970s. In the late 1970s, federal funds, administered through the Alliance for Arts Education, helped establish arts programs that embraced music, dance, literature, theatre, and the visual arts. These types of arts programs emphasized performing and producing art works (Kern, 1980, p. 49).

In 1981 the J. Paul Getty Trust initiated a series of surveys of art education in the United States. The Trust’s initial research found that very few school districts considered art as an academic subject like mathematics, language, and science. Art was not seen as vital to a child’s education, and it was a commonly held belief that individuals required little or no formal education to experience, comprehend, or create art (Rand Corporation, 1985). A result of the surveys was the formation of the Getty Center for Education in the Arts in 1982, and in 1985 the report, Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America’s
The authors of *Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools* identified three critical factors necessary to effecting change in art education in our nation's schools; specifically a change in perspective regarding the value of art education in our schools, advocacy and financial support from school administrators, teachers, and community, and academic rigor similar to that found in other subjects (Rand Corporation, 1985, p.6). The research supported that even schools concerned with teaching art tended to emphasize art-making activities to the exclusion of critical, and art historical study (Rand Corporation, 1985, p.3). The authors of *Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America’s Schools* concluded that art education programs would continue to be viewed as frills unless: (a) Those who help shape the school’s curricula believe that art education makes unique and vital contributions to a child’s development, (b) The content of art programs is expanded to include art history, art criticism, and aesthetics, along with art production (Rand Corporation, 1985, p.3).

**Problem Statement**

The current nationwide standards-based reform movement is a cause for concern among visual arts proponents. Standards-based reform movements are generally organized around four concepts: a) a framework describing what students should know and be able to do at specified grade levels and in specific subjects, b) curriculum containing agreed upon knowledge; c) assessments and evaluations that measure whether students have achieved the specified goals, and d) rewards and punishments directed at schools and systems that fail to meet the standards as measured by the tests (Meier, 2000).
*Toward Civilization* (NEA, 1988) documented a gap between commitment and resources for arts education, and the actual practice of arts education in classrooms. The report included the following research recommendations: (a) surveys and critical analyses of goals, purposes and curricular content of arts education, (b) analyses of arts education program requirements that include time, personnel, resource materials and organizational and administrative support systems, (c) historical inquiries, (d) studies of learner development, behavior, perception, attitude and knowledge, (e) studies of teaching methodologies, (f) studies of the effects of experimental and ongoing art education programs and, (h) an analysis of how research findings can affect study of the arts in the classroom.

Those of us in art education know the history of economic pressures upon schools and their eventual effects on art programs. Our current concern is that in order to finance the new testing regimen, states, districts, and schools may use arts education program funds as a fiscal source. This creates other burdens: the curtailment of arts programs altogether, or the forcing of art teachers to spend more time on fundraising instead of preparing instructional and curricular activities for students. It is difficult to understand how American students will learn art if visual arts programs are reduced or art teaching positions are eliminated (Hatfield, 2002).

General histories of education often omit references to the introduction of the arts in American schools. If the subject is mentioned it’s often seen as a special event, unrelated to the social climate of the time. “Yet the arts were neither introduced capriciously nor accidentally; they entered the schools because [influential and powerful individuals] saw
them as ways of furthering social, moral, or economic aims” (Efland, 1985, p.113).

Historically, since the arts have not been standardized by testing and are often considered a
frill subject to budget cuts, education decision maker’s favorable attitudes toward the arts
have been responsible for the introduction, maintenance, and expansion of art programs.

In this study, the researcher seeks to answer this question: Do the art attitudes,
background experiences in visual art, and other selected variables, of a sample of
Superintendents in the Public Schools of New Jersey have an influence on the financial
support of the visual art program within their school systems?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to use a Likert-type Scale of 30 statements related to
the visual arts, to determine the relationship, if any, between the attitudes, background
experiences in visual art, and other selected variables, of key persons, specifically
Superintendents, who make decisions about funding visual art education programs in the
New Jersey Public Schools. The methodology employed a non-experimental, survey
approach. The Stuckhardt (1976) Scale to Measure Attitudes Held Toward the Visual Arts
(SAAS) was used to gather data about attitudes held toward visual arts education,
accompanied by a Personal History Statement aimed at collecting demographic and
personal involvement in the visual arts. The researcher sought to explain what selected
variables, if any, may influence the Superintendent toward support or lack of support of the
visual art program within their district. In addition, the researcher obtained and analyzed
additional and bibliographical data to determine which, if any, selected factors most
affected the participants’ attitudes toward visual arts education. Two hundred fifty New
Jersey Superintendents were surveyed and asked to provide selected demographic and background information. Subjects were asked to respond to the extent to which they strongly agreed, agreed, and were uncertain, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with each question. The Personal History Statement solicited information on age, gender, ethnicity, total school budget, visual art budget allocation, college major and years of formal art training. The researcher was also interested in what selected variables, if any, may influence the Superintendent toward support or lack of support of the art program within their school district.

Results of this study will inform the profession by providing valuable information to assist those who develop educational arts programs, advocacy programs, develop policy, prepare future art education teachers, and conduct research on student learning.

Research Question

Do the art attitudes, background experiences in visual art, and other selected variables, of a sample of Superintendents in the Public Schools of New Jersey have an influence on the financial support of the visual art program within their school systems?

Secondary Questions

The researcher also answered the following six additional questions:

1. Superintendents have backgrounds that include the study of visual art?

2. Do Superintendents with visual arts training allocate more funding for visual art education than Superintendents with less or no formal visual art training?
3. What is the relationship between the art attitudes of Superintendents and their ethnicity and/or gender?

4. How does District Factor Grouping in New Jersey relate to the funding for visual art education?

5. How does the age of the Superintendent have an impact upon the funding for visual arts education?

6. How does ethnicity and/or gender of the Superintendent have an impact upon the funding for visual arts education?

Definition of Terms

*Aesthetic experience.* A person's reflection upon the experience of art, its impact, and meaning. Such judgments depend upon an understanding of art's meaning and value, the nature of the art objects, and the elements that make the art experience unique (Dobbs, 1992).

*Art.* Art is an expression of ideas and feelings in the form of an original product, for example, a painting, sculpture or collage, etc (NCES, 1997).

*Art attitude.* A learned and relatively enduring evaluative system of affective predispositions held toward art referents (Morris & Stuckhardt, 1977).

*Art criticism.* Art criticism encompasses spoken or written talk about art (Feldman, 1994).

*Art history.* Art history is the ability to understand, and appreciate the value of contributions of art in society, and culture, by exploring art in a variety of historical
contexts, and recognizing, and appreciating the singular qualities of style developed by individual artists and schools (Dobbs, 1992, p.2).

*Art production.* Art production refers to art works made by people, and intended to have expressive or aesthetic character. The creative production of new art works involves the active manipulation of selected materials using various techniques that elicit the desired visual effects (Dobbs, 1992, p.21).

*Attitude.* The sum total of a man’s (and woman’s) inclinations and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about a specified topic (Thurstone, 1928).

*Attitude object.* Entity that is evaluated; may be abstract, e.g. liberalism while others are concrete, e.g. painting, sculpture. (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).

*Construct validity.* Construct validity is the unifying framework for all evidence regarding validity. To show construct validity of intended score interpretations is to provide an evaluative of the evidence for them (Krathwohl, 1998)

*Critical thinking skills.* Critical thinking is the ability to measure and express a reasoned opinion on any matter especially involving a judgment of value, truth, beauty, or technique through analysis, evaluation, or appreciation of works of art or artistic performances.

*Discipline-based art education.* (DBAE) Discipline-based art education is a comprehensive approach to art education that incorporates the four disciplines of aesthetics or philosophy of art, art criticism, art history, and art production in the education process (Trust, 1985).

*Face validity.* The degree to which the empirical measure aligns with common agreements and individual mental images of a particular concept. Scale values of the
statements on a scale should not be affected by opinions of people who constructed it
(Thurstone, 1928, p.547).

*Opinion.* The verbal expression of an attitude (Thurstone, 1928, p. 531).

*Reliability.* The extent to which the scale/test instrument yields consistent results
over repeated observations and is free from random error (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993).

*Validity.* The extent to which an empirical measure adequately and consistently
reflects the real meaning of the concept under consideration is known as validity.

*Visual art.* An expression of ideas and feelings in the form of an original product,
for example, a drawing painting, sculpture or collage. In this study, visual art refers to the
two and three dimensional products that are the final expression of the individual’s ideas
and feelings. Visual are does not include the performing arts of dance, drama, and music.
(NCES, 1997).

**Delimitations and Limitations of the Study**

The literature in the field of art education has been limited to political, social, and
cultural phenomena that set the stage for decisions regarding visual arts instruction in
American public schools. This study attempts to fill in some of the gaps by gaining insight
into what factors may influence the Superintendent with regard to visual arts programs in
New Jersey Public Schools.

Delimitations of the study include a random sampling of New Jersey Public School
Superintendents, sample size, time frame of the study, and length of the study. The
assessment did not include the performing arts of dance, theater, music and/or crafts. The
study does not include all administrators in New Jersey public schools and did not attempt to evaluate the art training or background art experiences of Superintendents. The researcher did not attempt to predict the success of visual art programs based upon the budget allocated to the program.

Limitations of the study include that there is no guarantee that the attitude under measure will stand still long enough for a one time measure to be totally reliable. When studying attitudes researchers do so without universal agreement on their nature (Henson, Morris, & Fitz-Gibbon, 1987). Attitude scales can effectively show an individual’s placement within a test group, accurately indicate a range of attitudes held within a given group (as has been done in this study) and in test/retest settings to measure changes in attitudes by comparing pretest and post-test group means. Another disadvantage of the Likert method is in the fact that the exact level of measurement of the resulting scale scores is unknown. Additional limitations include incomplete responses, the possibility for lost and re-directed mail and the assignment to complete the task to another individual other than the Superintendent of the school district. Another limitation of the study includes the fact that study participants may have attended schools outside the state of New Jersey for their K through 12 and college education, thereby making it difficult to ascertain the exact nature of their formal and college level visual art training. In summary, attitude scales may be used for the purpose of comparing different groups.

Significance of the Study
What can be uncovered from a study of this kind will be valuable to those who plan and develop visual arts education programs and advocacy programs, leaders and policy makers, professional associations, art teacher and administrative preparation programs, current practitioners in the field, parents, and those interested in art education in general. Individuals may use the results of the study to assist them when planning programs to improve the status of visual art programs in the public schools, colleges and universities and strengthen the field of art education. The findings will allow the decision makers to be reflective of their own background art experiences, and of the decisions they make regarding visual arts programs. The results may also provide a glimpse into why visual arts programs have been marginalized in schools. Positive findings may provide current leaders the impetus to embrace visual arts education within their organization, as well as set aside anxieties and apprehensions they may hold regarding the value of visual arts education in their schools.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

Background

The arts were included in the Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994 (Congress, 1994) thereby declaring them an academic subject and in the nation’s interest as part of a core curriculum for students.

Congress cited learning in the arts in the national goals for education and similar policies are being adopted or considered in almost every state. Nationally, arts educators have agreed on a set of challenging standards which outline the expectations for what all students should know and be able to do in the arts. Measuring students’ arts achievement will also be included in the National Assessment of Educational Progress, the nation’s report card (Murfee, 1997). Priorities for Arts Education (Murfee, 1997) listed the following recommendations for researchers:

1. Conduct studies examining the effects of arts education enabling student learning, as well as success in adult roles.

2. Conduct studies that provide educational policy makers with information on the conditions of arts education in America’s schools and public attitudes toward arts education. Specifically, conduct studies that determine the attitudes of the public, policy makers,
employers, parents, school administrators, teachers, and students about arts education. (p. ii)

There are conflicting views about the extent, quality and purpose of arts education in America's schools. A legislator or school board member poised to make a decision on an arts education curriculum or budget is largely functioning in the realm of perception. Surveys should be conducted along with studies that probe the views of legislators, school board members, school administrators, parents, teachers, and students on the role of the arts in schooling (Murfee, 1997, p.12 - 14).

Toward Civilization (NEA, 1988) documented a gap between commitment and resources for arts education, and the actual practice of arts education in classrooms. The report included the following research recommendations: (a) surveys and critical analyses of goals, purposes and curricular content of arts education, (b) analyses of arts education program requirements that include time, personnel, resource materials and organizational and administrative support systems, (c) historical inquiries, (d) studies of learner development, behavior, perception, attitude and knowledge, (e) studies of teaching methodologies, (f) studies of the effects of experimental and ongoing art education programs and, (g) an analysis of how research findings can affect study of the arts in the classroom.

Attitudes

Allport (1935) indicated that the word attitude is derived from the Latin term aptus, has significance of fitness or adaptedness and like its by-form aptitude connotes a
subjective or mental state of preparation for action. In the field of art, however, the term came to have an independent meaning referring to the outward or visible body posture of a figure in a statue or painting. Allport’s definition implies mental attitudes and motor attitudes, and “…connotes a neuropsychic state of readiness for mental and physical activity.” (p. 3).

The zeitgeist for the study of attitudes in experimental psychology probably occurred with Lange’s 1888 study (as cited in Allport, 1935) of reaction times. Freud (as cited in Allport, 1935) contributed to attitude research by identifying attitudes with various characteristics such as longing, hatred, and so forth. The study of attitudes in sociology evolved with the study of culture.

According to Fishbein (1967), Allport defined an attitude as a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual’s response to all objects and situations with which it is related. Attitudes can be either positive or negative.

Thurstone (1928) defined an attitude as the “…sum of total of a man’s inclinations and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about a specified topic” (p. 531). A verbal expression is an opinion, and the interpretation of the expressed opinion is the attitude. An opinion, therefore, symbolizes an attitude.

Measuring Attitudes

Three methods have been identified for assessing attitudes: census of opinions, a priori scale, and the psychophysical scale. In a census of opinions ballots are counted or answers to questions tabulated to determine the range and distribution of public opinion.
However, the intensity of their opinion is not measured. A good example of this methodology is evident in the research conducted by Katz and Allport (as cited in Allport, 1935) of 4,248 college students who responded to a questionnaire. The a priori scale is based upon logic, economical, and widely used but has been criticized for arbitrary scoring problems. A good example of this methodology can be found in the research of Bogardus (1925, 1927) who examined the degree of social distance by asking subject’s about the degree of intimacy they would tolerate between themselves and various races. The scoring problem occurred when attempting to calculate the distance between each degree of intimacy. The distances were not comparable. The psychophysical scale was the most significant development in the history of attitude measures. Thurstone (as cited in Allport, 1935) conceived of attitudes as having a degree of affect for or against an object.

Thurstone’s (1928) study was to devise a method whereby the distribution of the attitude of a group on a specified topic or issue could be represented in the form of a frequency distribution. The baseline would represent the whole range of opinions from those at one end, most strongly in favor of the topic/issue, to those at the other end of the scale, strongly opposed to the topic/issue. Thurstone’s methodology is still widely used in the construction of attitude scales. The procedure for constructing a scale utilizing his methodology involves asking several groups to write out opinions on an issue in a question format. The literature is searched for suitable statements that serve the purpose of the scale. The list is edited to create a list of 100 to 150 statements that cover the total range of the scale from pro to con, and includes neutral. Practical considerations are considered such as writing brief statements, writing statements so they can be endorsed or rejected, writing statements so that when accepted or rejected they indicate something about the reader’s attitude toward the issue, and avoiding double-barreled statements. Taking these factors
into consideration, the original list is edited to 80 – 100 statements to form the scale.

Next, the validity of each statement is calculated and some statements are eliminated by
criteria of ambiguity and some statements are eliminated by criteria of irrelevance. The
final scale consists of a shorter list of approximately 20 – 30 statements evenly graduated
along the scale.

Likert’s study (as cited in Fishbein, 1967) outlined steps for constructing an attitude
scale. He determined it was essential that all statements be expressions of desired behaviors
and not statements of fact to be sure the scale would measure the present attitude and not an
attitude from the past. Statements must be written in clear, concise, straight-forward
language using simple vocabulary and avoid ambiguity. It is desirable to word the
questions so the reaction to some is more toward one end of the attitude continuum and
word others more in the middle or toward the other end of the continuum. To avoid space
error and the tendency for a stereotyped response statements should be worded so one half
have one end of the continuum corresponding to the left/upper and the other half
correspond to the right/lower point of reaction alternatives. If multiple choice statements
are used, alternatives should involve only a single attitude variable, not several.
Researchers must calculate the split-half reliability by correlating the sum of odd
statements for each individual against the sum of even statements.

Eagly and Chaiken (1993) defined an attitude as a psychological tendency that is
expressed by evaluating a particular entity with some degree of favor or disfavor. Attitudes
may be divided into three categories: cognitive, affective, and behavioral. An individual
may acquire beliefs about an attitude object, think about the knowledge, and decide upon a
course of action or generate an emotional response. Attitudes are developed as individuals
respond, in an evaluative manner, to an attitude object on an affective, cognitive or
behavioral basis. A mental representation of the attitude is formulated and stored in memory and activated by the presence of the attitude object and/or clues related to it. Attitudes are hypothetical constructs, used by psychologists. Attitudes are not directly observable but inferred by the subject’s observable response to the attitude object.

An attitude is also a short-term internal state that can be learned or unlearned, enduring or changeable, and important and/or unimportant. Attitudes encompass expressions of approval or disapproval, favor or disfavor, liking or disliking, approach or avoidance or similar reactions with evaluation responses that differ in valence and are bifurcated into positive or negative directions.

Two models of measuring attitudes exist; psychophysical scaling, as in the case of Thurstone, and psychometric scaling, as in the case of Likert. Psychometrics has its origins in mental and psychological testing. The attributes that are to be measured have no physical stimulus counterpart. Participants respond to a series of items, each intended to assess a common underlying attribute, that the test is designed to measure. Because more precise information about the attribute accumulates as the number of items increases, the sum (average) of the scores on a number of items provides a good indication of where the subject stands on the attribute. The most common methods for measuring attitudes seek to locate subjects on a single dimension of favorability, for example, uni-dimensional scaling models (Eagly & Chaiken, 1993). In a Likert scale, stimuli are classified *a priori* as either favorable or unfavorable toward the attitude object. The term scale is reserved for the “set of items” that has been chosen for the instrument, based upon an item analysis, and therefore can be used as a scale to assess an attitude (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993, p. 86). The location of subjects along the attitude dimension are determined by the number of items with which they agree and the extent of their agreement. The responses are viewed as
indicators of a common variable and can be applied to cognitive, affective, and behavioral classes (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993, p. 51).

Likert (as cited in Stockhard, 1976) developed a method of summated ratings because he believed that Thurstone’s technique was too cumbersome and time consuming. When using the Likert method the researcher collects statements of belief about behavior or affective reactions toward an attitude object. The items are written and selected so agreement with the item represents either a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the object. The degree of favorability/unfavorability is ignored. Likert’s technique is referred to as the method of summated ratings because the scores received on each item are summed to obtain the respondents total score on the attitude scale (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993, p.53).

The disadvantages of the Likert method lie in the fact that the exact level of measurement of the resulting scale scores is unknown. The scale can also lack internal checks for its representative measurement properties and it is difficult to determine whether it yields internal or ordinal level measurement. Additionally, the technique has no built-in test of dimensionality. Although Likert scaling attempts to locate subjects on a single dimension of favorability, it is impossible to make statements about the underlying dimensionality of Likert scales without further statistical analysis (Eagly and Chaiken, 1993, p.55).

The interest in attitude research is increasing once again because of concern about the applied relevance of attitude research and the growing awareness that the study of relationships between theoretical variables cannot be divorced from the issue of how these variables were measured. When attempting to measure attitudes researchers rely on inference, since it’s impossible to measure attitudes directly. Researchers understand that the behaviors, beliefs, and feelings will not always match even when it is agreed they
reflect a single attitude. Therefore, to focus only on one manifestation of an attitude in
the construction of a scale will distort and mislead. Additionally, there is no guarantee that
the attitude under measure will stand still long enough for a one time measure to be
reliable. This is why those who develop attitude scales must include multiple items aimed
at ascertaining the attitude toward the variable under study. In summary, when studying
attitudes researchers do so without universal agreement on their nature (Henerson et al.,
1987).

Art Attitudes

An attitude represents a rather abstract entity adaptable to a wide range of
theoretical problems and experimental settings. It is a flexible concept, can be and has been
adapted to multiple investigations and descriptive situations. An art attitude is a learned and
relatively enduring evaluation system of affective predispositions held toward art referents
(Morris & Stuckhardt, 1977). Six major characteristics are inherent in all attitudes:

Attitudes are affective evaluation concepts which give rise to motivational behavior
and, in art, they are related to the affective qualities and evaluation responses ascribed to
the nature of art, art objects, and art learning.

Attitudes are learned, and Maguire (as cited in Morris and Stuckhardt, 1977 p. 23)
has argued that direct contact with art is the major determinant of attitudes held toward art.

Attitudes have specific social referents and the domain of content for an art attitude
referent is confined to art, art-related objects, and art phenomena. Attitude referent in art
can be as simple as a single work of art or as complex as an entire category of art.
Attitudes are relatively stable and enduring. The stability of an attitude is the result of three factors; specifically individuals actively resist change to held attitudes, individuals tend to reinforce held attitudes through selective learning, and individuals hold many interrelated attitudes; therefore the alteration of one attitude implies readjustment of others (Morris and Stuckhardt, 1977, p. 24).

Attitudes vary in quality and intensity representing a range from extremely positive through neutral, to extremely negative. Neutrality is non-evaluative and may be an indication of no attitude toward a particular referent.

Attitudes exist in varying degrees of interrelatedness (Morris and Stuckhardt, 1977, p. 22).

Art educators have not thoroughly studied attitudes and those studies that have been conducted may be limited in their usefulness because of conceptual and procedural flaws (M. H. Stuckhardt, 1976).

Measuring Art Attitudes

Bettelheim's 1947 (as cited in Stuckhardt, 1976, p. 50) Inventory of the Arts was the first study in attitudes to use a Likert type scale consisting of 170 items for the purpose of ascertaining the opinions of subjects toward the fine arts, in general. The study indicated no attempt to obtain validity or reliability of the items used in the final scale.

The Beittel Art Acceptance Scale (1953) (as cited in (M. S. Stuckhardt, 1973) was designed to measure the aesthetic attitudes of college students. The methodology employed a Guttman technique, was well designed and reliable, however, the instrument assessed the
aesthetic attitudes of college students toward art reproductions, specifically 11 art reproductions.

The Burkhart Uniqueness of Self-Acceptance Scale (1957) (as cited in Stuckhardt, 1973, p. 15) examined the correlations between high school students' adjustment in the creative process and the quality of the work they do by examining the attitudes held during the production of their art objects. The scale was not constructed following recognized attitude measurement techniques thereby raising questions of validity and reliability, and therefore can only be used with subjects engaged in making art.

The Shaffer Art Attitude Scale (1964) (as cited in Stuckhardt, 1973, p. 19) was a Likert-type scale to measure attitudes held by elementary classroom teachers toward art, teaching art, and toward the self as a teacher of art. Although it was constructed following appropriate procedures its one technical flaw was that it was administered to two different groups. Additionally, the investigator offered no bibliographic information of sources used to cull the 200 statements used in the scale.

The Grossman Scale (1971) (as cited in Stuckhardt, 1976 p. 52) was constructed like a Likert scale and was intended to examine relationships between teachers' attitudes toward children’s learning potential in art, teaching art, and personal involvement in art. The scale did not include enough items and there was no clear conceptualization of the attitudes under study, nor an attempt to identify the procedures followed in assembling the items.

Stuckhardt (1976) developed a scale to measure attitudes held toward the visual arts. He was interested to know if subjects with dissimilar amounts of training in art held dissimilar attitudes toward art and what effect training held on attitudes; specifically the
study aimed to investigate the positive and negative evaluations made by individuals toward the visual arts.

In a dissertation, Stuckhardt (1976) used a Likert method to develop a Scale to Measure Attitudes Toward the Visual Arts because the technique yielded higher reliable coefficients, with fewer items, and required less time than other scales to, complete and evaluate. The final form of the scale was called the Stuckhardt Art Attitude Scale (SAAS). The domain to be assessed was visual arts and was delimited to two and three dimensional forms of painting, drawing, printmaking, and sculpture. The researcher was interested in assessing the general attitudes toward the visual arts. Stuckhardt reviewed 115 sources to collect 619 statements. The editing and re-writing of the statements took 1 year and this process produced 621 potential statements for the scale. Keyword qualifiers were identified and the statements were sorted into categories based upon these qualifiers. One hundred statements were identified for inclusion in the initial trial scale and administered to 50 art trained subjects and 80 untrained subjects from Miami University. The trained subjects consisted of undergraduate ($n=47$) and graduate ($n=3$) students majoring in art and art education. Untrained subjects were undergraduate students majoring in elementary education ($n=32$) and business ($n=48$). The final form of the SAAS consisted of 30 discriminating items which were identified from the trial scale administration. The items were randomized and inserted into the final form in such a way that approximately one half were worded favorably toward the referent object and one half worded unfavorably. The pilot tests indicated the SAAS had a high degree of equivalence and reliability for both trained and untrained test groups (Stuckhardt, 1976, p.100). The equivalence reliability of the scale represented by Cronbach’s Coefficient Alpha was .87 for the trained group ($n=100$) and .91 for the untrained group ($n=228$). The reliability coefficients from the second
administration of the scale indicated that the scale consistently measured attitudes held
toward the visual arts (Stuckhardt, 1976, p.103). The researcher computed test retest
reliability by computing Guttman’s Lambda-3 and obtained .91 for the trained respondents
and .94 for the untrained respondents. This second assessment substantiated the scale’s
stability. Stuckhardt’s findings indicated a direct positive correlation between the amount
of training individuals have in art and the attitudes they hold toward art. Use of the SAAS
tool is recommended for research purposes only, as it is not appropriate for individual
assessment. It is a viable tool for assessments made within and among groups of those
trained and untrained in visual arts, and of general, shared attitudes.

Stuckhardt and Morris (1980) presented an instrument developed to assess the
verbal attitudes held by individuals toward arts education, specifically the: Attitudes
Toward Arts Education Scale (ATAES). ATAES was developed in conjunction with a
federally funded program aimed at initiating arts programs in a district. The methodology
followed a Likert scale model and art education was defined as a formal education program
in which the arts (visual art, music, dance, and drama) in combination are an integral part
of the school curriculum. Content validity was obtained by assembling 83 statements that
were edited to conform to the established criteria. All the statements were reviewed, similar
ones consolidated, and dual statements broken in two, and redundant statements eliminated,
thereby resulting in 60 statements. These statements were scrutinized for monotone toward
the referent and statements not conforming to protocol were re-written. The 60 statements
were further examined for keyword categories and sorted for common content. Common
categories were identified by determining recurring key terms/phrases. The 8 keyword
categories included: (a) value of, (b) life contribution, (c) personal expression, (d)
society/culture, (e) teaching, (f) emotion, (g) learning, and (h) general education. After the
keyword review, the statements were examined for redundancy and reduced to 48
without sacrificing the representation of the keyword categories or meaning invested in the
original 60 statements. The 48 statements were assembled into a summated rating scale and
administered to two samples drawn from a target population of elementary classroom
teachers \( n = 50, n = 48 \) representing kindergarten through grades 6, from 2
demographically similar neighboring school districts in Ohio. A \( z \) test determined there was
no statistically significant difference between the mean scores of the groups. The data were
examined using a Kohr computer program to identify those items best suited for the final
scale. Forty-three items were deemed appropriate for the scale. Additionally, the trial data
were subjected to factor analysis performed for the purpose of establishing the validity of
the ATAES resulting in the final form for the ATAES consisting of 30 items. The final
ATAES contained 30 items with a high degree of differentiating ability \( (r = .50 \) or better).
Stuckhardt administered the ATAES to 100 elementary classroom teachers from a third
school district in southwestern Ohio. The data were evaluated with the Kohr computer
program and established all 30 items as satisfactorily discriminating \( (r = .51) \). Individual
item correlation coefficients ranged from a very acceptable low of .43 to a high of .69.
Therefore, the ATAES was shown to maintain properties of validity, reliability, and
unidimensionality. All items on the scale demonstrated to measure some aspect of attitudes
held toward arts education, differentiate between individuals holding varying attitudes
toward arts education, and be universally understood by the target group (Stuckhardt and
Morris, 1980, p.53). These obtained levels of validity and reliability indicate that upon re-
evaluation the scale should be effective with other populations.

Ntukidem (1982) published a Comparative Analysis of Elementary School
Teacher's Attitudes Toward Visual Art Education: Nigeria – United States (USA). The
study reviewed attitude research conducted by Morris and Stuckhardt. Ntukidem’s research was descriptive and investigated and compared the attitudes of 80 elementary school teachers, 6 principals or headmasters, and 2 supervisors from among 6 public elementary schools in the USA and Nigeria. Additionally, a total of 20 respondents - 12 elementary school teachers, 6 elementary school principals, and 2 art supervisors - from the same population were selected for follow-up interviews.

Ntukidem concluded his research with suggestions for the United States Department of Education, Ministry of Education in Nigeria, policy study specialists, principals and elementary school teachers of both countries to re-examine their negative attitudes for the total benefit of the children. There were three limitations of the study: (a) the concentration on attitudes toward visual art education held by teachers in the USA and Nigeria, (b) a sample drawn from Tennessee, USA and the Cross River State, Nigeria, and (c) the exclusion of the functions of art directly related to business, industry, and the general public because the study concentrated specifically on the functions of art relating to children in elementary schools in the process of their physical and mental growth. The researcher admonished administrators, policy makers, and elementary school teachers not to forget that some characteristics of highly successful people include imagination, inventiveness, determination to succeed, adaptability and creativity, and the subject area which most develops these is visual arts education. He also recommended that visual arts supervisors visit schools more frequently to serve better as liaisons between the administration and the schools for the ultimate interest of both parties.

Jensen (1983) conducted an Analysis of the Attitudes Toward Fine Arts Education Among Nevada State Legislators, Lobbyists, School Board Trustees, Superintendents, Curriculum Coordinators, Principals, Fine Arts Educators, and Other Educators in the
Nevada Public Schools. The purpose of the study was to determine the attitudes of key persons who make decisions about curriculum in the state of Nevada, and who assist in making funds available for education. Two Likert-style questionnaires were constructed and distributed in February and April, 1981 respectively to 1574 subjects. On questionnaire 1, sent in February of 1981, the number of returns from the 1574 key persons questioned was 772 or 49% of the sample population. Responses to the first questionnaire provided the foundation for items selected to be included in the second instrument. The second instrument was distributed to the same group of subjects. On questionnaire 2, sent in April of 1981, 512 persons returned the forms in a completed state or 32.5%. This represents a 16.5% drop from the total number returned on questionnaire 1. However, the information derived from questionnaire 2 provided interesting data for determining the attitudes towards Fine Arts education of approximately one-third of the respondents originally contacted for this study. In both scales, art education was defined as a formal educational program in which the arts (visual art, dance, drama, and music) are integral components of public school curricula. The final questionnaire consisted of 40 statements in a Likert scale and was administered to the selected 1574 key persons in the state of Nevada. The scale consisted of 20 statements from a positive position for the arts and the other 20 statements were created as negative to the first 20. The final questionnaire also included a second section which asked respondents to rate four different placements of electives in public school curricula in the order of individual preference to the individual answering the questionnaire. A key finding of the study showed two political groups; the Assembly (85.7% disagreed) and the Senators (50% disagreed) revealed their attitudes to be definitely opposed to any supportive legislation for fine arts maintenance. The only group showing 50% of its answers to be skewed toward agreement for support was the Fine Arts Educators
(Jensen, 1983, p.95). The final questionnaire instructed the 1574 respondents to designate their preference as to the placement of four sets of electives. The four sets, depicted in Table 1, were organized so Fine Arts were arranged in first, second, third and fourth places. Respondents were instructed to rank their selected electives numerically in the order of their personal preference. One hundred eighty-one respondents or 46.1% of the sample surveyed placed group B as their most preferred set of electives in first place. Fine Arts classes appeared to hold second place to Skills Development courses. This does lend support for the arts and the importance of their part in an elective program. Results from the second questionnaire distributed to Legislators, Lobbyists, School Board Trustee, Curriculum Coordinators, Superintendents, Principals, Fine Arts Educators, and Other Educators within the state of Nevada indicated a generally high degree of support for the value and continuance of arts education within the state of Nevada. Additionally, there was a consensus among the respondents that indicted competency testing within the arts was an impractical approach, and that essentially arts education should be considered basic to most public school curricula.

Table 1.

Four Different Rank Placements of Electives in Nevada Public School Curricula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>Group C</th>
<th>Group D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Skills Development</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills Dev</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Ed</td>
<td>Foreign Language</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Skills Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Lg</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>Skills Development</td>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Material reprinted from an unpublished dissertation:

The Eisner Art Attitude Inventory (1966) (as cited in Stuckhardt, 1973, p.9) assessed the amount of personal involvement or participation in the visual arts in which subjects engaged rather than art attitudes or attitudes toward art. The study was delimited to secondary and college level subjects who were actively engaged in art production and how they felt about themselves as performing artists. Four areas of attitude toward art were specifically investigated: (a) voluntary activity in art, (b) satisfaction in art, (c) self-estimate in art, and (d) attitude toward art and artists. Eisner established validity and reliability of the instrument by administering it to approximately 1500 subjects attending secondary and post-secondary institutions in six states. The split-half method was used to analyze the data to estimate the reliability of the instrument. The reliability estimate for the total population was .93 and did not fall below .90 at any grade level. Eisner assumed validity of the instrument on the basis that the art interested high school students consistently scored higher on the attitude inventory than did the non-art college students. Information is lacking on the construction techniques, and theoretical basis for the selection of items used to create the Eisner Art Attitude Inventory. However, Eisner’s study did provide indications for the affirmation that background or exposure to art, whether or not formally received, will likely result in more positive attitudes toward art but because of the limitations of the evaluative instrument there has been no conclusive supporting evidence.
Chapter III

Design and Methodology

The design of this cross-sectional study utilized nomothetic, quantitative survey research. Survey research is appropriate for making descriptive studies of large populations and may also be used for explanatory purposes. Nomothetic research permits the study of large collections of people and deals with most cases but not all cases. Three of the main criteria for nomothetic causal relationships in social research include: (a) the variables must be correlated, (b) the cause takes place before the effect, and (c) the variables are nonspurious (Babbie, 2002). The units of analysis consisted of a cross-section sample \((n = 250)\) of subjects who were randomly drawn from the population of New Jersey superintendents \((n = 638)\). To guard against overgeneralization the researcher chose to replicate a study (Stuckhardt, 1976). Results of the self-administered survey were examined through descriptive statistics on demographic and key study variables; along with frequency distributions, Pearson product–moment correlation coefficients \((r)\) and multiple regression analysis of the hypothesis. The dependent variable in the design was the art budget as a percent of the total school budget. The predictors were DFGs, age, gender, art attitude scores, years of formal art training \((k - 12)\) and semester hours of training (college courses). The researcher was interested in identifying sufficient cause \((a)\) that would account for the art budget as a percent of the total budget. A sufficient cause represents a condition that, if present, guarantees the effect in question. This does not mean that a
sufficient cause is the only possible cause of a particular effect. A cause may be sufficient, but not necessary.

Selection of the Likert Technique

The purpose of this study was to use the Stuckhardt Art Attitudes Scale (SAAS), a Likert-type scale of 30 statements related to the visual arts, to determine the relationship, if any, between the attitudes, background experiences in art, and other selected variables of Superintendents who make decisions about funding art education programs in the New Jersey Public Schools. This scale was chosen because of its suitability to the objectives and needs of this study. In this study the domain to be assessed was the visual arts; specifically two and three dimensional forms of painting, drawing, printmaking, and sculpture. The assessment did not include the performing arts of dance, theater, or music. Other scale techniques were rejected because in considering the advantages and disadvantages of each technique they were less suitable, or non-existent, for the purposes of this investigation. Some strengths of the Likert method include: (a) high reliability coefficients, even when there are few scale items, and (b) the Likert technique requires less time and labor to evaluate than other scales. The Stuckhardt SAAS was used to gather data about attitudes held toward visual arts education, accompanied by a Personal History Statement aimed at collecting demographic and personal involvement in the visual arts. The researcher sought to explain what selected variables, if any, may influence the Superintendent toward financial support or lack of financial support of the visual art program within their district. In addition, the researcher obtained and analyzed additional
and bibliographical data to determine which, if any, selected factors most affected the participants’ attitudes toward visual arts education.

Characteristics and Limitations of Likert Scales

When properly used, a Likert scale is highly efficient, reliable, accurate and valid. Likert scales consist of statements about some psychological object. Scales offer more assurance of ordinality by tapping intensity structures among indicators and rank-ordering units of analysis in terms of specific variables (Babbie, 2002). Several items in a composite measure may have different intensities in terms of a variable. This technique presents data in a summary form while maintaining the original information as much as possible (Leedy, 2002).

Attitude scales are adequate for research purposes, for example, investigations in which comparisons are made of the attitudes held between groups of people (Stuckhardt, 1976). The results or data should not be misinterpreted by assuming definitive measures of individual attitudes. The interpretation of a single subject’s attitude score obtained on a Likert type scale cannot be made without reference to the distribution of the scores of a defined group because the point between the maximum and minimum possible scores is difficult to make since the summated-rating score corresponding to the neutral point on a favorable-unfavorable continuum is unknown. The midpoint score will vary from group to group. The attitude of a single subject can be compared to the attitudes of other subjects in terms of the distribution of scores obtained from a particular group.

Attitude scales should not be used as a complete catalogue, precise indicator, or qualifier of an individual’s attitudes. If specific information is required about an
individual's attitude some other technique must be implemented. Attitude scales can effectively show an individual's placement within a test group, accurately indicate a range of attitudes held within a given group (as has been done in this study) and in test/retest settings to measure changes in attitudes by comparing pretest and post-test group means. In summary attitude scales may be used for the purpose of comparing different groups.

Population and Sample

The study was conducted in the state of New Jersey. There are over 600 (NJDOE, 2004) individual school districts in New Jersey. Some districts are governed by a superintendent, principal/superintendent and/or acting superintendent, while others operate without an appointed superintendent, and in some cases one superintendent may govern more than one school district. Those school districts operating without a superintendent were removed from the roster. For these reasons the total population was estimated at 600 and the sample (N = 250) represented a little over one third of that population. The purpose of sampling is to select a set of elements from a population in such a way that the descriptions of those elements accurately portray the total population from which the elements are selected (Babbie, 2002). To eliminate selection bias a table of random numbers was used to select the sample. Every potential participant was assigned a numerical value. Using a table of random numbers the study sample was selected to represent the population. Those included in the sample represented the 21 counties that comprise New Jersey, as well as the 8 District Factor Groupings (DFGs) currently in effect in the state.
Data from 100 New Jersey Superintendents were collected and analyzed for this study. During the 2003 – 2004 school year surveys were mailed to 250 Superintendents via the US Postal Service. One hundred surveys, representing a return rate of 40%, were returned to the researcher. One participant returned a survey but did not respond to the Personal History Statement, or the SAAS preferring instead to comment, “I am over 55 – I guess my feelings are unimportant!” Complete data included responses to the Personal History Statement and the SAAS.

Procedures

New Jersey is comprised of 21 counties. District Factor Groups (DFGs) were initially developed in 1975 to compare student performance on statewide assessments across demographically similar school districts. The DFGs represent an approximate measure of a community’s relative socioeconomic status (SES). These categories are updated every 10 years when the Census Bureau releases the latest Decennial Census data. The following six variables were used to calculate a school district’s DFG using the 2000 Decennial Census data: (a) Percent of adults with no high school diploma, (b) Percent of adults with some college education, (c) Occupational status, (d) Unemployment rate, (e) Percent of individuals in poverty, and (f) Median family income.

The analysis and weighting of these six indices was used to produce a statistical score for each school district which was ranked and placed into one of eight groupings: A, B, CD, DE, FG, GH, I and J. Each grouping consists of districts with similar scores. I and J districts score the highest on the socioeconomic scale. District Factor Group I had the most subjects (23, 23%), followed by DE (21, 21%). District Factor Groups CD and GH
each had 14 subjects (14%), FG had 11 (11%), and B had 10 (10%). The least frequently represented DFGs were A with six subjects (6%) and J with one subject (1%).

During the fall 2003 semester a 3 week window of opportunity was established and subjects were mailed a survey package with instructions for completing the survey by hand. Responses were coded and the data was entered into SPSS for the initial analysis. Quantitative data were used to address subsidiary questions. Descriptive statistics were generated on the demographic variables and key study variables and used to analyze the research question and subsidiary questions. Significance was determined at the $p \leq 0.05$ level.

The 250 New Jersey Superintendents who were surveyed were asked to provide selected demographic and background information. Each survey was coded by DFG. Subjects were asked to respond to the extent to which they strongly agreed, agreed, and were uncertain, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with each question. The SAAS was used to assess the superintendents’ attitudes toward art. Scores on this 30-item questionnaire were computed by summing the responses to each question and dividing by 30. Cronbach’s alpha was computed to estimate the internal reliability of the SAAS. A coefficient of .86 was obtained, indicating that the scale was reliable. The Personal History Statement solicited information on age, gender, ethnicity, total school budget, visual art budget allocation, college major and years of formal art training. The data were analyzed to determine the relationships, if any, between the art attitudes of the Superintendents, their background experiences in art, selected variables and the funds allocated for art in the school budget. The researcher was also interested in what selected variables, if any, may exert an influence on the Superintendent toward support or lack of support of the art program within their school district.
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ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Overview

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the statistical analyses that were conducted to analyze the research question and secondary questions. The chapter begins with a presentation of basic descriptive statistics that were generated on the demographic variables and the key study variables. This is followed by the results of the analyses conducted to analyze the research question and the secondary questions.

Descriptive Statistics on the Subjects and Key Variables

Data from 100 New Jersey Superintendents were collected and analyzed for this study. The subjects included 78 males (78.8%) and 21 females (21.2%). Their gender is presented in a frequency distribution in Table 2.

Table 2:

Frequency Distribution on the Subjects’ Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3 presents a frequency distribution on the subjects’ age. Most subjects (48, 48.5%) were in the 51 to 55 year old group. The next largest age group was over 55 (21, 21.2%). The 46 to 50 year old category was represented by 16 subjects (16.2%), and the 41 to 45 year old category contained 10 subjects (10.1%). The 30 to 35 year old group and the 36 to 40 year old group both contained 2 subjects each. Most subjects (48, 48.5%) were in the 51 to 55 year old group. The next largest age group was over 55 (21, 21.2%). The 46 to 50 year old category was represented by 16 subjects (16.2%), and the 41 to 45 year old category contained 10 subjects (10.1%). The 30 to 35 year old group and the 36 to 40 year old group both contained 2 subjects each (2%).

Table 3:

Frequency Distribution on Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 to 35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 subject did not respond to this question
Regarding ethnicity, the subjects were predominantly White (97, 98%). One respondent did not report ethnicity and one respondent claimed two ethnic categories; White and Pacific Islander. Study participants represented 21 counties and 8 District Factor Groupings in New Jersey.

Table 4:

Frequency Distribution on Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 1 subject did not respond to this question and 1 participant claimed 2 ethnicities.
A frequency distribution on District Factor Groupings is presented in Table 5.

District Factor Group I had the most subjects (23, 23%), followed by DE (21, 21%).

District Factor Groups CD and GH each had 14 subjects (14%), FG had 11 (11%), and B had 10 (10%). The least frequently represented DFGs were A with 6 subjects (6%) and J with 1 subject (1%).

Table 5:

Frequency Distribution on DFG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DFG</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A frequency distribution on the subjects' college major areas of study is presented in Table 6. Elementary education (14, 14.4%), education (11, 11.1%), history/political science (9, 9.3%) and social studies (9, 9.3%) were the most frequently reported college majors. One subject (1.0%) reported majoring in fine arts.
Table 6:

*Frequency Distribution on College Majors*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary/Education/Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/PE</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/English</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History/Political Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy/Social Sciences</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>82.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>96.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 3 subjects did not respond to this question

A frequency distribution on the subjects’ years of training in visual arts is presented in Table 7. Years of training in visual arts ranged from 0 years (37, 37%) to 13 years (6, 6.0%). The mean was 5.05 years of training in visual arts with a standard deviation of 4.93 years.

Table 7:

*Frequency Distribution on Years of Training in Visual Arts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>53.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A frequency distribution on semester hours of training in visual arts is presented in Table 8. One course was equal to 3 semester hours, two courses were equal to 6 semester hours and 3 courses were equal to 9 semester hours of visual art training. Semester hours of training in visual arts ranged from zero to 93 hours. The mean semester hours of training in visual arts was 7.07 with a standard deviation of 14.17 hours.
Table 8:

*Frequency Distribution on Semester Hours of Training in Fine Arts*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are the art attitudes, background experiences in visual art, and other select variables of a sample of Superintendents in the public schools of New Jersey related to the financial support of the visual art program within their school systems?

The SAAS was used to assess the superintendents' attitudes toward visual art. Scores on this 30-item questionnaire were computed by summing the responses to each question and dividing by 30. Subjects were asked to respond to the extent to which they strongly agreed, agreed, and were uncertain, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with each question. Strongly agree and agree were scored 5 and 4, respectively. An uncertain response was scored as 3, and strongly disagree and disagree were scored 1 and 2, respectively. Higher scores reflected more positive attitudes toward visual art. A frequency distribution on the subjects' SAAS scores is presented below in Table 9. Obtained scores ranged from 3.37 to 4.93. The mean SAAS score was 4.24 with a standard deviation of .33. Cronbach's alpha was computed to assess the reliability of the SAAS. A coefficient of .86 was obtained, indicating that the scale was highly reliable.

Table 9:

Frequency Distribution on the Art Attitude Scale Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art Attitude Score</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00 to 1.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.50 to 1.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 to 2.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.50 to 2.99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Attitude</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 to 3.49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.50 to 3.99</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 to 4.49</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.50 to 5.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 presents a frequency distribution on the reported total school budgets.

School budgets ranged from a low of $400,000 to a high of $158,000,000. The mean school budget was $26,000,000 with a standard deviation of $2,800,000.

Table 10:

Frequency Distribution on Total School Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Budget</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4,999,999</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000,000 to 9,999,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000,000 to 14,999,999</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000,000 to 19,999,999</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000,000 to 24,999,999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000,000 to 34,999,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,000,000 to 39,999,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Budget</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000,000 to 44,999,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>77.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45,000,000 to 49,999,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>80.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000,000 to 54,999,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55,000,000 to 59,999,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000,000 to 64,999,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70,000,000 to 74,999,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000,000 and greater</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 presents a frequency distribution on the visual arts budgets for the school districts represented in the subjects. Visual arts budgets ranged from $1,000 to $1,805,000. The mean visual arts budget was $239,919.50 with a standard deviation of $356,244.30.

Table 11:

*Frequency Distribution on Visual Arts Budgets*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arts Budget</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 9999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 19,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 to 29,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Budget</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Cumulative Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 to 39,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 to 59,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000 to 69,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70,000 to 79,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80,000 to 89,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000 to 149,999</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000 to 199,999</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200,000 to 249,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250,000 to 299,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300,000 to 349,999</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350,000 to 399,999</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400,000 to 449,999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450,000 to 499,999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 and greater</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 19 subjects did not provide a visual arts budget

Table 12 shows a frequency distribution of visual arts budgets as a percent of total budgets. Eighty one of the participants responded by providing an allocation for the visual art program representing 32% of the sample. Participants who neglected to provide
a budget figure on the returned surveys were contacted via telephone and requested to provide a budget figure. Of those participants who were contacted 19 did not provide a budget figure. The percents ranged from 0 to 75%. The mean arts budget was 2.3% with a standard deviation of 7.8%.

Table 12:

*Frequency Distribution of Visual Arts Budget as a Percent of Total School Budget*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Art Budget</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of Total Budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than .00</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.01</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.02</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 indicates the Pearson Product – Moment correlation coefficients ($r$) between the variables. Significance was determined at the .05 level. These bivariate correlations show that: Visual art budgets and art attitude scores ($r=.23, p=.03$) indicate that subjects with higher visual art budgets had more positive views toward art. Visual art budget percent and gender (GEN) ($r=.25, p=.02$) indicate that female subjects had
higher visual art budget percents than did their male counterparts who participated in the study. The participants age and DFG ($r=.32, p=.004$), indicate that older subjects tended to work at DFGs FG, GH, I, and J. The participants age and years of visual art training ($r=-.35, p=.001$), indicate that younger subjects tended to have more visual art training than did older study participants. The participant's age and art attitude scores ($r=.22, p=.04$), indicate that older subjects had more positive attitudes toward art than did the younger study participants. Gender and art attitude scores ($r=.30, p=.006$), indicate that female subjects had more positive art attitude scores than did male subjects.

Table 13:

*Pearson Correlation Coefficients between the Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ARTS</th>
<th>ART</th>
<th>DFG</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>TRAIN</th>
<th>TRAIN</th>
<th>ATT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BUDG</td>
<td>PERC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>YRS</td>
<td>HRS</td>
<td>SCOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDG</td>
<td>(.001)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
<td>(.54)</td>
<td>(.03)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERC</td>
<td>(.39)</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td>(.02)</td>
<td>(.21)</td>
<td>(.95)</td>
<td>(.23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.004)</td>
<td>(.53)</td>
<td>(.70)</td>
<td>(.82)</td>
<td>(.71)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.14)</td>
<td>(.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.58)</td>
<td>(.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARTS</th>
<th>ART</th>
<th>DFG</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>TRAIN YRS</th>
<th>TRAIN HRS</th>
<th>ATT SCOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUDG</td>
<td>PERC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td>(.33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.67)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCORE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: n = 98, 81, 100, 95, 95, 99, 99, 99 respectively.

Research Question

Are the visual art attitudes, background experiences in visual art, and other select variables of a sample of Superintendents in the public schools of New Jersey related to the financial support of the visual art program within their school systems?

Hypothesis 1: There is no relationship between the visual art attitudes, background experiences in visual art, and other selected variables of superintendents (DFG, gender, age, visual art training years, and visual art training hours) and the financial support of the visual art program within their school district.

Multiple regression analysis was used to analyze the data for this hypothesis. Multiple regression analysis is the appropriate statistical technique to use to analyze the data to determine the relationship between multiple independent variables (predictors), and a dependent variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1989). A multiple correlation is computed that expresses the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. In this analysis, the dependent variable is the art budget as a percent
of the total school budget, and the predictors were DFG, age, visual art attitude scores, years of visual art training, and semester hours of visual art training.

Prior to conducting the regression analysis, the data were analyzed to insure conformance to the conditions necessary to a valid analysis. The data were checked for outliers, multicollinearity and singularity, normality, and homoscedasticity. All assumptions were satisfactory except outliers. One outlier was found on art budget as a percent of total budget (75%), and this case was withheld from analysis. This particular school budget was for an arts magnet school. Other outliers were found on semester hours of visual art training (90, 93) and these cases were withheld from the analysis. These participants had exceptional hours of visual arts training and had either majored or minored in the visual arts when in college. The multiple regression analysis results are presented in Table 14.

Table 14:

Multiple Regression Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Un-standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.03881</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTSCOR</td>
<td>-.002788</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFG</td>
<td>.0001188</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-.003529</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>-1.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>.02.065</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>2.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-standardized Coefficients</td>
<td>Standardized Coefficients</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINYRS</td>
<td>-.0002201</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAINHRS</td>
<td>.0003308</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dependent variable is Art Budget as a percent of total budget

R=.35

The beta coefficients in the multiple regression analysis results show that the only significant variable was gender. Visual art attitude score, DFG, gender, years of visual art training, and semester hours of visual art training were not significant. The multiple correlation was .35, which indicates that 12.3% of the variance in visual art budgets as a percent of total budget could be explained by the total of these variables.

Secondary Questions

Secondary Question 1. Do superintendents have backgrounds that include the study of visual art?

In general, the subjects did not show demographics that indicated significant patterned study of the visual arts. The frequency distribution on college majors shows that only 1 subject (1.0% of the sample) was a fine arts major. The frequency distribution on years of training in art shows that 37% of the subjects had 0 years of training in visual art, and 50% of the subjects had 3 or fewer years of training in visual art. The frequency distribution on semester hours of visual art training showed that 57% of the subjects had none or 1 class (3 hours) in visual art.
Secondary Question 2. Do superintendents with visual art backgrounds allocate more funding for visual art education than do those with less or no formal visual art training?

Since only 1 subject majored in visual art, college major was not included in this analysis. The correlation coefficients in Table 12 indicate that years of training in visual art ($r = -.14, p = .20$) and semester hours of training in visual art ($r = -.06, p = .54$) showed no significant patterned relationship with visual art budgets. Also years of training in visual art ($r = -.14, p = .21$) and hours of training in visual art ($r = .00, p = .95$) showed no significant patterned relationship with art budgets as a percent of total school budgets. As a result, it appears that no patterned relationship exists between superintendents' backgrounds in visual art and funding for the visual arts.

Secondary Question 3. What is the relationship between the visual art attitudes of Superintendents and their ethnicity or gender?

Since the subjects were predominately white, ethnicity could not be analyzed with regard to visual art attitudes. A t-test was used to compare the male ($n=78$) and female ($n=21$) subjects on visual art attitude scores. The results indicated that a significant patterned difference was found between the mean visual art attitude scores for the male and female subject ($t = 2.95, df = 97, p = .004$). These results show that the mean visual art attitude score of 4.43 for the females was significantly higher than the mean of 4.19 for the males. The female art attitudes were significantly more positive toward the visual arts than the attitudes of the males.
Secondary Question 4. How is District Factor Grouping (DFGs) related to funding for visual arts education?

The correlation coefficients in Table 12 show no significant patterned relationship between visual art budget and DFG ($r = .17, p = .12$) and between visual art budget as a percent of total budget ($r = -.09, p = .39$). No significant patterned relationship was found between DFG and visual art funding. Also, analysis of variance was used to compare the DFG groups on visual art budgets and visual art budgets as a percent of total budgets. Since DFG J contained 1 subject, it was included with group I. The results, presented below show that no significant patterned differences were found between the DFGs on visual art budget $df(6,93) = .68, p = .66$ or on visual art budget as a percent of total budget $df(6,93) = 1.23, p = .29$. The results are presented in Table 15.

Table 15:

**Analysis of Variance Results on Funding by DFG**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>428392501669.660</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>71398750278.277</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUD</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9724408164311.240</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>104563528648.508</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10152800665980.900</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERC</td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Secondary Question 5. How does the age of the superintendent relate to the funding for visual arts education?

The frequency distribution on age in Table 2 shows that most subjects were in the 51 to 55 year old age category. The average age range of the Superintendents who participated in this study was between 51 and 55 years. The correlations in Table 12 show that age did not correlate significantly with visual art budget (r=.20, p=.06) or visual art budget as a percent of total budget (r=.04, p=.71). Also, analysis of variance was used to compare the age groups on visual art budget and visual art budget as a percent of total budget. Since the 30 to 35 and the 36 to 40 age groups contained 2 subjects each, they were included in the 41 to 45 age category. The results presented below show that no significant patterned differences were found between the age groups on visual art budget df(3,95)=1.98, p=.12 or on visual art budget as a percent of total budget df(3,95)=.51, p=.67. The results are presented in Table 16.

Table 16:

Analysis of Variance Results on Funding by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>597936989104.156</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>199312329701.385</td>
<td>1.982</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUDG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>9554863676876.740</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>100577512388.176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10152800665980.90</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig.
Secondary Question 6. How does the gender and or ethnicity of the Superintendent relate to the funding for visual arts education?

A t-test was used to compare the male ($n=78$) and female ($n=21$) subjects on percent of budget and percent of visual art budget. Results of the analysis indicated that visual art budget percent for females ($r = .25, p = .02$) produced a patterned significance. In districts with female superintendents the percent of the total budget devoted to visual art was greater than in districts headed by male superintendents. Female superintendents had higher visual art budget percents as compared with male superintendents.

Additionally, gender and art attitude scores ($r= .30, p= .006$) indicate that female subjects had more positive visual art attitude scores than did male subjects. This result aligns with the results of the Pearson Correlation in that subjects with higher visual art budgets also held more favorable visual art attitudes ($r= .23, p= .03$) as indicated on the SAAS.

Ethnicity as a variable was unable to be analyzed since 98% of the subjects were White, 2% of the subjects were African-American, and 1 subject claimed 2 ethnicities.
Chapter V

Summary, Significant Findings, Discussion and Recommendations

Summary

A review of the literature revealed that visual art education has been an active component of educational programming in the United States dating back to the 1800s. The literature review also established that the visual arts were intentionally introduced into the schools because influential and powerful individuals saw the visual arts as a way of furthering social, moral, and/or economic aims. Historically, since the visual arts have not been standardized by testing they are often subject to budget cuts. As a result program survival has often been at the mercy of school leaders. Often it has been the administrative and school based decision makers, with favorable attitudes toward the visual arts, who have been responsible for the introduction, maintenance and expansion of visual art programs. A study of the visual art attitudes of a sample of New Jersey Public School Superintendents, who were selected because of the leadership roles they play in shaping New Jersey’s public school programs, was undertaken to discover to what extent support at the local level existed for the visual arts.

The purpose of this study was to use the Stuckhardt Art Attitude Scale, a Likert-type scale of 30 statements related to the visual arts, to determine the relationship, if any, between the visual art attitudes, background experiences in visual art, and other selected variables, of key persons, specifically a sample of Superintendents, who make decisions about funding visual art education programs in the New Jersey Public Schools. The
primary research question addressed how the visual art attitudes, background experiences in visual art, and other selected variables of a sample of Superintendents from the Public Schools of New Jersey relate to the financial support of the visual art program within their school systems. The researcher used the SAAS to assess certain affective (attitude) responses of a sample of New Jersey Superintendents toward the visual arts and a Personal History Statement that solicited background experiences and formal training in visual art, as well as other selected data such as age, gender, visual arts budget and total school budget for the analysis. The results highlighted that a significant variable was gender; specifically female Superintendents who participated in the study held more positive visual art attitudes and provided more funding for visual art programs than did their male counterparts who participated in this study.

Significant Findings

Are the art attitudes, background experiences in visual art, and other select variables of a sample of Superintendents from the public schools of New Jersey related to the financial support of the visual art program within their school systems?

The analysis of the data obtained from the administration of the SAAS indicated the primary research question was answered. One of six variables; gender, was significant. Female School Superintendents with higher visual art budgets also tended to have more positive attitudes toward art ($r=.23, p=.03$) as reported on the SAAS.

Is there a relationship between the ethnicity and/or gender of the Superintendent and their allocation of funding for visual art education?
Ethnicity was unable to be analyzed as (97%) of the Superintendents were White and 2% were African-American. There was a patterned significance between the art attitudes of female Superintendents (n=21) in New Jersey and their budget percent allocation for visual art programs under their supervision as compared with their male counterpart participants (n=78). The visual art budget and gender (r=.25, p=.02) indicated that female subjects had higher budget percents allocated for visual art programs than did their male counterparts who participated in the study.

Is there a relationship between the ethnicity and/or gender of the superintendent and their art attitudes?

Ethnicity was unable to be analyzed as (97%) of the Superintendents were white and 2% were African-American. The beta coefficients in the multiple regression analysis showed a significant difference between the mean art attitude scores for the male and female subjects (r=2.95, df=97, p=.004). Female art attitudes (M=4.43) were significantly more positive than the attitudes of the males (M=4.19). Attitude scales can effectively show an individual's placement within a test group and accurately indicate a range of attitudes held within a given group as has been done in this study.

Is the age of the Superintendent related to the funding for visual art education in their district?

The Superintendent's age and DFG (r=.32, p=.004) indicated that older subjects tended to work at DFGs FG, GH, I and J. It should be noted that these DFGs ranked the highest on the socioeconomic scale. Additionally, age and art attitude score as reported on the SAAS (r=.22, p=.04) indicated that the older subjects had more positive attitudes toward art than the younger subjects. However, older superintendents did not allocate more funding for the visual art programs in their school districts.
Do Superintendents with visual art training allocate more funding for visual art education than those Superintendents with less or no formal visual art training?

It should be noted that the participants in this study may have received their education outside the boundaries of the state of New Jersey. An analysis of the Superintendent's age and years of visual art training \( (r= -0.35, p=0.001) \) demonstrated that younger subjects tended to have more visual art training but held less positive attitudes toward visual art than the older subjects. Older subjects, despite less visual art training, had more positive art attitudes as reported on the SAAS \( (r=0.22, p=0.04) \) than did their younger counterparts; however, older subjects did not necessarily allocate more funding for visual art education than did the younger study participants. The correlation coefficients in Table 12 indicate that years (K – 12) of training in visual art \( (r= -0.14, p=0.20) \) and semester hours of training in visual art \( (r=0.06, p=0.54) \) showed no significant patterned relationship with visual art budgets. Also years of training in visual art \( (r= -0.14, p=0.21) \) and semester hours of training in visual art \( (r=0.00, p=0.95) \) showed no significant patterned relationship with visual art budget as a percent of total school budget. As a result, it appears that no patterned relationship exists between superintendents' backgrounds in visual art and funding for the visual arts.

Discussion

The concern for the sustenance of visual art education is not merely a passing fancy because real problems related to financing, high-stakes testing, and the current shift in back-to-basics, as evidenced by the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (Paige, 2002) legislation, will continue to influence those who are in leadership positions and have the
ability to determine what is funded and studied in schools as society advances. The
NCLB Act requires school districts to implement standards-based programs that will
enable students to meet required academic benchmarks of achievement. It requires annual
assessments that measure what students know and can do in reading and math in grades 3
through 8. NCLB legislation requires annual school report cards that provide comparative
information on the quality of schools. Districts and schools that do not make adequate
yearly progress toward achieving state proficiency goals will be targeted for assistance
and ultimately subject to corrective disciplinary and/or restructuring action. The NCLB
Act places an emphasis on the use of educational programs that have been scientifically
researched and thereby deemed effective.

Since the visual arts are included in the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content
Standards (NJCCCS) they are considered part of the basic curriculum for all New Jersey
public school students, however, there is considerable flexibility to interpret and
implement the NJCCCS within the school curriculum. Specifically, it is up to the school
district leaders and administrators to determine the level of importance visual art will
hold within the school curriculum, scope and sequence of visual art programs, staffing,
and the budget for materials. This flexibility permits considerable variation to exist
among programs from school to school, town to town, county to county and region to
region across the state. While the lack of standardization for visual art programs permits
greater flexibility and creativity when designing the programs it also makes it difficult to
ascertain why some visual art programs are handsomely or adequately funded and
flourish and others struggle to remain an integral component of the school curriculum. If
school leaders hold favorable attitudes toward the visual arts the program may be
handsomely funded, staffed and supplied, as has been demonstrated in this study.
However, if school leaders hold less than favorable visual art attitudes the visual art program could be in serious trouble. As Morris and Stuckhardt (1977) argued attitudes are relatively stable and enduring. The stability of an art attitude is the result of three factors: specifically individuals actively resist change to held attitudes, individuals tend to reinforce held attitudes through selective learning, and individuals hold many interrelated attitudes; therefore the alteration of a attitude implies readjustment of others. This evidence would suggest that visual art educators, professional organizations and those interested in the visual arts need to be consistently vigilant in their efforts to promote and maintain the current level and future development of visual art education. While the NJCCCS include the visual arts as one component of a basic education in New Jersey the content standards do not mandate the study of the visual arts by all children in all grades kindergarten through 12, nor is the study of the visual arts required to be assessed at this time. Therefore, visual art education programs in New Jersey may be implemented in any fashion deemed appropriate by the school district and since there is no current assessment practice in place, there is no accountability for school districts that do not meet the visual art education content standards.

This study produced actual figures which can be used to display a concern and support for visual art education within the state of New Jersey. The results may be employed to aid the continuance of visual art programs and in providing others with readily available data to assist them in salvaging visual art education programs in New Jersey, whose continued existence might otherwise be in jeopardy. The results may also inspire other researchers interested in visual art to design research studies aimed at gathering the scientific data necessary to support the continuance of visual art education programming in New Jersey public schools.
Stuckhardt (1976) was interested in assessing the general attitudes toward the visual arts and his findings indicated a direct positive correlation between the amount of training individuals have in visual art and the attitudes they hold toward visual art. His study delimited the area under scrutiny to two and three dimensional forms of painting, drawing, printmaking and sculpture, as did this study. This researcher was interested in determining the visual art attitudes of a sample of school leaders who work in New Jersey and their background visual art experiences. This study used the same definition of visual arts as Stuckhardt, and the results of the study demonstrated that younger subjects who had more background visual art experiences did not hold more favorable visual art attitudes.

The findings of this study indicate that more research needs to be conducted to further study this phenomena for example; Without the visual art experience is the preparation of school leaders lacking? What, if any, is the difference in the quality of the visual art experience with female participants from this study? What happened in the subjects' life and/or art experience that impacted the participants' visual art attitudes? What are the key factors responsible for the paradigm shift in the visual art attitudes of older superintendents? Is it the quality, immediacy and/or distance from visual art experiences that account for less favorable visual art attitudes?

Hopefully, when the positive art attitudes of key individuals who participated in this study and who also allocate funds to visual art programs are tested by external pressures their actions will reflect the strength of their responses they have provided in this study and they will continue to support visual art education in New Jersey public schools.
Recommendations for Future Research

The researcher makes the following recommendations for future research:

1. Qualitative studies that explore in greater depth the visual art attitudes of Superintendents and other educational leaders in New Jersey; specifically, an exploration of those variables that contribute to the positively held visual art attitudes and successfully funded visual art programs.

2. Studies that would assess the effects of an instructional treatment and/or advocacy campaign on the visual art attitudes of subjects.

3. Studies that examine the impact of the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards on the visual art attitudes held by educational leaders, school board members, teachers, and parents.

4. Studies that examine the visual art attitudes and background experiences of those who teach in the areas of Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies.

5. Studies that would examine the effects of the back-to-basics movement and its effect on visual art programs.

6. Studies that examine the visual art attitudes and background experiences of parents, classroom teachers, and other instructional staff.

In closing, it is appropriate to express that American education is based upon the premise that a student who is well educated is one who has had the opportunity to be exposed to all areas of curriculum. Visual art education holds a place within the picture of the “well-rounded” student. The future of visual art education in New Jersey is at a crossroad given the high stakes testing environment, NCLB legislation, scrutiny of educational spending and the pressure from the public for tax relief that currently exists.
There are those who would have students learn only those things which enable them to read, write, spell, and perform basic mathematical tasks. There are also the ever-present budgetary restraints. These are the realities faced by leaders involved in the educational process. Hopefully, when the positive visual art attitudes of key leaders who participated in this study are tested by external pressures their actions will reflect the strength of their responses they have provided in this study.
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Appendix A
PERSONAL HISTORY STATEMENT

AGE: (Circle the appropriate category)

SEX: Male  Female

Ethnicity: (circle one)
White  African American  Hispanic/Latino  Pacific Islander  Other

Total School Budget: ______________ Visual Art Allocation: ______________

College Major: ____________________

Formal Art Training:
• Elementary School – Number of Years: ______________
• Junior High School – Number of Years: ______________
• Senior High School – Number of Years: ______________
• College – Please estimate the number of semester or quarter hours of training you have had in each of the following areas of study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
<th>Quarter Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART STUDIO..............</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART HISTORY, APPRECIATION, AESTHETICS...........</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART EDUCATION...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHER ART TRAINING – Please specify the amount:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Appendix C
Letter of Solicitation

Date

Dear Superintendent,

Researcher
My name is Paula Valenti and I am a graduate student at Seton Hall University in the College of Education and Human Services.

Purpose of Research
The purpose of my research project is to examine the Attitudes Held Toward the Visual Arts by Superintendents in the state of New Jersey.” A Personal History Statement and an attitude survey called the Stuckhardt Art Attitude Scale (SAAS) will be used to assist me in measuring administrator attitudes toward the arts.

Description of Procedures
You have been selected to participate in this study based upon the assignment of random numbers. Participation in this project should take approximately ten minutes of your time. Participation consists of completing the Personal History Statement and SAAS, a Likert type rating scale, frequently used in marketing research, with questions about the visual arts. Kindly complete your responses by December 31, 2003.

Participation
Your much appreciated participation is anonymous and voluntary. There will be no penalty should you decline to participate in the study.

Anonymity
All information will be collected and coded using random numbers. Please do not write your name on the Personal History Statement or SAAS survey. In addition, data will be reported by county.

Confidentiality and Security
Confidentiality is assured as only I and my mentor will have access to this information. At no time will anyone know or trace a participant’s responses to a given name. Materials associated with the project will be kept in the researcher’s home and destroyed three (3) years after completion of the project.

Risks
Follow-up Postcard

Date

About two weeks ago you received a survey requesting your input regarding the visual arts. Your name was randomly selected from a professional membership list to participate in this survey.

If you have already returned the survey, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, kindly complete it today. Since the survey was sent to a small number of subjects I very much need your responses if the results are to accurately represent the opinion and experiences of the membership.

If you did not receive the questionnaire, or have any questions regarding this research, please call me at (201)862-6062.

Sincerely,
Paula Valenti
Doctoral Student
Seton Hall University
There are no foreseeable risks to participants regarding their responses to questions about their attitudes toward the arts.

Benefits
There are no direct benefits to participants, however, researchers and others may have interests in the attitudes school administrators hold toward the arts and the ways in which they support the arts.

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Seton Hall University Institutional Review Board of Human Subjects Research. The IRB believes that the research procedures adequately safeguard the subject’s privacy, welfare, civil liberties, and rights. The Chairperson of the IRB may be reached at (973) 275-2974.

If participants have questions about this research project they may contact Paula Valenti, Assistant Principal at (201) 862-6062.

Thank you in advance for your time.

Sincerely,

Paula Pelak - Valenti