
model have been reported. When the full model is measured, beta weights (obtained through the use of multiple regression of the A and SN on the BI) can be seen to differ between A and SN, with the attitude usually being the largest and therefore the best predictor of that behavioral intention. For instance, when A and SN toward the behavioral intention to "share anecdotal notes with students" were examined, the attitude w_1 was .69, while the subjective norm w_2 was .38. Likewise, the SN component was nearly twice as influential as the A when faculty reported their intentions to "prepare students for difficult situations."

The investigators could have greatly strengthened their study through the measurement of the subjective norm in a population well known to be influenced by peer pressure. Not having this information seriously impedes their ability to state whether the Fishbein model is indeed applicable to the problem studied.

Additionally, the reference title and date of publication under Fig 1 on page 65 are incorrect. That particular diagram of the components of the theory is no longer correct; it does not reflect the most recent developments in the theory, which can be found in the latest publication by Ajzen and Fishbein (1980, p8).

*Betty J. Pugh, RN, PhD
Associate Professor and Director
Parent-Child Nursing
College of Nursing
The University of Utah*

Authors' response:

First, we are gratified that our article has generated scholarly interest and we invite any reader who has further comments or questions about the article to write to us at any time.

Second, we agree with Dr Pugh that our

study concluded correctly that a person's beliefs have a good deal to do with his or her behavior. Since we did not intend to mislead, we were careful to point out that we were measuring only one part of Fishbein's current model. We refer the reader to the original article, p 65, which states, "The current study . . . does not include the subjective norms component of the Fishbein model. . ."

Finally, we will clarify the citation for Fig 1, p 65, of our article. In 1984, Random House purchased the copyright to Fishbein's 1975 Addison-Wesley publication. Hence, the permission to print a copy of Fishbein's earlier model was obtained from Random House. We would also point out that on pp 68 and 69 of the article, we cited both of Fishbein's books, to which Dr Pugh referred in her letter.

*Bonnie Marie Ewald, RN, MS
Nursing Faculty
Glendale Community College
Glendale, Arizona*

*Carolyn Sara Roberts, RN, MS
Associate Professor
College of Nursing
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona*

CLARIFICATION

To the editor:

I would like to clarify one small but important point regarding my article, "Research Testing Nursing Theory: State of the Art" (*ANS* 9:1, October 1986). In my original manuscript, I wrote that the hand searches covered the period 1952-1985. The article was printed saying the searches covered the years 1952 to 1985. The hyphen usage was different from my past experience and from what I had intended. The search covered the inclusive

dates, that is, 1952 *through* 1985. This makes a one-year difference in the database discussed in the article.

Mary Silva, RN, PhD
Professor
School of Nursing
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

THEORY TESTING RESEARCH: METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

To the editor:

I read with great interest Silva's article "Research Testing Nursing Theory: State of the Art" in the October 1986 issue of *ANS*. I believe, however, that one methodological decision made by Silva requires some elaboration.

"State of the art" is defined in Webster's Dictionary as "the level of development (as a device, procedure, process, technique or science) reached at any particular time." The state of the art of theory-testing research, then, should reflect the level of development of all research that tests theory. Silva decided to include only published research, excluding all unpublished research, particularly doctoral dissertations and master's theses. It seems to me, however, that to obtain a complete perspective, a state of the art view, it is necessary to include both published and unpublished research. A large portion of the research being conducted in nursing is done by graduate students. To exclude their work in a review such as this minimizes their contribution to the knowledge base of the discipline.

One might argue that by including only published research in the review, a minimum standard of scientific rigor and merit is ensured. However, students completing dissertations and theses have departmental and university requirements that must be met and these help to ensure scientific acceptability, ie, merit and rigor. To me, there is a major differ-

ence between *unpublished* research and *unpublishable* research. Unpublishable research (scientifically unacceptable) is a small subset of the domain of unpublished research. Unfortunately, a great deal of scientifically acceptable research never gets into print, for a variety of reasons.

Silva probably realized (and rightly so) that to include unpublished research in her review would have been extremely difficult, if not impossible, to do. I know from personal experience how hard it is to obtain dissertations and theses. Dissertation abstracts are available in *Dissertation Abstracts International*, but acquiring the actual dissertations is expensive and time consuming. As for theses, no compilation of thesis titles exists that I am aware of, so the first step of identifying possible theses for review is essentially impossible. I can understand why Silva made the methodological decision to include only published research in her review. But understanding her decision does not fully address the issues that are apparent as a result of having read this review. Specifically, I think it is important to realize that this review is a limited view of the state of the art of theory-testing research and this should be made explicit. I would even venture that the title state of the art is not completely accurate.

A more generalized issue relates to the process of disseminating and communicating research results. While individual researchers have a responsibility to present research results, both orally and in published form, the larger professional community should focus more attention on how research reports are catalogued and accessed. A regularly published list of thesis and dissertation titles could be a beginning catalogue; easy accessibility could be achieved by establishing a national archive housing copies of all reports of research done by nurses. Sigma Theta Tau is planning a Center for Nursing Scholarship—maybe the center could serve as a central archival location. These are only two ideas—I