

---

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