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INTRODUCTION

The school foodservice program has expanded greatly over the past twenty years primarily because of federal involvement. As a result individuals working with school foodservice have to deal more with federal government now than ever before. The objective of school foodservice is based on the rationale that no school child should suffer from poor nutrition. While public policies are aimed at meeting public needs they often fall short of established goals. Data indicate that less than 50 per cent of the elementary and secondary school children participate in the program (1).

The failure of the program to meet the needs of the target population completely has been explained in a variety of ways. One possible explanation may be related to the attitudes of those administering the program toward the proper role of government in meeting the economic and social needs of its citizens. Another factor that may be related to program effectiveness is how those in administration perceive their roles as school foodservice directors. Recent data indicate that role perception may have an effect on job performance (2).

The overall objective of this research was to study relationships among administrative role perceptions, attitudes toward social equality and selected other social and political issues, and effectiveness of the school foodservice program. More specifically the objectives were:

a) to assess the level and type of program activity of school foodservice;

b) to measure program effectiveness by the degree to which certain activities and functions identified as components of a successful
school foodservice program were accomplished; and to study program effectiveness scores in relation to some of the demographic variables which included: present position, number of years in position, school district city size, education level, and major in college;

c) to study organizational role descriptions by measuring the importance school foodservice directors attached and the time they devoted to various nutrition and administrative position elements; and to study these ratings in relation to present position, years in position, school district city size, education level and major in college;

d) to measure selected political and social attitudes of school foodservice directors in relation to economic status, geographic region, city size of residence, age, and education level;

e) to measure the degree of political activity and interest of school foodservice directors in relation to economic status, geographic region, education level, and group activity; and

f) to relate measures of political and social attitudes and political activity to school foodservice program effectiveness.

It was hypothesized that those school foodservice directors who were more liberal in their attitudes towards social welfare issues would have a more effective foodservice program. Literature reviewed relative to the study included: history, development and current status of school foodservice, political behavior, and role theory.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

School Foodservice

History and Development

Prior to government involvement in the school foodservice program, provisions for school lunch began as private charities in a few major cities--New York, Boston, Philadelphia. The objective was "to feed the hungry" (4).

In 1904, the economic and social effects of poverty-induced hunger among the nation's school children were first pointed out by Hunter in his book Poverty. Hunter's focus on hunger influenced the United States efforts to feed its needy school children (5). Extensive school lunch service was begun by the Women's Educational and Industrial Union in Boston in 1908. During that same year New York also began school feeding. The program attempted to provide one-third of a child's daily required nourishment (6). During this early period school lunch programs moved slowly from urban to rural areas because public funds were not available and the intensity of the poverty problems was less in rural areas (7).

During the depression of the early thirties the Federal Employment Relief Agency was authorized to distribute surplus food to the destitute school children (8). At this time the federal government stepped into the school lunch program and funds were appropriated by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in 1932. These funds paid for the labor for the preparation of lunches in several southwestern Missouri towns. By 1934 this funding was expanded to thirty-nine states (9). In 1935 the purchase and distribution of food commodities for school lunch were authorized (7).
Legislative Background

The National School Act, passed in 1946 by the 79th Congress, gave the school lunch program permanent status within the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) (7). The purpose of the National Lunch was defined as follows:

It is hereby declared to be the policy of congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States through grants-in-aid and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of nonprofit school lunch programs (10).

The National School Lunch Act has been amended numerous times since 1946. Poverty moved into the spotlight again in the 1960's which brought more legislation. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 allowed for programs for pre-school children in the Head Start program. In 1965 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act allocated funds to be used for school foodservices in deprived areas (10). This expansion of the school foodservice program opened new eras in child nutrition programs and brought benefits to more needy children (11).

The Child Nutrition Act, enacted in 1966, launched a two year pilot breakfast program. Primary consideration was given to schools with large ratios of children from areas where poor economic conditions existed and to those with a substantial proportion of the children traveling long distances to school (12). The program was reinforced again in 1970 by Public Law 91-248 which allowed every child from a low income family the right to a meal at school (13). This legislation represented a milestone in increasing school lunch participation. The number of children receiving free or reduced priced lunches increased from two million in 1968 to 11.5 million in 1976 (13).
During 1971 the United States Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs suggested changes in funding for the program to deal with increased demands brought about by greater participation (14). An increase in reimbursement from 8 to 10 cents, with a 45 cent average for free lunches was enacted in 1973 by Public Law 93-150 (15). This law provided an escalator clause which required USDA to assign reimbursement rates in relation to increased food costs.

In October of 1975 permanent authorization was given to the School Breakfast Program through Public Law 94-105. The legislation called for breakfast to be made available in all schools where it was needed to provide adequate nutrition for school children (16).

Participation

The national school foodservice program was reported by USDA in 1976 as the largest single foodservice in the United States. However, while the program serves approximately twenty-five million students per day, only 50 per cent of the 80 per cent of the children who have access to the program participate in school lunch (1).

One possible cause for low participation has been attributed to increases in price per meal. While there has been an increase in the number of children eligible for free and reduced priced meals, the lack of distribution in a non-discriminatory manner also has been indicated as a reason for low participation among these students. In some schools children eligible for free or low cost meals were singled out and labeled as "welfare recipients" (17, 18).

In an effort to improve participation among the needy Project ANSER (Advancement of Nutrition Service Education Research) suggested the use of
media to educate the community that the school lunch program is available to all children. It was also suggested that payments be established at a level affordable to most parents (19).

USDA interviewed secondary students in an attitude study in twenty schools across the nation. Students were interviewed in both high and low participation schools. Factors listed as affecting participation were: portion sizes, student's desire to be treated as customers, time permitted at lunch, involvement in menu planning, and choices offered (20).

In a study conducted in five urban secondary schools in Montreal, Martineau (21) concluded that attitudes towards school lunch are determined by external factors. These factors include: socio-economic levels, cafeteria environment, and class level in school.

The USDA Food and Nutrition Service (22) also has suggested that not only should personal preferences be considered in menu planning for school lunch but that regional and cultural preferences also should be considered. Further suggestions for increasing participation have been made by various school foodservices across the nation. Some of the ideas for increasing participation include: conducting a student poll of those not participating to find out why, offering "grab bag lunches," selling a combination breakfast and lunch ticket, and lowering the price of Type A lunches (23).

Student Involvement

Chegwidden (24) indicated that student involvement in school lunch has been a positive approach to increasing participation and reducing plate waste. Students can be involved in a variety of ways. Garrett (25) found that student selected menus increased school lunch participation as well as decreased plate waste.
USDA conducted a study in a Georgia county high school in an attempt to provide methods for improving lunchroom experiences. One suggestion was to involve students in the lunch program through the organization of a Student Nutrition Council. These students were involved in Nutrition Week activities and in improving cafeteria environment (26).

Lewis (27) reported that participation in a high school in Florida was increased by involving students in a cafeteria committee. Ideas for improving the cafeteria were transmitted to the School Foodservice Committee which was made up of the principal, the cafeteria manager, a teacher, a guidance counselor, and a student representative. Other suggestions cited for student involvement include: involving home economics students with cafeteria staff in learning about quantity food cookery, students decorating the cafeteria, and involving students in planning a promotional campaign for school lunch (23).

Nutritional Contribution

The school lunch menu is based on the Type A pattern. The nutrient standards for this pattern are defined by USDA and require that one-third of the recommended daily allowances (RDA) for children nine to twelve years be provided (28, 29).

Various studies have been conducted on the nutrient content of Type A lunches. In 1966, 300 schools in nineteen states were surveyed to obtain data to evaluate the nutritional content of Type A lunches. Results indicated some differences in lunches served. The majority met one-third of the recommended daily allowances for protein and calcium but the nutritional goal was not met for food energy, iron, and magnesium (30-33). From an analysis of lunches in twenty-one schools in North Carolina, Head et
al. (34) reported that fat provided 43 per cent of the calories in school lunches while all meals were inadequate in calories and low in ascorbic acid and iron. In another study Murphy et al. (30) concluded that the Type A lunch pattern exceeded the values for Vitamin A, thiamine, riboflavin, Vitamin D, niacin, and Vitamin B₁₂ required to meet the nutritional goal.

Studies indicate that children who participate in the school food-service program consume a more nutritionally adequate meal than those who bring their lunch or eat away from school (35). A Massachusetts study (36, 37) indicated that two-thirds of the children who did not eat a Type A lunch consumed an inadequate lunch compared to 28 per cent of those who participated in the lunch program.

In the Ten State Nutrition Survey (38, 39), which focused on the nutritional status of low income families, results indicated that school lunches supplied 20 to 50 per cent of calorie, calcium, iron, and vitamin A intakes of children 10-16 years of age. Participation in school lunch and breakfast was credited with far superior health status of children in a Mexican-American community in Texas, as compared to the status of children in other low income communities in the survey. None of the children had low hemoglobin or serum vitamin C levels, only 6 per cent were low in plasma vitamin A, and the condition of their teeth was reported the best examined in the state.

The White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health (40) concluded that the Type A pattern did not meet the nutritional needs and food preferences of the students. This conclusion was based on the results of a nationwide survey conducted by USDA. The conference recommended that a thorough study be conducted of children not reached by current child feeding programs in relation to nutritional status, location, economic status,
and race. A cost-effectiveness study of the various systems and techniques of delivering food to children with special emphasis on the cost of food-service to schools with no facilities also was recommended. The conference further suggested a study of the relative importance of school breakfasts and lunches for different age and socioeconomic groups in relation to school achievement, IQ, health status, physical capacity, and social behavior.

Determinants of Political Behavior

The preceding discussion clearly indicates that government and the political process are an integral part of the school foodservice program. Feeding school children is public policy. But passing legislation does not ensure its success nor does any law contain all the necessary components for its implementation. It will ultimately have to be carried out by local public employees—in this case school foodservice directors. Those individuals administering bring to their jobs social and political orientations which may affect the quality and success of the program. Political orientations and behavior are the results of various factors of background and experience. Political orientations are correlated to a variety of factors including education, sex, age, region, and party identification.

Education

Studies indicate that better educated people have a stronger sense of duty to participate in politics (41). They are better informed, more likely to vote and have a higher sense of political efficacy (42). Political efficacy is the extent to which an individual feels he has an effect on the political world (43). Not only are the educated more efficacious
and informed about politics, they are also more liberal and more tolerant of change (44, 45). Educational groups differ considerably in their perception of political questions. The college educated are more apt to consider particular issues in broader more abstract terms. Since political life does in part deal with remote abstractions, the more educated possess the cognitive capacities to comprehend the relationship between the welfare of a particular individual and the well-being of a nation (46). Feldman and Newcomb (47) found that from the freshman to the senior year in college there is a decline in authoritarianism, dogmatism and prejudice and a decrease in conservative attitudes toward public issues.

In a study of federal bureaucrats Wynia (48) concluded that those bureaucrats employed by the agency were in favor of government involvement in housing had an educational level of sixteen years or more, while those with a lower education level were less in favor of government involvement. Results from issue positions of the 1974 election indicate that while those individuals with some college education are less in favor of guaranteed jobs than those with no college education, they are more in favor of health insurance and aid to minorities (49).

Sex

One of the most substantiated findings in social science is that men are more likely to participate in politics than women. Almond and Verba (44) found women to be especially low in political interest and somewhat more candidate oriented than men. Sex differences are most apparent at the lower socio-economic levels; as education and economic status improve the differences disappear. A 1972 Harris Poll (50) indicated that nearly 3/4 (71%) of the women and more than 2/3 (68%) of the men felt that women are
more sensitive to the poor and underprivileged than men are. When asked which aspects of government spending they would like to see cut least or receive additional funds more women than men mentioned education, poverty programs, and welfare spending.

Age

Age also is related to political activity and orientation. Numerous studies indicate that political participation rises gradually with age, peaks in the late 30's, levels off in the 40's and 50's, then gradually declines after the age of 60 (41). Lower activity in younger adults is the result of the distractions that they are faced with such as: marriage, family, career, and school. These distractions tend to draw attention away from political issues (51). Results from the 1972 election indicate that while the overall voter turnout has declined the highest participation among voters was in the 35 to 64 year age group (41). Age also influences political opinions, Linski (52) found that the biggest divergence in political opinion is between those under 30 and over 50. Studies indicate that those under 30 tend to be more trusting of government benefits for all. Those over 50, as can be anticipated, tended to be more in favor of medical assistance (42, 53).

Geographic Factors

Rural men and women are less likely to become politically active than urban persons because of their greater distance from the center of political activity. Urban environments provide far greater stimuli to politics than rural settings. The urban citizen interacts with a larger number of groups of people with whom they can identify; also the potential for influence is greater (54).
Size of community is also a factor in participation, with larger communities showing higher rate of participation than smaller cities and towns. Political opinion is influenced by geographic factors. Those living in cities with a population of 500,000 and over tend to be more liberal than those living in smaller cities (55). Regional differences are also important. In general southerners are considered to be less willing to voice their opinions concerning political issues than those from other areas of the country (56). Concerning the issue of government providing jobs and benefits for all results from a 1971 Gallup Poll (58) indicate that those in agreement with the statement tended to live in the northeast and west. Nie et al. (41) concluded that in general those individuals living in the north tended to be more liberal than those from the south.

Socio-Economic Status

There is significantly more political activity at the high and middle income level than there is at the low income level. People of high income are more apt to vote, do party work, join a political organization, attend meetings and try to persuade voters to adopt their political viewpoints. Studies by Lane (57) indicate that people of higher occupational status are more likely to participate in politics than people in lower status occupations. According to Dawson (42) the most significant difference towards government's role in welfare and economic issues is seen between the professional-business people and the unskilled workers. The professional-business people are less favorable towards government involvement (48). Results from the Survey Research Center, University of Michigan (55), indicate the professional-business people were less in favor of government insuring job equality than the unskilled worker.
Cognitions, Beliefs, and Political Attitudes

One measure of political awareness can be seen in the accuracy of one's political knowledge, the variety of issues in which opinions are held and the ability to conceive a political philosophy from these relationships. Substantial correlations have been found between a person's cognitive knowledge and belief about politics and political participation. The greater the knowledge the greater the likelihood of participation (41).

Anomie, cynicism, and alienation are personal traits which attract negative feelings about the environment and government. Hence, persons possessing them are less likely to participate politically (57). According to studies educational attainment is an effective measure against anomie (47). Cynicism and alienation cause a more severe rejection of politics. Persons of high economic status and high educational achievement are less likely to develop negative attitudes about politics. Generally people who believe in their own political efficacy tend to engage in more discussion about an election and vote more often (43, 48). Nie et al. (42) concluded similar results in a national survey. However, there has been a decrease in political efficacy when measured by the statement "government officials care what people like me think." In 1973, 56 per cent responded negatively. This figure doubled from the 1956 figures. Political interest has also dropped from 23 per cent. This decrease may reflect the turbulence of the 1960's and the disillusionment over the Watergate scandals.

Organizational Membership

People who are involved in social organizations are less likely to have feelings of alienation from society and politics. Organizational memberships and group activities are conducive to political participation.
(43). The organization itself, especially if it involves public policy areas, motivates its members to become politically involved (53). Consequently, organizational membership and community involvement for some persons may be a manifestation of feelings of self-confidence, self-esteem, efficacy, and faith in people and institutions (59, 60).

Party Identification

Party identification is another agent affecting political opinion. Republicans have been cited as being traditionally less favorable towards unemployment benefits and expansion of social security; while Democrats are generally more in favor of expanding government programs (40, 54).

Role Theory

Definition

The concept of role relates to the activities of an individual in a particular position (61). Newcomb stated that role behavior is affected by motivation and individual perception and is unique to each individual. According to Linton (62) roles are learned on the basis of status either current or anticipated. A role is considered to be an aspect of a status. Individuals will perform a role in order to occupy a certain status. Merton (63) further suggested that each social status involves not a single role but an array of roles.

Role is referred to as a set of behaviors which are expected of everyone in a particular position (64). Newcomb also contended that some of the factors which make up individuals' personalities are expressed in all of their roles. The concept of self and role have been linked to socialization—role is considered as the independent variable and self as the
dependent variable (68). According to Backman and Secord (65) the occupation of a role category by individuals defines their behavior and the behavior of others toward them. O'Dowd and Beardsley (67) concluded that individuals prefer occupations commonly associated with personality characteristics most like their own and role selection is guided by the way an individual perceives himself.

Role Perception and Role Expectation

Kast and Rosenzweig (64) stated that accuracy in role perception has an impact on the effectiveness of the employee's performance in the organization. While individuals have certain abilities and are motivated in varying degrees, if a task to be performed within a given role is perceived inaccurately this will result in ineffectiveness for the organization. In a study conducted in nine government research and development organizations located in the southwest, Miles (2) found that the degree of role ambiguity in role perception was directly related to personal and job outcomes which included: job related tension, job satisfaction, attitudes towards role senders, and perceived performance effectiveness. It was suggested that these results indicate that role perception may be critical to organizational performance and behavior.

In a study conducted in a college housing and foodservice division Haga et al. (66) concluded that managers who are professionally oriented view their roles differently from those who are less professionally oriented. High professional managers behave quite differently from their low professional counterparts in the areas of performing above expected levels, being more involved in their jobs, and seeking task assignments outside of their organizational roles. Newcomb et al. (68) summarized that
individuals are most attracted to those organizational roles where their worth is given a high value and are least attracted to those organizational roles where little value is given by others.

Most individuals are faced with a wide variety of role expectations. The problems concerning relations between roles exist both intrapersonally and interpersonally (69). According to Goode (70) when individuals are confronted with a variety of roles they may conform completely in one direction and will be unable to fulfill the obligations in another. Goode further stated that generally, the individual will perform in all roles to accomplish whatever is required to meet the needs of society. But many times an individual cannot fully satisfy all demands and will move through a sequence of role decisions and bargains. In order to reduce the strain a person will demand as much as possible from others and perform as little as possible.
METHODOLOGY

Development of the Instrument

Initial Development and Pretest

A preliminary instrument with ninety-eight items was developed and distributed to a select group for review. In compiling items related to the school foodservice operations, a district-level director was consulted to determine the type of data collected and the records maintained to comply with government regulations. Items pertaining to role description and social-psychological and political attitudes were adapted from various measures used in other studies (55, 71, 72).

Personal interviews were held with the review group for conceptualizing other issues related to the study and for review of the preliminary instrument. The review group consisted of two Washington, D.C., legislative consultants with extensive experience working with government food programs; a director of a Washington, D.C., community action group; two state school foodservice directors; and a director of a large metropolitan school district foodservice division.

Based on the interviews several revisions were made in the instrument. The first section was expanded to include additional questions concerning program status and a section pertaining to program activities was added. The review group suggested condensing the section on social equality and deleting several very sensitive questions.

For pretesting and further review the instrument was distributed to a selected sample of six district-level and state school foodservice
directors. It also was distributed for re-evaluation to the three
directors in the review group. Minor revisions were made in the first
section of the instrument to simplify the form. Some of the questions
concerning social and political attitudes were deleted to shorten the
instrument because several respondents commented on the length. Copies of
correspondence from this developmental phase are included in Appendix A.

Research Instrument

The final research instrument was printed in booklet form with the
first page printed on official letterhead indicating the title of the study
and identifying the sponsor. Appendix B includes a copy of the final
instrument. The instrument was comprised of five sections:

Section I. The first portion consisted of twenty-five items relating
to biographical and demographic information and school foodservice program
data. Several biographical items were those cited as having relevance to
political and social attitudes: sex, age, education, political party
identification, and salary level. Other information requested included:
geographic location and size of childhood community, and geographic loca-
tion and size of present community. Questions pertaining to the director's
employment were: present position and number of years in present position
in school foodservice. This section of the instrument also included ques-
tions concerning program status: types of programs served in the school
district, number of operating days, number of economically needy in the
district, total labor hours for a given month, total number of foodservice
employees, and types and number of meals served to students and adults.

Section II. The sixteen items in the second section of the instrument
provided a description of the organizational role of the respondents.
Fourteen items were adapted from the instrument used by Vaden (71) in her research with school foodservice directors. These statements were developed to measure descriptions of organizational role in relation to administrative and nutrition education aspects of the school foodservice director's position. Importance and time ratings were developed to provide a basis for assessment of various position elements. Two questions were added to this section related to responsibilities for layout and design and school foodservice education.

**Section III.** The eighteen items in the third part of the instrument consisted of a listing of activities and functions identified as components of a successful school foodservice program. These items were designed from interviews and from reports in the literature (73, 74). A Likert-type scale was used for response categories to indicate the degree of activity.

**Section IV.** Twenty-four items comprised Section IV and were related to social and political attitudes. Items were selected from various measures of attitudes toward social welfare and political issues (55, 72). Appendix C details the specific sources for each of the items. The agree-disagree response categories used for most items were expanded to a four-point Likert-type scale: strongly agree, agree, disagree, strongly disagree.

**Section V.** The fifth section of the instrument included sixteen items related to political efficacy, political activity, and political interest. These items also were adapted from measures used in other studies (55, Appendix C).

**Study Sample**

The sample for the study was selected from two sections (Sections 2 and 3) of the membership listings of the American School Foodservice...
Association (ASFSA). These two sections include members who are classified as district-level school foodservice directors. The sample was chosen from ASFSA because it is the only professional association for school foodservice personnel. The listings of school foodservice directors are available only from ASFSA.

The population (N = 3,399) included the major city school foodservice directors (N = 233) in Section 3 and the district directors from smaller cities, counties, or school districts in Section 2 (N = 3,166). The sample was comprised of all major city directors and an approximate 50 per cent random sample (N = 1,467) from Section 2. Because of the length of the questionnaire, the sensitivity of many of the questions, and the wide national distribution of the sample, a low rate of return was expected; therefore a large sample was selected. The Section 2 listing was numbered sequentially and the sample randomly selected using a computer generated table of random numbers.

Distribution of Research Instrument

The research instrument, a cover letter explaining the study, and a statement of informed consent were sent to each person in the sample (Appendix D). The informed consent statement was included to insure confidentiality of the responses and anonymity to the participants. A self-addressed envelope with prepaid postage to facilitate return of the questionnaire also was included. Three weeks following the initial mailing a follow-up mailing which included an additional cover letter (Appendix D), a self-addressed envelope, and an additional questionnaire were sent to a random sample (N = 800) of non-respondents (N = 1,241).
Data Analyses

Criterion measures for the study were listed in Table 1. Scores were computed for each of the variables listed. These scores were used for studying effects of biographical data and for studying interrelationships among criterion measures.

Frequency distributions were compiled for data related to program size and employment in school foodservice. Percentage participation in the school lunch program was computed from attendance data and number of meals served (% participation = number of meals served per day ÷ number of students in attendance).

Analyses of Program Effectiveness

Frequency distributions were compiled for individual items that comprised Section III related to program effectiveness. A program effectiveness score was computed as indicated in Table 1. Analyses of variance were used to study differences in the mean scores among groups defined by present position, number of years in position, school district city size, education, and major in college (75, 76).

Analyses of Role Description Data

Mean ratings were computed for position elements in Section III of the questionnaire. Two ratings were computed for each position element: an importance rating and a time rating. Five scores were computed using the ratings of the position elements as shown in Table 1: nutrition activity importance and time rating scores, administrative activity importance and time rating scores, and relative importance of nutrition activity score. These scores were studied in relation to the variables as defined for studying program effectiveness scores.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Criterion variables of study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>scores</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>program effectiveness score (Prgeff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role description scores:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. nutrition activity--importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nut I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. nutrition activity--time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nut T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. administrative activity--importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adm I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. administrative activity--time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Adm T)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. relative importance of nutrition activity (Rel I)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socio-political scores:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. factor scores as derived by analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. political involvement (PI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. community-political interest (CPI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>item 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civic or local association</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyses of Social-Political Attitudes and Activities

Factor analysis was used to develop scores from the social-political attitude items in Section IV and items 1-5 in Section V (77). Coefficient alpha was used to study reliability of the resulting factors (78). Intercorrelations were computed among the scores to study relative independence of the factors (75, 76).

Analyses of variance were used to study effects of various biographical and demographical variables on the factor scores: geographic area and size of childhood community, education, age, and political party identification (75, 76).

Frequency distributions also were compiled for items related to political activity and community political interest. Two scores were computed to study effects of biographical and demographical variables, a political involvement score and a community-political interest score (Table 1). Differences in mean scores were studied among groups defined by political party identification, age, and income using analyses of variance (75, 76).

Interrelationships among Criterion Measures

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to identify predictors of program effectiveness (76). Independent variables in the equation were nutrition and administrative importance and time rating scores, social-political factor scores, political involvement score, and community-political interest score. The dependent variable was the program effectiveness score.
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Description of the Sample

Research instruments were returned from 767 school foodservice directors or 45.1 per cent of the sample. Thirty-four were not used in the data analysis because of late return or incomplete or incorrect completion. A few were from individuals no longer employed in school foodservice.

The resultant sample (N=733) was composed of 586 district foodservice directors, 134 district level foodservice staff, and four district level staff other than foodservice (Table 2). Approximately half of the respondents had been in their present position for eight or more years and 35.2 per cent, for three to seven years. Over half had been employed in school foodservice for eight or more years. Over 50 per cent of the respondents were fifty years of age or older and 22 per cent were between 40-49 years. A large majority of the respondents were female (87.2 per cent).

Contrary to national norms of party identification (42), 40 per cent of the sample were identified as Republicans and an additional 41.5 per cent were identified as Democrats. The remaining 18.4 per cent indicated they were either Independents or identified with a party other than the two major political parties.

Almost three-fourths of the respondents had been raised in small cities or rural areas. Twenty-nine per cent of the respondents spent the majority of their childhood in the midwest; 29 per cent, in the northeast; and 23 per cent, in the southeast.
Table 2: Characteristics of study sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>characteristic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>present position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district foodservice director</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district-level foodservice staff</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>years in present position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years or less</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7 years</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years or more</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>years employed in school foodservice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years or less</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7 years</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>age group</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29 years old</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years old</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years old</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years old</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>87.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>party identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Total N = 733; N is given for each item because of nonresponses on some questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size of childhood community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big city (over 150,000)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium city (25,000-150,000)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city (2,500-25,000)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural community (less than 2,500)</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic area of childhood community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School district, city size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big city (over 150,000)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium city (25,000-150,000)</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small city (2,500-25,000)</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural community (less than 2,500)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic area of present residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midwest</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed grade school</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed high school</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended college but did not complete degree</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed associate degree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed bachelor's degree</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed master's degree</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>characteristic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>major for bachelor's degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dietetics, foods and nutrition, or institutional management</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home economics education</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elementary or secondary education</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business administration</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational administration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major for master's degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dietetics, foods and nutrition, or institutional management</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home economics education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elementary or secondary education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>business administration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational administration</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background in nutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>94.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional association memberships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American School Foodservice Association</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>99.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Dietetic Association</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society for Nutrition Education</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association for School Business Officials</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Education Association</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Home Economics Association</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta Kappa Gamma</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual salary level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000-6,999</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000-8,999</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000-10,999</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000-12,999</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,000-14,999</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,999</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 20,000</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approximately 44 per cent of the subjects were employed in a small city while 47 per cent were employed in a medium-size or large city. Approximately 26 per cent of the respondents lived in the northeast, 20 per cent in the southeast and 16 per cent in the southwest. The remaining 38 per cent were divided among other geographic regions.

Over half of the respondents had completed college. Dietetics or a closely related field was the major for the bachelor's degree for almost 50 per cent of the sample; 35.9 per cent majored in home economics education. Of the 17.3 per cent with a master's degree, 41.9 per cent majored in dietetics or a related field. Almost all of the respondents reported they had taken a nutrition course at some time.

A number of respondents reported memberships in several associations other than ASFSA. The Association of School Business Officials and The American Dietetic Association were the other organizations listed most frequently. Salary levels varied widely; e.g., 31.8 per cent reported salaries of $15,000 and over whereas, 23.3 per cent reported salaries less than $9,000.

School Foodservice Program Status

The data reported for several items related to program size and employment were incomplete for a number of questionnaires; also, data appeared not to be accurate for several others. Therefore, these items were eliminated from the analyses.

The size of the school districts varied widely. Average daily student attendance in March, 1976, was the measure used for district size because this was a month described as "average" by directors consulted in
design of the study. The smallest average daily student attendance reported was 300 and the largest, almost 2.7 million.

The average number of meals served per day to students among districts during the month of March, 1976, was 7,459; 44.3 per cent of which were free and reduced-price meals. However, this percentage varied widely. Because of the number of directors who failed to report the number of meals served during the month of March, it was not possible to compute an accurate percentage participation in the lunch program. The mean number of operating days for the month of March, 1976, for lunch and breakfast was 21. Breakfast was served in at least a portion of the schools in 294 (or 40 per cent) of the districts. One third of the districts had closed campus policies during the noon hour; only 15.6 per cent reported open campus policies for all or most schools in their districts and 28.4 per cent had open campus policies at secondary schools only.

Almost 40 per cent of the directors reported that no other programs were served other than lunch and/or breakfast for grades K-12 (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>program served</th>
<th>N (^1)</th>
<th>% (^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>day care</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meals-on-wheels</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group feeding for elderly</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Number of districts servicing the program.

\(^2\)% of total sample (N = 733) servicing program.
The program served by the largest number of districts was Head Start. Only 11.2 per cent of the districts were providing food for congregate meals for the elderly.

**Description of Program Activities**

Program effectiveness was described by the degree to which activities and functions identified as components of a successful school foodservice program were accomplished. Item analyses (Table 4) indicated that the use of standardized recipes was listed most frequently by the directors as a regular activity. However, this measure did not provide a qualitative assessment of the recipes used.

Other activities reported as regularly performed by at least 50 per cent or more of the directors were: checking plate waste, on the job training for employees, scheduling staff meetings, checking food temperatures, and providing choice in luncheon items. Those activities which were performed rarely or only occasionally by 50 per cent or more of the directors were related to nutrition education activities, such as involving students in menu planning, working with teachers on nutrition projects, in-service training for teachers on nutrition, arranging class tours, and conducting classes for students on nutrition education.

Analyses of the program effectiveness mean scores (score = the sum of scores on individual items) indicated significant differences in relation to school district city size. The mean score was significantly higher for foodservice programs in medium and big cities than in small cities and rural areas (Table 5). The score also was significantly higher for the group of directors who had completed college than for those who did not hold bachelor's degrees. Although the education of the director was not
Table 4: Extent of school foodservice program activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>activity</th>
<th>rarely</th>
<th>occasionally</th>
<th>regularly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>involve students in menu planning</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obtain student evaluations or reactions to food service</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involve students in testing new food products and/or recipes</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide choice in luncheon items</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sponsor special events or feature days for students</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suggest source materials to teachers for use in a class unit on nutrition education</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conduct classes for students on nutrition education</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrange class tours of foodservice facilities</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work with teachers on tasting experiences or food preparation in classrooms</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work with teachers on nutrition projects, etc.</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>become involved in in-service training sessions on nutrition for teachers</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provide on the job training for employees</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>check plate waste</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use standardized recipes</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>activity</th>
<th>extensiveness of activity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schedule staff meetings with supervisors and/or managers</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>check temperatures of foods served</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>activity</th>
<th>all or most schools</th>
<th>secondary schools only</th>
<th>only a few schools or none</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sponsor student foodservice advisory council</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N varies from 664 to 726.
Table 5: School foodservice program effectiveness scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>mean and s.d.</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>present position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district foodservice directors</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>34.17 ± 6.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district foodservice staff</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>34.05 ± 6.1</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years in position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years or less</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>33.00 ± 6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-7 years</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>34.17 ± 5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years or more</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>34.30 ± 6.4</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>school district, city size</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big city</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>35.76 ± 6.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium city</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>34.95 ± 5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small city or rural community</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>33.0 ± 6.4</td>
<td>12.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not a college graduate</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>32.57 ± 7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed college</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>35.03 ± 5.4</td>
<td>25.69***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>major in college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dietetics or related area</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>35.14 ± 5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home economics education</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>35.13 ± 6.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>34.57 ± 5.5</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Analysis of variance with LSD procedure for comparison of differences among means. Lines between means indicate significant differences among groups at .05 level.

* P ≤ .05  
** P ≤ .01  
*** P ≤ .001
studied by size of district, it is presumed that the directors in the larger cities were more often better educated; therefore, these data may be reflecting similar groups.

Description of Organizational Role

Organizational role descriptions indicated the importance attached to various position elements by the school foodservice directors and also, the estimated time devoted to these various activities. The five scores computed using the ratings on the position elements were studied from various perspectives. The scores were nutrition activity importance and time rating, administrative activity importance and time rating, and relative importance of nutrition activity.

Of the seven nutrition-related position elements used to compute the nutrition activity score, five were identified as primarily nutrition education (items 5, 7, 9, 10, 13). The other two were labeled nutrition education-related (items 1, 6). Item analyses of these seven items (Table 6) indicated that ratings on items 1 and 6 ranked highest on importance and time. These two items dealt with menu planning activities which the directors apparently saw as more related to their jobs than the items solely concerned with nutrition education activities.

The remaining nine items were administrative-related position elements (items 2-4, 8, 11, 12, 14-16). The administrative scores were computed from ratings on the seven items used in Vaden's study (71) (items 15, 16 were excluded). Items 2, 11, and 12 of the administrative activities were found to rank the highest on the importance ratings; whereas items 2, 4, and 12 were highest on time ratings. The management of human and financial resources apparently was the primary concern of the directors; while record
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item number</th>
<th>position element</th>
<th>importance rating(^2) mean and s.d.</th>
<th>time rating(^3) mean and s.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nutrition related</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>suggesting menu ideas which have special nutritional merit</td>
<td>3.30 ± .86</td>
<td>1.91 ± .85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>preparing and presenting information about sound nutrition practices to laymen (parents, children, etc.)</td>
<td>2.58 ± 1.03</td>
<td>1.37 ± .67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>approving foodservice menus to maintain nutritional balance and menu variety</td>
<td>3.57 ± .74</td>
<td>2.13 ± .90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>enlisting interest and cooperation of students in developing sound nutritional practices</td>
<td>2.83 ± 1.02</td>
<td>1.36 ± .65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>providing training regarding the role of foodservice employees in nutrition education</td>
<td>2.87 ± 1.0</td>
<td>1.58 ± .80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>developing material for use in nutritional education programs</td>
<td>2.41 ± 1.05</td>
<td>1.29 ± .62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>obtaining support of school personnel, parents, or other adults for promoting sound nutritional habits among students</td>
<td>2.83 ± 1.03</td>
<td>1.41 ± .69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Refers to item number in research instrument.

\(^2\)Scale = 1, minor importance to 4, very important.

\(^3\)Scale = 1, less than 2 hrs./wk. to 4, 10 or more hrs./wk.

N varies from 606 to 733.
Table 6: (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item number</th>
<th>position element</th>
<th>importance rating mean and s.d.</th>
<th>time rating mean and s.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>budgetary detail (keeping funds and accounts straight, reimbursing schools, etc.)</td>
<td>3.41 ± .90</td>
<td>2.72 ± 1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>commodity food detail (receiving, handling, distributing commodity foods)</td>
<td>3.06 ± .97</td>
<td>1.83 ± .89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>other administrative detail (record keeping, making reports, etc.)</td>
<td>3.32 ± .80</td>
<td>2.87 ± 1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>process aspects of foodservice (establishing and controlling policies and procedures for preparing and disbursing meals, cleaning up, etc.)</td>
<td>3.25 ± .85</td>
<td>2.28 ± 1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>personnel management (staffing, in-service training, obtaining substitutes, resolving disputes or grievances among foodservice personnel)</td>
<td>3.38 ± .85</td>
<td>2.43 ± 1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>food purchasing (including negotiating with suppliers)</td>
<td>3.45 ± .82</td>
<td>2.55 ± 1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>public information and relations (including dealing with special interest groups)</td>
<td>2.51 ± 1.03</td>
<td>1.31 ± .63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>writing equipment specifications, planning kitchens, etc.</td>
<td>2.77 ± 1.10</td>
<td>1.42 ± .74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>promoting school foodservice education</td>
<td>2.98 ± 1.05</td>
<td>1.50 ± .81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
keeping ranked high on the time rating. This may be a result of the vast amount of record keeping required of school foodservice directors by the governmental regulations.

Significant differences were found on importance scores for nutrition activity, administrative activity, and relative importance of nutrition activity in relation to administrative roles (Table 7). The mean scores for the district foodservice directors were significantly higher than for district foodservice staff other than directors on nutrition activity and administrative activity importance scores. However, the district staff scored higher on the relative importance score. Although the directors scored higher on both aspects of their organizational role; the district staff saw nutrition activities as relatively more important than administrative activities. This was not surprising since the directors have the ultimate responsibility for total administration of the school foodservice program.

Significant differences on nutrition and administrative activity scores were found among directors from various sizes of cities and communities. Directors from small and medium cities and rural communities rated nutrition activities as significantly more important; perhaps reflecting that these directors can become more involved in nutrition education than those in big cities. The administrative scores may be higher for directors from smaller districts because they may not have support personnel to whom they can delegate some of the tasks and therefore, they personally must assume the responsibilities.

Persons with home economics education as their college major rated nutrition-related activities as significantly more important than did those majoring in dietetics or other disciplines. The reason for this finding
Table 7: Nutrition and administrative activity scores for groups defined by present position, years in position, school district size, education, and college major

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Nutrition Activity Score</th>
<th>Administrative Activity Score</th>
<th>Relative Importance Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Importance Rating</td>
<td>Time Rating</td>
<td>Importance Rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N mean and s.d. F</td>
<td></td>
<td>N mean and s.d. F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Position:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district foodservice director</td>
<td>492 20.6±4.2</td>
<td>450 11.0±3.4</td>
<td>497 22.8±3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district foodservice staff</td>
<td>99 19.3±5.8</td>
<td>91 11.2±3.0</td>
<td>95 20.3±4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Position:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 years or less</td>
<td>103 20.0±5.0</td>
<td>103 11.0±3.3</td>
<td>102 22.0±3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–7 years</td>
<td>210 19.8±4.8</td>
<td>196 11.0±3.4</td>
<td>215 21.8±3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years or more</td>
<td>286 20.8±5.1</td>
<td>249 10.9±3.2</td>
<td>284 22.9±3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District, City Size:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big city</td>
<td>95 18.8±5.4</td>
<td>90 10.0±2.9</td>
<td>96 20.8±4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium city</td>
<td>187 20.4±5.0</td>
<td>170 11.0±3.6</td>
<td>186 22.0±4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small city or rural community</td>
<td>293 20.0±4.7</td>
<td>270 11.0±3.2</td>
<td>295 23.0±3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not a college graduate</td>
<td>185 20.8±4.9</td>
<td>169 11.2±3.3</td>
<td>189 23.0±3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completed college</td>
<td>366 20.0±5.0</td>
<td>343 10.8±3.3</td>
<td>367 21.9±4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major in College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dietetics or related area</td>
<td>178 19.9±5.3</td>
<td>167 11.0±3.3</td>
<td>178 21.6±4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home economics</td>
<td>135 21.1±4.5</td>
<td>121 11.2±3.6</td>
<td>128 22.4±4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>52 18.4±4.3</td>
<td>53 10.0±2.9</td>
<td>57 21.7±3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Analysis of variance with LSD procedure for comparison of differences among means. Lines between means indicates significant differences among groups at .05 level.

* P ≤ .05   ** P ≤ .01   *** P ≤ .001
may be that the nutrition education activities are consonant with the educational background of the home economics educators and they may be more comfortable with the role. This also would explain the higher relative importance score of this group.

Social and Political Attitudes and Activities of School Foodservice Directors

Factor Analysis of Social Political Items

The factor analysis was done to determine if the items relating to social and political attitudes could be meaningfully conceptualized by a small number of components which could account for their interrelationships. Following conventional practice, factors were considered significant if the associated eigen value was 1.0 or higher. The resulting factor matrix was then rotated by the varimax procedure. Six factors were identified (Table 8). Items which possessed a loading factor of .30 or greater on a factor were regarded as contributing significantly to the composition of a factor (77). One factor (Factor VI) was eliminated from the analysis because of low reliability (Table 9). Factor V was not considered conceptually logical and was eliminated. The reliability tended to be low on Factor V as well.


Factor I measures beliefs of trust in government; of government's role in unemployment, housing, and hunger; and of one's obligation to help those less fortunate.

II. Personal Impotence in Government (seven items).

Factor II assesses degree to which a belief is held that government cannot be trusted to do what is right and is not influenced by what people
Table 8: Factor analysis of social and political attitude items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Governmental involvement in social problems: Amount (20.7)²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.2.</td>
<td>Government should do less in housing</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.1.</td>
<td>Government should do less in unemployment</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.3.</td>
<td>Government should do less in hunger</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.4.</td>
<td>&quot;Haves&quot; are not obligated to help &quot;have nots&quot;</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.4.</td>
<td>Can't trust government</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Personal impotence in government (8.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.21.</td>
<td>People like me can't influence government</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.18.</td>
<td>Public officials don't care about what people like me think</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.13.</td>
<td>No one cares about what happens to you</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.22.</td>
<td>Politics and government so complicated, it can't be understood</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.4.</td>
<td>Government can't be trusted to do what's right</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.11.</td>
<td>Government control increases graft</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.5.</td>
<td>What government does doesn't affect people like me</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Government involvement in social problems: Goals (5.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.23.</td>
<td>Government in Washington should get work for those who want to work</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.24.</td>
<td>Government should get medical care for people at a low cost</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.8.</td>
<td>Government should initiate relief programs in poverty areas</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.17.</td>
<td>Unemployment insurance is an inalienable right of the working man</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.1.</td>
<td>People who try but are unable to provide for their own welfare deserve help from others</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.12.</td>
<td>An individual deserves the feeling of satisfaction after helping others</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Refers to item number in research instrument.

²% of overall variance accounted for by each factor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item number</th>
<th>item</th>
<th>factor loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV.3</td>
<td>Action to protect welfare of others is personal preference not moral obligation</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.4</td>
<td>A nation's prospects imposes no moral obligation to help the have nots</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.5</td>
<td>People have aversions to hard work; prefer to be parasites on society</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.19</td>
<td>The way people vote is the main thing that decides how things are run in this country</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.20</td>
<td>Voting is the only way people like me can have any say about the way government runs things</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.12</td>
<td>Individual deserves a feeling of satisfaction after helping others</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.6</td>
<td>People keep too much to themselves instead of being involved in community government</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.5</td>
<td>People have an aversion to hard work; prefer to be parasites on society</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.1</td>
<td>People who try but are unable to provide for their own welfare deserve help from others</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.11</td>
<td>Government control increases graft</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Factor V was eliminated because the reliability tended to be low and items did not relate logically.

4 Factor VI was eliminated because of low reliability.
think; also, that what government does, does not affect the individual citizen.

III. Government Involvement in Social Problems: Goals (six items).

Factor III indicates beliefs that are social welfare-oriented—government in Washington should provide jobs, medical care, relief from poverty, and unemployment insurance. Satisfaction from helping others is another aspect of the items loading on this factor.

IV. Altruism as a Moral Obligation (three items).

Items loading on Factor IV measure attitudes concerning persons' responsibilities for themselves; personal responsibility for protection of the welfare of others; and a nation's moral obligations in meeting citizens' needs. Also, one item relates to belief in the Protestant Work Ethic.

Reliability of Factor Scores

Reliability of the factor scores from the factor analysis was analyzed using coefficient alpha. Coefficient alpha provides a standard method for estimating the reliability of attitude scales which contain no "right" or "wrong" answers but assess degree of agreement. It is based on internal consistency among the items composing a scale. Five of the six factors identified in this study had values above .40 (Table 9) which is considered the minimum acceptable level (78). Coefficient alpha demonstrated that five of the six scales were sufficiently reliable to study differences among groups on the factor scores. However, the items loading on Factor V did not have a conceptually logical relationship; therefore this factor also was eliminated.

The intercorrelation of the factor scores indicated that Factors I and IV apparently were tapping similar dimensions, because of the high
Table 9: Reliability of scales constructed from factor analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>factor</th>
<th>coefficient alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Extent of governmental involvement in social problems</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Personal impotence in government</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Government involvement in social problems</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Altruism as a moral obligation</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Faith in democracy</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Cynicism in people</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

correlation, \( r = .74 \) (Table 10), which was higher than the reliability coefficient. Also, the correlation coefficient \( (r = .62) \) between scores on Factors II and IV did not differ greatly from the reliability coefficient; therefore, the independence of the factor was questioned. Factor III was independent of the other factors in the analysis.

Table 10: Intercorrelations of factor scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>score</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Governmental involvement in social problems: Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Personal impotence in government</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Governmental involvement in social problems: Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Altruism as a moral obligation</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpretation of the factor scores is presented in Table 11. As indicated Factor III (Governmental involvement in social problems: goals) differs markedly from the other factors. Higher scores on Factor III reflect a social welfare-oriented attitude; whereas, higher scores on the other factors relate to a more limited social view.

Table 11: Scores from sections IV and V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>score</th>
<th>higher score indicates:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Governmental involvement in social problems: Amount</td>
<td>belief in limited governmental role in social programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Personal impotence in government</td>
<td>cynical attitude toward the influence of the individual on government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Governmental involvement in social problems: Goals</td>
<td>belief in governmental responsibilities for social programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Altruism as a moral obligation</td>
<td>belief that people should be responsible for themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Factor Scores

Only a few differences were found on the factor scores among the various groups studied (Tables 12 and 13). The multivariate analyses of effects of biographical variables on Factor I (amount of government involvement in social problems) (Table 12) indicated that those with a more socially-oriented view toward extent of government involvement in social problems were raised in the northeast and northwest and in big cities (over 150,000). High school graduates also had lower scores than those who had attended or graduated from college. Lower scores on Factor I represents a more socially liberal view. Individuals under thirty and over sixty had
Table 12: Multivariate analyses of effects of biographical variables on Factor I: Government involvement in social problems—extent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>mean and std. error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>geographic area and size of childhood community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>northwest</td>
<td>13.894 ± .485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west</td>
<td>14.369 ± .702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>southwest</td>
<td>14.693 ± .400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>midwest</td>
<td>14.400 ± .242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>southeast</td>
<td>14.112 ± .307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>northeast</td>
<td>13.376 ± .229</td>
<td>2.713</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big city (over 150,000)</td>
<td>13.340 ± .366</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medium city (25,000-150,000)</td>
<td>14.132 ± .441</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small city (2,500-25,000)</td>
<td>14.390 ± .305</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rural community (less than 2,500)</td>
<td>14.701 ± .253</td>
<td>3.199</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>level of education and age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high school graduate</td>
<td>12.614 ± .583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some college</td>
<td>13.120 ± .412</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college graduate</td>
<td>14.066 ± .166</td>
<td>4.085</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29 years old</td>
<td>11.222 ± .853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years old</td>
<td>13.125 ± .710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years old</td>
<td>14.146 ± .302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 years old</td>
<td>14.019 ± .198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>13.822 ± .402</td>
<td>2.847</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Data presented for significant findings only.

2 Factor score = cumulative sum of agreement disagreement scores for items comprising the factor.
Table 13: Relationship of political party identification to social-political attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>factor</th>
<th>variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>mean and s.d.</th>
<th>F²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Governmental involvement in</td>
<td>social problems: Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political affiliation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>14.55 ± 2.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>13.78 ± 2.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent and other</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13.99 ± 2.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Governmental involvement in</td>
<td>social problems: Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political affiliation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>13.13 ± 1.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>14.03 ± 1.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent and other</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13.49 ± 1.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.16***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹Data presented for significant findings only.

²Analysis of variance with LSD procedure for comparison of differences among means. Lines between means indicate significant differences among groups at .05 level.

* P ≤ .05

*** P ≤ .001
the most liberal scores, or social views, compared to the middle age
groups.

Analysis of party identification in relation to the factor scores
indicated that the Democrats and Republicans differed significantly (Table
13). Not surprisingly the Democrats favored more extensive government
involvement in social problems than did the Republicans. Also, higher
scores on Factor III indicated the Democrats favored the goals of govern-
ment involvement in social problems more strongly.

The data related to age groups and political party identification were
predictable; the data related to education groups were not completely
understood. However, the overall group mean (14.1) indicated a relatively
high degree of support of government involvement in social programs. The
maximum score possible on the Factor I score was 23 indicating a strong
belief in limited government involvement (Appendix E).

Analyses of Social-Political Attitude Items

Tables 14 and 15 enumerate frequency distributions and mean scores for
the overall sample for attitude items in Section IV and items 1-5 in
Section V. It was interesting there were relatively few very strong feel-
ings regarding the issues posed by these items; i.e., percentages were
small for strongly agree or strongly disagree response categories. The
only exception was on item 7 (Table 14), where 63 per cent strongly dis-
agreed with the nationalization of industry.

Overall agreement-disagreement responses reflected a fairly high degree
of socially oriented values. Feelings of responsibility for other people
were indicated by responses in Table 14 to items 4, 5, 10, 12, and 13.
Over 75 per cent projected a socially liberal attitude as measured by
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Mean ± s.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. People who try but are unable to provide for their own welfare have a right to expect help from others.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.96 ± .57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. If people worked hard at their jobs, they would reap the full benefits of our society.</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2.64 ± .71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Whether an individual acts to protect the welfare of persons beyond his circle of friends and relatives is a matter of personal preference, not moral obligation.</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.25 ± .73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The mere fact that one group or nation is prosperous and another is not places no moral obligation on the &quot;have&quot; group to improve the lot of the &quot;have not&quot; group.</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.05 ± .66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most people seem to have an aversion to plain hard work; they tend to be parasites on society by finding easy, nonproductive jobs.</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.10 ± .68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N varies from 642 to 720.

\(^1\)Score = 1, strongly disagree to 4, strongly agree.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Mean ± S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. People keep too much to themselves, instead of taking the proper interest in community problems and good government</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>2.88 ± 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Wages and salaries would be fairer, jobs more steady, and we would have fewer people out of jobs if the government took over and ran our mines, factories, and industries.</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.44 ± 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. It is the concern of the federal government to initiate, direct, and finance relief programs for poverty stricken areas.</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.69 ± 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The abolition of poverty in America is a technical impossibility.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.73 ± 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Current social practices are fundamentally sound because they lead to the survival of the fittest.</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.05 ± 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The greater the amount of governmental control over anything, the greater the increase in graft.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>2.83 ± 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. An individual most deserves the feeling of satisfaction with himself after he has done something to help someone else.</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>3.13 ± 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>mean s.d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>2.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>2.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14: (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>mean s.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. People like me don't have any say about what the government does.</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sometimes politics and government seems so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The government in Washington ought to see to it that everybody who wants to work can find a job.</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The government ought to help people get doctors and hospital care at low cost.</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15: Responses to items concerning government role and political efficacy\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>response categories(^2)</th>
<th>%(^3)</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>s.d.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Some people think the national government should do more in trying to deal with unemployment. Others think that the government is already doing too much. On the whole, would you say that what the improvement has done has been about right, too much, or not enough?</td>
<td>definitely should do more</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should do more</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about right</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should do less</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>definitely should do less</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>±1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Some people think the national government should do more in trying to deal with housing. Others think that the government is already doing too much. On the whole, would you say that what the improvement has done has been about right, too much, or not enough?</td>
<td>definitely should do more</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should do more</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about right</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should do less</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>definitely should do less</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>±1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some people think the national government should do more in trying to deal with hunger. Others think that the government is already doing too much. On the whole, would you say that what the improvement has done has been about right, too much, or not enough?</td>
<td>definitely should do more</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should do more</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>about right</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should do less</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>definitely should do less</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>±1.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. How much of the time do you think we can trust the government in Washington to do what is right?</td>
<td>always</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>most of the time</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some of the time</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none of the time</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>±.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How much difference do you think it makes to people like you what the government in Washington does?</td>
<td>good deal</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not much</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>depends</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>±.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Items 1-5, Part V.

\(^2\)Scored in order listed, 1 to 4 or 5.

\(^3\)N varies from 668 to 707.
these items. For example, there was agreement that people unable to provide for their own welfare have a right to expect help from others and that an individual gains satisfaction by helping others. Whereas, they disagreed that individuals do not have a moral obligation to help the "have-nots"; they also disagreed that some people are parasites on society, that social practices should lead to the "survival of the fittest," and that people who have misfortune got what they deserved.

Responses to a number of other items lend additional support to these findings of socially responsible views (Table 14: items 3, 8, 13, and 14). These responses indicated moral obligation to protect the welfare of others and agreement that government should assist in poverty areas. Also, they rejected the view that "no one is going to care what happens to you." With regard to extent of government involvement in unemployment, housing, and hunger, it was not surprising that the group favored increased involvement in hunger programs to a greater degree than the other two areas (items 1-3, Table 15). Responses to item 9 (Table 14) may indicate perceived social realism rather than an anti-welfare view. Approximately two-thirds agreed that abolition of poverty was a technical impossibility.

Items 23 and 24 (Table 14) indicated more support for government involvement in health care than in finding jobs for individuals. This was not surprising since the Medicare and Medicaid programs and other health care subsidization have been well accepted. These attitudes were of interest since the majority were employed in the public sector, except a few who were responsible for private school programs. Perhaps these data represent a degree of job security on the part of the respondents.

A high degree of interest in government was reflected in responses to item 6 (Table 14). Over 75 per cent believed that people should have more interest in community problems and good government.
The group was relatively politically efficacious (refer to Table 14, items 18-20). They disagreed that public officials don't care what people think and that voting is the main thing that decides how government runs things. Also 84 per cent disagreed that "people like me don't have any say about what the government does." This latter finding may be influenced by the emphasis on legislative action programs in the American School Foodservice Association (ASFSA) at both state and national levels. This continued emphasis in the Association is focused on involving the membership in influencing government support for the foodservice programs (79).

However, a degree of distrust in government was reflected on item 4 in Table 15. Almost 70 per cent indicated that citizens can trust government only some of the time. A similar attitude was projected on item 11 in Table 14. Almost 70 per cent agreed that greater government control leads to increased graft. Perhaps responses to these two questions are lingering memories of the effects of Watergate on the federal government.

Their consciousness of the strong role of government and extensive regulations in the school foodservice programs may have influenced responses on two items. Item 22 (Table 14) indicated a belief that government is very complicated. The strong feelings on item 5, Table 15, that it makes a great deal of difference what government in Washington does, also supports this supposition.

Political Involvement and Community-Political Interest

Data on Table 16 indicate active voting behavior among school foodservice directors. Over 90 per cent reported they had voted in the local and state elections, and in the 1968 and 1972 presidential elections. Also a very large number (91 per cent) reported they had written to public
Table 16: Degree of political involvement reported by overall group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>political activity</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever worn a campaign button for a candidate?</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever helped a candidate by doing things such as handing out buttons or papers with his/her name on them?</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever written to a public official expressing your opinion about something that should or should not be done?</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you vote in the last local election?</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you vote in the last state election?</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you vote in the 1972 presidential election?</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGovern</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace or other</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you vote in the 1968 presidential election?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nixon</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humphrey</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace or other</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>both correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name U.S. senators</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N varies from 713 to 721.
officials at some time. These data were extremely revealing since the
ASFSA has placed a great deal of emphasis on legislative activity. Also,
it was of interest that the majority had voted for the Republican candidate
in the 1968 and 1972 elections (59 per cent, 1968; 70 per cent, 1972),
especially since relatively liberal social welfare attitudes had been
expressed.

The majority of the group were able to name correctly the United
States senators from their state. Sixty-nine per cent named both senators
and another 12 per cent named at least one correctly. This finding was
interesting in view of the report on written contact with public officials.

Voting behavior was not transferred to active campaign involvement,
however. Less than 40 per cent reported they had campaigned for a candi-
date by wearing buttons or distributing campaign materials. Data in Table
17 also supports this conclusion; only 4 per cent indicated they were
active in political organizations. Although their political involvement
may be limited because of employment in the public sector; these directors
may be reluctant to take a strongly partisan stance. Also, this may be
reflecting a misunderstanding of the rights of public employees to partici-
pate in political activity. In addition, the legislative program of ASFSA
has emphasized gaining bipartisan support for school foodservice-related
legislation.

Data in Table 17 do not reflect a particularly high degree of
community-political interest except in the area of interest in community
problems. This latter finding would be expected since the directors are
employed in community institutions.
Table 17: Degree of community-political interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>activities related to community-political interest</th>
<th>respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free-time activity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read daily newspapers</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read weekly news</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>listen to the radio</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watch television</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frequent informal discussion topics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political affairs</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>world affairs</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>national problems</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community problems</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government policies</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organizations in which active:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political organization</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civic or local association</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The political involvement score indicated a higher degree of political participation among Republicans than among Democrats (Table 18). As anticipated, those in the lower income brackets were less politically involved. Results with regard to community-political interest scores showed that the younger age groups had the least interest.

Interrelationships among Criterion Variables

Stepwise multiple regression analysis was used to identify predictors of program effectiveness. Table 19 shows the significant predictors of the dependent variable, the program effectiveness score. The overall hypothesis of the study was supported by these data. The negative beta weight for
Table 18: Effects of age, political party identification, and income on political involvement and community-political interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>measure</th>
<th>variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>mean and error</th>
<th>std. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>political involvement</td>
<td>political affiliation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>12.21 ± .11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>11.65 ± .15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independent and other</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>10.97 ± .29</td>
<td>11.154***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual income:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000- 6,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.79 ± .43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,000- 8,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>10.77 ± .34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,000-10,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>11.77 ± .21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,000-12,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>11.70 ± .21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,000-14,999</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>11.94 ± .20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-19,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>12.18 ± .14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11.90 ± .28</td>
<td>4.98***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community-political interest</td>
<td>age:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.18 ± .65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4.84 ± .42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>5.35 ± .22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td></td>
<td>269</td>
<td>5.78 ± .14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.67 ± .29</td>
<td>4.63**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Data presented for significant findings only.

** P < .01
*** P ≤ .001
the Factor IV score indicates that a lower score is a significant predictor of program effectiveness. As discussed earlier, a lower score is translated into a more socially-oriented view. The hypothesis of the study was that those school foodservice directors who were more liberal in their attitudes toward social welfare issues would have a more effective foodservice program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>predictors</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>β²</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nutrition importance score</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political involvement score</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nutrition time rating score</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factor IV. altruism as a moral obligation</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Dependent variable in multiple regression analysis was the program effectiveness score. N = 516.  
2 Partial standard beta coefficient.

It also was of interest that the political involvement score was a significant predictor of program effectiveness. In addition, nutrition importance and time rating scores were predictors. Results indicated that as the scores for nutrition importance and nutrition time ratings and political involvement increased so did program effectiveness scores. While program effectiveness cannot be precisely defined, apparently these factors may influence program success. Since the objectives of government food programs, such as the school foodservice program, are focused on nutrition, it was particularly noteworthy that emphasis on nutrition was significantly related to program effectiveness.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The school foodservice program has expanded greatly over the past two decades primarily because of expansion of federal support. As a result school foodservice directors have to deal more with the federal and state governments now than ever before. The objective of school foodservice is based on the rationale that no school child should suffer from poor nutrition. While public policies are aimed at meeting public needs they often fall short of established goals. Recent data indicate that less than 50 per cent of the elementary and secondary school children participate in the program.

The failure of the program to meet the needs of the target population completely may be related to the attitudes of those administering the program toward the proper role of government in meeting the economic and social needs of its citizens. Another factor that may be related to program effectiveness is how those in administration perceive their roles as school foodservice directors. Role perception has been purported to have an effect on job performance.

District level foodservice directors, staff, and staff other than foodservice comprised (N = 733) the sample for evaluation of the relationships among administrative role perceptions, attitudes toward social equality and other social and political issues, and effectiveness of the school foodservice program. Several biographical and demographical variables were studied in relation to criterion measures.
School Foodservice Program Status and Activities

The smallest average daily student attendance among the districts was 300 and the largest almost 2.7 million. The average number of meals served per day to students during the month of March, 1976, was 7,459 and the mean number of operating days for lunch and breakfast was 21. Breakfast was served in 40 per cent of the districts.

Program activities listed as regularly performed by 50 per cent or more of the directors were related to administrative functions and included: use of standardized recipes, checking plate waste, on the job training for employees, scheduling staff meetings, checking food temperatures, and providing choice in luncheon items. Those items performed rarely or only occasionally by 50 per cent or more of the directors were related to nutrition education activities such as involving students in menu planning, working with teachers on nutrition projects, in-service training for teachers on nutrition, arranging class tours, and conducting classes for students on nutrition education. Programs in the larger cities rated higher on the program effectiveness measures than did those in smaller cities and communities.

Organizational Role Description

Organizational role descriptions were measured by the time and importance the directors gave to various nutrition and administrative related position elements. The management of human and financial resources apparently was the primary concern of the directors, while record keeping ranked high on the time rating. Significant differences (P ≤ .001) were found on importance scores for nutrition activity, administrative activity,
and relative importance of nutrition activity in relation to administrative roles. The mean scores for the district foodservice directors were higher than for district foodservice staff other than directors on nutrition activity and administrative activity importance scores.

Social-Political Attitudes

Factor analysis which was used to develop scores from the social-political attitude items resulted in six factors. Four factors were sufficiently reliable for analysis among groups: I. Government involvement in social problems: Amount; II. Personal impotence in government; III. Government involvement in social problems: Goals, IV. Altruism as a moral obligation.

Factor III differed markedly from the other factors. High scores on Factor III reflected a social welfare oriented attitude. Higher scores on the other factors reflected a more limited social view. Age and political party identification explained most of the differences among the factor scores. However, the directors projected a relatively social welfare oriented attitude. They expressed feelings of responsibility for other people and support for government welfare programs. These findings were interesting since the ratio of persons identifying political allegiance to the Republican Party was much higher than the national norm. Even though Republicans generally tend to be less supportive of government involvement in social programs, these directors did not follow that trend. Perhaps their involvement in a government supported program designed to provide for basic needs of school children had an effect on their general views of social welfare programs. As anticipated the group favored
increased governmental involvement in hunger programs, to a greater degree than they favored increased support for unemployment and housing.

A strong interest in government was expressed among the directors. A large majority believed that people should have more interest in community problems and good government. However there also was a degree of distrust in government reflected. Almost 70 per cent indicated that citizens can trust government only some of the time and that greater government control leads to increased graft. Perhaps these views were an aftermath of the focus on wrongdoing and unethical behavior among government officials in the early 1970's.

The group was relatively politically efficacious; they disagreed that public officials don't care what people think and that voting is the main thing that decides how government runs things. The large majority disagreed that "people like me don't have any say about what the government does." This latter finding may be influenced by the emphasis on legislative action programs in the professional association for the school foodservice. The consciousness of the strong role of government in the child nutrition programs and extensive regulations affecting school foodservices may have influenced responses on two measures of political efficacy. The directors agreed that government is very complicated and that it makes a great deal of difference what government in Washington does.

Political Involvement and Community-Political Interest

Active voting behavior among school foodservice directors was indicated. Over 90 per cent reported voting in the last local, state, and presidential elections. Active political participation also was reflected
in reports of contacts with public officials. Almost all of the directors had written to government representatives.

Voting behavior was not transferred to active campaign involvement however. Only a few directors indicated they were active in political organizations. These directors may be reluctant to take a strong partisan stance because of employment in the public sector. Also, they may fail to understand the rights of public employees to participate in political activity.

The relatively high level of political participation among the school foodservice directors deserves more in-depth investigation. The implication suggested from these data is that the emphasis of the professional association on political action has had a definite impact on the political behavior of the membership. However, perhaps the directors should be encouraged to become more involved in political campaigns of the candidates of their choice as a means of increasing their legislative clout.

Interrelationships among Measures

Predictors of program effectiveness were studied. Political involvement, emphasis on nutrition-related aspects of the school foodservice director's position, and social-welfare oriented attitudes were significant predictors of effective school foodservice programs. Apparently the more effective directors were those who were aware of and alert to political issues and those who were committed both to the nutrition objectives of the school feeding programs and to beliefs in the obligations of a nation to provide for the less fortunate.
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APPENDIX A

Correspondence from Developmental Phase of Study
To: (School Foodservice Directors in Pilot Study)

From: Allene Vaden, Ph.D.
       Sandra Ress

We need your help! Please complete the attached questionnaire that is the preliminary instrument for a research study here at K-State.

After you have completed the survey please give us your suggestions--are the questions understandable, which ones need revision? Please be frank!

The study is part of a research project entitled "Administrators and Public Policy." The project will involve a nationwide sample of school foodservice directors. We are interested in obtaining social attitudes and role perceptions and the relationships to effectiveness in the school foodservice program.

Please return the questionnaire to me by April 16--we hope to distribute the survey in early May.
Evaluation of the Study

1. The questionnaire was difficult to answer.
   
   ___ yes
   ___ no
   
   Comments:

2. What suggestions do you have for revising the questionnaire?
   
   ___ leave questionnaire as it is
   ___ suggestions (specify)

3. What additions would you suggest?
   
   ___ none
   ___ as listed below

4. What would you omit on the questionnaire:
   
   ___ nothing
   ___ as indicated below
Follow-up Letter

April 14, 1976

TO: (School Foodservice Directors in Pilot Study)

FROM: Sandy Ress

I hope you have had a chance to review the questionnaire that we sent to you early last week.

We would like to have the final questionnaire completed by the first of May. Thank you for your time.
APPENDIX B

Research Instrument
SCHOOL FOODSERVICE STUDY

PLEASE RETURN IN THE ENCLOSED, STAMPED ENVELOPE.

THANK YOU!
I. DIRECTIONS: Please place an "X" in front of the answer that best applies to you.

1. What is your present position?
   (1) District or County School Foodservice Director
   (2) District Staff, other than Foodservice
   (3) District-level Staff, other than Director (i.e., supervisor coordinator)

2. How many years have you been employed in your present position?
   (1) 2 years or less
   (2) 3-7 years
   (3) 8 years or more

3. How many years have you been employed in school foodservice?
   (1) 2 years or less
   (2) 3-7 years
   (3) 8 years or more

4. Which of the following are served by the foodservice in your school district?
   (1) Day Care
   (2) Head Start
   (3) Meals-on-Wheels
   (4) Group feeding for the elderly (Title VII)
   (5) None
   (6) Other (please specify)

5. Daily average student attendance in your district in March 1976?

6. Number of operating days in March 1976 (days meals were served).
   Days lunches served
   Days breakfasts served

7. Number of economically needy in March 1976 (as reported on claim).

8. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Attendance Centers in Your District</th>
<th>Number of Centers with Type A Lunch Program</th>
<th>Number of Centers with a Breakfast Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle-school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Total number of school foodservice employees in the district.
   25 hours or over per week
   less than 25 hours per week

10. If available, total labor hours in March 1976.

11. Total number of school staff (teaching, administrative and support) in the district, excluding school foodservice.

12. a. Number of meals served to adults and to other programs during March 1976.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Breakfasts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Breakfasts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(contracted, Meals-on-Wheels, Title VII, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Lunches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Lunches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(contracted, Meals-on-Wheels, Title VII, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. b. Number of meals served to students during March 1976 (as reported in Monthly Reimbursement Claim).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Free</th>
<th>Reduced</th>
<th>Paid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breakfasts (K-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunches (K-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. What is your age group?
   ____ (1) 18-29 years old
   ____ (2) 30-39 years old
   ____ (3) 40-49 years old
   ____ (4) 50-59 years old
   ____ (5) 60 and over

14. What is your sex?
   ____ (1) Male
   ____ (2) Female

15. What is your party identification?
   ____ (1) Republican
   ____ (2) Democrat
   ____ (3) Independent
   ____ (4) Other

16. In what size community did you spend the majority of your childhood?
   ____ (1) Big city (over 150,000)
   ____ (2) Medium city (25,000-150,000)
   ____ (3) Small city (2,500-25,000)
   ____ (4) Rural community (less than 2,500)

17. In what area of the country did you spend the majority of your childhood?
   ____ (1) Northwest
   ____ (2) West
   ____ (3) Southwest
   ____ (4) Midwest
   ____ (5) Southeast
   ____ (6) Northeast

18. In what size community do you work?
   ____ (1) Big city (over 150,000)
   ____ (2) Medium city (25,000-150,000)
   ____ (3) Small city (2,500-25,000)
   ____ (4) Rural Community (less than 2,500)

19. In what state do you live now?

20. What is your level of education?
   ____ (1) Completed grade school
   ____ (2) Completed high school
   ____ (3) Attended college but did not complete degree
   ____ (4) Completed associate degree
   ____ (5) Completed bachelor's degree
   ____ (6) Completed master's degree

21. If college graduate what was your major for the bachelor's degree?
   ____ (1) Dietetics, Foods and Nutrition, or Institutional Management
   ____ (2) Home Economics Education
   ____ (3) Elementary or Secondary Education (other than Home Economics)
   ____ (4) Business Administration
   ____ (5) Educational Administration
   ____ (6) Other (please specify)

22. If you have earned a master's degree what was your major?
   ____ (1) Dietetics, Foods and Nutrition, or Institutional Management
   ____ (2) Home Economics Education
   ____ (3) Elementary or Secondary Education (other than Home Economics)
   ____ (4) Business Administration
   ____ (5) Educational Administration
   ____ (6) Other (please specify)

23. Have you ever had a course in nutrition?
   ____ (1) Yes
   ____ (2) No
24. From the following list, check the professional organizations to which you belong.
   (1) American School Food-service Association
   (2) American Dietetic Association
   (3) Society for Nutrition Education
   (4) Association for School Business Officials
   (5) National Education Association
   (6) American Home Economics Association
   (7) Delta Kappa Gamma

25. What is your annual salary?
   (1) 5,000-6,999
   (2) 7,000-8,999
   (3) 9,000-10,999
   (4) 11,000-12,999
   (5) 13,000-14,999
   (6) 15,000-19,999
   (7) over 20,000

II. DIRECTIONS: Describe your present position by indicating (A) the degree of importance and (B) the amount of time you spend on each of the following activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>A. Importance</th>
<th>B. Amount of Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Suggesting menu ideas which have special nutritional merit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Budgetary detail (keeping funds and accounts straight, reimbursing schools, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Commodity food detail (receiving, handling, distributing commodity foods)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other administrative detail (record keeping, making reports, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Preparing and presenting information about sound nutrition practices to laymen (parents, children, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Approving foodservice menus to maintain nutritional balance and menu variety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Enlisting interest and cooperation of students in developing sound nutritional practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>A. Importance</td>
<td>B. Amount of Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Process aspects of foodservice (establishing and controlling policies and procedures for preparing and disbursing meals, cleaning up, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Providing training regarding the role of foodservice employees in nutrition education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Developing material for use in nutritional education programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Personnel management (staffing, in-service training, obtaining substitutes, resolving disputes or grievances among foodservice personnel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Food purchasing (including negotiating with suppliers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Obtaining support of school personnel, parents, or other adults for promoting sound nutritional habits among students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Public information and relations (including dealing with special interest groups)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Writing equipment specifications, planning kitchens, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Promoting school foodservice education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**III. DIRECTIONS:** Indicate the activities that are a part of the foodservice program in your district by placing an "X" in front of the answer that best applies to your program.

1. Involve students in menu planning.
   - (1) Rarely
   - (2) Occasionally
   - (3) Regularly

2. Obtain student evaluations or reactions to foodservice.
   - (1) Rarely
   - (2) Occasionally
   - (3) Regularly

3. Involve students in testing new food products and/or recipes.
   - (1) Rarely
   - (2) Occasionally
   - (3) Regularly

4. Provide choice in luncheon items (e.g., salad plate, sandwich plate, entree choice).
   - (1) Rarely
   - (2) Occasionally
   - (3) Regularly

5. Sponsor special events or feature days for students.
   - (1) Rarely
   - (2) Occasionally
   - (3) Regularly

6. Suggest source materials to teachers for use in a class unit on nutrition education.
   - (1) Rarely
   - (2) Occasionally
   - (3) Regularly
7. Conduct classes for students on nutrition education.
   ___(1) Rarely
   ___(2) Occasionally
   ___(3) Regularly

8. Arrange class tours of food-service facilities.
   ___(1) Rarely
   ___(2) Occasionally
   ___(3) Regularly

9. Work with teachers on tasting experiences or food preparation in classrooms.
   ___(1) Rarely
   ___(2) Occasionally
   ___(3) Regularly

10. Work with teachers on nutrition projects, experiments, animal feeding demonstrations, etc.
    ___(1) Rarely
    ___(2) Occasionally
    ___(3) Regularly

11. Become involved (planning and/or teaching) in inservice training sessions on nutrition for teachers.
    ___(1) Rarely
    ___(2) Occasionally
    ___(3) Regularly

12. Provide on-the-job training for employees
    ___(1) Rarely
    ___(2) Occasionally
    ___(3) Regularly

13. Check plate waste.
    ___(1) Rarely
    ___(2) Occasionally
    ___(3) Regularly

14. Use standardized recipes.
    ___(1) Rarely
    ___(2) Occasionally
    ___(3) Regularly

15. Schedule staff meetings with supervisors and/or managers.
    ___(1) Rarely
    ___(2) Occasionally
    ___(3) Regularly

16. Check temperatures of foods served.
    ___(1) Rarely
    ___(2) Occasionally
    ___(3) Regularly

17. Sponsor student foodservice advisory council(s).
    ___(1) in all schools
    ___(2) in secondary schools only
    ___(3) in most schools
    ___(4) in only a few schools
    ___(5) none at the present time

18. Schools with "open campus" policy at lunch.
    ___(1) all
    ___(2) secondary only
    ___(3) most schools
    ___(4) only a few schools
IV. DIRECTIONS: Do you agree or disagree with these sentences? Please check the number that shows your opinion.

1 - Strongly disagree
2 - Disagree
3 - Agree
4 - Strongly agree

There are no right or wrong answers—only how much you agree or disagree with the statement.

Example: Blue is my favorite color.

(1) Strongly disagree
(2) Disagree
(3) Agree
(4) Strongly agree

1. People who try but are unable to provide for their own welfare have a right to expect help from others.
   (1) Strongly disagree
   (2) Disagree
   (3) Agree
   (4) Strongly agree

2. If people worked hard at their jobs, they would reap the full benefits of our society.
   (1) Strongly disagree
   (2) Disagree
   (3) Agree
   (4) Strongly agree

3. Whether an individual acts to protect the welfare of persons beyond his circle of friends and relatives is a matter of personal preference, not moral obligation.
   (1) Strongly disagree
   (2) Disagree
   (3) Agree
   (4) Strongly agree

4. The mere fact that one group or nation is prosperous and another is not places no moral obligation on the "have" group to improve the lot of the "have not" group.
   (1) Strongly disagree
   (2) Disagree
   (3) Agree
   (4) Strongly agree

5. Most people seem to have an aversion to plain hard work; they tend to be parasites on society by finding easy, nonproductive jobs.
   (1) Strongly disagree
   (2) Disagree
   (3) Agree
   (4) Strongly agree

6. People keep too much to themselves, instead of taking the proper interest in community problems and good government.
   (1) Strongly disagree
   (2) Disagree
   (3) Agree
   (4) Strongly agree

7. Wages and salaries would be fairer, jobs more steady, and we would have fewer people out of jobs if the government took over and ran our mines, factories, and industries.
   (1) Strongly disagree
   (2) Disagree
   (3) Agree
   (4) Strongly agree

8. It is the concern of the federal government to initiate, direct, and finance relief programs for poverty stricken areas.
   (1) Strongly disagree
   (2) Disagree
   (3) Agree
   (4) Strongly agree
9. The abolition of poverty in America is a technical impossibility.
   (1) Strongly disagree
   (2) Disagree
   (3) Agree
   (4) Strongly agree

10. Current social practices are fundamentally sound because they lead to the survival of the fittest.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly agree

11. The greater the amount of governmental control over anything, the greater the increase in graft.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly agree

12. An individual most deserves the feeling of satisfaction with himself after he has done something to help someone else.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly agree

13. No one is going to care much what happens to you, when you get right down to it.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly agree

14. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly agree

15. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly agree

16. Individuals with the ability and foresight to earn and accumulate wealth should have the right to earn and accumulate wealth without interference and regulations.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly agree

17. Unemployment insurance is an inalienable right of the working man.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly agree

18. I don't think public officials care much about what people like me think.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly agree

19. The way people vote is the main thing that decides how things are run in this country.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly agree

20. Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things.
    (1) Strongly disagree
    (2) Disagree
    (3) Agree
    (4) Strongly agree
21. People like me don't have any say about what the government does.
   ___(1) Strongly disagree
   ___(2) Disagree
   ___(3) Agree
   ___(4) Strongly agree

22. Sometimes politics and government seems so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.
   ___(1) Strongly disagree
   ___(2) Disagree
   ___(3) Agree
   ___(4) Strongly agree

23. The government in Washington ought to see to it that everybody who wants to work can find a job.
   ___(1) Strongly disagree
   ___(2) Disagree
   ___(3) Agree
   ___(4) Strongly agree

24. The government ought to help people get doctors and hospital care at low cost.
   ___(1) Strongly disagree
   ___(2) Disagree
   ___(3) Agree
   ___(4) Strongly agree

V. DIRECTIONS: Please place an "X" in front of the answer that best applies to you.

1. Some people think the national government should do more in trying to deal with unemployment. Others think that the government is already doing too much. On the whole, would you say that what the improvement has done has been about right, too much, or not enough?
   ___(1) Definitely should do more
   ___(2) Should do more
   ___(3) About right
   ___(4) Should do less
   ___(5) Definitely should do less

2. Some people think the national government should do more in trying to deal with housing. Others think that the government is already doing too much. On the whole, would you say that what the improvement has done has been about right, too much, or not enough?
   ___(1) Definitely should do more
   ___(2) Should do more
   ___(3) About right
   ___(4) Should do less
   ___(5) Definitely should do less

3. Some people think the national government should do more in trying to deal with hunger. Others think that the government is already doing too much. On the whole, would you say that what the improvement has done has been about right, too much, or not enough?
   ___(1) Definitely should do more
   ___(2) Should do more
   ___(3) About right
   ___(4) Should do less
   ___(5) Definitely should do less

4. How much of the time do you think we can trust the government in Washington to do what is right?
   ___(1) Always
   ___(2) Most of the time
   ___(3) Some of the time
   ___(4) None of the time

5. How much difference do you think it makes to people like you what the government in Washington does?
   ___(1) Good deal
   ___(2) Some
   ___(3) Not much
   ___(4) Depends
6. Have you ever worn a campaign button for a candidate?  
   (1) Yes  
   (2) No

7. Have you ever helped a candidate by doing things such as handing out buttons or papers with his/her name on them?  
   (1) Yes  
   (2) No

8. Have you ever written to a public official expressing your opinion about something that should or should not be done?  
   (1) Yes  
   (2) No

9. Did you vote in the last local election?  
   (1) Yes  
   (2) No

10. Did you vote in the last state election?  
    (1) Yes  
    (2) No

11. Who did you vote for in the 1972 Presidential election?  
    (1) Nixon  
    (2) McGovern  
    (3) Wallace  
    (4) Other (please specify)  
    (5) Did not vote

12. Who did you vote for in the 1968 Presidential election?  
    (1) Nixon  
    (2) Humphrey  
    (3) Wallace  
    (4) Other (please specify)  
    (5) Did not vote


14. Please check all of the following that you do quite a bit of in your free time.
    (1) Travel  
    (2) Visit or entertain friends or relatives  
    (3) Read daily newspapers  
    (4) Participate in sports  
    (5) Watch sports events  
    (6) Read weekly news magazines  
    (7) Hobbies like woodworking, photography, etc.
    (1) Listen to the radio  
    (2) Read business or professional journals  
    (3) Watch television  
    (4) Work in the yard or garden  
    (5) Go to the movies  
    (6) Listen to music  
    (7) Attend plays, opera or ballet  
    (8) Read books  
    (9) Others  
    Explain

15. When you get together with other people, which several of the following things are you likely to talk about?  
    (1) Your work  
    (2) Religion  
    (3) Political affairs  
    (4) World affairs  
    (5) Your family  
    (6) Business conditions  
    (1) National problems  
    (2) Sports  
    (3) Music, art, etc.  
    (4) Community problems  
    (5) Government policies  
    (6) Labor union matters  
    (7) Others  
    Explain
16. Are you very active in any of the following types of organizations? Check all those in which you are very active.

____(1) Professional association      ____ (7) Fraternal or veteran's organization such as Elks, Legion, etc.
____(2) Church or religious group or club
____(3) Political organization
____(4) Service club such as Rotary, Lions, Junior League
____(5) Sports club like a country club, golf club, swimming, sports club, etc.
____(6) Labor union or organization

____(8) Civic or local association such as school board, community association, etc.

____(X) Business association
____(Y) Others

____(0) None of these

Explain
APPENDIX C

Sources for Social-Political Attitude Items
(Sections IV and V, Research Instrument)
Sources for social-psychological and political attitudes and political activity (Parts IV and V)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. People who try but are unable to provide for their own welfare have a right to expect help from others.</td>
<td>Perloe, S.I.: Social Values Questionnaire, Final Report to Office of Education on Project S-308, Bureau No. 5-8210, 1967.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Whether an individual acts to protect the welfare of persons beyond his circle of friends and relatives is a matter of personal preference, not moral obligation.</td>
<td>Perloe, S.I.: op. cit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The mere fact that one group or nation is prosperous and another is not places no moral obligation on the &quot;have&quot; group to improve the lot of the &quot;have not&quot; group.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Most people seem to have an aversion to plain hard work; they tend to be parasites on society by finding easy, non-productive jobs.</td>
<td>Sullivan, P. and Adelson, J.: Misanthropy in Ethnocentrism and Misanthropy, J. of Abnorm. and Soc. Psych. 4:246, 1954.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. People keep too much to themselves, instead of taking the proper interest in community problems and good government.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Item number refers to placement in research instrument.

2 Items were adapted from the sources indicated. The original source is referenced. Publications (55, 72) of the Survey Research Center, University of Michigan were the resources for this research.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Wages and salaries would be fairer, jobs more steady, and we would have fewer people out of jobs if the government took over and ran our mines, factories, and industries.</td>
<td>Nettler, G. and Huffman, J.: The Radicalism Conservatism Scale in Political opinion and personal security, Sociometry (20), 1957.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Current social practices are fundamentally sound because they lead to the survival of the fittest.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The greater the amount of governmental control over anything, the greater the increase in graft.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. No one is going to care much what happens to you, when you get right down to it.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources for social-psychological and political attitudes and political activity (Parts IV and V) (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Unemployment insurance is an inalienable right of the working man.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The way people vote is the main thing that decides how things are run in this country.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Voting is the only way that people like me can have any say about how the government runs things.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. People like me don't have any say about what the government does.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Sometimes politics and government seems so complicated that a person like me can't really understand what's going on.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. The government ought to help people get doctors and hospital care at low cost.</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources for social-psychological and political attitudes and political activity (Parts IV and V) (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Part V</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Some people think the national government should do more in trying to deal with unemployment. Others think that the government is already doing too much. On the whole, would you say that what the improvement has done has been about right, too much, or not enough?</td>
<td>Campbell, A., op. cit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Some people think the national government should do more in trying to deal with housing. Others think that the government is already doing too much. On the whole, would you say that what the improvement has done has been about right, too much, or not enough?</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Some people think the national government should do more in trying to deal with hunger. Others think that the government is already doing too much. On the whole, would you say that what the improvement has done has been about right, too much, or not enough?</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How much difference do you think it makes to people like you what the government in Washington does?</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Have you ever worn a campaign button for a candidate?</td>
<td>Campbell, A., op. cit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources for social-psychological and political attitudes and political activity (Parts IV and V) (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>out buttons or papers with his/her name on them?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Have you ever written to a public official expressing your opinion</td>
<td>Campbell, A., op. cit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>about something that should or should not be done?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Did you vote in the last state election?</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Name your U.S. senators</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Please check all of the following that you do quite a bit of in</td>
<td>The Initiators, Oregon Research Center, 1960.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your free time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Travel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Visit or entertain friends or relatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Read daily newspapers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Participate in sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Watch sports events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Read weekly news magazines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Hobbies like woodworking, photography, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Listen to the radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Read business or professional journals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Watch television</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Work in the yard or garden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Go to the movies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sources for social-psychological and political attitudes and political activity (Parts IV and V) (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6) Listen to music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Attend plays, opera or ballet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8) Read books</td>
<td>Explain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. When you get together with other people, which several of the following things are you likely to talk about?
   (1) Your work
   (2) Religion
   (3) Political affairs
   (4) World affairs
   (5) Your family
   (6) Business conditions
   (7) National problems
   (8) Sports
   (9) Music, art, etc.
   (10) Community problems
   (11) Government policies
   (12) Labor union matters
   (13) Others
   Explain

16. Are you very active in any of the following types of organizations. Check all those in which you are very active.
   (1) Professional association
   (2) Church or religious group or club
   (3) Political organization
   (4) Service club such as Rotary, Lions, Junior League
   (5) Sports club like a country club, golf club, swimming, sports club, etc.
   (6) Labor union or organization
   (7) Fraternal or veteran's organization such as Elks, Legion, etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>item</th>
<th>source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (8)  | Civic or local association  
|      | such as school board,  
|      | community association, etc. |
| (9)  | Drama, arts, or cultural group, etc. |
| (X)  | Business association |
| (Y)  | Others |
|      | Explain |
| (0)  | None of these |
APPENDIX D

Correspondence for Distribution of Research Instrument
Dear Schoolfoodservice Director:

As you know, school foodservice has expanded over the past twenty years primarily because of federal resources. In turn the program reaches more children, the administration is better, and as a result, it is providing more jobs. Those who work with school foodservice have to deal more with the federal government now than ever before.

We are interested in your reactions to government involvement. The enclosed questionnaire is part of a research project entitled "Administrators and Public Policy" co-sponsored by the Departments of Institutional Management and Political Science here at Kansas State University. We are studying role perceptions and attitudes of school foodservice directors, as well as characteristics of school foodservice programs.

This project involves a national sample of directors from the American School Foodservice Association membership listing. All information will be confidential; each questionnaire is identified by code number for follow-up purposes only. The questions are phrased only to elicit a response. In order to obtain valid results your opinions are an important part of this project. If you have additional comments please feel free to express them.

When you have completed the questionnaire please place it in the enclosed stamped envelope and drop it in the mail. This should take only about 20-25 minutes of your time---will you please return it to me by the end of the week? Thank you very much!

Sincerely,

Sandra H. Ress
Sandra H. Ress, R.D.
Graduate Research Assistant
Department of Institutional Management

Research Team:
Sandra H. Ress, R.D.
Allene G. Vaden, PH.D., R.D.
Assistant Professor of
Institutional Management
Naomi B. Lynn, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of
Political Science
Dear School Foodservice Director:

We need your help! A couple of weeks ago you were sent a questionnaire concerning role perceptions and attitudes of school foodservice directors. Because you were randomly chosen from the membership lists of the American School Foodservice Association, we definitely need your input. The findings will not be as representative without your reactions. A number of school lunch directors have requested information about the results of this study and we will be happy to furnish a summary after the data are compiled.

In the event you did not receive the mailing, let me restate the purpose of the study. We are interested in getting the reactions of school foodservice directors to government involvement. The overall research project is entitled, "Administrators and Public Policy" and is co-sponsored by the Departments of Institutional Management, and Political Science here at Kansas State University. This study will give you the opportunity to express your opinions concerning government as well as some of the characteristics of the school foodservice program.

If you have comments, please feel free to express them. When you have completed the questionnaire please place it in the enclosed stamped envelope and drop in the mail. This should take only about 20 minutes of your time--will you please return it to us by June 7? Thank you for your cooperation and time in answering the questionnaire.

Your response is critical to assure unbiased representation within the research sample of school foodservice directors.

Sincerely,

[Signed]

Sandra H. Ress, R.D.
Graduate Research Assistant
Department of Institutional Management

Research Team:
Sandra H. Ress, R.D.
Allene G. Vaden, Ph.D., R.D.
Assistant Professor of
Institutional Management
Naomi B. Lynn, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of
Political Science
INFORMED CONSENT INFORMATION

The purpose of this study is to survey the role perceptions and attitudes of a national sample of school foodservice directors. If you have questions concerning the research, please contact by phone or mail any one of the research team whose signatures are on the cover letter. As indicated, all information provided will be anonymous and will be kept fully confidential. Code numbers are used for follow-up purposes only and names of individual respondents will not be released.

We would appreciate your responses to all items on the questionnaire; however, if there are individual items you would prefer not to answer, please leave those blank. Your return of the questionnaire will indicate your willingness to participate in the study.
APPENDIX E

Supplemental Table
Table 20: Scores on social-political factors for overall group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>factor</th>
<th>maximum score</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>score for overall group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Government involvement in social problems: Amount</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>14.12 ± 2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Personal impotence in government</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>16.02 ± 2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Government involvement in social problems: Goals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>13.57 ± 1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Altruism as a moral obligation</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>6.43 ± 1.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ADMINISTRATORS AND PUBLIC POLICY: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE SCHOOL FOODSERVICE PROGRAMS

by

SANDRA G. HALLETT

B.S., Winthrop College, 1973

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Dietetics, Restaurant, and Institutional Management

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1977
ABSTRACT

The school foodservice program has expanded greatly over the past twenty years primarily because of federal involvement. The objective of school foodservice is based on the rationale that no school child should suffer from poor nutrition. While public policies are aimed at meeting public needs they often fall short of established goals. Less than 50 per cent of the school children participate in the program.

The failure of the program to meet the needs of the target population completely has been explained in a variety of ways. One explanation may be related to the attitudes of those administering the program towards the proper role of government in meeting the economic and social needs of its citizens. Another factor that may be related to program effectiveness is how those in administration perceive their roles as school foodservice directors.

The purpose of this research was to study relationships among role perceptions, attitudes toward social equality and selected other social and political issues, and effectiveness of the school foodservice program. Role perceptions and social-political attitudes also were studied in relation to selected biographical and demographical characteristics. Information was obtained from school foodservice district directors selected from the membership of the professional association of school foodservice personnel. The instrument consisted of five sections: demographic data, measures of social welfare attitudes, ratings of elements of the school foodservice director's role, program effectiveness, and political efficacy and activity.
Most of the respondents (N = 733) were female. Approximately half had been in their present position for eight years or more and were fifty years of age or older.

Breakfast was served in 40 per cent of the districts. Almost 40 per cent of the directors reported no other programs were served other than lunch and/or breakfast. Head Start was the program served most often; few served meals for the elderly.

Activities reported as regularly performed by at least 50 per cent or more of the directors were: use of standardized recipes, checking plate waste, on-the-job training for employees, scheduling staff meetings, checking food temperatures, and providing choice in luncheon items. Those activities which were performed rarely or only occasionally by 50 per cent or more of the directors were related to nutrition education activities, such as involving students in menu planning, working with teachers on nutrition projects, in-service training for teachers on nutrition, arranging class tours, and conducting classes for students on nutrition education.

Organizational role descriptions were measured by the time and importance directors gave to various nutrition and administrative related position elements. The management of human and financial resources was reported as the major concern of the directors. These administrative functions were rated as somewhat more important than the nutrition-related aspects of their jobs.

Factor analysis resulted in six factors related to social and political attitudes. Four were sufficiently reliable for analysis among groups: I. Government Involvement in Social Problems: Amount; II. Personal Impotence in Government; III. Government Involvement in Social Problems: Goals; IV. Altruism as a Moral Obligation. Significant
differences in scores were primarily explained by party identification and geographic region of childhood community. Overall the directors had relatively socially-oriented attitudes.

Active voting behavior also was indicated. Over 90 per cent reported they had voted in state and local elections and in the 1968 and 1972 presidential elections. A very large number (91 per cent) reported they had written to public officials.

Stepwise multiple regression was used to identify predictors of program effectiveness. Socially-oriented attitude scores, political involvement, and nutrition importance and time rating scores were significant predictors of program effectiveness. Since the objectives of government food programs, such as the school foodservice program, are focused on nutrition it was particularly noteworthy that emphasis on nutrition was significantly related to program effectiveness.