



# VCU

Virginia Commonwealth University  
**VCU Scholars Compass**

---

Theses and Dissertations

Graduate School

---

2007

## The Muse in the Classroom: Some Effects on American Nonprofit Arts Organization of Partnering with Schools

Susan A. FitzPatrick  
*Virginia Commonwealth University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#)

© The Author

---

Downloaded from

<https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/etd/1141>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at VCU Scholars Compass. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of VCU Scholars Compass. For more information, please contact [libcompass@vcu.edu](mailto:libcompass@vcu.edu).

© Susan Adele FitzPatrick 2007

All Rights Reserved

THE MUSE IN THE CLASSROOM: SOME EFFECTS ON AMERICAN NONPROFIT  
ARTS ORGANIZATIONS OF PARTNERING WITH SCHOOLS

A Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University.

by

SUSAN ADELE FITZPATRICK  
M.P.A., Virginia Commonwealth University, 2002  
B.A., University of Virginia, 1984

Director: WILLIAM C. BOSHER, JR., ED.D.  
DISTINGUISHED PROFESSOR OF PUBLIC POLICY AND EDUCATION  
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, COMMONWEALTH EDUCATION POLICY INSTITUTE  
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION AND L. DOUGLAS WILDER SCHOOL OF  
GOVERNMENT AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Virginia Commonwealth University  
Richmond, Virginia  
May, 2007

## Acknowledgement

This work is dedicated to my mother, Marie Baker FitzPatrick, and to my late father, Raymond Erlan FitzPatrick. No person has ever had a better cheerleader, supporter, inspiration, moral compass, and friend than I have in my mother.

Special thanks are due to Billy W. Kinsey, Jr. and Howard J. Sanderson of the Virginia Center for Urban Development for their tireless help and guidance as I put the survey online and conducted data analysis. Dr. Pratt helped make their expertise available, was always supportive, and provided critical help in assembling a fine dissertation committee. Dr. Urban was unfailingly generous with his time and expertise in helping to guide methodology and data analysis decisions. Dr. Holsworth's feedback is always insightful and first-rate. Dr. Boshier's support and guidance ultimately made this project possible. I am grateful to each member of the dissertation committee. Betty Moran helped in innumerable ways.

I am also grateful for the suggestions and comments contributed to this project by Peggy Baggett, Executive Director, Virginia Commission for the Arts; and Rob Horowitz, Associate Director, Center for Arts Education Research, Teachers College, Columbia University.



## Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	ii
List of Tables .....	vi
 Chapter	
1 Introduction.....	1
Research Questions .....	1
Rationale for Study.....	2
Background Issues.....	3
Summary .....	7
2 Review of Literature .....	8
Collaboration Models.....	10
Advantages and Disadvantages of School-Arts Partnerships .....	11
Evaluation of School-Arts Organization Partnerships .....	13
Arts Organizations.....	19
Theoretical Considerations.....	22
Research Questions .....	31
Definitions.....	38
Summary .....	42
3 Methodology.....	43

Purpose .....	43
Study Design and Methods .....	44
Limitations .....	47
4 Data Analysis .....	49
Sample .....	49
Demographic Profile of Respondents .....	50
Geography .....	51
Type of Arts Organization .....	55
Annual Revenue .....	56
Selected Frequency Data .....	58
Multicollinearity of Independent Variables .....	60
Research Questions .....	61
Additional Characteristics of Respondents and Partnerships .....	79
Summary of Key Findings .....	80
5 Summary and Conclusions .....	83
Summary of the Study .....	83
Findings and Conclusions .....	84
Concluding Remarks .....	100
Literature Cited .....	107
Appendices .....	115

A	APPENDIX A Survey of Arts Organizations.....	115
B	APPENDIX B Text of Email Invitation to Take Part in Survey .....	121
C	APPENDIX C Text of First Reminder Email .....	122
D	APPENDIX D Text of Second Reminder Email .....	123
E	APPENDIX E Frequency Data for Survey Responses .....	124

## List of Tables

	Page
Table 1: Geographic distribution of survey respondents, sample and target population...	52
Table 2: Survey respondents, sample, and target population by type of arts organization .....	56
Table 3: Survey respondents, sample and target population by total revenue.....	57
Table 4: Correlation matrix for independent variables.....	60
Table 5: Arts education advocacy efforts by level (local, state, national, or combination).....	61
Table 6: Arts education advocacy efforts by type of activity.....	62
Table 7: Predictors of the odds of advocating for arts education.....	65
Table 8: Question 9(b): “Our organization has changed its artistic direction due to partnering with schools.”.....	66
Table 9: Question 1: “To what extent do rules and regulations of outside organizations such as funding agencies affect your organization?” .....	69
Table 10: Question 9(e): “Partnering with schools has meant we have to comply with more rules and regulations.”.....	71
Table 11: Question 9(d): “Our organization has had more costs due to our work with schools.”.....	73
Table 12: Question 12: “How much income did your organization get last year	

from services provided to schools?" .....	75
Table 13: Question 9(a): "Partnering with schools has helped our organization grow artistically." .....	76
Table 14: Predictors of the odds of agreeing with the statement, "Partnering with schools has helped our organization grow artistically." .....	78
Table 15: Reasons for partnering with schools, among respondents paid to partner during the past year. ....	87

# Abstract

## THE MUSE IN THE CLASSROOM: SOME EFFECTS ON AMERICAN NONPROFIT ARTS ORGANIZATIONS OF PARTNERING WITH SCHOOLS

By Susan Adele FitzPatrick, Ph.D.

A Dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor  
of Philosophy at Virginia Commonwealth University.

Virginia Commonwealth University, 2007

Major Director: William C. Boshier, Jr., Ed.D.  
Distinguished Professor of Public Policy and Education  
Executive Director, Commonwealth Educational Policy Institute

Nonprofits, including cultural organizations, are increasingly relying upon fees for service as part of their operating budgets. Arts organizations have taken an increasingly prominent role in arts education starting with federal budget cuts in the 1960s and 1970s. There is a lack of data on the effects of partnering with schools on nonprofit arts organizations as well as the effects of government contracting on nonprofits.

This study consists of an email/internet survey to determine how contracting with schools to provide arts activities affects nonprofit arts agency independence, vendorism, bureaucratization, costs, and artistic quality. The survey was pilot tested with 22 leaders of arts organizations. The survey was emailed to a random sample of 680 leaders of American

nonprofit arts organizations identified as art museums; ballet; dance; music; music groups, bands and ensembles; opera; singing choral; symphony orchestras; theaters; and visual arts organizations. Responses were gathered from 280 respondents for a 41% response rate. The researcher analyzed the data using frequencies, cross tabulations, logistic regression, and linear regression.

This study reveals limited negative effects on arts organizations of partnering with schools. The major findings of this study support Lester Salamon's (1995) theory that bureaucratization is among the most likely effects of government contracting on nonprofits, and a study of nonprofits by Patricia Hughes and William Luksetich (2004) indicating that greater reliance on private funding does not divert funding from program service delivery. Organizations that partner with schools have greater odds of being affected by rules and regulations compared to those that do not partner with schools, but these rules seem to fall within acceptable limits for arts organizations of the types studied.

Earning higher levels of income from school partnerships does not make arts organizations less likely to advocate for arts education, change artistic direction or offer significantly different programs, or impose unreimbursed costs.

This study does not support Bruno Frey's (2003) Crowding Theory of the effect of external rewards on creativity. More collaborative types of school activity had no effect on organizational creativity in this study. However, enhanced artistic growth appears to be an important positive effect of school partnerships.

# CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

American public elementary and secondary schools often turn to nonprofit arts organizations to both provide and supplement arts instruction. Arts-producing organizations such as theatres, operas, music organizations, and dance ensembles provide activities ranging from a single performance to long-term residencies. Programming provided by arts organizations can offer students exposure to the arts and increase access to arts instruction. For arts organizations challenged to maintain financial stability, partnerships with schools offer both earned income and the chance to develop current and future audiences for the arts. Literature has focused on whether classroom teachers or arts professionals are best qualified to deliver arts instruction, with no attention paid to the financial, artistic, and administrative effects of these partnerships on arts organizations.

### Research Questions

This study measures some of the effects on American nonprofit arts organizations of their partnerships with schools to provide arts activities. The study yields a comparative data baseline for launching public debate about the effects on arts organizations of partnering with schools. The project will address the following research hypotheses: 1. Agency Independence. There is an expected inverse relationship between level of income



earned from partnerships with schools by American nonprofit arts organizations and the self-reported likelihood of those organizations to act as advocates regarding school policy.

2. Vendorism. Earned income from school partnerships has led American nonprofit arts organizations to produce more work geared to schools. 3. Bureaucratization. Arts organizations that partner with schools are not expected to have greater odds of being affected by rules and regulations of outside agencies. 4. Costs Arts organizations that partner with schools assume higher costs that may outweigh the benefit of earned income. 5. Artistic Quality. Arts organizations that engage in more collaborative partnerships with schools are more likely than groups that undertake more limited, service-provider roles to self-report an increase in artistic quality.

### Rationale for Study

A review of literature on partnerships between schools and nonprofit arts organizations finds that most writers have been mainly concerned with the impact of partnerships upon arts education. Some literature identifies elements of successful partnerships. To date, no studies have been found that examine the effect of such partnerships upon nonprofit arts organizations. Such data is needed because of the economic and cultural importance of nonprofit arts organizations in the United States and because the study of this phenomenon will add to the store of knowledge about the larger field of government support of nonprofit organizations. The proposed exploratory study is timely since data shows that nonprofits, including cultural organizations, are both expanding and are increasingly relying upon fees for service as part of their operating

budgets (De Vita 1999, 226), Weisbrod (1997, 541-2), Linder and Rosenau (2000, 7-8). In addition, partnerships between schools and arts organizations are attracting a growing proportion of arts funding. A 2005 study conducted by The Foundation Center found that American foundation support for arts education grew faster than arts giving overall between 1999 and 2003. However, grants to schools declined while arts organizations received four out of five arts education dollars and grants (Renz and Atienza, 2005). State arts agency funding patterns for arts education have remained constant, with one out of every three grants and one out of every four grant dollars going to arts education. Funding for artists-in-residence and performances and exhibitions constituted about 29% of arts education funding in 2004 (News from NASAA, 2005).

This study is important because leaders in arts organizations and cultural policymakers can benefit from data revealing any unintended consequences for arts organizations of partnering with schools. Policymakers in education should understand the reasons arts organizations undertake such partnerships. In addition, this study can add to the data on the effects of government contracting with nonprofits. According to Salamon (1995), there is an urgent need and a reticence to examine the tools governments use to finance the provision of social services, particularly through the nonprofit sector.

### Background Issues

In recent years, there has been a renewal of interest in arts instruction prompted by state and national reform initiatives such as the adoption of voluntary standards in arts education (Horowitz 2004, Remer 1996). However, school districts are under pressure to

meet high-stakes standardized testing goals, and resources for arts education have been scarce. Proponents of arts education have debated whether art should be taught for its own sake, or to enhance learning in other academic disciplines. More rigorous evaluation of arts education programs has also gained more attention following the call for scientifically based research on school programs in the No Child Left Behind law (Horowitz 2004, 7). Within the context of these debates, partnerships between schools and arts organizations have come under increased scrutiny as policy leaders discuss who should teach the arts and how they should best be taught.

Remer (1996), Oreck (2004) and Blakeslee (2004) note that the status of arts in the American curriculum has ebbed and flowed in the past 80 years, increasing when progressive reform is prevalent and decreasing when funding is low and back-to-basics movements are in favor. The involvement of local arts organizations in education grew as part of federal, state and local responses to escalating cuts of arts programs nationwide in the late 1960s and 1970s (Fineberg 2002). The reform agenda of the Goals 2000 Educate America Act signed into law in 1994 energized a national interest in exploring partnerships as a means of attaining difficult outcomes, encouraging partnerships between the public and private sectors in many areas including the arts (Ellis and Dreeszen, 2003). Partnerships with arts organizations have become standard in many school districts (Fineberg 2002). Oreck (2004) points out that for the past decade, there has been a significant increase in the arts as part of in-service professional development programs for classroom and academic subject-area teachers. Oreck (2004) attributes this increase to national school reform efforts based on educational research; public/private partnerships

between schools and cultural institutions; and new national and state standards in the arts. Horowitz (2004) points out that while the recent federal No Child Left Behind law defines the arts as part of the core curriculum, one of its unintended consequences is that schools under pressure to show improvement in high-stakes tests are directing scarce resources to academic areas other than the arts. In 1997, the National Center for Educational Statistics conducted The National Assessment of Educational Progress, a survey designed to assess both the frequency with which American 8<sup>th</sup> grade students receive instruction in the arts, and how well these students can create, perform, and respond to works of visual art, music, and theatre (The NAEP 1997, <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/arts/>). In 1994, the Consortium of National Arts Education Associations (under the guidance of the National Committee for Standards in the Arts) produced the National Standards for Arts Education, which outlines basic arts learning outcomes integral to the comprehensive K-12 education of every American student. Remer (1996) points to these voluntary national standards, along with state and local standards, as part of a climate of reform that enhances the potential for partnerships between schools and arts organizations to lead to significant gains in arts education.

Another important trend in arts education is that policy and advocacy should be based on the notion that the arts are inherently valuable, rather than being important because they increase socialization and learning abilities in other subjects. In 2002, the national arts education advocacy organization Arts Education Partnership, with financial support from the National Endowment for the Arts and the U.S. Department of Education, published a report called *Critical Links: Learning in the Arts and Student Academic and*

*Social Development*. This report was a compendium of recent research on the academic and social effects of arts learning. The journal *Arts Education Policy Review* responded with a symposium consisting of articles heavily critical of the report by writers including Tusa (2003), Silvers (2003), Gee (2003), Smith (2003), and Winner & Hetland (2003). These writers attack the scientific validity of the research gathered in *Critical Links* and argue for the need to re-conceptualize and articulate the inherent value of the arts and arts education. Gee (2002) compares advocacy statements and strategies of national arts organizations in the mid-1990s with the same agencies' statements in 2002, noting that the more recent versions include more statements about the inherent value of the arts along with claims about the instrumental value of the arts in attaining other goals.

Access to arts education varies by artistic discipline. The 1997 National Assessment of Educational Progress reported that 91% of American eighth graders receive music education and 83% receive visual arts instruction. In most cases full time or part time specialists deliver this instruction. However, only 26% of eighth grade students receive theater instruction and only 20% receive dance instruction (The NAEP 1997, <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/arts/>). The National Center for Education Statistics (Carey et al., 2002) conducted a survey on the availability and quality of art education in public elementary and secondary schools. The survey reveals that schools with higher proportions of students coming from disadvantaged backgrounds (measured as percentage enrollment eligible for free school meals) have fewer arts courses and these tend to be of a lower quality (Carey et al., 2002). Partnerships with individual artists and arts organizations provide exposure to the arts to enhance or replace ongoing art education.

## Summary

Chapter 1 serves as a general introduction to the problem, the rationale for the study, problem statements and research questions. This chapter describes the climate for educational change, characterized by the adoption of voluntary standards in arts education, that encourages school partnerships with private entities; the call for teaching arts for their own inherent value rather than for their value in facilitating learning in other subjects; debate over whether teachers or professional artists are more qualified to deliver arts instruction; lack of access to arts education; and the absence of research on how arts organizations are affected by working with schools. Partnerships between schools and arts organizations are attracting a growing proportion of arts funding. Nonprofits, including cultural organizations, are both expanding in number and are increasingly relying upon fees for service as part of their operating budgets.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Most analysis of arts education partnerships examines arts education policy, rather than impact on arts organizations. Many writers, while acknowledging some benefits of school-arts organization partnerships, point out that they can have unintended negative consequences for arts education by minimizing the role of arts teachers.

For example, Chapman (1992) and Hoffa (1993) trace the history of federal attempts to address arts education policy to its beginning in the 1960s. Chapman (1992) argues that early initiatives such as seminars sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, the CEMREL Aesthetic Education Program, and the National Endowment for the Arts' Artists-in-Schools Program led to a national policy that has influenced arts education for the worse. Chapman (1992) attributes to national policy the following views: arts education should address all arts disciplines or none at all; the arts are most useful in improving other areas such as racial and social understanding, truancy, and reading scores; arts education should focus on the creation and performance of works of art rather than understanding and interpretation; and perhaps most damaging of all, schools should rely on artists and community organizations rather than teachers to provide instruction in the arts. Chapman (1992) refers to the influence of federal policy as the "de-schooling" of arts education, since it has led to a reliance on sources outside of schools for expertise. Among

the problems created by this policy are lack of access to the arts for all children due to limited instruction; lack of consistent quality in the work of artists and arts organizations; lack of opportunity for children to grow through analyzing and interpreting works of art; the restriction of meaningful arts experiences to those children whose families can pay for them outside of school; and the lack of substantive discussions about priorities among the arts disciplines and their instruction (Chapman 1992). Chapman (1992), Smith (1992), Hoffa (1993), Jones (1994), Gee (2002) and Hanley (2003) argue that arts organizations and professional artists should enhance arts education, not substitute for it.

Gee (2002) points out that recent arts advocacy statements by national arts organizations such as the National Endowment for the Arts continue to identify professional artists and arts organizations as the “experts” who should receive funding to deliver arts education in the schools and professional development to teachers. Hanley (2003) notes that policymakers, funders, the media, and administrative educational decision makers in Canada have enthusiastically encouraged partnerships between schools and arts organizations, while failing to critically examine the long-term implications of these new ventures for arts education. Hanley (2003) points out that the trend toward partnering with outside organizations comes at the same time that many arts specialist and coordinator positions in schools have been lost.



### Collaboration Models

Remer (1996, 114-9) distinguishes between administrative and instructional partnerships. Administrative partnerships are institutional arrangements that address the form, structure and operation of a relationship. Such matters may include overall roles and responsibilities, evaluation, organization, design, coordination and governance.

Instructional partnerships, on the other hand, address the content and methodology of the curriculum. Remer notes that the boundaries between these two models often overlap, as in the case of a school-theatre collaboration that begins with an instructional partnership involving a single performance and develops a broader administrative partnership.

Dreeszen (2002) and Remer (1996, 118-21) offer a continuum illustrating six stages of instructional partnerships, ranging from the simplest form of arts exposure to the most complex.

Horowitz' (2004) analysis of six large-scale partnerships summarizes five different implementation models identified by a Minnesota partnership. These are 1) the residency model, in which schools bring in one or more artists for a period of time for projects not related to curricular goals; 2) elaborated residency model, in which the artist is the primary teacher in a residency tied to developing non-arts skills; 3) the capacity-building model, in which artists prepare teachers to use an art form in their own teaching; 4) the co-teaching model, involving teacher-artist pairs integrating concepts from the arts and non-arts disciplines that reinforce each other; and 5) concepts across the curriculum model,

involving arts and non-arts teachers working with artists to select an art form that would reinforce concepts in several disciplines with common concepts (Horowitz 2004, 114-8).

#### Advantages and Disadvantages of School – Arts Organization Partnerships

Chapman (2000, 38) writes: “The language of partnership and collaboration has two effects. It announces some form of alliance and accord, but it also suppresses hierarchies of significant expertise, effort, commitment, and authority for arts education in schools.” Much analysis of partnerships expresses the same tension between the benefits of partnership, such as shared purposes and resources, and their drawbacks including failure to contribute to, and even erosion of, permanent sequential arts instruction. Hanley (2003) discusses artist-in-the schools programs in Canadian elementary schools, ranging from a single visit by artists to artist-in-residence programs. The author concludes that the positive effects of these programs include excitement among students and teachers, and renewed interest in arts education in some geographic areas. However, she argues, such partnerships further displace permanent art specialists, replacing them with temporary arts experiences. These programs also emphasize a final performance or exhibition rather than ongoing, sequential learning. In addition, such partnerships imply that teachers are less valuable than practitioners and underestimate the contribution of teachers. Finally, these programs fail to achieve mandated learning outcomes in the arts. In short, many partnerships foster exposure rather than continuous programs and focus on learning other subjects through the arts rather than learning in the arts (Hanley 2003). Hanley (2003) also

suggests that arts partnerships have been diverting resources that could be more effectively used in comprehensive, developmental arts education.

Skomal (1993) suggests, however, that one reason for the lack of support for arts education by those outside of the field is the attitude that arts specialists are the only experts who should be involved in arts education. He suggests that involving stakeholders, including arts organizations, can broaden support for arts education (Skomal 1993). In addition, Remer (1996) argues that partnerships can ultimately help move the arts from the periphery to the mainstream of school curricula. In her book *Beyond Enrichment: Building Effective Partnerships with Schools and Your Community* (1996), she interviews practitioners and leaders at the local, state, and national levels to gather qualitative data on partnership case studies and provide guidelines within which partnerships can enhance, rather than substitute for, sequential arts education. Seidel et al (2001) point out that for some schools, partnerships represent the only form of arts education available. In *The NAEP 1997 Arts Report Card*, 268 schools were asked whether the state or district provides curriculum in the arts. Ninety percent of participating schools responded that they had no curriculum for dance; 85% reported no curriculum for theatre; 28% reported no curriculum for music; and 36% had no curriculum for visual arts (The NAEP 1997 Arts Report Card, <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/arts/>).

Harlan Hoffa (1993) analyzes written goals of organizations that partner with schools in arts education, noting that often these goals are unrelated to the actual programs they offer. Funders contributed to the rise of partnerships by increasing the money

available for such efforts. Problems included reluctance by either arts organizations or educators to adapt to the needs of the other.

Jones (1994) draws upon his experience with the Metropolitan Life Foundation and its history of funding arts partnerships. He attributes the formation of many partnerships to the requirements by state, local, and federal governments for arts organizations to serve student populations. He identifies problems with arts partnerships including: 1) selecting artists of low quality or artists that do not relate well to children; 2) lack of meaningful evaluation - often nothing beyond participation figures; and 3) lack of institutional commitment.

However, Jones generally supports partnerships. He describes a model Metropolitan Life Foundation program, "Partnerships: Arts and the Schools," that began in the late 1980s. The author is a staff member at MetLife Foundation, whose model features include the involvement of teachers and school administrators, and sensitivity to the diversity of the student body (Jones 1994).

### Evaluation of School – Arts Organization Partnerships

Methods of evaluating arts partnerships usually involve a qualitative element, whether as case studies or as mixed-method approaches. Horowitz (2004) synthesized evaluations of six large-scale arts education partnerships, noting that evaluators used quasi-experimental, descriptive, and ethnographic designs. Data collection techniques for the six

projects included surveys, site observations, interviews, focus groups, demographic data, standardized test scores, and self-developed measures to assess student learning (Horowitz 2004, 13). Other case studies have been written by partnership participants, such as Jones (1993), Constantino (2003) and Rademaker (2003).

The six projects whose evaluations were analyzed by Horowitz (2004) are unlike most school/arts organization partnerships in at least two ways. First, the organizational partners were mainly large entities whose purpose explicitly involved arts education. Many partnerships involve, by contrast, arts-producing organizations such as theatres or symphonies for which arts education is at best a secondary mission (Hoffa 1993). Second, the partnerships Horowitz studied were larger in scale than most partnerships, involving multiple school sites across a state or city. These six projects, which aimed to restore and/or sustain arts education in schools, had varying goals and produced a variety of effects on schools and, in some cases, school systems. Findings in some programs included increased arts instruction; teachers incorporating arts activities into their instruction when the teaching artist was not present; teachers used new classroom management techniques acquired from teaching artists; teachers improved knowledge about art forms; schools viewed the arts as more fundamental to learning; and parents became more involved with school curriculum. All of the programs reported changes in instructional practice, with teachers changing perceptions about student capacity, accessing new instructional tools, and making instruction more child-focused. In addition to enhanced student mastery of learning in the arts, some programs reported that students also became more verbally fluent, developed creative thinking abilities, became positive risk-takers, gained self-

confidence, and demonstrated gains in collaboration and cooperative learning. The arts and cultural organizations involved often developed their own educational staff and expertise; began or increased professional training programs for teachers; and paying more attention to student assessment and input from schools (Horowitz 2004).

Seidel et al. (2001)'s study of sustainability analyzes twenty-one U.S. arts partnerships the authors describe as "surviving" to determine what elements they had in common. The researchers conducted surveys, semi-structured phone interviews, focus groups, and interviews with the participants, who were selected from among 300 arts partnerships nominated by practitioners. Criteria for selection were financial stability and the program's plans for sustained funding (Seidel et al 2001, 16-7). Surviving arts partnerships, the authors conclude, share the following traits: 1) they place the needs of students and schools at the center of their mission; 2) they are fueled by deep personal commitments to the educational power of arts experiences; 3) multiple dimensions of the work, such as leadership and relationships, receive regular attention; 4) they embrace the need to listen, to learn, and to change; and 5) they require a broad base of ownership and investment (Seidel et al 2001, xxv-xxvi).

In 2001, Arts Education Partnership convened a forum of thirteen partnerships judged to be exemplary to discuss challenges, best practices, and strategies for success. The report resulting from the forum and from survey research of the programs indicates that the most promising partnerships are those combining schools, arts organizations, and institutions of higher learning to improve professional development of teachers and artists

working in schools (*Teaching Partnerships* 2002, 2). Fineberg (1994) also identifies institutions of higher learning as important partners in school-arts collaborations.

Case studies, such as those by Brouillette (1996) and Stankiewicz (2001), identify key characteristics of successful partnerships and obstacles to achieving them. For example, Stankiewicz (2001) describes the partnership between the Sarasota, Florida school district and the Arts Education Task Force of the County Arts Council. Between 1988 and 1995, Sarasota lost the position of fine arts coordinator, and the school board eliminated many art and music classes taught by specialists at the elementary and middle school level. Partnerships with local arts organizations led to advocacy campaigns resulting in art and music teachers returning to all schools, with some schools adding dance and theatre. This case demonstrates that local groups can cite national standards to affirm the importance of the arts; that the National Standards offer broad goals for local arts education programs; and that the national Opportunity-to-Learn Standards offer benchmarks against which to measure local conditions. The author identifies several factors in the success of this partnership: first, the local arts community lobbied for the restoration of curriculum-based, in-school arts education rather than providing after-school enrichment; communication and trust were built by sharing information with one another and compromising when necessary; a core of active participants remained involved despite some departures; familiarity of core participants with national arts education initiatives; leadership was shared among members rather than resting with one person; the long-range plan was developed after data documenting the current status of arts education in each school had been collected; brainstorming was wide-ranging and inclusive of stakeholders;

persistence despite setbacks; and support from principals and the central administrators who supervised them (Stankiewicz 2001).

Fineberg (1994) argues that the degree to which partnerships are successful rests with policies developed by school systems and partnering organizations. National education associations such as the National School Board Association, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, and others, offer advocacy statements that support school district policies that make time and money available for such partnerships. Fineberg (1994) identifies obstacles to successful partnerships, including lack of communication about the project to parents, legislators, and funders; lack of a shared philosophical basis among partners; the difficulty of finding and paying for planning time; lack of clarity about the need for certification or other credentials of visiting artists; lack of money from funders for “art for art’s sake” while the same funders provide incentives for learning through the arts; and the need for accountability.

Blakeslee (2004) calls for clear standards to be applied in evaluating the effectiveness of arts programs, particularly those involving arts-producing organizations such as theatres and symphonies. Using the voluntary national standards accepted by the U.S. secretary of education in 1994 as a benchmark, the author formulates three questions that could serve as a measure of what he terms “educational efficacy.” (Blakeslee 2004, 34) These questions are:

- 1) Do we expect students in the program to be able to reach the achievements suggested in the standards, and at what level?



- 2) What breadth of standards-based achievement do we expect of students in the program?
- 3) What portion of the student population do we expect to reach with the program in question? (Blakeslee 2004, 34)

Blakeslee (2004) acknowledges that most programs would not successfully meet all three criteria. Still, it would begin to provide clear standards to differentiate what funders and policymakers consider to be educational programs from recreational experiences.

The Chicago Community Trust conducted a survey during the 2000-2001 school year of arts organization officials and elementary and high school principals in Chicago. The survey, which had an 85% response rate from principals and a 29% response rate from arts organization representatives, revealed that 102,000 students took part in classroom programs provided by outside arts organizations. Of this number, 12% received a program offering 28 hours or more of instruction during the year. Half of Chicago Public Schools elementary students received less time than this from their school arts specialist (Constantino 2003, 26-7).

Constantino (2003) offers recommendations for philanthropists inspired by the case study of the Chicago Community Trust Arts Education Task Force, of which she is a member. The Task Force was formed after survey found inconsistent opportunities for arts education provided by arts specialists and arts organizations. The Task Force has created an educational policy agenda that encourages the implementation of comprehensive and sequential K-12 arts education in every public school. Following the creation of the policy,

the Task Force's efforts have been directed toward advocacy, information gathering, and planning for arts programming in demonstration schools.

### Arts Organizations

A Knight Foundation study indicates that in 1998, one in three arts organizations in America was operating with a budget deficit (National Assembly of State Arts Agencies 2001). Financial stability has become increasingly important and elusive for arts organizations due to a number of factors. Changing community priorities and demographics have affected resources such as volunteer time, private support and audience size; shifting philanthropic patterns have made organizations more dependent on gifts from individuals; and arts organizations face both the need to keep up with advancing technology and the realization that technology represents competition for audiences. These factors have combined with unstable government funding to make it harder for arts organizations to achieve financial stability. As public funding for arts education remains constant and private arts education grants continue to grow, arts organizations have a financial incentive to initiate partnerships with schools. Still, fifty percent of U.S. arts organizations surveyed reported no income from fees for service in fiscal year 1998 (Cohen et al 2002).

There is a small body of research addressing how changing funding sources affect nonprofit arts organizations. Tuckman and Chang (1992) review data for the nonprofit sector as a whole and find evidence that organizations pursue a deliberate goal of

equity accumulation, in spite of the intent of tax laws governing nonprofit organizations. Richard Rosett (1991) presents data indicating that art museum funding patterns influence museum spending, with museums changing their product mix to be more compatible with donors' preferences. Anheier and Toepler (1998) find that art museums benefited from an increase in private and institutional funding in the 1970s and 1980s, leading to growth in capital investment, special acquisitions, and special projects. Without a corresponding increase in support of general operations and maintenance and with declining government support, museums have turned to income-earning ventures (Anheier and Toepler 1998). Massarsky and Beinhacker (2002) surveyed 519 nonprofits and find that arts and culture organizations are more likely to operate earned income ventures than other types of organizations. Their study finds that nonprofit organizations operating business ventures are staffed with greater numbers of employees, supporting Gronbjerg's (1993) observation that greater income diversity requires greater managerial effort and expertise. However, Massarsky and Beinhacker (2002) also find that organizations operating a business venture reported a positive effect on the organization's reputation, mission, service and program delivery, entrepreneurial culture, and ability to attract and retain donors and staff. Hughes and Luksetich (2004) analyze public data from museums, performing arts organizations, and media and communications organizations. Their analysis of revenue and expenditures indicates that greater reliance on private funding does not divert funding from program service delivery (Hughes and Luksetich 2004).

These studies support the notion that greater income diversity leads to greater costs and may change product mix, but does not divert from organizational mission and can

provide positive effects. Most of this literature analyzes commercial ventures. School partnerships receive less attention from those studying nonprofit arts organizations. A literature review reveals that museums write more about school partnerships than do other kinds of arts organizations. Franco (1992) notes that the increasing emphasis on public service in museums has broadened the role of education from school visits as an add-on to an integral part of all programs. O'Connell (1992) offers guidelines for museums in developing educational materials for schools. Diane B. Frankel, Director of the Institute of Museum Services (INS), profiles fifteen school-museum collaborations that received financial support from INS in order to identify best practices (1996). Sullivan (1996) advises museums to develop educational programs for youth that work against the educational trend toward measurable objectives. He wants museums to offer a "counterbalancing curriculum, stressing the development of critical judgment, awe, piety, sensitivity, empathy, affection." (Sullivan 1996, 64)

Xanthoudaki (1998) offers a rare attempt to analyze school field trips to museums from the perspectives of both institutions. Using field observations of classroom art practice and school visits to two galleries and one museum as well as theory regarding the educational value of museums, she observes two different models for visual arts institutions. In the first, the gallery is designed as a resource for teachers, who play a large role in determining the theme, content, structure, and learning activities of the class visit. The second model positions the gallery as teacher about its own collection, offering educational programs on its own temporary exhibits but requiring much less involvement by classroom teachers. Xanthoudaki (1998) finds that these two models, along with other

factors such as the physical environment of the gallery and resources available to teachers, affect differently the ability to carry out the “three-part” model of preliminary classroom work, visit to the institution and follow-up activities in the classroom.

Private and public grant making has played a strong role in arts education partnerships. As Seidel et al (2001) point out, many arts partnerships do not receive financial support from school districts. The National Endowment for the Arts, the U.S. Department of Education, the Institute of Museum Services, and state arts agencies are among the institutions offering financial support for partnerships between schools and arts organizations. Hanley (2003), Gee (2002), Chapman (2000), Remer (1996), Hoffa (1993), Jones (1994), and Fineberg (1994) point to the increasing availability of funds for education as an important motivator for arts organizations to initiate and cooperate in partnerships with schools. Hanley (2003) suggests that the economic motive for many partnerships is to provide jobs for artists. Fineberg (1994) points out that, while purer motives exist and often lead to more successful collaborations, collaborations often develop after the availability of funding earmarked for such purposes. As proof of local commitment to partnerships, state arts agencies and other funders often require evidence of matching funds, in-kind services, and sufficient time for planning (Fineberg 1994).

### Theoretical Considerations

A discussion of the theoretical basis for the study must begin with a brief analysis of U.S. public-private partnerships, then identify characteristics of school-arts organization

partnerships within that framework. Finally, this section will provide theoretical bases for each of the research hypotheses.

Writers including Salamon (1987, 1995), Linder & Rosenau (2000), and Dixon et al. (2004) note that western industrialized countries including the U.S. have shown growing interest in experimenting with public-private partnerships in the past thirty years. According to Salamon (1995), there is an urgent need and a reticence to examine the tools governments use to finance the provision of social services, particularly through the nonprofit sector. Linder (2000) identifies six uses of the term “public-private partnership” based on intended outcomes: first, as management reform by using market efficiencies to enhance government’s productivity. Second, to convert government’s challenge from providing services to attracting entrepreneurs. Third, to rid public assistance of moral baggage that comes with public programs such as welfare. The fourth function served by public-private partnerships is to shift financial and political risk away from government and to the private sector. Fifth, public-private partnerships restructure public service by relieving government of some administrative functions and by imposing the discipline of a private labor market. Finally, public-private partnerships enable governments to share power horizontally with the private sector rather than impose power hierarchically, creating an ethos of cooperation and trust (Linder 2000, 26-31). The second, fourth and fifth of these functions are most relevant to some kinds of partnerships between schools and arts organizations. When schools contract with arts organizations to provide activities that substitute for ongoing curriculum, their challenge is to attract entrepreneurial organizations rather than to provide education. Any political risk inherent in potentially

controversial content of work provided by arts organizations can initially be shifted to the organization itself, though administrators must ultimately answer for the decision to engage the organization. A controversial project or activity can more easily be accounted for as an isolated event than the controversial activities of a permanent teacher. Finally, schools that contract with arts organizations for activities that replace rather than enhance arts education can expect considerable cost savings over the cost of additional teaching positions.

In *Democracy in America*, de Tocqueville's analysis of private organizations characterizes associations as sites of political socialization and civic engagement. This argument is often used to characterize nonprofit organizations as a force resisting the expansion of state power. To what extent do nonprofit organizations lose the ability to act independently when they partner with government? This project examines arts organizations, which were seen by at least one writer to be especially vulnerable to co-optation by the state. Theodor Adorno extends Marx's notion of commodity fetishism to what he describes as "the culture industry" (2002). Adorno uses the term "culture industry" to refer to film, radio, television, and popular music as opposed to "high art" which contained the possibility of providing an aesthetic experience that could reveal insight into human suffering as well as the need for social transformation (Kellner 2002, 92-3). For Adorno, the entrenchment of capitalism includes the co-optation of art and culture as tools for reinforcing people's passive satisfaction and lack of interest in overthrowing institutions that oppress them. The culture industry creates false needs that it satisfies with formulaic products rather than providing more challenging art that might address real

needs such as freedom and full creative expression (2002). Cultural experiences have been transformed by commodity fetishism; their value lies in the exchange cost involved rather than in the actual value of the use of the experience for its own sake (2002). To the degree that nonprofit arts organizations rely upon earned income from institutions like schools, they become co-opted by those institutions and two outcomes can be predicted. First, they will become less likely to advocate for substantial change in the institutions that pay them. Second, they are less likely to produce art that offers serious challenge to social institutions.

In addition, Adorno writes of the need for expert guidance when governments purchase art: “No city administration, for example, can decide from which painter it should buy paintings, unless it can rely on people who have a serious, objective and progressive understanding of painting.” (2002, 128). However, the presence of such an expert risks negating democratic values (2002, 128-9). Decisions involving the selection of nonprofit arts organizations to provide arts education are often made by school administrators or non-arts teachers. Katz (1984) notes that the fields of education and nonprofit organization are both marked by lack of national policy, leaving important policy decisions to the state and local level.

Dixon et al. (2004, 25-46) delineate philosophical differences between public agencies and private contractors that can lead to failure of such partnerships. The writers contend that private managerialists, with their focus on efficiency and cost-effectiveness, often misconstrue the needs of the public sector with its multiplicity of stakeholders and political constraints (Dixon et al. 2004, 25-34). This leads to one of two results. The first



possibility is an unresponsive dialogue, in which one voice extolling the virtues of privatized public services dominates discourse. The second possible outcome is a “dialogue of the deaf,” in which many voices are heard but no one is listening or engaging (Dixon et al. 2004, 30-32). Ryan and Shreyar (1996) analyze arts education partnerships and find a similar dissonance between the values and philosophical assumptions of teachers and artists. They note that schools treated the role of educators as one of transmission, in which predetermined knowledge and skills are passed along to passive students who are then tested for retention. By contrast, artists adopted either a transactional or transformational approach. A transactional approach acknowledges that knowledge is socially constructed within the context of experience, and aims to engage students in learning based on students’ needs and experiences that helps them reconstruct themselves and their world. A transformational approach also recognizes the socially constructed basis of knowledge and emphasizes the ability of the learner to address social inequities and problems. As Freire states, education for critical consciousness is “learning to perceive social, political, economic contradictions and to take action against the oppressive elements of reality” (Freire, 1994, p. 17).

Many critics have described one of art’s most important roles as that of cultural critic. Nietzsche (1872) writes, “Art is not merely an imitation of the reality of nature, but in truth a metaphysical supplement to the reality of nature, placed alongside thereof for its conquest.” Fischer (1959) suggests that art must comment on manmade institutions in addition to nature: “In a decaying society, art, if it is truthful, must also reflect decay. And unless it wants to break faith with its social function, art must show the world as

changeable. And help to change it.” DiMaggio (1987, 200) is among the writers noting that most U.S. arts industries have islands of nonprofit activity, and that nonprofit organizations present most of what is called “high art” or “serious art.” For nonprofit arts organizations to maintain the ability to critique social institutions, they must preserve a degree of independence. One of the primary questions motivating this survey is whether arts organizations receiving significant income from schools find themselves less inclined to critique schools by advocating for change in structure, curriculum, or leadership.

While many researchers have studied the economic impact of the nonprofit arts sector, researchers in the arts have more recently broadened their focus from economic impact studies to include different kinds of economic analyses. These include attempts to clarify definitions of the arts sector and types of support; increased research into funding streams and increasingly complex models of financial support; and models of competition and collaboration. One such effort is the work of the National and Local Profiles of Cultural Support Project, undertaken by the Americans for the Arts in collaboration with Ohio State University between 1999 and 2001. The resulting report states, among other findings, that over the past decade local and state support for the arts have grown as federal support has diminished. Since the 1980s devolution has caused nonprofits to increasingly rely on charging fees for services, including cultural organizations (De Vita 1999, 226).

While no significant research is found on the impact of partnerships with schools on nonprofit arts organizations, several studies sponsored or co-sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts attempt to identify elements of successful partnerships. Also, DiMaggio’s (1983) survey of theatre and orchestra managers demonstrates that the

availability of state funding has led to changes in the structure of the arts field. He urges researchers to focus not on outcomes of funding programs but to investigate long-term structural changes to fields when state support is introduced or increased. Several writers suggest that government support of nonprofit organizations including contracts for service may lead to negative consequences for nonprofits. First, De Vita (1999) and Salamon (1987, 114) suggest that increased dependence on government funding may cause organizations to lose their capacity to act as advocates on policy issues. Second, Salamon (1987, 114-5) notes that government funding may cause organizations to shift their priorities to be more in line with those of government, leading them to change their missions and undertake activities they would not otherwise attempt (vendorism). Third, Berger & Neuhaus (1996, 196-201) and Butler (1996, 121-2) note that government regulations may require nonprofit organizations to incur greater bureaucracy and higher costs. Finally, Frey (2003, 148-53) discusses the Crowding Out theory, which posits that external rewards such as government funding may actually decrease innovation and creativity. In addition, many writers, while acknowledging some benefits of school-arts organization partnerships, point out that they can have unintended negative consequences for arts education by minimizing the role of arts teachers. Hanley (2003), Gee (2002), Chapman (2000), Remer (1996), Hoffa (1993), Jones (1994), and Fineberg (1994) point to the availability of funds for education as an important motivator for arts organizations to initiate and cooperate in partnerships with schools. Research is needed that clarifies the reasons arts organizations undertake collaborative initiatives with schools.

There is a theoretical basis for ascribing financial motives to arts organizations. In a landmark study first published in 1966 that drew the attention of other economists to the field of the arts, *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*, William J. Baumol and William G. Bowen (1993) reveal that the perceived “cultural boom” of the time masked a less promising trend. When adjusted to reflect real income, dollars spent on admissions to live arts events did not increase over time. More importantly, their examination of the structure of performing arts institutions leads them to conclude that these organizations would never be able to earn enough revenue through admissions to cover costs. This is because of the failure of technical progress in the arts to keep pace with technical progress in the economy as a whole, while wages rise in the arts at a comparable rate to the rest of the economy (Baumol & Bowen 1993). Technology plays a small role in the production of art, and technical advances do little to increase the output of performances, for instance. Heilbrun & Gray (2001) agree with Baumol & Bowen that in the nonprofit arts sector, the average unit cost of production falls continuously over the range of output demanded in the market. Marginal cost lies below average cost as long as average cost declines. In order to break even, the arts organization must charge admission equal to average cost which would be greater than marginal cost, thus creating a market failure (Heilbrun & Gray 2001, 235). DiMaggio (1984, 61-2), however, points out that arts organizations may employ strategies designed to achieve economies of scale, such as reducing rehearsal time or extending the number of planned performances. Contracting with schools may be another way to achieve an economy of scale, if the cost of additional overhead (sets, performers’ pay, travel, etc.)

is not greater than fees received from schools. School fees may be higher than an arts organization might expect to be able to recover through ticket sales to the general public.

However, arts organizations may have other reasons for partnering with schools. DiMaggio (1987, 207-9) points out that nonprofit cultural organizations may have a variety of objectives other than budget maximization. First, artistic quality is an important consideration, reflected in a high degree of innovation or outstanding production values. Second, DiMaggio points out that economists have often assumed that arts organizations desire the largest and most heterogeneous audience possible, though there is evidence that audience development may be a means to a larger end, such as legitimizing the organization (DiMaggio 1987, 208). Third, survival and legitimacy are important and sometimes interconnected goals of cultural organizations, according to DiMaggio (1987, 208-9). Case studies show arts organizations expending significant effort to establish high standing among local, state, regional and national communities. Legitimacy may be linked to survival, as when organizations continue money-losing programs in order to attract grants. Fourth, DiMaggio (1987, 209) acknowledges budget maximization and growth as goals of arts organizations. Fifth, he notes that participants derive personal, professional and artistic rewards from arts organizations (DiMaggio 1987, 209). This study asked arts organizations to rank these and other factors as motivators in pursuing arts education partnerships.

## Research Questions

**Hypothesis 1. Agency Independence. There is an expected inverse relationship between level of income earned from partnerships with schools by American nonprofit arts organizations and the self-reported likelihood of those organizations to act as advocates regarding school policy.** De Vita (1999) discusses legislative attempts to limit nonprofits' ability to act as advocates in the 1990s following welfare reform and the devolution of funding to the state and local levels. She notes the strong role of nonprofits in voicing public concerns, needs and preferences. Salamon (1987) notes longstanding concerns that government funding would cause nonprofits to lose their independence to act as advocates, though he finds no evidence of this taking place in a recent study of private agencies serving the handicapped. He also notes that sole reliance on private funding may pose an equally great challenge to agency independence. Dixon et al. analyze public-private partnerships and the competing epistemological and ontological assumptions that cause tensions between managerialists looking to benefit from privatization and the public sector with its need to meet goals that are not always consistent and commonly shared. Dixon et al. (2004, 30-2) note that those in the private sector providing public goods through government contracts are motivated to suppress criticisms and reform of the existing arrangement and to argue that any inadequacies in the public-private partnership arise from bad luck or from a few rogues in the marketplace. The case of arts organizations acting as private contractors is complicated by the fact that many arts organizations have

voiced the expectation that their industry would benefit from strong arts education programs consisting of sequential curricula taught by licensed educational specialists.

While few arts organizations have advocacy as their sole purpose, policy decisions about arts education have increasingly shifted to the local level in recent years.

Professional artists and arts organizations have voiced a number of reasons for advocating strong school arts programs, including the need to nurture creativity, to identify and guide talented students, and to develop future audiences for the arts. On the other hand, arts organizations may derive a significant source of earned income from providing arts experiences not offered by schools. It was expected that quantitative data would show that increasing levels of income earned from school partnerships serve as a disincentive to advocate for more positions for teachers who might provide arts instruction in place of arts organizations.

**Hypothesis 2. Vendorism. Earned income from school partnerships has led U.S. nonprofit arts organizations to produce more work geared to schools.** Salamon (1987) uses the term “vendorism” to describe one potential effect of government sponsorship upon nonprofit organizations. This term is used to describe the distortion of an agency’s original mission to fit priorities for which government funding is available. Individual artists including Meban (2002) report that school partnership experiences led to self-censorship to select themes and issues that would not be considered controversial in the setting. Weisbrod (1997, 547) notes that nonprofits undertaking more diversified sources of earned income risk unplanned changes of direction. Bowen (1994, 30-01) suggests that opportunities to add new programs and pursue funding constitute temptations

for organizations that may lead them away from their central mission. Salamon (1987) finds little empirical evidence to support this concern. In addition, a recent analysis of data from 209 nonprofit arts organizations shows that greater reliance on private funding does not divert funding from program service delivery (Hughes and Luksetich, 2004).

However, arts organizations losing sources of operating support are especially vulnerable to vendorism. DiMaggio notes that the need to earn income through ticket sales constrains the nonprofit cultural organization and that donated support allows it to pursue its objectives more efficiently (DiMaggio 1983 and 1984). In a later article, he writes that arts organizations have varying objectives and that managers often switch among these goals in order to “put out fires.” (DiMaggio 1987, 209). DiMaggio also suggests that nonprofits’ objectives change with growth and with age. Further, goals may be stated in terms so ambiguous as to allow for a vast array of activities and pursuits. (DiMaggio 1987, 210). DiMaggio (1987, 211) notes that public sponsorship is one factor influencing objectives. For example, the availability of public money through Titles I and III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act enticed many orchestras to create programs for schoolchildren in the late 1960s and early 1970s (DiMaggio 1987, 211).

This study sought to determine, first, how many arts organizations working in schools have arts education as part of their mission. This is important because of the heated debate over who should provide arts experiences in the schools. Harlan Hoffa (1993) analyzes written goals of organizations that partner with schools in arts education, noting that often these goals are unrelated to the actual programs they offer.



Second, this study asked respondents who work with schools whether their partnerships have led to their organizations' producing work of a substantially different nature. If earned income from schools influences artistic direction and programming decisions, arts policymakers and funders need to consider the implications of providing financial incentives to work with schools.

Finally, this study investigated other reasons arts organizations partner with schools. Arts organizations often cite the need to develop current and future audiences for the arts. In 2004, Borgonovi used a logistic regression model to analyze personal socio-economic factors to determine to what degree each influences attendance at professional performing arts events (theatre, classical music, opera, ballet and dance). Borgonovi studied factors including art education, prices, gender, age, income, and general educational attainment. The author found that art education was much more important in determining attendance than any other factor (Borgonovi 2004).

**Hypothesis 3. Bureaucratization.** **Arts organizations that partner with schools are not expected to have greater odds of being affected by rules and regulations of outside agencies.** Salamon (1987) identifies bureaucratization as another possible effect on nonprofits when they carry out work specified by governments. With an increasing emphasis on accountability in government, nonprofits receiving government funding are under growing pressure to demonstrate compliance with government rules and regulations. In *Bureaucratizing the Muse: Public Funds and the Cultural Worker*, Dubin (1987) describes the Chicago Artists-in-Residence Program that operated from 1977 to 1981 under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). Dubin's detailed case

study demonstrates that even when program administrators tried to shield artists from the burdensome administrative requirements of CETA, the program itself gave in to the need to produce measurable results and participating artists grew to feel alienated and creatively stifled.

It was expected that subjects in the proposed study would not report bureaucratization as a significant effect of working with schools. While Salamon (1987) finds this to be the most credible of the three possible effects of government funding he identifies (agency independence, vendorism, bureaucratization), he notes that the push for professionalism comes from sources other than government funding (Salamon 1987, 115). In addition, those arts groups whose work in schools consists of providing a service in exchange for a fee are usually not subject to extensive reporting requirements that come along with less restrictive types of funding, such as grants. Arts groups that engage in longer, more collaborative partnerships in which payments are distributed over a longer time period may report that they have had to take on additional administrative procedures.

**Hypothesis 4. Costs Arts organizations that partner with schools are assuming higher costs that may outweigh the benefit of earned income.** Baumol and Bowen (1966, 1993) demonstrate that performing arts organizations face a gap between operating expenses and earned income due to forces beyond their control. Because they cannot take advantage of innovations in technology, these organizations can never earn enough income to cover operating costs. DiMaggio (1984, 63-4), however, points out that there are several ways organizations can increase productivity.

Performing arts organizations may regard school performances as an opportunity to recover more revenue in fees than they would be able to earn through ticket sales to the general public. However, there may be costs directly related to working with schools. Sets must be built, artists must be paid, the cost of transportation to schools and travel expenses must be covered. In addition, offering attractive productions to schools may involve absorbing new production costs if the performances offered are not already mounted and suitable for touring. Arts groups involved in short- and long-term collaborations may incur administrative expenses not charged directly to fees from schools. If school activities become a significant priority, they may have to hire a tour manager or other professionals to handle details of negotiating contracts, arranging for technical requirements to be met, locating accommodations for artists, etc. Insurance premiums may be higher for organizations touring to schools. It is unknown whether longer-term collaborations or short-term fee-for-service contracts involve greater costs, and to what degree these costs are offset by earned income from schools.

**Hypothesis 5. Artistic Quality. Arts organizations that engage in more collaborative partnerships with schools are more likely than groups that undertake more limited, service-provider roles to self-report an increase in artistic quality.** In *Arts & Economics: Analysis & Cultural Policy* (2003, 148-53), Bruno Frey describes a theoretical relationship between external interventions and creativity called Crowding Theory. Crowding Theory is based on the notion that creativity in individuals relies strongly upon motivation to act for its own sake. When an external incentive is introduced, internal motivation is no longer needed. Under certain conditions, external reward may

reduce creativity in what is called the Crowding-Out Theory. Applying this theory to government support, Frey finds that Crowding-Out Theory is strongest when government support is contingent on a particular performance, and when artists are given uniform treatment by government rather than taking into account the diversity prized by artists. On the other hand, under other conditions external reward may sometimes serve to increase creativity rather than stifle it. This is called Crowding-In Theory, and its effect is strongest when government support is given in a way that supports artists' autonomy, as in unconditional grants or awards; and when artists themselves rather than the government have a high degree of involvement in artistic choices and the artistic process.

Groups that offer schools one-time performances would seem to be most subject to the Crowding-Out Effect. Although they have complete artistic control over the product initially offered to schools, the performance cannot be altered significantly in performance without danger of losing payment from the schools. During longer-term collaborations, schools have more voice in determining the nature of the final product, but arts organizations may have greater flexibility in shaping the process and the nature of the experience. Put another way, a school may buy a performance of *The Nutcracker* from any ballet company, but a long-term residency designed to increase dance skills will take on the imprint of the individual artist or company providing artistic direction. Do schools risk buying an artistically inferior product when they specify a one-time purchase as opposed to a longer-term relationship? Lois Olshan, coordinator of arts education in P.S. 144 in Queens, N.Y., advises those considering arts education partnerships, "A distinction should be made between accepting a prefabricated program and developing programs in

partnership. In a prefabricated program, the dominant party owns the program and provides a ‘teacher-proof’ series of experiences at the pleasure of the principal and head of the arts organization. If the service provided is appreciated, everyone is happy. In a partnership, all parties – artists, teachers, and often children – help design the implementation of the service. They all have a stake in its success.” Olshan 2002, 108).

DiMaggio (1987) identifies innovation and production values as two components of artistic quality. Pilot testing of the survey among 22 leaders of arts organizations did not result in questions or confusion of the language used in the survey.

### Definitions

Oreck (2004) points out the difficulty of collecting data on the use of the arts in teaching. The arts are taught as separate subjects, and as intrinsic parts of other subjects such as history, literature, and culture, with links to math and science. Students may be exposed to art in school through field trips, touring performances, visiting artists, or media. They may create their own works of art or explore other subjects using movement, dramatic play, music, writing, or visual art materials. Arts experiences may take place outside of school, in settings like museums; in school; or after school. The same difficulties apply to partnerships between schools and arts organizations. School-arts organization partnerships vary dramatically according to their purpose, structure, depth, and number of students reached, among other factors. Partnerships may include a single in-school performance by a theatre, a yearlong school residency by a visual artist, or in-service teacher training provided by arts organizations and institutions of higher learning.

Writers such as Fineberg (2002), Gee (2002) and agencies including the Virginia Commission for the Arts (2004) adopt definitions of “arts education” and “arts in education” which are helpful in clarifying the array of activities affected by arts education policy. “Arts education” refers to sequential, curriculum-based arts instruction delivered by certified arts teachers. “Arts in education” or “artists in education” refers to artist residencies in the schools, innovative projects that integrate the arts with non-arts curricula, and the educational programs of nonprofit arts organizations. Arts in education may involve partnerships with individual artists or arts organizations. However, arts in education may take place without partners in the case of infusing the arts into non-arts curricula; for example, a math teacher using the works of Leonardo Da Vinci to illustrate principles of geometry.

Often, though, the terms “arts education” and “arts in education” are used interchangeably by practitioners and writers, who may refer to a single performance by a visiting artist using the term “arts education.” Gee (2002) notes that additional terms such as “arts participation,” “arts exposure,” “involvement in the arts” and “arts learning experiences” are being used to refer to short-term activities separate from sequential arts curricula.

Fineberg (2002, 65) distinguishes between “integrated arts programs” and sequential curricula in music, art, drama, and media. Integrated arts programs do not teach the same cognitive skills as sequential curricula, but they engage students more actively and imaginatively into other subjects (Fineberg 2002, 65). Professional artists bring to the classroom real-world skills. Integrated arts programs, a term coined during the Johnson

administration, weave arts-related activities throughout many disciplines and require the involvement of arts organizations, composers, playwrights, musicians, choreographers, and other artists. Outside funding makes integrated arts curricula possible. Partnerships are now standard in many school districts (Fineberg 2002, 64) Integrated arts efforts are most often the result of planning by teachers and artists including written units of study that hold students accountable for information and skills. (Fineberg 2002, 67)

Fineberg (1994, 10) defines collaboration as a situation in which “two or more partners get together over a period of time to conceive, develop, and evaluate a program with clear goals and objectives.” Remer (1996) adopts Dreeszen’s (1992, 2002) definition of arts education partnerships, which is similar to Fineberg’s in its emphasis on long term relationships and planning: “the deliberate cooperation of community cultural organizations, school teachers and administrators, local arts agencies, and public and private funders to connect children with arts experiences and instruction in and out of schools (Dreeszen 1992, cited in Remer 1996, 114).” The researcher adopts this definition of partnerships for the purposes of this study.

Remer (1996) and Fineberg (1994) point out that the term “collaboration” is often misused to refer to what is a client-provider relationship, such as a school purchasing a single in-school performance from a theatre company. However, such client-provider relationships are common and often serve the same function performed by longer-term collaborations. Both connect children with arts experiences and instruction in and out of schools. Dreeszen himself identifies this kind of interaction as a “joint transaction,” one of six progressive stages of involvement of partnerships (Dreeszen 2002). One intended

outcome of this exploratory study is to provide data on the relative frequency of single-event partnerships and longer-term collaborations. Dreeszen (2002) distinguishes between six stages of involvement. These are 1) simple transaction, in which the school purchases an arts program with no school input into the program's design; 2) joint venture, in which the school and the arts organization work together to define the students' needs and to design the arts education enrichment program (this may be one-time event or a series of events); 3) an information network, in which arts groups and schools organize to share information about arts education funding, school priorities and contacts, and methods for program design and delivery; 4) coordinated tasks, which might evolve from information networks and which might include the publishing of artist rosters for the schools, the organization of arts education conference and training events, the planning of artist showcases, the mounting of arts festivals, and the coordination of artistic programs; 5) ongoing collaborations, which may develop from coordinated tasks into more formal organizational structures and increased intensity of interaction; and 6) institutional collaborations, in which the collaboration itself becomes a corporate entity with its independent purpose, staff, budget, and programs (Dreeszen 2002, 22-4).

While Dreeszen's operational definitions are useful, they would require lengthy definition or explanation if used in a survey. Therefore, the researcher adapted these models and the five implementation models described by Horowitz (2004) and Freeman (2002). These models include 1) the residency model, in which a visiting artist engages students in an arts program or activity designed by the visiting artist; 2) the elaborated residency, in which the visiting artist leads students in an arts experience that is



intentionally tied to developing non-arts skills; 3) the capacity building model, in which a visiting artist prepares a teacher to use the arts in his or her own teaching; 4) the co-teaching model, in which teachers and visiting artists work together to teach arts and non-arts concepts that reinforce each other; 5) the “concepts across the curriculum” model, which extends the co-teaching model to three or more disciplines (Freeman 2002, Horowitz 2004). The researcher blended concepts from both the Dreeszen and Horowitz models to operationalize partnerships in the survey to distinguish between six stages of involvement.

### Summary

Chapter 2 reviews literature on partnerships between schools and nonprofit arts organizations. While the federal government has encouraged such partnerships and financial incentives are offered by public and private funding agencies, little attention has been paid to their effect on arts organizations. This chapter reviews collaboration models in such partnerships; advantages and disadvantages for arts organizations; evaluation of partnerships; and the theoretical basis for each research question. Finally, this chapter discusses difficulties in defining terms commonly used in discussing arts education. The basis for operationalizing partnerships in this study is presented.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODOLOGY

#### Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine some financial, organizational, administrative, and artistic effects on American nonprofit arts organizations of providing programs to schools for a fee. A review of literature was conducted to identify research on partnerships between schools and nonprofit arts organizations, and theories on how nonprofits are affected by being paid for services by the government. While most literature on school-arts partnerships examines elements of successful partnerships and debates who is most qualified to deliver arts programming to students, no research was found to analyze the effects of such partnerships on arts organizations. Literature review led the researcher to develop hypotheses for five research questions. Analysis will be focused on testing the primary research hypotheses: 1. Agency Independence. There is an expected inverse relationship between level of income earned from partnerships with schools by American nonprofit arts organizations and the self-reported likelihood of those organizations to act as advocates regarding school policy. 2. Vendorism. Earned income from school partnerships has led U.S. nonprofit arts organizations to produce more work geared to schools. 3. Bureaucratization. Arts organizations that partner with schools are not expected to have greater odds of being affected by rules and regulations of outside agencies. 4. Costs Arts organizations that partner with schools assume higher costs that may outweigh the benefit

of earned income. 5. Artistic Quality. Arts organizations that engage in more collaborative partnerships with schools are more likely than groups that undertake more limited, service-provider roles to self-report an increase in artistic quality.

### Study Design and Methods

The study design is an exploratory, correlational written online survey delivered by email invitation to senior staff and board leaders at a random sample of 680 U.S. nonprofit arts organizations. Each chapter begins on a new page. The survey method is useful in describing characteristics of large populations, analyzing multiple variables simultaneously to explore different relationships, and developing standard definitions for concepts that will be measured (Babbie, 1990; Rubin & Babbie, 2001). Surveys are appropriate for collecting data from samples that are geographically diverse and difficult to assess at one time. Questionnaires eliminate the potential for interviewer bias by minimizing the level of personal contact, allowing more accurate answers to be collected for items that may be sensitive in nature.

The survey was pilot tested on a sample of 22 senior staff members at American nonprofit arts organizations. Three pilot participants are personally known by the researcher; the other 19 pilot participants responded to an email message the researcher sent to 40 randomly chosen American arts organizations not included in the survey population. GuideStar provided a random sample of 883 U.S. nonprofit arts organizations. After the researcher eliminated organizations that were defunct or mischaracterized as arts organizations, 862 organizations remained. To further ensure randomization, the researcher

randomly selected 712 of these organizations to receive the survey invitation. There were 32 ineligibles (30 returned for bad email addresses and 2 contacted the researcher to identify their organizations as non-arts organizations), creating a population of 680 (N=680). There were 280 completed responses, for a response rate of 41.18%.

Fields provided by GuideStar included:

Federal Employer ID number

Organization name

NTEE code (identifies type of organization by artistic discipline)

State

Telephone number

Total revenue in most recently completed fiscal year

Services revenue in most recently completed fiscal year

Organizational website

The researcher used the websites to identify the individual at each organization best suited to respond to the survey, and email addresses. In most cases, the survey was sent to the highest ranking staff member for whom an email address was available, such as an executive director, managing director, or artistic director. In some cases, a curator of education or education director was chosen to receive the survey based on likeliness to respond and ease of access to desired response data. The researcher targeted board presidents for organizations with no paid staff.

The survey was developed by the researcher, based on implementation models described by Freeman et al (2002). The survey consisted of several short sections. First,

respondents were asked the extent to which rules and regulations of outside agencies restrict their actions; financial stability; and whether their organization actively works toward changes in arts education. The final question in this section determines whether the organization partners with schools for a fee, for free, both, or not at all. If respondents answer for free or not at all, respondents were told the survey is complete. If the answer is for a fee or both for a fee and for free, respondent were asked whether arts education is part of their organization's mission; level of income from partnerships (categorized starting with \$0). Respondents were asked to identify their main consumer in working with schools; they were asked to rank the frequency of several types of typical school services (performances, residencies, teacher training, and other). They were asked to rate on a scale from 1 to 5 the importance of each of several possible reasons for pursuing partnerships with schools. Next, respondents were asked to indicate their agreement with a series of statements that illustrate possible effects of partnerships on their organizations. Respondents were asked to choose from among several descriptions that classify the majority of their school partnerships. These statements were designed to correspond with constructs identified in the research questions. Respondents were asked to provide the number of days of their typical school program, and level of income last year from working with schools. Finally, an open-ended question asked for comments on how the respondent's organization has been affected by working with schools. At the end of the survey respondents could choose to click a "finish" button to submit the data. Two follow-up emails encouraged potential respondents to complete and return the survey. Data collection took place between October 30, 2006 and December 15, 2006.

### Limitations

While the survey design may accurately measure feelings or attitudes in multiple settings when responses are standardized, it is limited by its ability to capture the range of perspectives and experiences of respondents (Rubin & Babbie, 2001). The researcher attempted to allow respondents to provide in-depth answers or address issues that may not have been asked by offering open-ended response options on several questions and an open-ended comment field at the end of the survey.

This survey was intended to measure some effects of organizations supplying services and does not address demand for those services.

While the intended unit of analysis is the organization, individual respondents may have provided answers based on their personal opinions that may not always match the stance of their organization. To minimize this possibility, instructions before individual questions asked respondents to answer based on current practice of their organization.

The instrument was developed by the researcher and is not a validated survey instrument and could contain resulting variable errors. The survey was pre-tested on 22 participants and adjusted based on their feedback. The most significant change was the addition of a question classifying the frequency of three common types of school programs provided by arts organizations.

The survey population was a national random sample that did not include arts organizations in the following states: Arkansas, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. In addition, no responses were collected from organizations in Alaska, Montana, and West Virginia. The lack of data from the contiguous states of Idaho,

Wyoming, Montana, and North and South Dakota mean that the data is missing regional perspective. However, arts organizations are sparse in number in those states and even a robust response from those states is unlikely to affect the outcomes of the research questions. Data from states not represented in the survey responses might have included state laws affecting school partnerships, such as Florida's Jessica Lunsford Act requiring school visitors to be fingerprinted and security checked at their own expense, or other information that would have created a more complete profile of arts organizations and their work with schools.

The sample was derived from Internal Revenue Service data. Nonprofit organizations earning less than \$25,000 are not required to file Form 990 with the Internal Revenue Service, and thus are not represented in the sample. As described in Chapter 4, the sample is more affluent than the same types of organizations in the target population. However, financial data for the sample is up to four years more recent than financial data for the target population. And removal of two outlying organizations earning more than \$50,000,000 from the sample makes mean total revenue comparable between the sample and the target population.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### DATA ANALYSIS

Chapter 4 reports the analysis of data generated from the arts organization survey used for this research. The first section summarizes the sampling method used in this study of the effects of school partnerships on nonprofit arts organizations. After analyzing respondents demographically for geographic representation, artistic discipline, and amount of annual revenue, selected frequency data is presented to contextualize analysis of the research questions. Appendix E presents complete frequency data for each survey question other than open-ended questions and comment fields. The bulk of this chapter presents analysis of data that address each of the five research questions. Finally, this chapter concludes with analysis of additional data provided by survey respondents that illustrates characteristics of school partnerships. Presented first is a description of the sample.

#### Sample

The sampling frame used in this study was compiled from a dataset of American nonprofit arts organizations procured from Guidestar, a nonprofit organization that compiles public information from the Internal Revenue Service Form 990 submitted by nonprofit organizations with total annual revenue over \$25,000. The researcher selected the types of arts-producing organizations most likely to provide programmatic services to schools, including ballet companies; dance organizations; music organizations; music groups, bands, and ensembles; symphony orchestras; singing choral organizations; theaters; opera companies; and visual arts organizations. She also selected art museums,



which often offer educational programming. These categories correspond to designations under the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE). The random sample of 883 organizations provided by Guidestar was reduced by the researcher to 862 after eliminating organizations that are defunct or mischaracterized as arts organizations following a review of websites. The researcher further reduced the survey population to 712 by randomly choosing 150 organizations for elimination. The researcher did not eliminate any organizations that were the sole representatives of one state. The survey was pilot-tested on 22 leaders of U.S. nonprofit arts organizations, with minor changes made to the survey based on their comments. A hyperlink to the survey was emailed to 680 leaders of American nonprofit arts organizations with a cover letter explaining the research objectives. There were 32 ineligibles (two invitees contacted the researcher to identify their organizations as non-arts, and 30 invitations were undeliverable due to bad email addresses). The ineligibles did not reduce the number of states represented in the survey population. Two follow-up reminders were emailed to potential respondents who had not yet completed the survey. The survey yielded a total of 280 respondents for a response rate of 41% (280/680). Data was downloaded from Inquisite into SPSS version 11.5 for analysis.

### Demographic Profile of Respondents

In order to understand how representative the sample is of the target population of arts organizations, the researcher consulted the online Unified Database of Arts Organizations (UDAO), a collaborative effort of the National Endowment for the Arts, the

National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, and the National Center of Charitable Statistics. Data is derived from the Internal Revenue Service and from state arts agencies, with the most recent available information dating from 2001. Whenever possible, the researcher has compared the survey sample and respondents with the same NTEE types of organizations in the target population.

**Geography.** The survey was sent to a random sample of American nonprofit arts organizations representing every state except Arkansas, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming. These states were not represented in the random sample provided by GuideStar. As shown in the table below, the greatest number of respondents came from California (13.6%) and New York (9.3%). This is not unusual, considering the heavy concentration of arts organizations in those states. In addition to the states missing from the random sample, there were no respondents from Alaska, Louisiana, Montana, and West Virginia. Thus in addition to Alaska, Arkansas, Louisiana, and West Virginia, the database of responses does not represent the contiguous states of Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, and North and South Dakota. The target population of arts organizations is rather sparsely concentrated in those states, as shown in Table 1; in 2001 these states collectively represented less than 2% of the total population of the type of arts organizations studied in this research project (Unified Database of Arts Organizations). However, despite the relative scarcity of arts organizations, the lack of data from so large a region is noted as a limitation of the study. Similarly, the absence of data from other states not represented in the survey responses may mean that the study lacks data on state laws or other factors that would have provided a more complete profile of arts organizations. Table 1 illustrates

survey respondents, survey population, and the same types of arts organization (classified by NTEE code) by state.

**Table 1. Geographic distribution of survey respondents, survey sample, and target population**

<b>State</b>	<b>Survey Respondents Number %</b>	<b>Survey Sample Number %</b>	<b>2001 Target Population* Number %</b>
Alabama	2 .7	2 .3	72 .8
Alaska	0 0	2 .3	36 .4
Arizona	2 .7	6 .9	129 1.5
Arkansas	0 0	0 0	37 .4
California	38 13.6	100 14.7	1,213 13.9
Colorado	9 3.2	22 3.2	176 2.0
Connecticut	6 2.1	13 1.9	157 1.8
D.C.	5 1.8	16 2.4	92 1.1
Delaware	1 .4	2 .3	31 .4
Florida	14 5.0	33 4.9	342 3.9
Georgia	1 .4	9 1.3	160 1.8
Hawaii	3 1.1	3 .4	46 .5
Idaho	0 0	0 0	35 .4
Iowa	1 .4	7 1.0	94 1.1
Illinois	14 5.0	38 5.6	387 4.4

Table 1. continued.

State	Survey Respondents Number %	Survey Sample Number %	2001 Target Population* Number %
Indiana	2 .7	11 1.6	160 1.8
Kansas	1 .4	4 .6	74 .9
Kentucky	7 2.5	14 2.1	72 .8
Louisiana	0 0	2 .3	72 .8
Massachusetts	7 2.5	20 2.9	338 3.9
Maryland	7 2.5	13 1.9	156 1.8
Maine	3 1.1	4 .6	61 .7
Michigan	10 3.6	15 2.2	280 3.2
Minnesota	9 3.2	22 3.2	201 2.3
Missouri	4 1.4	13 1.9	114 1.3
Mississippi	1 .4	1 .1	38 .4
Montana	0 0	2 .3	57 .7
North Carolina	6 2.1	13 1.9	210 2.4
North Dakota	0 0	0 0	24 .3
Nebraska	3 1.1	7 1.0	59 .7
New Hampshire	1 .4	4 .6	62 .7
New Jersey	7 2.5	12 1.8	218 2.5
New Mexico	2 .7	7 1.0	62 .7
Nevada	1 .4	2 .3	27 .3

Table 1. continued.

State	Survey Respondents Number %	Survey Sample Number %	2001 Target Population* Number %
New York	26 9.3	65 9.6	1,010 11.6
Ohio	11 3.9	29 4.3	322 3.7
Oklahoma	1 .4	7 1.0	87 1.0
Oregon	2 .7	8 1.2	152 1.7
Pennsylvania	15 5.4	38 5.6	408 4.7
Rhode Island	2 .7	3 .4	41 .5
South Carolina	5 1.8	8 1.2	87 1.0
South Dakota	0 0	0 0	23 .3
Tennessee	5 1.8	7 1.0	109 1.3
Texas	17 6.1	32 4.7	460 5.3
Utah	3 1.1	4 .6	52 .6
Virginia	11 3.9	19 2.8	202 2.3
Vermont	1 .4	4 .6	38 .4
Washington	8 2.9	20 2.9	230 2.6
West Virginia	0 0	1 .1	45 .5
Wisconsin	6 2.1	15 2.2	170 2.0
Wyoming	0 0	0 0	14 .2
Total	280 100	680 100	8,742 100

\*Target population refers to same types of arts organization identified by NTEE code. Source: Unified Database of Arts Organizations, online, <http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/UDAO/>, accessed 2/15/07

**Type of arts organization.** Arts organizations are classified by artistic discipline according to the National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE). The researcher compared type of arts organization among survey respondents and sample with the number of American organizations in the same NTEE codes in 2001 (Unified Database of Arts Organizations). As illustrated below, the survey respondents and sample are underrepresented compared with the target population in dance, ballet, music, music groups, bands, and ensembles, and singing choral organizations with the largest disparity in dance and singing choral organizations. The survey respondents and sample are overrepresented compared with the target population in opera, symphony orchestras, art museums, visual arts organizations and theaters, with the largest disparity in visual arts organizations. The strongest concentration of survey responses came from theaters, followed by symphony orchestras, then art museums. The discipline least represented among respondents is dance organizations other than ballet. Non-ballet dance organizations represent 7.8% of the types of organizations surveyed in the target population, but only 2.9% of respondents. This lower response rate could reflect that dance organizations are less likely to engage in school partnerships than other kinds of organizations, or it could merely signal a smaller interest in and/or ability (due to human resource constraints) to take part in internet surveys.

**Table 2. Survey respondents, survey sample, and target population by type of organization**

Type of organization	Survey Respondents Number %	Survey Sample Number %	2001 Target Population* Number %
Art museums	34 12.1	77 11.3	731 8.3
Ballet	9 3.2	27 4.0	430 4.9
Dance	8 2.9	40 5.9	681 7.8
Music	28 10.0	58 8.5	1,236 14.1
Music groups, bands, ensembles	9 3.2	21 3.1	500 5.7
Opera	15 5.4	34 5.0	375 4.3
Singing choral	19 (6.8)	54 (7.9)	1,092 (12.5)
Symphony orchestras	43 (15.4)	93 (13.7)	1,009 (11.5)
Theater	88 (31.4)	212 (31.2)	2,380 (27.1)
Visual arts organizations	27 (9.6)	64 (9.4)	336 (3.8)
Total	280 (100)	680 (100)	8,770 (100)

\*Source: Unified Database of Arts Organizations, online, <http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/UDAO/>, accessed 2/15/07

**Annual revenue.** Guidestar provided data from Internal Revenue Service Form 990s for each organization, including total revenue and revenue from services in the most recently reported fiscal year. Data were recoded into categories and analyzed for frequency. Table 3, below, compares total revenue of survey respondents and survey population in the most

recently completed fiscal year with 2001 total revenue categories for the same NTEE types of organizations in the general public.

**Table 3. Survey respondents, survey sample, and target population by total revenue**

<b>Total revenue in most recently completed fiscal year</b>	<b>Survey Respondents Number %</b>	<b>Survey Sample Number %</b>	<b>2001 Target Population* Number %</b>
\$0-<100,000	37 13.2	84 12.4	4,336 49.4
100,000-<1,000,000	137 48.9	394 57.9	3,449 39.3
1,000,000-<10,000,000	84 30.0	168 24.7	827 9.4
10,000,000 and higher	22 7.9	34 5.0	158 1.8
Total	280 100	680 100	8,770

\*Source: Unified Database of Arts Organizations, online, <http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/UDAO/>, accessed 2/15/07

Survey population and respondents are significantly more affluent than the same type of organizations in the general U.S. population, despite the fact that most total revenue figures for survey population and respondents come from years more recent than 2001. The largest category of respondents, 48.9%, generate between \$100,000 and \$999,999 in annual revenue. The next largest category is organizations with total revenue of \$1,000,000 to \$9,999,999. The random sample for the survey is drawn from Internal Revenue Service data, and nonprofit organizations that have gross annual receipts not normally in excess of \$25,000 are not required to file reports with the Internal Revenue Service. This means that



emerging and declining organizations with the smallest budgets are underrepresented in the study.

However, mean total revenue of the survey population is \$3,885,688. Mean total revenue of respondents is \$5,138,308. After removing two outlying organizations with total revenue over \$50,000,000, mean total revenue of respondents is \$3,181,350. This is consistent with 2001 mean total revenue of \$3,423,817 for 30,938 American nonprofit organizations included in the Unified Database of Arts Organizations (Unified Database of Arts Organizations).

#### Selected Frequency Data

Among U.S. nonprofit arts organizations of the NTEE type studied, 48.9 percent have provided school programs both for a fee and for free in the past year. In addition, 28.9% have provided programs for free and 12.9% have provided school programs for a fee only. The smallest category of respondents, 11.4%, have not provided any school programs in the past year. The most common form of school partnership is a performance for a school audience, followed by in-school residencies and finally professional training for teachers. In typical school partnerships, the most common activity involves the arts organization teaching arts skills, followed in descending order of frequency by a single performance or activity not tailored to a specific school; integrating concepts from arts and non-arts areas; preparing teachers to use the arts in their own teaching; using the arts to teach non-arts skills; joint design of enrichment programs; and joint teaching of arts skills. Mean length of typical school partnership is 14.33 days.

Among those respondents paid to provide school programs, 90.9% of respondents have arts education as part of their organizational mission. Among those paid to provide school programs, the most important reason for partnering with schools is to develop future audiences for the arts ( Mean = 4.67) and the least important reason is to “enhance our organization’s artistic quality” (Mean = 3.59). However, the same respondents rated “partnering with schools has helped our organization grow artistically” as the result of school partnerships with which they most strongly agreed (Mean = 3.61). Most organizations paid to partner with schools (57.9%) earn less than \$50,000 per year from this source of earned income. Most organizations paid to partner with schools see students as their main customers (84.1%) rather than teachers, parents, or school administrators.

Frequency data for all survey questions are presented in Appendix E.

## Multicollinearity of Independent Variables

**Table 4. Correlations matrix for independent variables – Pearson Correlation (r scores)**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	1.0	-.14	-.03	.21**	-.14	.19*	.02	.11	.03	.15	.02	.20*
2	-.14	1.0	-.46**	-.35**	.15	-.08	.12	-.00	-.08	-.04	.07	-.03
3	-.03	-.46**	1.0	-.50**	-.06	.16*	.07	.05	.07	.02	.03	-.04
4	.21**	-.35**	-.50**	1.0	-.11	-.03	-.11	.04	.05	.05	-.07	.04
5	-.13	.15	-.06	-.11	1.0	-.07	-.19*	-.12	-.04	-.17*	-.15	-.15
6	.19*	-.08	.16*	-.03	-.07	1.0	.42**	.33**	.30**	.40**	.40**	.22**
7	.02	.12	.07	-.11	-.19*	.42**	1.0	.37**	.28**	.33**	.57**	.24**
8	.11	-.00	.05	.04	-.12	.33**	.37**	1.0	.27**	.23**	.37**	.11
9	.03	-.08	.07	.05	-.04	.30**	.28**	.27**	1.0	.33**	.35**	.04
10	.15	-.04	.02	.05	-.17*	.40**	.33**	.23**	.33**	1.0	.43**	.12
11	.02	.07	.03	-.07	-.15	.40**	.57**	.37**	.35**	.43**	1.0	.17*
12	.20*	-.03	-.04	.04	-.15	.22**	.24**	.11	.04	.12	.17*	1.0

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

## LEGEND

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1=length (days) of typical school program | 7= you use the arts to teach non-arts skills               |
| 2=somewhat weak financially               | 8=you use the arts to teach arts skills                    |
| 3=financially stable                      | 9=preparing teachers to use the arts in their own teaching |
| 4=financially strong                      | 10=joint teaching  |
| 5=single performance                      | 11=integrating concepts from arts and non-arts areas       |
| 6=joint design of program                 | 12=level of income from school partnerships                |

The researcher examined multicollinearity prior to analyzing the effects of the independent variables on agency independence, vendorism, bureaucratization, costs, and artistic growth. If predictor variables were highly correlated, they could attempt to account for the same variance in the dependent variable. Sample size is large at 680, and the cutoff score was set at 0.70 or above. Table 4, above, shows no multicollinearity between independent variables. The r scores, or Pearson correlations, range from .00 to .57.

## Research Questions

**Hypothesis 1: Agency Independence.** There is an expected inverse relationship between level of income earned from partnerships with schools by U.S. nonprofit arts organizations and the self-reported likelihood of those organizations to act as advocates regarding school policy.

The researcher first analyzed frequency and type of advocacy activities reported. Among all respondents, 62.1% indicated that they do not take part in arts education advocacy efforts while 37.9% do advocate on behalf of arts education.

Respondents who answered in the affirmative were then asked to describe their arts education advocacy efforts. Most respondents (66%) limit their arts education advocacy efforts to the local or state levels, or both. Table 5, below, illustrates the level(s) at which respondents advocate for arts education.

**Table 5. Arts education advocacy efforts by level (local, state, national, or combination)**

<b>Advocacy effort level(s)</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Local only	25	25.8
State only	24	24.7
National only	3	3.1
Both local and state	15	15.5
Both state and national	3	3.1
Local, state, and national	6	6.2
Unable to determine	21	21.6
Total	97	100
Missing	8	

In addition, comments were classified according to the type of advocacy effort(s) described. The most common activity is writing letters and/or email to policymakers

(20.8%), with membership in statewide advocacy organization and visits to elected officials tied for second most frequent (16%). Respondents could indicate more than one type of advocacy effort. Table 6, below, illustrates types of arts education advocacy efforts.

**Table 6. Arts education advocacy efforts by type of activity**

<b>Type of advocacy effort</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Write letters/email	22	20.8
Membership in statewide advocacy organization(s)	17	16.0
Visits to legislators/elected officials	17	16.0
Membership in local advocacy committees/consortia	12	11.3
Take part in annual statewide arts advocacy events	11	10.4
Membership in national advocacy organization	6	5.7
Speeches	5	4.7
Lobby local schools	3	2.8
Hire a lobbyist	2	1.9
Phone calls	1	0.9
Other	10	9.4
Total	106	99.9

To determine whether the odds of advocating are affected by being paid to partner with schools, the research first ran a cross-tabulation, then a logistic regression. The researcher created a dummy variable for Question 4, which asks all respondents if they have provided artistic programs or services to a public school or school system in the past year either for a fee, for no fee, both with and without charging a fee, or not at all. The dummy variable assigns a value of 1 to each respondent that was paid, and 0 to each respondent that was not paid or did not partner. The dummy variable was cross tabulated

with answers regarding advocacy. The Pearson chi-square of 10.920 ( $P=.001$ ) indicates a relationship significant at the 95% confidence level, though Phi of .199 indicates a somewhat weak positive relationship (based upon Phi of less than .3) between being paid to partner with schools and the odds of advocating for arts education.

To learn more about this relationship, the researcher conducted a logistic regression on these variables. Wald statistic of 10.677 ( $P=.001$ ) indicates a relationship significant at the 95% confidence level; Exp(B) of 2.388 indicates that the odds of advocating for organizations that are paid to partner with schools are 138% greater than those that are not paid to partner with schools and those that do not partner with schools.

Since being paid to partner with schools increases the odds of advocating, the researcher cross tabulated level of income from schools against whether or not an organization advocated. Question 12 asks respondents that partner with schools to indicate level of income from school activities. Analysis of frequency data revealed that 57.9% of respondents earned \$0-\$49,999 for services provided to schools last year. The researcher created a dummy variable with this category of income coded “low (0)” and all other categories coded “high (1)”. “Don’t know” responses were omitted from the dummy variable. Cross tabulation of high/low income from schools against advocacy reveals a significant weak positive relationship, with Pearson chi-square of 7.642 ( $P=.006$ ) significant at the 95% level of confidence; Phi is .225. Logistic regression yields Wald of 7.476 ( $P=.006$ ) and Exp(B) of 2.574. Among arts organizations paid to partner with schools, earning \$50,000 or more from school partnerships increases the odds of

advocating for arts education by 158% compared with organizations earning less than \$50,000.

The researcher next looked for control variables to test the model. Length (in days) of typical school activity, level of income from partnerships, types of work done for schools, and self-reported organizational financial strength were analyzed against odds of advocating. Variables for type of work include “a single performance or activity not tailored to a specific school;” “joint design of enrichment program;” “you use the arts to teach non-arts skills;” “you teach arts skills;” “preparing teachers to use the arts in their own teaching;” “joint teaching of arts skills;” and “integrating concepts from arts and non-arts areas;” dummy variables were created assigning a value of 0 to responses “not at all” and “to a small extent.” Self-reported financial strength is assessed on Question 2, with respondents selecting from categories: “Weak – not at all stable, we are concerned with survival;” “Somewhat weak – cash flow is sometimes a concern;” “Fairly stable, though our finances react to outside conditions such as the economy;” “Strong – very stable, we have developed cash reserves.” Dummy variables were created for each response with “don’t know” responses omitted. After selecting only those cases in which respondents were paid to partner with schools (since income from partnerships is a variable to be analyzed), binary logistic regression reveals that among arts organizations paid to partner with schools, level of income from school partnerships is not a significant predictor of the odds of advocating when controlling for organizational financial strength and type of school activity. As shown in Table 7, below, no variable in the model is a significant predictor of the odds of advocating for arts education.

**Table 7. Predictors of the odds of advocating for arts education**

<b>Independent variable</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>Degrees of freedom</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>
Length in days of typical school program	.004	.005	.450	1	.502	1.004
Income from schools	.682	.406	2.823	1	.093	1.977
Single performance	.093	.468	.039	1	.843	1.097
Joint design of enrichment programs	-.141	.500	.079	1	.779	.869
You use the arts to teach non-arts skills	.458	.556	.677	1	.410	1.581
You use the arts to teach arts skills	-.284	.777	.134	1	.715	.753
Preparing teachers to use the arts in their own teaching	.007	.504	.000	1	.989	1.007
Joint teaching of arts skills	.699	.443	2.485	1	.115	2.011
Integrating concepts from arts and non-arts areas	.955	.599	2.539	1	.111	2.598
My organization's financial strength is somewhat weak	.004	.812	.000	1	.996	1.007
My organization's financial strength is fairly stable	-.484	.800	.365	1	.546	.617
My organization's financial strength is strong	.510	.803	.403	1	.525	1.665
Constant	-1.799	1.075	2.802	1	.094	.165

**Hypothesis 2. Vendorism. Earned income from school partnerships has led American nonprofit arts organizations to produce more work geared to schools.** Two variables address whether arts organizations produce more work geared to schools as a result of working with schools. Both are scale variables on Question 9 to which respondents indicated level of agreement or disagreement: “Our organization has changed its artistic direction due to partnerships with schools” and “Our organization offers much



different programs than in the past due to our work with schools.” Organizations may change artistic direction (for instance, a theatre may move from offering a range of productions to specializing in 20<sup>th</sup> century playwrights) but still offer the same type of programs (performances, residencies). However, correlation matrix showed a correlation of .594 between the two variables. This score is below the cutoff of .70 given the large sample size. However, the researcher chose to focus analysis on “Our organization has changed its artistic direction due to partnerships with schools” rather than “Our organization offers much different programs in the past due to our work with schools” since a change in artistic direction is seen as a more fundamental change in organizational mission and thus a more profound and significant indicator of change.

Analysis of frequency data reveals that among arts organizations that partner with schools, only 31.9% of respondents agree that artistic direction has changed due to work with schools. Table 8, below, illustrates respondents’ level of agreement that artistic direction has changed due to school partnerships.

**Table 8. Question 9 (b): “Our organization has changed its artistic direction due to partnership with schools.”**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Valid percent</b>
Strongly disagree	26	15.7
Somewhat disagree	32	19.3
Neither agree nor disagree	55	33.1
Somewhat agree	42	25.3
Strongly agree	11	6.6
Total	166	100.0
Missing system	1	
Total	167	

The researcher created a dummy variable for question 9b, “Our organization has changed its artistic direction due to partnerships with schools,” in which responses of “strongly disagree” and “somewhat disagree” were assigned a value of 0; “somewhat agree” and “strongly agree” were assigned 1; and “neither agree nor disagree” were omitted.

Selecting the cases in which organizations are paid to partner with schools, the researcher cross tabulated the dummy variable for income from school partnerships (recoded as described in hypothesis 1) against the dummy variable for change in artistic direction due to work with schools. The Pearson chi-square of .007 ( $P=0.933$ ) was not significant at the 95% level of confidence. This indicates that among arts organizations that are paid to partner with schools, level of income from school partnerships is not related to changes in artistic direction due to work with schools. Additional logistic regression shows that neither length (in days) of typical school activity nor level of income from school partnerships is significant in predicting either change in artistic direction or changes in programming.

**Hypothesis 3. Bureaucratization. Arts organizations that partner with schools are not expected to have greater odds of being affected by rules and regulations of outside agencies.** Two survey questions allow for testing of Hypothesis 3. The first is a comparison of arts organizations that partner with schools with those that do not partner using Question 1 (“To what extent do rules and regulations of outside organizations such as funding agencies affect your organization?”), using frequencies, cross tabulations, and logistic regression. The second type of analysis is frequency data from the 167 selected

cases of those organizations paid for school programs indicating level of agreement or disagreement with the statement, “Partnering with schools has meant we have to comply with more rules and regulations (Question 9e).”

In order to compare partnering vs. nonpartnering arts organizations’ level of impact from rules and regulations, the researcher first recoded data from Question 4 into a new variable. Question 4 asks whether, in the past year, your organization has provided artistic programs or services to a public school or school system for a fee, for free, both, or not at all. In order to analyze the data, the researcher recoded the data so that “No, not at all” = 0; “Yes, without charging a fee” = 1; “Yes, both for a fee and without charging a fee” = 1; and “Yes, for a fee” = 1. (variable name “partall”).

The first question on the survey asks respondents to what extent they are affected by rules and regulations of outside organizations such as funding agencies. The researcher first analyzed the frequency of responses to this question, finding that 124 respondents (44.6%) report being affected by rules to some extent, while 78 (28%) report little or no impact. A total of 76 respondents (27.4%) say that rules of outside organizations affect their own organization to a great extent or to a very great extent. Table 9, below, illustrates the extent to which respondents report being affected by rules and regulations.

**Table 9. Question 1: “To what extent do rules and regulations of outside organizations such as funding agencies affect your organization?”**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Not at all	17	6.1
To a small extent	61	21.9
To some extent	124	44.6
To a great extent	58	20.9
To a very great extent	18	6.5
Total	278	100
Missing system	2	
Total	280	

The researcher then recoded the data from this question so that responses of “not at all” and “to a small extent” were assigned a value of 0; responses of “to a great extent” and “to a very great extent” were assigned a value of 1. The dummy variable was used for cross tabs and for logistic regression as a dependent variable against the independent variable representing whether or not an organization partnered with schools either on a paid or unpaid basis. Cross tabs yield a Pearson chi-square of 6.001 ( $P=0.14$ ) and Phi statistic of .197 ( $P=0.014$ ); both significant at the 95% level of confidence. The significant Pearson chi-square statistic indicates that the two variables in question are not independent, while the significant Phi statistic indicates a weak positive relationship (based on  $\Phi < .3$ ).

Logistic regression shows that partnering with schools increases the odds that an organization is affected by rules and regulations of outside organizations with a Wald statistic of 5.352 ( $P=0.021$ ), significant at the 95% level of confidence. Organizations that partner with schools on a paid or unpaid basis have odds of being affected by rules and

regulations of outside organizations that are 294% greater than those of organizations that do not partner with schools.

However, the researcher performed logistic regression with the same dependent variable (dummy for the extent to which rules and regulations affect your organization) and a different independent variable (dummy for organizations paid to partner, rather than all organizations that partner whether paid or unpaid). This regression shows that being paid to partner is not a significant predictor of the odds of being affected by rules and regulations, with Wald statistic of 2.728 ( $P=.099$ ), not significant at the 95% level of certainty. Organizations paid to partner do not have significantly greater odds of being affected by rules and regulations compared with organizations that do not partner or partner on an unpaid basis.

For the second type of analysis, the researcher analyzed the 167 cases of organizations paid to partner with schools. Frequency data was examined for responses indicating level of agreement with the statement, “Partnering with schools has meant we have to comply with more rules and regulations (Question 9e).” Table 10 illustrates frequency data from this question.

**Table 10. Question 9(e): “Partnering with schools has meant we have to comply with more rules and regulations.”**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Strongly disagree	21	12.7
Somewhat disagree	17	10.3
Neither agree nor disagree	53	32.1
Somewhat agree	51	30.9
Strongly agree	23	13.9
Total	165	100
Missing system	2	
Total	167	

More respondents agree than disagree that their organizations have had to comply with more rules and regulations, as shown in Table 10, above. However, while 44.8 percent of respondents agree or strongly agree, a significant percentage (32.1) neither agree nor disagree. Logistic regression of the dummy for this variable as the dependent variable against independent variables length and type of school partnership reveals that length and type of school partnership have no significant ability to predict whether an arts organization has had to comply with more rules due to partnerships with schools. Comments from respondents give some examples of the types of rules and regulations affecting arts organizations. Two Florida respondents cite security screenings and processes required before contact with students as a result of the Jessica Lunsford Act: “School System now requires that anyone who goes into the school must be finger printed and have a background check at the expense of the individual or organization.” “Specifically, Florida's Jessica Lunsford Act has had a dramatic effect on our ability to help schools.” Another comment reflects acceptance of constraints posed by partnering

with schools: “Rules and regulations are part of any partnership and generally acceptable as we enter into the culture of schools.”

Several comments, though, refer to the need to tailor school programs to school time and content restraints: “Partnering with schools does mean that we have to tailor our time allotments to fit their schedules, which, with NCLB, has changed greatly - limiting the time we have access.” This type of programmatic adjustment, while important in that it indicates limitations on the content and quantity of programs provided to schools, is not the kind of organizational constraint on arts organizations addressed by the research question. No organizations report the need to add new administrative and accounting procedures, professional positions, or financial management practices.

**Hypothesis 4. Costs Arts organizations that partner with schools assume higher costs that may outweigh the benefit of earned income.** The researcher first analyzed frequency data for the 167 cases of organizations paid to partner with schools. These organizations were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with the statement, “Arts organizations that partner with schools assume higher costs that may outweigh the benefit of earned income.” Table 11 illustrates the number and percent of responses to this statement.

**Table 11. Question 9 (d): “Our organization has had more costs due to our work with schools.”**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Strongly disagree	13	7.9
Somewhat disagree	19	11.6
Neither agree nor disagree	28	17.1
Somewhat agree	69	42.1
Strongly agree	35	21.3
Total	164	100
Missing system	3	
Total	167	

More respondents agree (62.5%) than disagree (19.5%) with the statement, as shown in Table 11. However, several respondents comment that costs are mitigated by funding opportunities: “I want to be clear that while there are more costs there are also more chances for funding, although we do not offer educational programs because we can get funding.” “Although there are more costs, the partnerships are usually grant-funded anyway.” “More costs have been offset by contributed income and fees.” “Funding opportunities (and mandates) can be major factors in museum program offerings. Only some are good and authentic matches, philosophically. We’ve ended some partnerships because of different philosophies, thereby rejecting some funding.” Several respondents cite other financial benefits of partnerships with schools: “Partnering with schools has sometimes given this company the opportunity to provide additional performance experience and additional paychecks for our artists.” “The growth of the education programs in partner schools has resulted in the ability to recruit professional artists to the



area. This creates a stronger arts environment in the community.” “Better positioning for corporate and philanthropic support.”

In order to learn more about factors that may affect costs borne by arts organizations, the researcher examined both length and type of typical school activities and self-reported organizational financial strength. The scale variable in which respondents indicated level of agreement with the statement, “Our organization has had more costs due to our work with schools” was recoded into a dummy variable. Responses of “strongly disagree” and “somewhat disagree” were assigned a value of 0; “somewhat agree” and “strongly agree” were assigned a value of 1. “Neither agree nor disagree” responses were not included since they have little meaning.

Cross tabulation of this dummy for more costs due to work with schools against the dummy for level of income from school partnerships yields a Pearson chi-square statistic of 0.731 ( $P=0.393$ ), not significant at the 95% confidence level. Level of income from school partnerships is not significantly related to higher costs due to working with schools.

Logistic regression of dependent variable costs against independent variables for length in days of typical school activity, income from school partnerships, self-reported financial strength, and types of school activities yields a model in which the only significant variable is self-reported organizational financial strength of “fairly stable, though our finances react to outside conditions such as the economy.” The Wald statistic for “fairly stable” is 4.402 ( $P=0.036$ ) and is significant at the 95% confidence level. Among arts organizations paid to partner with schools, organizations that are “fairly stable” have odds of reporting more costs due to working with schools that are 633%

greater than organizations whose financial status is “weak – not at all stable, we are concerned with survival.”

Finally, the researcher found that levels of income from school partnerships are relatively low as shown in Table 12, with 57.9% of organizations paid to partner with schools earning less than \$50,000 last year from school income.

**Table 12. Question 12: “How much income did your organization get last year from services provided to schools?”**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
\$0-\$49,999	95	57.9
\$50,000-\$99,999	22	13.4
\$100,000-\$149,999	16	9.8
\$150,000-\$199,999	8	4.9
\$200,000-\$249,999	2	1.2
\$250,000 or higher	8	4.9
Don’t know	13	7.9
Total	164	100
Missing system	3	
Total	167	

**Hypothesis 5. Artistic Quality. Arts organizations that engage in more collaborative partnerships with schools are more likely than groups that undertake more limited, service-provider roles to self-report an increase in artistic quality.**

The researcher first analyzed frequency data for the 167 cases of organizations paid to partner with schools. These organizations were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with the statement, “Partnering with schools has helped our organization grow artistically.” Table 13 illustrates responses to this question.

**Table 13. Question 9(a): “Partnering with schools has helped our organization grow artistically.”**

<b>Response</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Valid Percent</b>
Strongly disagree	11	6.6
Somewhat disagree	4	2.4
Neither agree nor disagree	58	34.9
Somewhat agree	58	34.9
Strongly agree	35	21.1
Total	166	100
Missing system	1	
Total	167	

More respondents agree (56.0%) than disagree (9.0%) with the statement, with 34.9% neither agreeing nor disagreeing, as shown in Table 13. Comments from respondents elaborate on the additional experience offered by school partnerships, and the artistic value of performing for students: “School audiences see the same productions our adult audiences see. The student performances inform the production in ways adult audiences do not.” “if one is committed to partnerships and learning from partners - it seems inevitable that programs will change over time due to what is learned. Many partnerships - because of their sustained and in-depth nature - allow for experimentation...*(comment truncated due to space constraints)*”

Question 10 on the survey asks respondents to indicate the extent to which several types of learning take place in their activities with schools. The activities were derived from earlier models of school-arts partnerships (Horowitz 2004). The researcher assigned an ascending scale value to indicate estimated degree of arts organization collaboration with school for each response as follows:

“A single performance or activity not tailored to the school” – 1

“You use the arts to teach non-arts skills” – 2

“You teach arts skills” – 2

“Preparing teachers to use the arts in their own teaching” – 3

“Joint teaching of arts skills” – 4

“Joint design of enrichment programs” – 4

“Integrating concepts from arts and non-arts activities” – not included in collaboration model as degree of collaboration could vary more widely than in other responses and is not determinable from the response.

These scores were assigned to dummy variables in which the respondent answered either “to a great extent” or “to a very great extent.” Responses of “not at all,” “to a small extent,” and “to some extent” were coded to 0. Cross tabs of dummy variables representing degree of collaboration against the dummy variable for Question 9a (“Partnering with school has helped our organization grow artistically”) indicate Pearson chi-square statistic of .362 ( $P = 0.547$ ). In this model, there is no significant relationship between degree of school-arts collaboration and reporting artistic growth due to work with schools.

In order to learn more about factors that may affect artistic quality, the researcher examined length and type of typical school activities, income from school partnerships, and self-reported financial strength. First, the researcher created a dummy variable for responses indicating level of agreement with the statement, “Partnering with schools has helped our organization grow artistically.” Responses of “strongly disagree” and “somewhat disagree” were assigned a value of 0; responses of “somewhat agree” and

“strongly agree” were assigned a value of 1. “Neither agree nor disagree” responses were not included in the new variable since they have little meaning. The new dummy variable became the dependent variable in a logistic regression, with independent variables including length of school activity in days, level of income from school partnerships, and type of activity (single performance, joint design of enrichment programs, using the arts to teach non-arts skills, teaching arts skills, preparing teachers to use the arts in their own teaching, joint teaching of arts skills, and integrating concepts from arts and non-arts areas).

Logistic regression yields a model in which none of the independent variables listed above is a significant predictor of artistic growth. Table 14, below, illustrates the results of the logistic regression.

**Table 14. Predictors of the odds of agreeing with the statement, “Partnering with schools has helped our organization grow artistically.” {Question 9(a)}**

<b>Independent variable</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>Degrees of freedom</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>
Length in days of typical school program	-.002	.009	.045	1	.832	.998
Income from schools	.430	.856	.253	1	.615	1.538
Single performance	1.539	.924	2.772	1	.096	4.658
Joint design of enrichment programs	.688	1.025	.451	1	.502	1.990
You use the arts to teach non-arts skills	1.895	1.037	3.338	1	.068	6.656

**Table 14. continued.**

<b>Independent variable</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>S.E.</b>	<b>Wald</b>	<b>Degrees of freedom</b>	<b>Significance</b>	<b>Exp(B)</b>
You use the arts to teach arts skills	-1.938	1.602	1.464	1	.226	.144
Preparing teachers to use the arts in their own teaching	.075	1.067	.005	1	.944	1.078
Joint teaching of arts skills	.314	.868	.131	1	.718	1.369
Integrating concepts from arts and non-arts areas	1.185	1.128	1.103	1	.294	3.271
My organization's financial strength is somewhat weak	-.656	14806.797	.000	1	1.000	.519
My organization's financial strength is fairly stable	-21.146	12865.192	.000	1	.999	.000
My organization's financial strength is strong	-20.399	12865.192	.000	1	.999	.000
Constant	19.794	12865.192	.000	1	.999	3.9E+08

#### Additional Characteristics of Respondents and School Partnerships

**Is level of income from school partnerships related to percent of total income from program income?** The researcher used percentage of total organizational income from program fees as the dependent variable in a linear regression with the dummy for income from school partnerships as the independent variable. The F change statistic is .061 ( $P = 0.805$ ), not significant at the 95% confidence level. There is no significant relationship

between level of income from school partnerships and percent of total revenue from program income.

**Is self-reported financial strength related to the odds of being paid to partner with schools?** The researcher used the dummy variable for being paid to partner as the dependent variable in logistic regression with dummies for self-reported financial strength as the independent variables. Organizations that are somewhat weak, fairly stable, or financially strong have no greater odds of being paid to partner with schools than financially weak organizations. Respective Wald statistics are 1.013 ( $P=.314$ ), .019 ( $P=.891$ ), and .076 ( $P=.783$ ); none are significant at the 95% confidence level.

#### Summary of key findings

Hypothesis 1 (agency independence): There is a weak positive relationship between being paid to partner with schools and the odds of advocating for arts education. Among arts organizations paid to partner with schools, earning \$50,000 or more from school partnerships increases the odds of advocating for arts education by 158% compared with organizations earning less than \$50,000. However, level of income from school partnerships is not a significant predictor of the odds of advocating when controlling for organizational financial strength and length and type of school activity.

Hypothesis 2 (vendorism): Among arts organizations that partner with schools, only 31.9% of respondents agree that artistic direction has changed due to work with schools (35% disagree and 33.1% neither agree nor disagree). Among arts organizations that are paid to partner with schools, level of income from school partnerships is not

related to changes in artistic direction due to work with schools. However, 42.1% of arts organizations that partner with schools agree with the statement, “Our organization offers much different programs than in the past due to our work with schools” (32.6% disagree, and 25.4% neither agree nor disagree). Neither length of typical school activity or level of income from school partnerships is significant in predicting either change of artistic direction or offering more programs geared to schools.

Hypothesis 3 (bureaucratization): Among all arts organizations, 27.4% report being affected by rules and regulations of outside agencies to a great or very great extent. Partnering with schools on a paid basis is significantly related to the odds of being affected by rules and regulations of outside organizations. Organizations that partner with schools on either a paid or unpaid basis have 294% greater odds of being affected by rules and regulations compared to those that do not partner with schools. However, organizations paid to partner do not have greater odds of being affected by rules and regulations compared to those that do not partner or those that partner on an unpaid basis. Among organizations paid to partner with schools, 44.8% agree that partnering with schools has meant having to comply with more rules and regulations. While organizations generally report having to adapt programs to school curricula and space and time constraints, no organizations report the need to add new administrative and accounting procedures, professional positions, or financial management practices. Length and type of school partnership do not affect an arts organization’s odds of having to comply with more rules due to school partnerships.



Hypothesis 4 (costs): Most organizations that partner with schools agree that they have more costs as a result; however, qualitative analysis of responses to open-ended question reveals that costs are offset by funding opportunities available to them through school partnerships. In addition, respondent comments indicate that school partnerships have enlarged their base of audience, donors, and volunteers. Most organizations earn less than \$50,000 annually from school partnerships and there is no significant relationship between level of income from school partnerships and higher costs due to work with schools. The only significant variable in predicting higher costs is “fairly stable” financial status of organization – not length or type of school activity or level of income from school partnerships.

Hypothesis 5 (artistic quality): Most organizations (56.0%) agree that working with schools has facilitated artistic growth (9.0% disagree and 34.9% neither agree nor disagree). However, there is no significant relationship between level of school-arts organization collaboration and reporting artistic growth due to work with schools. The only significant variable in predicting artistic growth is school activities that typically involve teaching non-arts skills, in a model that includes length and type of school activity, income from school partnerships, and self-reported financial strength. Using the arts to teach non-arts skills is a common type of school activity, but not the one most frequently mentioned by respondents.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the study and important conclusions drawn from the data presented in Chapter 4. It provides a discussion of the implications for action and recommendations for further research.

#### Summary of the Study

Nonprofits, including cultural organizations, are increasingly relying upon fees for service as part of their operating budgets (De Vita 1999, Weisbrod 1997, Linder and Rosenau 2000). Arts organizations have taken an increasingly prominent role in arts education starting with federal budget cuts in the 1960s and 1970s, and now private foundations give 4 out of 5 arts grants and dollars to arts organizations rather than schools (Renz and Atienza 2005). There is a lack of data on the effects of partnering with schools on nonprofit arts organizations as well as the effects of government contracting on nonprofits. This study consists of an email/internet survey of 680 leaders of American nonprofit arts organizations to determine how contracting with schools to provide arts activities affects agency independence, vendorism, bureaucratization, costs, and artistic quality. After pilot testing the survey with 22 leaders of arts organizations, the survey was distributed to a random sample of 712 American arts organizations identified as art museums; ballet; dance; music; music groups, bands and ensembles; opera; singing choral; symphony orchestras; theaters; and visual arts organizations. There were 32 ineligibles,

resulting in a final survey sample of 680. Over a six week data collection period, responses were gathered from 280 respondents for a 41% response rate. In order to improve the initial response rate, two reminder emails were sent to those who had not yet responded. The researcher analyzed the data using frequencies, cross tabulations, logistic regression, and linear regression. Respondents are representative of the target population in terms of type of agency by NTEE code. Respondents are geographically representative of the target population, though several states including a contiguous region in the west are not represented in the study. Because the random sample was drawn from organizations required to report to the Internal Revenue Service due to having annual gross receipts over \$25,000 per year, emerging and declining organizations with the smallest budgets are underrepresented in the study.

## Findings and Conclusions

**Hypothesis 1: Agency Independence. There is an expected inverse relationship between level of income earned from partnerships with schools by American nonprofit arts organizations and the self-reported likelihood of those organizations to act as advocates regarding school policy.**

**Findings:** There is a weak positive relationship (based on  $\Phi < .3$ ) between being paid to partner with schools and the odds of advocating for arts education. Among arts organizations paid to partner with schools, earning \$50,000 or more from school partnerships increases the odds of advocating for arts education by 158% compared with organizations earning less than \$50,000. However, level of income from school

partnerships is not a significant predictor of the odds of advocating when controlling for organizational financial strength and type of school activity.

**Discussion and conclusions:** It was expected that quantitative data would show that increasing levels of income earned from school partnerships serve as a disincentive to advocate for more positions for teachers who might provide arts instruction in place of arts organizations. This hypothesis was based upon review of literature such as Salamon (1987) indicating that nonprofits could lose motivation to act as advocates of reform if earned income from existing arrangements was threatened. In Chapter 2, this expectation was qualified by Salamon's (1987) comment that research had yet to support his theory, and by the observation that arts organizations have voiced the belief that their organizations would ultimately benefit from strengthened arts curriculum and resources in the form of larger and more informed audiences for the arts. The research hypothesis was based upon several assumptions: that survey respondents understood arts education advocacy to mean working on behalf of increased funding for teachers and resources in the arts; and that the presence of more arts teachers and sequential arts curricula would lead to reduced demand for school services provided by arts organizations, thus less earned income from schools. While qualitative analysis of comments from respondents indicates that advocacy activities are aimed at increased funding for teachers and resources in the arts, findings suggest that arts organizations paid to partner with schools understand their interests to be best served by stronger arts education instead of less consistent resources for the arts. It may be theorized that they expect arts education advocacy to result in either more funding to provide programs supplied by arts organizations, or that arts organizations will ultimately

generate more revenue from a general population with stronger knowledge of the arts, or both. According to Peggy Baggett, Executive Director of the Virginia Commission for the Arts, arts organizations are likely to be motivated to advocate for both reasons, and an especially important factor in likelihood to advocate for arts education is the presence of a strong statewide arts advocacy network (personal conversation 3/16/07).

Arts organizations' reasons for partnering with schools provide additional insight into the research findings. Survey respondents that are paid to partner with schools were asked to indicate the level of importance of each of several reasons for partnering with schools. Responses for each included "Not at all important," "Somewhat unimportant," "Neither important nor unimportant," "Somewhat important," and "Very important", with values of 1 through 5 assigned respectively. As shown in Table 16, below, generating income was the second least important reason for partnering with schools. The reason with the highest mean score is "develop future audiences for the arts," indicating that organizations that partner with schools are motivated more strongly by the prospect of long-term benefit to the field than by current earned income. Advocating for enhanced resources for arts education is a behavior consistent with the motivation to develop future audiences for the arts. This helps to explain why arts organizations that partner with schools are more likely to advocate on behalf of arts education.

**Table 15. Reasons for partnering with schools, among respondents paid to partner during the past year. Question 8: “Listed below are several reasons why your organization might partner with schools. Using the scale provided, please indicate the degree of importance or lack of importance of each reason that your organization currently places on each reason when it considers partnering with a school.”**

<b>Reason for partnering with schools</b>	<b>Not at all important # %</b>	<b>Somewhat important # %</b>	<b>Neither important nor unimportant # %</b>	<b>Somewhat important # %</b>	<b>Very important # %</b>	<b>Mean S.D.</b>
Develop current audiences for the arts	3 1.8	2 1.2	5 3.0	70 42.2	86 51.8	4.41 .771
Develop future audiences	1 .6	1 .6	4 2.4	40 24.1	120 72.3	4.67 .617
Generate income for our organization	14 8.5	11 6.7	33 20.0	58 35.2	49 29.7	3.71 1.205
Personal satisfaction/rewards	12 7.4	1 .6	45 27.6	61 37.4	44 27.0	3.76 1.088
Enhance our organization’s artistic quality	14 8.5	12 7.3	47 28.5	47 28.5	45 27.3	3.59 1.205
Enhance our organization’s reputation	3 1.8	1 .6	14 8.5	65 39.4	82 49.7	4.35 .809

Qualitative analysis of additional comments provided in an open-ended question regarding reasons for partnering indicate frequent citations of community need and mission-driven motivation but no mention of earned income. Examples of comments include: “our mission is to connect creativity to daily life and we feel that partnering with the community as often as possible is a way to carry out that mission.” “Arts in our area schools have been under the gun. All of the major arts organizations in our area have been expected to try to take up some of the slack. To that end, many of us have developed

programming for primary and secondary grades.” When respondents do cite financial motivation as a reason for partnering with schools, they indicate that pressure from funding sources is more important than the need to generate earned income: “Frankly, because some funding agencies increasingly insist on the company having educational partnerships.” “To attract funding that is available for school-arts organization partnerships only.”

While agency independence was instrumentalized in this study as the odds of advocating for arts education reform, the weakness in this model is that arts education reform can benefit arts organizations in the long term although it may cost them current earned income. In addition, most organizations surveyed (62.1%) do not take part in arts education advocacy efforts.

The results of this study indicate that future research into relationships between earned income and agency independence should take pains to explore and articulate the expectations of nonprofits engaged in financial relationships with public partners. Motivations more important than earned income may mean that agency independence is not threatened by paid partnerships; or agency independence may need to be measured by factors that indicate more definitive negative consequences for nonprofit agencies.

**Hypothesis 2. Vendorism. Earned income from school partnerships has led U.S. nonprofit arts organizations to produce more work geared to schools.**

**Findings:** among arts organizations that partner with schools, only 31.9% of respondents agree that artistic direction has changed due to work with schools (35% disagree and 33.1% neither agree nor disagree). Among arts organizations that are paid to

partner with schools, level of income from school partnerships is not related to changes in artistic direction due to work with schools. However, 42.1% of arts organizations that partner with schools agree with the statement, “Our organization offers much different programs than in the past due to our work with schools” (32.6% disagree, and 25.4% neither agree nor disagree). Neither length of typical school activity or level of income from school partnerships is significant in predicting either change of artistic direction or offering more programs geared to schools.

**Discussion and conclusions:** The literature consulted by the researcher to develop this hypothesis illustrated contradictory trends. Individual artists including Meban (2002) report that school partnership experiences led to self-censorship to select themes and issues that would not be considered controversial in the setting. Weisbrod (1997, 547) notes that nonprofits pursuing more diversified sources of earned income risk unplanned changes of direction. Bowen (1994) suggests that opportunities to add new programs and pursue funding constitute temptations for organizations that may lead them away from their central mission. Rosett (1991) analyzes data indicating that art museum funding patterns influence museum spending patterns and therefore the goals being pursued. On the other hand, Salamon (1987) finds little empirical evidence to support this concern. In addition, a more recent analysis of financial data from 209 nonprofit arts organizations shows that greater reliance on private funding does not divert funding from program service delivery (Hughes and Luksetich, 2004).

Salamon’s (1987) description of “vendorism” refers to the distortion of an agency’s original mission to fit priorities for which government funding is available. Analysis of



frequency data for Question 5, asked of respondents paid to partner with schools, reveals that 90.9% of arts organizations that are paid to partner with schools have arts education as part of their mission. This is supported by responses to the open-ended survey question about reasons for partnering with schools, which contain frequent references to an organizational mission to provide arts education. Taken together, these data indicate that school partnerships are not leading arts organizations to stray from their artistic mission in exchange for earned income, but that most organizations pursuing school partnerships do so in part to fulfill their organizational purpose and do so with programming that is consistent with their artistic identity. However, there is a difference between arts organizations whose primary purpose is arts education and organizations that exist mainly to produce the arts for the general public but which include education and outreach as part of their mission. The second type of organization, more common in both the general population and in the survey population, can adjust its mix of programming to pursue funding opportunities without abandoning its overall mission. Further research could more thoroughly investigate the extent to which arts-producing organizations have shifted resources and programming to pursue funding available for school partnerships.

Despite the finding that only 31.9% of respondents agree that artistic direction has changed due to work with schools, analysis of a similar survey question reveals that only 32.6% of arts organizations paid to partner with schools disagree with the statement, “Our organization offers much different programs than in the past due to our work with schools.” Those that agree with the statement represent 42.1% of respondents. Thus while

most organizations have not changed artistic direction due to work with schools, more have significantly changed their mix of programs than have kept programming unchanged. Change of artistic direction represents a more profound organizational change than programming mix, but offering more programs geared toward schools indicates a shift in resources away from other priorities. However, because 90.9% of arts organizations partnering with schools have arts education as part of their mission, changes in programming do not raise concerns that organizations are experiencing mission shift in pursuing school partnerships.

The researcher concludes that in partnering with schools, arts organizations of the types studied are providing a program service consistent with their organizational missions and are more likely to change their mix of programs than to make more fundamental artistic changes. Level of income from school partnerships does not lead arts organizations away from their missions. Peggy Baggett, Executive Director of the Virginia Commission for the Arts, suggests that vendorism is unlikely to arise from school partnerships; because the current national emphasis on standardized testing has created a climate hostile to partnerships, arts organizations are unlikely to make the effort to pursue them unless arts education is an important part of their mission (personal conversation 3/16/07). This observation is supported by qualitative analysis of comments from survey respondents. For instance, "Partnering with schools is such a strange concept in Texas. We provide the service and they take it. If we did not constantly call and contact the schools, they would not take the initiative. Still, we believe it is important for the students..." Future research on vendorism could concentrate on the effects of commercial income from sources less

closely tied to arts organizations' mission than school partnerships, such as operating gift shops and other commercial ventures.

**Hypothesis 3. Bureaucratization.** Arts organizations that partner with schools are not expected to have greater odds of being affected by rules and regulations of outside agencies.

**Findings:** Among all arts organizations, 27.4% report being affected by rules and regulations of outside agencies to a great or very great extent. Partnering with schools on a paid basis is significantly related to the odds of being affected by rules and regulations of outside organizations. Organizations that partner with schools on either a paid or unpaid basis have 294% greater odds of being affected by rules and regulations compared to those that do not partner with schools. However, organizations paid to partner with schools do not have significantly greater odds of being affected by rules and regulations compared to those that do not partner or partner on an unpaid basis. Among organizations paid to partner with schools, 45.8% agree that partnering with schools has meant having to comply with more rules and regulations. While organizations generally report having to adapt programs to school curricula and space and time constraints, no organizations report the need to add new administrative and accounting procedures, professional positions, or financial management practices. Length and type of school partnership do not affect an arts organization's odds of having to comply with more rules due to school partnerships.

**Discussion and conclusions:** These findings support Salamon's (1987) observation that bureaucratization is the most credible of the three possible effects of government funding he identifies (agency independence and vendorism are the other two). However,

the study findings indicate that the influence of rules results from the partnering relationship itself whether paid or unpaid, rather than from government funding. This is significant since 28.9% of respondents have provided school programs at no charge during the past year, and 46.8% have provided school programs both on a paid and unpaid basis.

Comments provided by survey respondents indicate that adjusting programmatic content to fit school curricula and space and time constraints are acceptable modifications and do not require significant human and financial resources. One exception is Florida's Jessica Lunsford Act, which requires organizations and individuals working with students to undergo fingerprinting and criminal background checks at their own expense. If other states require similar security precautions for those working with students, more arts organizations may face additional financial and administrative hurdles in order to work with schools. According to Peggy Baggett, Executive Director of the Virginia Commission for the Arts, there has been national dialogue about whether background checks on artists working in schools should be the responsibility of artists and arts organizations or of state arts agencies that offer arts in education programs and funding (personal conversation 3/16/07).

Respondent comments indicate that school administrators' perceived lack of interest in school partnerships constrains organizations in addition to the effects of rules on their organizations. A substantial number of comments echo the following: "There is something going on here that is problematic, which is that we provide programs to the schools, and they don't want them. The teachers like them and try to (and sometimes do)

bring their students, but the upper management says that they take time from the classroom and the teachers shouldn't have to do them and 'there is no time for the arts anyway.' "

This study supports the theory that bureaucratization is among the more likely effects of government contracting. It only provides brief qualitative analysis of the types of rules and regulations imposed by school partnerships, which nevertheless indicates that these rules appear to fall within limits acceptable to arts organizations of the types studied. Future research into bureaucratization as an effect of government contracting could explore other sectors of the nonprofit industry and/or other types of government contracting more likely to attract regulation. The influence of bureaucratization on all partnerships, paid and unpaid, suggests that bureaucratization may be an effect of unpaid collaborative relationships and should be further studied in this and other nonprofit sectors. In addition, arts organizations that choose not to pursue school partnerships could be asked if their reasons include desire to avoid rules and regulations that come with school partnerships.

**Hypothesis 4. Costs Arts organizations that partner with schools assume higher costs that may outweigh the benefit of earned income.**

**Findings:** Most organizations that partner with schools agree that they have more costs as a result; however, qualitative analysis of responses to open-ended question reveals that costs are offset by funding opportunities available to them through school partnerships. In addition, respondent comments indicate that school partnerships have enlarged their base of audience, donors, and volunteers. Most organizations earn less than \$50,000 annually from school partnerships and there is no significant relationship between level of income from school partnerships and higher costs due to work with schools. The

only significant variable in predicting higher costs is “fairly stable” financial status of organization – not length or type of school activity or level of income from school partnerships.

**Discussion and conclusions:** Because the researcher was able to find no data on this topic, the hypothesis was developed by considering the application of Baumol and Bowen’s “cost disease” theory to school partnerships. Baumol and Bowen (1966, 1993) demonstrate that performing arts organizations face a gap between operating expenses and earned income due to forces beyond their control. Because they cannot take advantage of innovations in technology, these organizations can never earn enough income to cover operating costs. DiMaggio (1984, 63-4), however, points out that there are several ways organizations can increase productivity. The researcher theorized that this “cost disease” would follow arts organizations’ attempts to earn income through diversified sources such as school partnerships. Production, management and travel costs made necessary by school partnerships were anticipated to be reported as offsetting revenue. Indeed, the study did find instances of additional costs including additional staff, production costs, and expenses relating to producing educational materials such as study guides. In addition, some organizations assume unreimbursed expenses in order to provide school programming: “Typically (we earn) <\$500 per year from in-school performances. Free tickets to students, obviously, generates no income, and (we incur) \$2.50-3.00 per student additional cost from theater ticketing fees.” “We do not charge for school events, but instead frequently supply the buses.”

However, qualitative analysis of comments from respondents indicates that while school partnerships often entail additional costs, three factors mitigate these costs. First, the presence of funding opportunities available only to arts organizations that partner with schools; one museum respondent comments, "Funding opportunities (and mandates) can be major factors in museum program offerings. Only some are good and authentic matches, philosophically. We've ended some partnerships because of different philosophies, thereby rejecting some funding." The second factor mitigating costs is additional financial and human resources from audience, donor, and volunteer bases enlarged through school partnerships. For example, a theater comments, "We've grown many families into subscribers, donors and volunteers. Some students have even taken it upon themselves to work out internships at the high school and college level (as well as the internships we already offer)." The third factor mitigating costs is the flexibility to adjust programming to absorb production costs. For example, one theater organization comments, "Our touring plays do 120 performances over 13 weeks. Our touring ensemble now includes up to 3 equity people and as we have lengthened the run, we have added a second production choice." Offering programs for a longer time period has allowed the respondent to undertake additional production costs.

Finally, arts organizations that earn higher income from school partnerships do not depend upon program income as a percentage of total income to a greater degree than other arts organizations. This finding indicates that school partnerships are not leading arts organizations to become more dependent on earned income.

A surprising finding is that the only significant factor in predicting higher costs due to partnerships with schools is self-reported financial strength of “fairly stable, though our finances react to outside concerns.” These organizations have 633% greater odds to report higher costs than organizations whose financial status is “weak – not at all stable, we are concerned with survival.” Organizations rating their financial strength as higher than fairly stable are not more likely to report higher costs due to school partnerships. The next lower response category is “fairly weak, cash flow is sometimes a problem.” While self-reported financial status is not significantly related to partnering with schools, the largest category of survey respondents (39.9%) rate their organizations’ financial strength as “fairly stable.” The findings suggest that perhaps arts organizations for which cash flow is a problem avoid partnerships that entail higher production and management costs, while the least stable organizations for which cash flow is not a problem are willing to assume higher costs in order to pursue school partnerships.

The researcher concludes that grant funding opportunities, the chance to develop current audiences, and the ability to adjust programming and pricing offset additional costs necessitated by school partnerships, though organizations pursue school partnerships in order to develop future audiences for the arts. School partnerships are not leading arts organizations to greater dependence on income from program services. However, practitioners may be concerned that arts organizations that rate their financial stability as “fairly stable” are most likely to incur higher costs as a result of school partnerships. This sector of the nonprofit arts organization sector could be further analyzed to learn more about these costs, their short and long term effects on arts organizations, and offsetting



revenues. If funding opportunities from public and private sources should decline, what would be the impact on arts organizations and upon arts education?

**Hypothesis 5. Artistic Quality.** Arts organizations that engage in more collaborative partnerships with schools are more likely than groups that undertake more limited, service-provider roles to self-report an increase in artistic quality.

**Findings:** Most organizations (56.0%) agree that working with schools has facilitated artistic growth (9.0% disagree and 34.9% neither agree nor disagree). However, there is no significant relationship between level of school-arts organization collaboration and reporting artistic growth due to work with schools. There is no significant predictor of artistic growth in a model that includes length and type of school activity, income from school partnerships, and self-reported financial strength.

**Discussion and conclusions:** Artistic growth is the only positive potential effect of school partnerships analyzed in this study. Among reasons for partnering with schools, “enhance our organization’s artistic growth” received the lowest mean score from survey respondents. In descending order of mean score, reasons for partnering include “develop future audiences for the arts” (4.67), “develop current audiences for the arts” (4.41), “enhance our organization’s reputation” (4.35), “personal satisfaction” (3.76), “generate income for our organization” (3.71), and “enhance our organization’s artistic growth” (3.59). However, among effects of partnering with schools, the highest mean score (3.61) was received by the response, “partnering with schools has helped our organization grow artistically.”

While few respondent comments illuminate the ways in which school partnerships facilitate artistic growth, several responses indicate that both student feedback and the ability to provide work for more professional artists are important. “School audiences see the same productions our adult audiences see. The student performances inform the production in ways adult audiences do not.” “Our company has been working with schools for 22 years. Because of comments on feedback forms distributed post performance, we have developed new scenes and added new plays and workshops to the repertoire.” “The growth of the education programs in partner schools has resulted in the ability to recruit professional artists to the area. This creates a stronger arts environment in the community.” “Partnering with schools has sometimes given this company the opportunity to provide additional performance experience and additional paychecks for our artists.” One respondent added that one important reason for partnering with schools is “to pilot new ideas.”

Survey findings do not support either of Frey’s Crowding-Out or Crowding-In theories. In *Arts & Economics: Analysis & Cultural Policy* (2003, 148-53), Bruno Frey describes a theoretical relationship between external interventions and creativity called Crowding Theory. Crowding Theory is based on the notion that creativity in individuals relies strongly upon motivation to act for its own sake. In his Crowding-Out Theory, Frey suggests that creativity is reduced when government support is contingent on a particular performance, and when artists are given uniform treatment by government rather than taking into account the diversity prized by artists. On the other hand, under other conditions external reward may sometimes serve to increase creativity rather than stifle it.

This is called Crowding-In Theory, and its effect is strongest when government support is given in a way that supports artists' autonomy, as in unconditional grants or awards; and when artists themselves rather than the government have a high degree of involvement in artistic choices and the artistic process. In Chapter 2 the researcher described the decision to instrumentalize one-time school performances as representatives of the Crowding-Out Effect, in which creativity is expected to be reduced, and more collaborative school partnership activities as representative of the Crowding-In Effect, expected to increase creativity. One respondent's comments support this interpretation of Crowding-In theory: "Many partnerships - because of their sustained and in-depth nature - allow for experimentation that helps us grow artistically." However, study findings reveal that degree of collaboration with schools has no effect on whether arts organizations report enhanced artistic growth. Future research on this theory should include both quantitative and qualitative analysis of the external rewards and amount of autonomy experienced in school partnerships.

### Concluding Remarks

Most American nonprofit arts organizations have provided programs to schools in the past year, either for a fee (12.9%), without charging a fee (28.9%), or both on a paid and unpaid basis (46.8%). Most organizations (90.9%) that are paid to partner with schools have arts education as part of their mission and do so despite a school climate that is sometimes unwelcoming due in part to the pressures of standardized testing. This study supports Salamon's (1995) theory that bureaucratization is among the most likely effects

of government contracting on nonprofits, and an earlier study of nonprofits indicating that greater reliance on private funding does not divert funding from program service delivery (Hughes and Luksetich, 2004).

Organizations that partner with schools have 294% greater odds of being affected by rules and regulations compared to those that do not partner with schools, but these rules seem to fall within acceptable limits for arts organizations of the types studied. Additional research could explore the sources, natures, and effects of rules and regulations in more detail in order to understand whether rules resulting from school partnerships are similar to rules and regulations affecting other types of government contracting with nonprofits. Agency independence, vendorism, and costs are not tied to level of income from school partnerships. Level of income from school partnerships does not make arts organizations less likely to advocate for arts education, change artistic direction or offer significantly different programs, or impose unreimbursed costs. Further research on agency independence should instrumentalize this variable using factors that indicate more definitive negative consequences for nonprofit agencies than participation in arts education advocacy. In partnering with schools, arts organizations of the types studied are providing a program service consistent with their organizational missions and are more likely to change their mix of programs than to make more fundamental artistic changes.

This study does not support Frey's (2003) Crowding Theory of the effect of external rewards on creativity. More collaborative types of school activity did not enhance organizational creativity in this study. However, an important finding is that while artistic growth is the least important reason for partnering with schools, enhanced artistic growth

received the highest mean score among respondents asked to indicate agreement with statements about the effects of school partnerships. While respondent comments indicate that student feedback and the opportunity to provide more work for professional artists contribute to this enhanced artistic growth, further qualitative research is needed to fully understand this effect.

While frequency data reveal that school partnerships lead to organizational artistic growth, further analysis of the effects of school partnerships on arts organizations should pay closer attention to other potential positive effects. This study only addressed one research question to a potentially positive effect on arts organizations, but respondent comments clearly indicate that myriad other benefits accrue from school partnerships. A mixed-method study involving case studies and quantitative analysis that further explores the nature and effects of artistic growth could further address this issue and other positive effects of school partnerships.

Further, this study primarily studied the effects of being paid to partner with schools. The study reveals that the largest category of respondents provided programs to schools both for a fee and for free in the past year. The quantity and quality of programs provided to schools without charge has implications for both education and nonprofit policymakers and should be studied further.

The study offers broader implications for cultural and public policy. First, the role of school-arts organization partnerships in establishing consistent arts instruction and arts education policy has been subject to debate as described in Chapter 2. Some believe that partnerships diminish the role of teachers and are a poor substitute for ongoing, sequential

arts instruction. Others see partnerships as a tool for generating political momentum in making the case for permanent arts instruction. In 2004, the Chicago Community Trust and the Illinois Arts Alliance conducted a series of interviews with key players in ten states with substantive arts education policies (Illinois Arts Alliance 2004). Among the key factors identified in successfully implementing arts education policies is developing a strong partnership among key players including state arts councils, the state department of education, community leaders, and community-based organizations. The report also identifies the need for local data on how the arts enhance student learning (Illinois Arts Alliance 2004). This study found that only 37.9% of arts organizations of the types studied take part in arts education advocacy efforts. Among arts groups paid to partner with schools, this figure rises to 45.8%. While the overwhelming majority (90.9%) of arts organizations paid to partner with schools have arts education as part of their mission, less than half actively advocate on behalf of arts education. This study indicates that the potential for partnerships to contribute to consistent sequential arts instruction is not fully developed in existing advocacy efforts.

Second, the difficulty of operationalizing agency independence as advocacy in this study suggests that public and private goals are not always discrete. Writers including Dixon (2004) and Salamon (1987) discuss agency independence as a function of a nonprofit's ability to act as advocate or to critique the existing arrangement between government and nonprofit. In this study, however, respondent comments suggest that acting as an advocate seems to be a flawed measure of agency independence. Arts organizations advocating for stronger arts education may lose some current opportunities

for earned income. But stronger arts education programs may also help to expand the base of community and financial support for the arts. And arts organizations paid to partner with schools are more likely, not less likely to advocate for arts education. If this difficulty in operationalizing agency independence does indicate a true convergence of public and private goals, why do less than half of arts agencies that are paid to partner with schools advocate on behalf of arts education (45.8%, compared with 37.9% of all respondents)? Perhaps a better way to operationalize arts agency independence is to study their criticisms of public and private funding agencies, including support of arts education partnerships. In addition, this study revealed that 42.1% of arts organizations that partner with schools agree that their programming has changed as a result of working with schools. Have agencies diluted the content of their work for schools and for the public in order to win school contracts? If arts organizations produce work that is less strident in an effort to please school administrators, does this demonstrate a loss of agency independence? It should be noted that respondent comments to this survey do not suggest that such a dilution of artistic material or critical viewpoint is taking place. Research in other nonprofit sectors should carefully operationalize and analyze agency independence.

The study has a third implication for public policy. As discussed in Chapter 2, Linder (2000) suggests that one function of public-private partnerships is to shift financial and political risk to the private sector. The debate over whether to publicly fund art is long and well documented. The arts are said to produce collective benefits including a legacy to future generations, national identity, benefits to the local economy, contribution to a liberal education, social improvement of arts participants, and encouraging artistic innovation

(Heilbrun & Gray 2001, 226-9). Heilbrun & Gray (2001) note that these benefits are open to debate, and those who oppose public funding for the arts have claimed that the arts produce no relevant external benefits. Debate over whether public funding of the arts is appropriate is often stirred by controversial and provocative individual works of art to which public funding is directly or indirectly linked. In contrast, policymakers and the public often see providing arts experiences and instruction to youth as a less controversial use of public funds. School-arts partnerships may be an effective means to share political risk inherent in public funding of the arts: funding agencies support the arts through a method with more widespread public appeal than direct support to artists; schools minimize the risk involved in a potentially controversial school art project or activity by gaining the capacity to account for it as an isolated event rather than an ongoing instructional practice or policy. This study found that arts groups that partner with schools have 294% greater odds of being affected by rules and regulations compared to those that do not partner. To what degree do these rules improve school partnerships, including student outcomes? Researchers in both public policy and education policy should investigate ways in which the various partners involved in school-arts organization partnerships are held accountable for student outcomes and other results.

Pablo Picasso said, "Every child is an artist. The problem is how to remain an artist once he grows up." Organizations that partner with schools to provide arts experiences and instruction undertake to nurture the creative spirit. This study suggests that such partnerships have limited negative effects on arts organizations. Partnerships can strengthen rather than erode their organizational structure by providing work for



professional artists, creative inspiration, and by developing current and future audiences. In the words of one respondent, “Our organization has built meaningful relationships with students, families and school administrators that has helped the organization establish itself as a vital member of the community.”

### **Literature Cited**

### Literature Cited

- Adorno, Theodor. *The Culture Industry*. Reprint edition. Routledge Classics: London: 2004.
- Alvarado, Audrey R. "Too Many Nonprofits?" National Council of Nonprofits Associations. Online. Accessed June 24, 2004. Available URL: <http://www.ncna.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=Page.view/Page&pageID=443>
- Americans and the Arts VI (1992). Princeton University: Princeton, N.J.: 2004. Online. Accessed 2/14/06. Available URL: <http://www.cpanda.org/arts-culture-facts/policy/harris92.html>
- Anheier, H.K., and Toepler, S. "Commerce and the muse: Are art museums becoming commercial?" In B.A. Weisbrod (Ed.), *To profit or not to profit: The commercial transformation of the nonprofit sector* (pp.233-48). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press: 1998.
- Babbie, E. *Survey research methods*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). California: Wadsworth: 1990.
- Baumol, William J. and Bowen, William G. *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*. Reprint edition. Ashgate Publishing Company: 1993.
- Berger, Peter L. and Neuhaus, Richard John. *To Empower People: From State To Civil Society: Twentieth Anniversary Edition*. Edited by Michael Novak. The AEI Press: Washington, D.C.: 1996.
- Blakeslee, Michael. "Assembling the Arts Education Jigsaw" *Arts Education Policy Review* vol 105 (March/April 2004) p. 31-36
- Borgonovi, Francesca. "Performing Arts Attendance: An Economic Approach" *Applied Economics*, vol. 26 (17) (Sept. 20, 2004) pp. 1871-86
- Brouillette, Liane. "Using the arts to integrate knowledge: Partnerships between schools and nonprofit organizations" in *Boundary Crossings: Educational Partnerships and School Leadership*. Cordeiro, Paula A, editor. Jossey-Bass: Lowell, Mass.: 1996

- Burchenal, Margaret K. "Thinking Through Art" *Journal of Museum Education* vol 23, no 2 (1998) p. 13-5
- Butler, Stuart M. "Practical Principles." In Berger, Peter L. and Neuhaus, Richard John. *To Empower People: From State To Civil Society: Twentieth Anniversary Edition*, 116-23. Edited by Michael Novak. The AEI Press: Washington, D.C.: 1996.
- Bowen, William C. *Inside the Boardroom: Governance By Directors And Trustees*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: New York: 1994.
- Carey, N., Kleiner, B., Porch, R., and Farris, E., Arts Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, 1999-2000. U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics: Washington, D.C.: 2002.
- Chapman, Laura. "Arts Education as a Political Issue: The Federal Legacy" in *Public Policy and the Aesthetic Interest*, Smith, Ralph A. and Berman, Ronald editors. University of Illinois Press: Urbana: 1992
- Chapman, Laura. "Questioning Arts Education in Action: The State Arts Agency Commitment" *Arts Education Review* vol 101 (January 2000) p. 36-40
- Cohen, Randy, Filicko, Therese, and Wyszomirski, Margaret. 2002. *National and Local Profiles of Cultural Support 2001: The National Survey* [codebook file]. CPANDA ed. Princeton, NJ: Cultural Policy and the Arts National Data Archive [producer and distributor]
- de Tocqueville, Alexis. *Democracy in America*. Translated, edited, and with an introduction by Harvey C. Mansfield and Delba Winthrop. The Folio Society: London: 2002
- De Vita, Carol J. "Nonprofits and Devolution: What Do We Know?" in Elizabeth T. Boris & C. Eugene Steuerle, eds., *Nonprofits & Government: Collaboration and Conflict*, 213-33, The Urban Institute Press: Washington, D.C.: 1999.
- DiMaggio, Paul. "State Expansion and Organizational Fields." In Richard H. Hall and Robert E. Quinn, eds., *Organizational Theory and Public Policy*, 147-61, Sage Publications: Beverly Hills: 1983.
- DiMaggio, Paul. "The Nonprofit Instrument and the Influence of the Marketplace on Policies in the Arts." In W. McNeil Lowry, ed., *The Arts & Public Policy in the United States*, 57-99, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall: 1984.

- DiMaggio, Paul. "Nonprofit Organizations in the Production and Distribution of Culture." In Walter W. Powell, ed., *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, 195-220, Yale University Press: New Haven and London: 1987.
- Dixon, John, Dogan, Rhys, and Kouzmin, Alexander. "The Dilemma of Privatized Public Services: Philosophical Frames in Understanding Failure and Managing Partnership Terminations." *Public Organization Review* vol 4, no 1 (Mar 2004) pp.25-46.
- Donaldson, Lynn and Pearsall, Erika. *Arts Education in the Chicago Public Schools: Executive Summary*. The Chicago Community Trust: Chicago: 2001. Online. Accessed 7/1/04. Available URL: [http://www.cct.org/publications\\_research/ArtsSurvey\\_ExecSummary.pdf](http://www.cct.org/publications_research/ArtsSurvey_ExecSummary.pdf)
- Dreeszen, Craig. *Intersections II: Community Arts and Education Collaborations: Second edition*. The Arts Extension Service: Amherst: 2002.
- Dubin, Steven C. *Bureaucratizing the Muse: Public Funds and the Cultural Worker*. The University of Chicago Press: Chicago: 1987.
- Ellis, Dawn M. and Dreeszen, Craig. *For the Greater Good: A Framework for Advancing State Arts Education Partnerships*. National Assembly of State Arts Agencies: Washington, D.C.: 2003
- Fineberg, Carol. "Integrating the Arts into the Wider Curriculum." In "Planning an Arts-Centered School. The Dana Foundation. The Dana Press: NYC: 2002. Online. Accessed 10/14/05. Available URL: <http://www.dana.org/books/press/artshandbook/artsbook.pdf> pp. 64-9.
- Fineberg, Carol. "Collaborations and the conundrums they breed: introduction to the symposium on community resources" *Arts Education Policy Review* vol 95 (May/June 1994) p. 9-12.
- Fischer, Ernst. *The Necessity of Art*, ch. 2 (1959, trans. 1963).
- Freeman, Carol, Ph.D., et. al. "Models of Implementing Arts for Academic Achievement: Challenging Contemporary Classroom Practice, Executive Summary." University of Minnesota: 2002. Online. Accessed 8/8/05. Available URL: <http://www.education.umn.edu/CAREI/Reports/Annenberg/Models.html>
- Frey, Bruno S. *Arts & Economics: Analysis & Cultural Policy: Second Edition*. Springer: Berlin: 2003.

- Freire, P. *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum: New York: 1994.
- Gee, Constance Bumgarner. "The 'use and abuse' of arts advocacy and consequences for music education (demonstrating the true value of art)." *Arts Education Policy Review* vol 103 (March-April 2002) p. 3-22.
- Gee, Constance Bumgarner. "Uncritical Pronouncements Build Critical Links for Federal Arts Bureaucracy" *Arts Education Policy Review* vol 104 (January-February 2003) p. 17-9
- Gronbjerg, K. *Understanding nonprofit funding: Managing revenues in social services and community development organizations*. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco: 1993
- Hanley, Betty. "The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly – Arts Partnerships in Canadian Elementary Schools" *Arts Education Policy Review* vol 104 (July-August 2003) p. 11-20.
- Heilbrun, James and Gray, Charles M. *The Economics of Art and Culture*. Second edition. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge: 2001.
- Hoffa, Harlan. "Policy statements: plain and fancy (clarifying the policies of groups involved in arts education)." *Arts Education Policy Review* vol 94 (July-August 1993) p. 2-9.
- Horowitz, R. *Summary of large-scale arts partnership evaluations*. Arts Education Partnership: Washington, D.C.: 2004.
- Hughes, Patricia and Luksetich, William. "Nonprofit Arts Organizations: Do Funding Sources Influence Spending Patterns?" *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* vol 33 no 2 (June 2004) p. 203-20.
- Illinois Arts Alliance. "Arts Education: Trends in Public Policy Development and Implementation." Online. Accessed 2/14/07. Available URL: [http://www.artsalliance.org/docs/adleg/ArtsEducPolicyReport\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.artsalliance.org/docs/adleg/ArtsEducPolicyReport_FINAL.pdf)
- Jones, Ed. "A corporate foundation perspective." *Arts Education Policy Review* vol 95 (May-June 1994) p. 18-22.

- Katz, Stanley N. "Influences on Public Policies in the United States" In Lowry, W. McNeil, ed., *The Arts & Public Policy in the United States* Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, N.J: 1984.
- Linder, Stephen H. "Coming to Terms With the Public-Private Partnership: A Grammar of Multiple Meanings." In Rosenau, Pauline Vaillancourt, ed., *Public-Private Policy Partnerships* The MIT Press: Cambridge: 2000 pp. 1-18.
- Linder, Stephen H. and Rosenau, Pauline Vaillancourt. "Mapping the Terrain of the Public-Private Policy Partnership." In Rosenau, Pauline Vaillancourt, ed., *Public-Private Policy Partnerships* The MIT Press: Cambridge: 2000 pp. 1-18.
- Massarsky, C.W. and Beinhacker, S.I., Enterprising nonprofits: Revenue generation in the nonprofit sector. Online. Internet. Accessed 2005. Available URL: [http://www.pewtrusts.com/pdf/vf\\_yeal\\_enterprising\\_nonprofits.pdf](http://www.pewtrusts.com/pdf/vf_yeal_enterprising_nonprofits.pdf)
- Meban, Margaret. "The Postmodern Artist in the School: Implications for Arts Partnership Programs" *International Journal of Education & The Arts* vol 3 no 1 (January 2002).
- National Assembly of State Arts Agencies. "Many Arts Organizations Are Running In The Red." Online. Internet. Accessed 2001. Available URL: <http://www.nasaa-arts.org/new/nasaa/nasaanews/red.shtml>
- National Endowment for the Arts. 2003. Survey of Public Participation in the Arts 2002 [codebook file]. CPANDA ed. Princeton, NJ: Cultural Policy and the Arts National Data Archive [producer and distributor]
- News from NASAA* December, 2005. Online. Internet. Accessed 2/14/06. Available URL: [http://www.nasaa-arts.org/nasaanews/arts\\_ed.shtml](http://www.nasaa-arts.org/nasaanews/arts_ed.shtml)
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Birth of Tragedy*, ch. 24 (1872).
- Olshan, Lois. "A Teacher's Perspective on Life in an Arts-Centered Elementary School." In "Planning an Arts-Centered School. The Dana Foundation. The Dana Press: NYC: 2002. Online. Accessed 10/14/05. Available URL: <http://www.dana.org/books/press/artshandbook/artsbook.pdf> pp. 106-13.
- Oreck, Barry. "The Artistic and Professional Development of Teachers: A Study of Teachers' Attitudes Toward And Use Of The Arts In Teaching" *Journal of Teacher Education* vol 55(January/February 2004) p. 55-69.

- Rademaker, Linnea L. "Community Involvement in Arts Education: A Case Study." *Arts Education Policy Review* vol 105 (September/October 2003) p. 13-24
- Remer, Jane. *Beyond Enrichment: Building effective arts partnerships with schools and your community*. ACA Books: New York: 1996.
- Renz, Loren and Atienza, Josefina. "Foundation Funding for Arts Education: an overview of recent trends." The Foundation Center; October, 2005. Online. Accessed 12/1/05. Available URL: [http://fdncenter.org/research/trends\\_analysis/pdf/arted05.pdf](http://fdncenter.org/research/trends_analysis/pdf/arted05.pdf)
- Rosett, Richard. "Art museums in the United States: A Financial portrait." Pp. 129-78 in M. Feldstein (Ed.), *The economics of museums*. University Press: Chicago: 1991
- Rubin, A. & Babbie, E. (2001). *Research methods for social work*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Wadsworth: Belmont, CA: 2001
- Ryan, S. & Shreyar, S. (1996). "Arts partnerships in the classroom: Some cultural considerations." Pp. 346-355 in J. Remer (Ed.), *Beyond Enrichment: Building effective arts partnerships with schools and your community*. American Council for the Arts: New York: 1996.
- Salamon, L.M. *Partners in public service*. Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore: 1995.
- Salamon, Lester. "Partners in Public Service: The Scope and Theory of Government-Nonprofit Relations." In Walter W. Powell, ed., *The Nonprofit Sector: A Research Handbook*, 99-117, Yale University Press: New Haven and London: 1987.
- Seidel, Steve, Eppel, Meredith, and Martiniello, Maria. *Arts Survive: A Study of Sustainability in Arts Education Partnerships*. Project Zero/Harvard University Graduate School of Education: Cambridge, Mass.: 2001
- Silvers, Anita. "Missing Links: On Studying the Connection of Arts Education to the Public Good" *Arts Education Policy Review* vol 104 (January-February 2003) p. 21-3
- Smith, Ralph A. "Policy for Arts Education: Whither the Schools, Whither the Public and Private Sectors?" in *Public Policy and the Aesthetic Interest*, Smith, Ralph A. and Berman, Ronald editors. University of Illinois Press: Urbana: 1992
- Smith, Ralph A. "Variety of Links: Academic, Aesthetic, and Political" *Arts Education Policy Review* vol 104 (January-February 2003) p. 9-11



Tuckman, H.P. and Chang, C.F. "Nonprofit equity: A behavioral model and its policy implications." *Journal of Policy Analysis & Management* 11(1) (1992) p. 76-87

Tusa, John. "Thou Shalt Worship the Arts for What They Are" *Arts Education Policy Review* vol 104 (January-February 2003) p. 3-7

Unified Database of Arts Organizations. Online. Accessed 2/2/07. Available URL: <http://nccsdataweb.urban.org/UDAO/index.php?page=CEmHome&server=localhost>

Virginia Commission for the Arts. *Guidelines for Funding 2004-2006*. Online. Accessed 7/1/04. Available URL: <http://www.arts.state.va.us/Guidelines2004-2006/ALLGDLNText.pdf>.

Weisbrod, Burton A. "The Future of the Nonprofit Sector: Its Entwinning with Private Enterprise and Government" *The Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* vol 16, no 4 (1997) pp. 541-555.

Winner, Ellen and Hetland, Lois. "Beyond the Evidence Given: A Critical Commentary on Critical Links" *Arts Education Policy Review* vol. 104 (January-February 2003) p.13-5

## **APPENDIX A**

### Survey of Arts Organizations

This survey is important because of the lack of research on how arts organizations are affected by working with schools. The results of this survey will form the basis of my dissertation toward a Ph.D. in Public Policy & Administration at Virginia Commonwealth University.

You have been randomly selected to participate in this survey because you are a leader of an arts organization. We would appreciate it very much if you could take a few moments to provide some feedback that will help to advance understanding of arts organizations. Even if your organization does not partner with schools, your responses are important.

This is a voluntary survey. To advance to the next question, click the “NEXT” button at the bottom of each page. For each question, mark the answer that best describes how you feel. If you do not know the answer to a question or prefer not to answer it, you may skip it. If you choose to withdraw from participating after you have started, simply exit this window. Your responses to this survey will be kept confidential.

If you need to pause at any time while completing the survey, click the SAVE button below and bookmark this webpage. You can return to the saved survey at a later time by using the bookmarked webpage. To submit your responses when you are finished, please click the FINISH button on the last page of the survey. Thank you for your participation – your response counts!

1. To what extent do rules and regulations of outside organizations such as funding agencies affect your organization?
  - ☐ Not at all
  - ☐ To a small extent
  - ☐ To some extent
  - ☐ To a great extent
  - ☐ To a very great extent
2. How would you rate the financial stability of your organization?
  - ☐ Weak - not at all stable, we are concerned with survival
  - ☐ Somewhat weak - cash flow is sometimes a concern
  - ☐ Fairly stable, though our finances react to outside conditions such as the economy
  - ☐ Strong - very stable, we have developed cash reserves
  - ☐ Don't know
3. To bring about change in local or statewide arts education in schools, some organizations take part in advocacy efforts such as developing and delivering a message to policymakers and to the public. Does your organization take part in such arts education advocacy efforts?
  - ☐ Yes
  - ☐ No
- 3 (a). If yes, please use the space below to briefly describe your arts education advocacy efforts.
4. In the past year, has your organization provided artistic programs or services to a public school or school system
  - ☐ Yes, for a fee
  - ☐ Yes, without charging a fee
  - ☐ Yes, both for a fee and without charging a fee
  - ☐ No, not at all

{If respondent answers either “Yes, without charging a fee” or “No, not at all,” they skip to the end of the survey. Respondents answering either “Yes, for a fee” or “Yes, both for a fee and without charging a fee” continue to question 5.

☐

5. Is arts education part of your organization’s mission?

☐ Yes

☐ No

6. In the work you do for schools, which of the following is your **main consumer** (please check only one):

☐ Students

☐ Teacher(s)

☐ Curriculum specialist

☐ School administrator

☐ Parents

☐ Other

7. How frequently does your organization take part in the following activities with schools? For each, please choose a number from 1 to 4, with 1 being most frequent and 4 being least frequent. Please use each number only once. If your organization does not take part in the activity, please leave it blank.

☐ Performances for school audiences

☐ In-school residencies

☐ Professional training for teachers

☐ Other

8. Listed below are several reasons why your organization might partner with schools. Using the scale provided, please indicate the degree of importance or lack of importance of each reason that your organization currently places on each reason when it considers partnering with a school.

	Not at all important	Somewhat unimportant	Neither important nor unimportant	Somewhat important	Very important
Develop current audiences for the arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Develop future audiences for the arts	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Generate income for our organization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Personal satisfaction/rewards	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enhance our organization’s					

	Not at all important	Somewhat unimportant	Neither important nor unimportant	Somewhat important	Very important
artistic quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enhance our organization's reputation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please describe below):	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

9. Listed below are some statements about the results of partnering with schools. For each of the following statements, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree, using the scale provided. Please base your responses on the type of school activity your organization takes part in most frequently: performances, residencies, or teacher training, for example.

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
Partnering with schools has helped our organization grow artistically.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our organization has changed its artistic direction due to partnerships with schools.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our organization offers much different programs than in the past due to our work with schools.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Our organization has had more costs due to our work with schools.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Partnering with schools has meant we have to comply with more rules and regulations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please use this space to provide comments on any of the statements above or to describe other ways your organization may have been affected by partnering with schools:

---



---



---

10. To what extent do each of the following take place in your activities with schools?

	Not at all	To a small extent	To some extent	To a great extent	To a very great extent
A single performance or activity not tailored to the school	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Joint design of enrichment programs	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You use the arts to teach non-arts skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
You teach arts skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Preparing teachers to use the arts in their own teaching	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Joint teaching of arts skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Integrating concepts from arts and non-arts areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please describe below):	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

---



---

11. How long, in days, does your typical school program last? Please type a single, whole number in the box below. If your typical program is less than one full day in length, please type 0.

\_\_\_\_\_

12. How much income did your organization get last year from services provided to schools?

- ☐ \$0- \$49,999
- ☐ \$50,000-\$99,999
- ☐ \$100,000 – \$149,999
- ☐ \$150,000 – \$199,999
- ☐ \$200,000 – \$249,999
- ☐ \$250,000 or higher
- ☐ Don't know

13. Please use the space below to add your own comments on how your organization has been affected by working with schools:

Thank you for taking part in this survey! Please click the FINISH button below to submit your responses. When you do, the automated response system will send you to the VCU website. Thank you again for your participation!

## **APPENDIX B**

### Text of Email Invitation to Take Part in Survey

From: Susan FitzPatrick, graduate student

Reply to: .

Subject: Survey, arts organizations and partnerships with schools

[SALUTATION]

I am surveying leaders of arts organizations about the effects of working with schools, and I would like to include your views in my research. Your responses will form the basis for my dissertation toward a Ph.D. in Public Policy & Administration at Virginia Commonwealth University. This survey is important because of the lack of research on how arts organizations are affected by working with schools.

Even if your organization does not work with schools, your participation is needed. Completing this survey should take no more than 5 minutes of your time, and your responses will be kept confidential.

If you complete the survey, I will send you a summary of the final results. If you have questions about this survey, please feel free to contact me at email [\[redacted\]](#) or [\[redacted\]](#). If you still have questions, please contact the principal investigator of this project, William C. Bosher, Ed.D., [\[redacted\]](#).

We truly appreciate your time and thoughts.

**[Click here to begin...](#)**

Thank you

Susan FitzPatrick



## **APPENDIX C**

### Text of First Reminder Email

From: Susan FitzPatrick, graduate student

Reply to:

Subject: Survey, arts organizations and partnerships with schools

Hello [FIRST NAME],

Please don't forget to complete the following survey:

**Click here to begin...**

If another person is to complete the survey, please forward this link to him or her. The survey should take no more than about 5 minutes.

Maybe you were drawn to work in the arts because you understood the power of telling a story through music, dance, theatre, or opera. This survey is intended to tell the story of how arts organizations are changed, if at all, by working with schools. It will also tell about differences between arts organizations that work with schools and those that do not. Please consider adding your organization to this story by completing the survey.

Thank you.

Note - If the above link does not work, copy and paste the following URL into your web browser:

[SURVEY URL]

This email was sent to: [EMAIL ADDRESS]

If you would like to be removed from this email list, click [here](#).

## **APPENDIX D**

### Text of Second Reminder Email

From: Susan FitzPatrick, graduate student

Reply to:

Subject: Arts organizations and partnerships with schools

Hello [FIRST NAME],

Please don't forget to complete the following survey:

**[Click here to begin...](#)**

The survey is important and should take no more than about 5 minutes.

If another person is to complete the survey, please forward this link to him or her. If you get an error message when you follow the survey link, your survey responses have already been recorded, and thank you for your participation.

Thank you,

Susan FitzPatrick

Note - If the above link does not work, copy and paste the following URL into your web browser:

[SURVEY URL]

This email was sent to: [EMAIL ADDRESS]

If you would like to be removed from this email list, click [here](#).

## **APPENDIX E**

### Frequency Data for Survey Responses

1. To what extent do rules and regulations of outside organizations such as funding agencies affect your organization?

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid percent</u>	
17	6.1	Not at all
61	21.9	To a small extent
124	44.6	To some extent
58	28.9	To a great extent
18	6.5	To a very great extent

N = 278      Missing = 2      Mean = 3.0

2. How would you rate the financial stability of your organization?

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid percent</u>	
20	7.2	Weak - not at all stable, we are concerned with survival
69	24.8	Somewhat weak - cash flow is sometimes a concern
111	39.9	Fairly stable, though our finances react to outside conditions such as the economy
77	27.7	Strong - very stable, we have developed cash reserves
1	.4	Don't know

N = 278      Missing = 2      Mean = 2.89

3. To bring about change in local or statewide arts education in schools, some organizations take part in advocacy efforts such as developing and delivering a message to policymakers and to the public. Does your organization take part in such arts education advocacy efforts?

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid percent</u>	
172	62.1	No
105	37.9	Yes

N = 277      Missing = 3      Mean = .38

4. In the past year, has your organization provided artistic programs or services to a public school or school system

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid percent</u>	
36	12.9	Yes, for a fee
81	28.9	Yes, without charging a fee
131	46.8	Yes, both for a fee and without charging a fee
32	11.4	No, not at all

N = 280      Missing = 0      Mean = 2.57

{If respondent answers either “Yes, without charging a fee” or “No, not at all,” they skip to the end of the survey. Respondents answering either “Yes, for a fee” or “Yes, both for a fee and without charging a fee” continue to question 5.

5. Is arts education part of your organization’s mission?

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid percent</u>	
150	90.9	Yes
15	9.1	No

N = 165      Missing = 2      Mean = .91

6. In the work you do for schools, which of the following is your **main consumer** (please check only one):

<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Valid percent</u>	
138	84.1	Students
18	11.0	Teacher(s)
1	.6	Curriculum specialist
3	1.8	School administrator
3	1.8	Parents
1	.6	Other

N = 164      Missing = 3

7. How frequently does your organization take part in the following activities with schools? For each, please choose a number from 1 to 4, with 1 being most frequent and 4 being least frequent. Please use each number only once. If your organization does not take part in the activity, please leave it blank.

<u>Mean</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Missing</u>	
1.49	1.0	142	25	Performances for school audiences
2.01	2.0	114	53	In-school residencies
2.71	3.0	107	60	Professional training for teachers

2.49      3.0      86      81      Other

8. Listed below are several reasons why your organization might partner with schools. Using the scale provided, please indicate the degree of importance or lack of importance of each reason that your organization currently places on each reason when it considers partnering with a school.

	Not at all important N %	Somewhat unimportant N %	Neither important nor unimportant N %	Somewhat important N %	Very important N %	Mean S.D.
Develop current audiences for the arts	3 1.8	2 1.2	5 3.0	70 42.2	86 51.8	4.41 .771
Develop future audiences for the arts	1 .6	1 .6	4 2.4	40 24.1	120 72.3	4.67 .617
Generate income for our Organization	14 8.5	11 6.7	33 20.0	58 35.2	49 29.7	3.71 1.205
Personal satisfaction/ rewards	12 7.4	1 .6	45 27.6	61 37.4	44 27.0	3.76 1.088
Enhance our organization's artistic quality	14 8.5	12 7.3	47 28.5	47 28.5	45 27.3	3.59 1.205
Enhance our organization's reputation	3 1.8	1 .6	14 8.5	65 39.4	82 49.7	4.35 .809

9. Listed below are some statements about the results of partnering with schools. For each of the following statements, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree, using the scale provided. Please base your responses on the type of school activity your organization takes part in most frequently: performances, residencies, or teacher training, for example.

	Strongly disagree N %	Somewhat disagree N %	Neither agree nor disagree N %	Somewhat agree N %	Strongly agree N %	Mean S.D.
Partnering with schools has helped our organization grow artistically.	11 6.6	4 2.4	58 34.9	58 34.9	35 21.1	3.61 1.054
Our organization has changed its artistic direction due to partnerships with schools.	26 15.7	32 19.3	55 33.1	42 25.3	11 6.6	2.88 1.154
Our organization offers much different programs than in the past due to our work with schools.	28 16.9	26 15.7	42 25.3	53 31.9	17 10.2	3.03 1.253
Our organization has had more costs due to our work with schools.	13 7.9	19 11.6	28 17.1	69 42.1	35 21.3	3.57 1.178

Partnering with schools has meant we have to comply with more rules and regulations.

21	17	53	51	23	3.23
12.7	10.3	32.1	30.9	13.9	1.198

10. To what extent do each of the following take place in your activities with schools?

	Not at all N %	To a small extent N %	To some extent N %	To a great extent N %	To a very great extent N %	Mean S.D.
A single performance or activity not tailored to the school	24 14.7	14 8.6	31 19.0	45 27.6	49 30.1	3.5 1.385
Joint design of enrichment programs	23 14.0	25 15.2	55 33.5	41 25.0	20 12.2	3.06 1.207
You use the arts to teach non-arts skills	27 16.4	15 9.1	52 31.5	41 24.8	30 18.2	3.19 1.301
You teach arts skills	5 3.0	9 5.5	47 28.5	43 26.1	61 37.0	3.88 1.067
Preparing teachers to use the arts in their own teaching	18 11.0	16 9.8	56 34.4	42 25.8	31 19.0	3.32 1.211
Joint teaching of arts skills	27 16.7	40 24.7	49 30.2	28 17.3	18 11.1	2.81 1.227
Integrating concepts from arts and non-arts areas	20 12.1	16 9.7	36 21.8	50 30.3	43 26.1	3.48 1.305

11. How long, in days, does your typical school program last? Please type a single, whole number in the box below. If your typical program is less than one full day in length, please type 0.

Mean: 14.33 S.D.: 37.863 Minimum: 0 Maximum: 200 N = 159 Missing = 8

12. How much income did your organization get last year from services provided to schools?

Frequency	Valid percent	
95	57.9	\$0- \$49,999
22	13.4	\$50,000-\$99,999
16	9.8	\$100,000 – \$149,999
8	4.9	\$150,000 – \$199,999
2	1.2	\$200,000 – \$249,999
8	4.9	\$250,000 or higher
13	7.9	Don't know

N = 164 Missing = 3

## VITA

Susan FitzPatrick was born July 7, 1963, in Fairfax County, Virginia. She is an American citizen. She earned a B.A. in English and Modern Studies from the University of Virginia and a Master's in Public Administration from Virginia Commonwealth University. She has also completed coursework at the College of William & Mary toward an M.A. in American Studies.

She is a member of Phi Kappa Phi and Pi Alpha Alpha national honor society and is the recipient of a VCU Graduate Student Research Scholarship (2005), a Phi Kappa Phi scholarship (2004), the Leigh E. Grosenick Essay Award (2003), an NPELRA scholarship (2003), and the ICMA-T.E. Temple Scholarship (2001-2).

Ms. FitzPatrick's article, "Open-Ended Tangled Hierarchies: Zen Koans and Paradox in Public Administration" was published in the *International Journal of Public Administration*, Vol. 28 (11-12), 2005 and was presented at the Southeastern Conference for Public Administration, October, 2003. Her article, "The Imaginary and Improvisation in Public Administration" was published in *Journal of Administrative Theory & Praxis*, Vol. 24 No. 4, December, 2002 and was presented at the Public Administration Theory Network conference, June, 2002.

Ms. FitzPatrick has been employed as assistant director of the Lawton (OK) Arts & Humanities Council, executive director of the Del Rio (TX) Council for the Arts, and has been employed by the Oklahoma Arts Council and the Virginia Commission for the Arts. She is currently grants coordinator for Chesterfield County, Virginia, government.