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ABSTRACT

AN ASSESSMENT OF BEHAVIOR CHANGE
IN RESPONSE TO MEDIATED INSTRUCTION IN MORALS
USING THE INTERVENTION INSIDE/OUT

by
Sharon Carney
Master of Arts in Mass Communications

This study investigated the effect on children of televised instruction in moral development. The change in children's valuing of honesty after viewing the program was measured.

Research hypotheses are based on Piaget's and Kohlberg's theories of moral development, and on Bronfenbrenner's research in the development effects of children's integrating their environment to their belief systems.

Participants were 124 fifth grade students from two Los Angeles City schools who viewed a 15-minute episode title "I Dare You" from the series Inside/Out. Attitude change was measured using three alternate
versions of Bronfenbrenner's Moral Dilemma Questionnaire as pre-tests, post-tests, and delayed retention tests.

Two of four treatment groups received the educational intervention alone, whereas two received the intervention in conjunction with a discussion involving the development of honesty.

The outcomes were evaluated for significance using analyses of variance. No statistically significant changes over time emerged; however, the factor of teacher influence, although not originally designated as a variable, appeared to affect the outcomes. Differences in performance were also noted on the basis of ethnicity and IQ, with greater score stability for Whites and Asians, as well as for those of higher IQ.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Since the report of the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior was published, psychologists, educators, and parents have become seriously concerned over the impact of television on children. Although this research addressed the question of television viewing in the home, attention has been drawn to the need for research in the areas of instructional programming for television. It is being ever more clearly demonstrated that television functions not only as an entertainment entity but also provides role models that are being followed and gives the viewers substantial information about the physical and social world.

Research is now being done in which television, other than programming for a specific educational curriculum, is being manipulated toward explicitly educational ends. Such research evaluates the intended influence of television on social development, as well as the effects of television viewing on the deliberate formation, development, and change of values in the direction of prosocial behavior. Thus, children are being offered television programs which deal intentionally with the subjects of loyalty, open-mindedness,
honesty, and fairness in the hope of building prosocial attitudes. With the development of programs which are expressly produced for particular goals, comes the necessity to evaluate their effectiveness and instrumentality as agents of change.

The individual programs in the series Inside/Out are such examples. These films were developed for television with the express purpose of developing positive attitudes toward values. The films were produced under the aegis of thirty-three educational and broadcasting agencies in the United States and Canada, and were organized and managed by the National Instructional Television Center, later reorganized as the Agency of Instructional Television.

The series consists of thirty programs lasting fifteen minutes each. In Los Angeles, the programs are shown twice a week during the school year on Public Television Channels 28 and 58. The series is now in its eighth year of viewing.

The emphasis of the series is on helping the child develop a personally effective life style. The programs deal with day-to-day problems and emotions of children presented from the child's point of view. In each of the programs the child is presented with an experience which involves the solution of a problem or dilemma.

The program that was selected to be used in this study deals with the value of "honesty," and is entitled
"I Dare You." Criteria for choosing this program will be discussed in the chapter dealing with method.

Statement of the Problem

Since the programs are viewed by a large number of children throughout the United States, the question arises as to the effectiveness of these films in dealing with the educational task of instruction in values. Modern society is confronted with the enormous responsibility of educating its children despite such cultural and social stresses as divorce, transciency, and the breakdown of the family unit with its resulting negative impact upon both social standards and patterns. Bronfenbrenner (1975) maintains that although the school until recently emphasized subject matter to the exclusion of the child's development in "character education," that is, his or her values, motives, and patterns of social response, there is a responsibility for the school to provide instruction in these areas. In a curriculum guide for teachers in the Los Angeles City School System, the district affirms that students need to develop the ability to identify, evaluate, and choose their personal values and to have opportunities under supportive circumstances to clarify the values necessary for achievement and participation as a member of society. In order to meet these goals, television is one of the vehicles that has been chosen. Research is needed then to evaluate the success of this instruction. Although both the producers and
the educators strive to provide acceptable socialization-oriented instruction, the actual effectiveness of their efforts can only be established by evaluating the results of the students viewing these programs so as to determine whether subsequent change, either desirable or perhaps undesirable, develops in the attitudes of the viewers.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study will be to measure changes in children's attitudes toward values after viewing a selected episode of the television series *Inside/Out*. Attitude change in the value of "honesty" is to be studied.

The producers of the series state as their objectives that the emphasis of the series is to promote a personally effective life style by presenting situations that often cause the underlying elements of self-defeating behavior. The programs rely on exploring dilemmas to arrive at decisions, and on helping children deal with feelings aroused by prejudice, cruelty, dishonesty, and unfairness. The purpose of the producers is to help children become aware that appropriate decisions result from positive action based on knowledge and understanding.

These films are currently being shown extensively in the United States to teach values. Although effort has been devoted to establishing the educational goals of these films and to producing a meaningful tool, no study has been done specifically in the area of attitude change in moral
development to determine the effectiveness of this series as an instrument in the instruction of change in values.

Recent communication with AIT elicited the information that as of the 1980-81 school year two hundred and sixty stations were showing the series Inside/Out after seven years of availability. During the last eight years over 10,000 film prints and over 1,000 video cassettes have been sold to individual schools. Inside/Out is currently being used via television in forty-seven states and in four provinces in Canada.

Sources at Los Angeles instructional television station KCLS-TV stated that although no actual figures concerning the numbers of viewers of Inside/Out were available, the series had been continued because of enthusiastic feedback from the Los Angeles City School District, the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, and the Los Angeles County Schools. These conclusions were reached by periodically sampling the opinions of teachers representing 500 schools, by reviewing disbursement records of the teacher's guides sold to schools, from letters and phone calls, and from direct contact with the teachers by the Program Director.

**Definition of Terms**

The term "value" has been defined as the individual's system of general goals in life. Adler (1956) outlines values as absolutes or eternal ideas; as the potential of those ideals to satisfy needs or desires; as preferences
held by people whether innate, learned, or both; and as that structure which equates values with behavior. Rokeach (1968) defines values as a centralized belief structure of the individual which deals with the ultimate goals within his life. Scott (1965) further refines the meaning of values in that he considers the individual as having a particular value when the individual conceives a particular state of affairs as an ultimate end, an absolute good under all circumstances, and a universal "ought" toward which all people should strive.

Values have been separated into categories involving moral values concerning a personal sense of right and wrong, and that of social values containing a sense of right or wrong regarding maintenance of the collective welfare. Values consist of an enduring and central cluster of beliefs, thoughts, and feelings which influence or determine important evaluations or choices regarding persons, situations, and ideas. Values influence judgements and actions beyond an immediate or specific situation or goal by providing an abstract frame of reference for perceiving and organizing experience and choosing among courses of action (Robinson, 1973).

Moral standards in general tend to change and to become rather firmly established during the adolescent years, but they first appear much earlier. Even very young children make judgements of what is right and wrong and develop moral and ethical principles by which they guide
their conduct (Kohlberg, 1963). The moral judgements of young children are based on the anticipation of punishment, not on abstract principles. These judgements become abstract and logically coherent as children begin to grow toward adulthood. Children's reasons for being good progress from sheer self-interest to a concern for the approval of their consciences (Kohlberg, 1967).

Early theories, such as those of Allport (1935), proposed that "attitude" was a state of readiness organized through experience, causing a direct or dynamic influence upon the individual's responses to all objects and situations with which it was related. Attitude involves a fairly definite reference to things or ideas and usually is a disposition to react favorably toward or unfavorably against the object of reference. Attitude is further defined as the planned, organized response to a formal situation, and is central to an individual's cognitive belief system and has emotional content (Goldberg, 1974). Asch (1952) suggests that attitude is actually an inferred tendency to behave in a relatively stable and consistent way. Katz (1960) defines attitude as a predisposition of the individual to evaluate some symbol or object or aspect of his world in a favorable or unfavorable manner. In this definition Katz implies that if we know a person's attitude toward an object, we can predict his response to that object. If attitudes do predispose a person to
respond in particular ways to particular stimuli, then it is also important to study attitude change.

Examining a more specific type of attitude such as "honesty," we hold that it refers to uprightness of disposition and conduct, that is, straightforwardness. Gorsuch (1971) in developing a value socialization scale finds that children themselves define honesty as never cheating; always telling the truth; and informing authorities of all wrong doings. Shotland (1970) has found overt honesty to be related to how one rates the value of honesty relative to other values. The values of honesty in this study will be especially dealt with in the context of honesty within peer relationships as perceived in the elementary school experience.

Summary

This study is prompted by the need to evaluate the effectiveness of values training programs such as those shown in the television program Inside/Out. This study tries to ascertain if attitude change occurs in values and in particular in the value of honesty when children view programs from the series Inside/Out. Such research is significant in that television is considered to have a substantial influence on the social and moral development of children. Television programs developed for use in the schools are frequently used to instruct students in the values of society. An evaluation of the effects of viewing
patterns then is both necessary and meaningful to understand if this goal is being achieved.

In this paper the term "attitude" is referred to as the disposition to react favorably toward or unfavorably against the object of reference while the term "values" refers to an individual's system of general goals in life. The term "honesty" refers to uprightness of disposition and conduct. The value discussed will be dealt with in the context of peer relationships with the elementary school experience.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In addition to the concentrated research that has been done in mass communications in the areas of films and attitudes, disciplines such as sociology and psychology have added immeasurably to the understanding of the mass media and its effect on attitude change. Recently research has been conducted in the area of moral development through the pioneer efforts of psychologists such as Piaget, Kohlberg, Selman and Lickona. Studies, which will be specifically discussed in the following pages, have been conducted which assess the impact of the mass communication process on the components of morality. In this chapter research is reviewed which is directly relevant to the formation of moral development. The variables to be discussed in this chapter are values and attitude change.

Theories of Value Acquisition

Piaget (1970) in his studies of child development considers the moral development of the child not merely complementary to, but integrally part of cognition, based on the theory that the child receives impressions from without and that he reacts to impressions from within. Piaget speaks of children as moral philosophers in the
context that children ponder questions of the meaning of rightness and wrongness, and that they are involved in the process of social justice, that is, the conditions under which one will help another being. Kohlberg (1972) conceptualized how moral thinking occurs throughout the process of growth and development. Based on a long series of field interviews which were designed to find out how humans actually think about problems of social justice, Kohlberg discovered that the process of making judgments actually formed a developmental sequence of six stages. After investigating the judgments of people of different ages, social classes, economic classes and cultures, Kohlberg found a sequence of stage growth parallel to that which Piaget had found. Kohlberg's view is that all humans are concerned about such questions as social justice; that is, that humans do think about questions such as the meaning of human existence, the meaning of rightness and wrongness, and the conditions under which one will help another human being. The form of one's thinking about such questions, as well as the judgments one reaches as a result of that thinking, is distinctly different in the several stages of development.

The stage of development in moral judgment which concerns the research in this study is termed the Conventional Level. At this level maintaining the expectations of the individual's family, groups, or nation is perceived as valuable in its own right. Moral value
resides in performing good or right roles, in maintaining the conventional order, and in meeting the expectancies of others.

Three major ideas are prevalent in both Piaget's and Kohlberg's theories of moral development; first, all children go through the processes and stages of moral development in a step-by-step fashion; second, development is not merely learning expressions of meanings; and third, regardless of race, sex, religion, and culture, moral development is universal across all children and societies.

As a child is still developing his or her values, maturation, the impact of socializing agents attempting to shape his or her values, and the effects of the attitudes of the child's peers are all important and could contribute to change. The research on moral development as reported by Guilford (1971) theorizes that changes across time do occur.

The media provide a number of models for behavior by which children are strongly influenced. Due to the breakdown of the family as the prime social unit in today's society, parents are less influential as role models and as sources for mores and values (Bandura, 1969; Bronfenbrenner, 1975). Studies of learning have indicated that children will learn behaviors from a film as a function of characteristics of a model, as a degree of involvement with the model or the action, and as a perceived utility of the behavior observed (Flanders, 1968,
Bandura, 1969, and Schramm, 1969). Bronfenbrenner (1975) contends that in a society which is experiencing technological and social change as rapidly as ours, mass communications, either at the entertainment or instructional level, may provide children with more functional information than can parents.

Few experimental studies simultaneously examine the interaction of television and growth in moral development, or assess the impact of an educational intervention on the components of morality. Kohlberg and Selman (1971) collaborated on an educational intervention which was designed to stimulate moral development in the elementary school age child through the twin processes of cognitive conflict and exposure to peer reasoning at higher levels of morality. In a study in which Selman (1975) used this same intervention, he reports an increase in the development of prosocial behavior.

In a study designed to facilitate moral development and based on the theories of Piaget, Kohlberg and Selman, Sicoli (1978) further developed the theory that the use of film as an educational intervention enhanced or consolidated the levels of prosocial behavior.

Collins (1976) conducted a study in which films designed to foster emotional growth of children were rated on the behavior generated from the themes of the program. The conclusion of this study was that children can learn highly generalized prosocial behavior from television and
that there is evidence that television can serve as a source of modeling so that children can generalize from these models. Poulous, Rubenstein, and Leibert (1975), in a study which explored whether a specific act of helping would induce similar behavior in young viewers, states that observations of another's positive social behavior can facilitate imitation of such action by the observer and that television has potential to influence children's prosocial as well as their antisocial behavior.

In further studies in which experimental videotapes dealing with prosocial modeling were shown to elementary school children, Reich (1977) reported that, consistent with prior research and with Piaget's theory of development, there was evidence that children could develop the ability to delay gratification for future gain in accordance with societal values due to the influence of such an intervention. Corder-Bolz and O'Bryant (1978), in a study in which elementary school children viewed television programs, found that children viewing an intervention with an adult supplying interpretive comments retained more information than children who did not receive such guidance. The results showed that intervention by a significant person in addition to the mediated intervention alone could cause measurable increases in the amount of information learned and in the number of positive attitudes formed.
Theories of Attitude Change

In studying the influence of an intervention upon children's values or their social cognitive development, theories of attitude change must be considered. One of the general theories concerning attitude change involves the structural or, as referred to by Maccoby and Maccoby (1961), the homeostatic theories of behavior. These theories include Festinger's "cognitive dissonance" theory (1957), Heider's "balance theory" (1958), Osgood's "congruity theory" (1957), and Rosenberg's "affective-cognitive consistency theory" (1956). The premises which underly these theories are that when an individual is confronted with information in conflict with a belief he or she already possesses, a process is then entered upon in which a drive is initiated within the person so that he or she will be able to return to a "homeostatic" position, that is, a position of comfort. This may involve altering some belief, accepting the new belief outright, or finding some alternative means of avoiding acceptance of the new information.

Some writers use the terms "attitude" and "opinion" interchangeably. However, the concept of attitude often includes the tendency to feel or to act in a positive or negative way, while the term opinion is often used in the sense of specific beliefs or notions about which the subject is none too confident (McNeer, 1946).
Opinions and attitudes differ according to the extent to which they can be verbalized. Attitudes are often unconscious though there will be a high degree of mutual interaction between attitudes and opinions. Changes in the general approach and avoidance of orientation toward new attitudes may affect one's expectations, that is, opinions, toward forming new attitudes (Hovland, 1953).

**Classroom Impact on Attitudes**

Early studies in attitude change by McConnell (1936), Bateman (1936), Zapf (1938), and Peterson (1933) all indicate that attitudes are indeed changed by classroom instruction.

Peterson and Thurstone (1933) studied the effect of film on attitude change as regards social issues, while Blumer (1933) reported that films were more effective in stimulating or reinforcing existing motives. Jones (1936), in a study on the influence of movies on moral values, found that the influence of films on values is in the direction approved by the social group. In a study of opinion stereotypes as presented in movies it was found that there were no apparent differences in the opinions of movie-going and non-movie-going children (Shuttleworth and May, 1933). Since in those years there were no educational films developed especially for use in the classroom, the research on "movie-going" would have a
different value judgement associated with the term than would be thought of now.

Although the conclusions of these studies have a limited application in modern research due to the societal bias of that period, in which the vast changes in technology had not affected society in terms of its mores and values to the extent that these changes occur today, these studies are still important in understanding the development of attitude and opinion-change research. Interest, attitudes and behaviors that were developed before today's modern technology may lack validity for today's children. The children may turn then to society's institutions, to the schools and the mass media, for much of the information on belief systems they need. We need to know then the changes in attitude and how they are developed. Research and study into the elements which can most effectively facilitate these changes is vital to an understanding of and to the development of a viable instructional program in moral guidance and value systems.

Research Literature

Central to the study of attitudes is the problem of what constitute effective methods for changing attitudes. Several theories have been developed regarding experiences designed to change attitudes. Rosenberg (1960) proposes that although there are various theoretical constructs in the field of attitude change there is no one general theory.
Balance theory suggests that an experience which is disruptive to the individual's attitude balance will result in an effort to regain a form of balance. The removal of the introduced stress will sometimes cause a shift from the original position that was held in order to regain balance, since there is a strong tendency for a person to maintain internally consistent attitude structures. This group of theories applies to experiences that are both informational and personal.

Rosenberg (1960) has proposed a theory of attitude change which assumes that consistency between the affective and cognitive components of learning represents a stable psychological state in the individual. If either component shifts, the resulting inconsistency produces a drive or force toward changing the other until consistency is restored.

Festinger (1957) has developed another statement of the consistency point of view. According to Festinger's theory, the basic units involved are cognitive elements. He refers to these as knowledge about objects, beliefs, opinions and attitudes. Festinger suggests that when an imbalance occurs between the cognitive elements there is a pressure to restore balance usually by moving in the direction of the element that is psychologically the more dominant.

Heider (1958) has formulated a theory that attitudinal change is produced by the occurrence of a perceived
unity of persons or events which is opposite in direction to the existing attitude. Imbalance results in tension which forces change toward balance.

The theory of the principle of congruity developed by Osgood and Tannenbaum (1958) asserts that when two attitude objects of differing evaluations of the perceived good or right are linked with what is called an assertion, there is a tendency for the evaluations of each object to shift toward a point of equilibrium or congruity. Incompatible attitude objects may exist in the same cognitive structure without stress because they are never associated.

These theories of attitude change have relevance to the problem under consideration insofar as the introduction of new information can either be assimilated and not cause an imbalance, if perceived as similar, or can cause the individual to undergo stress that will force an attitudinal change if the new perceived information is inconsistent with the current affective orientations.

In summary, the balance theorists suggest that the introduction of a new element into the cognitive-affective structure of the individual will either be assimilated or will cause stress that will force the individual to find a point of balance. There does not appear to be agreement among the theorists regarding what condition will occur as a result of the imbalance; whether the end result will be a more positive orientation or a move in a more negative direction when balance is restored.
In summarizing the nature of attitude change in children, Bronfenbrenner (1975) emphasizes the evolving nature and scope of perceived reality as it emerges and expands in the child's awareness and the realization of the relations between two separate events. He asserts that the child becomes capable of adapting his perceptions to the constraints of objective reality and of integrating his environment so that it is more compatible with his abilities and his belief systems. He maintains that the developmental effects of a transition from one attitude to another are a function of the relationship of the balance between challenge and support presented by the introduction of new information in the social order.

Problems for Investigation

Using the balance theory as a basis for study, the problem to be investigated is the attitude change in the values of children brought about by exposure to an instructional film specifically developed to change attitudes. Hypotheses which evolve from this problem follow.

Theoretical Hypothesis I

The treatment can induce a positive change in attitude such as honesty.

Research Hypothesis I

After viewing the videotaped film from the television program Inside/Out, namely "I Dare You," the mean score
of a post-test scale, assessing the meaning of honesty in peer relations, namely, Bronfenbrenner's Moral Dilemma Questionnaire, will show a statistically significant positive shift from the mean score attained on a parallel pre-test.

**Theoretical Hypothesis II**

Use of a film as a treatment can induce a change in the attitude of honesty in peer relationships when such a film is followed by a discussion relevant to the film.

**Research Hypothesis II**

When a film is viewed from the television program Inside/Out, namely "I Dare You," and when a discussion follows the film, the mean score on Bronfenbrenner's Moral Dilemma Questionnaire assessing the perceived meaning of honesty will show a positive shift from the mean score of a parallel pre-test.

**Summary**

Extensive research in attitude change theory has been conducted by researchers in the social sciences. Studies based on research in the affective domain have led to diverse theories of attitude change such as cognitive-dissonance theory and the theory of affective-cognitive consistency.

Balance theory suggests that an experience which is disruptive to the individual's attitude balance will result
in an effort to regain a form of balance, or equilibrium. Bronfenbrenner asserts that the developmental effects of a transition from one attitude to another is a function of the relationship between challenge and support in the system. This study will evaluate the change in the value of honesty in the medium of film, namely a videotaped episode from the series Inside/Out titled "I Dare You." Attitude change will be measured with Bronfenbrenner's Moral Dilemma Questionnaire in three parallel versions used as a pre-test, post-test, and retention test.
CHAPTER III
DESIGN

Introduction

There are several approaches that could be taken in investigating the effect of attitude change in the classroom. These procedures, such as experiments, surveys and field studies, vary on several dimensions including the extent of manipulation by the investigator, the naturalness of the setting, the time element involved, and the intrusiveness of the measurement. In this study it was deemed more appropriate to conduct an experiment which would be as similar as possible to the normal classroom environment. This chapter includes information concerning the strategy of the testing procedure, the method of selecting the program from the series Inside/Out, and the details of the pilot study which was conducted to determine which scale was most effective in the measurement of attitude change in the value of honesty.

Research Hypotheses

The research hypotheses in this study are:

1. That a videotaped program from the series Inside/Out will cause at least a temporary positive change in the direction of values
when viewed by elementary school age
children and possibly may show a long-
term positive change; and

2. That an additional attitude change in
values will occur when children who view
a video-taped program from the series
Inside/Out will have that intervention
followed by a reinforcing discussion.

**General Objectives**

The research hypotheses led to the formulation of
the following design objectives:

1. To select that film which most effectively
   provides development and attitude change
   in the value of honesty;

2. To select a measurement instrument
   which effectively measures change in
   children's attitude toward the value
   of honesty;

3. To determine a design strategy which
   would most effectively assess the
   attitude of children toward the value
   of honesty.
Design Consideration for Materials

The materials which were needed to effectively measure attitude change in values were the selection of a treatment which instructed in the value of honesty, and a scale which could be used with fifth grade children in a pre-test, post-test, retention-test design paradigm.

Treatment Selection

It was felt that criteria should be established to determine which of the programs were most effective in instructing in values. A content analysis rating form was constructed by the researcher in a graduate class in Content Analysis. The content analysis rating form was used by a panel of fourth and fifth grade teachers who viewed the films and rated the films as to their effectiveness in instructing in the value of honesty. These films were viewed over a period of one semester from programs aired on KLCS, Channel 58. A sample of this rating sheet is included in Appendix A. On the basis of this selection process, the episode, "I Dare You," was selected.

Measurement Instrument

Several instruments for the measurement of attitude change were reviewed, among them Dyer's Rubric for Expressed Values (1970), Solomon's Value Socialization Scale (1976) and Rokeach's Value Survey (1973). All of these instruments were found to be either extremely complex in reading level
or dependent on individual interview procedures by the investigator.

The measurement instrument for attitude change that was selected was Bronfenbrenner's Moral Dilemma Questionnaire (1971). In this measurement instrument children are asked to respond to a series of conflict situations under the condition that no one will see their responses except the investigator conducting the research. Each response is scored on a scale from one to six with a total possible score of forty-two. To control for a positional response set, scale direction is reversed in half the items. Bronfenbrenner has devised three alternate forms with a different form to be used for each experimental condition, that is, for the pre-test, the post-test and the retention-test. Each test version contains a reliability check test, referred to in this study as YPRE, YPOST and YRET. This test is one page in length and contains six items with a total possible score of twenty-nine. Scale direction is reversed in half the items to control for a positional response set.

The items were evaluated during the pilot study and it was found that the instrument's considered reading level would be easier than the reading level expected in fourth grade. Therefore, the scales could be used at the fourth grade and at higher levels.
**Pilot Test**

In September, 1980, a pilot test was conducted in which 38 fourth grade students from a school in the San Fernando Valley area were tested. Two tests were administered. One test was Bronfenbrenner's Moral Dilemma Questionnaire (1970) and the other scale administered was Gorsuch's Semantic Differential Value Scale (1971).

The children were tested in a situation which could then be duplicated for the actual study. The age span of the children tested was between nine and ten, with an intelligence distribution which ranged from low to gifted. The classroom teacher indicated the intelligence level of those tested as gifted, high, middle, or low depending on her observations, on test scores on district tests and on scores on achievement and diagnostic tests.

**Gorsuch's Semantic Differential Value Scale**

Thirteen of the children, or one-third of the class, were tested with this scale. Those children identified as highly intelligent who took Gorsuch's Value Scale were able to answer all questions in the same direction. Those children of lower to normal intelligence had difficulty in understanding the directions to the test itself and also had difficulty in making decisions as to the meaning of the questions. The test results therefore appeared to be answers that the participants thought appropriate and that would please the investigator. It was felt that the test
could not be administered without test bias. The test also revealed that the children's answers were highly influenced according to the personalities of the children individually. Highly motivated children answered in terms of high moral and ethical values while children who were inner-directed responded with a slant toward their own particular set of values.

**Bronfenbrenner's Moral Dilemma Questionnaire**

Two-thirds of the class were tested with two versions of the test. One test was nine pages in length and one test was six pages in length. Although the original version was nine pages it was felt that a shorter version might be more appropriate in the test situation. In the shorter version three items which had content less appropriate for this age child were omitted from each version of the test. It was found that the longer test took too much time and that the children became frustrated in their attempts to complete the test whether they were of high or of low intellectual ability. In the shorter version the children seemed to be less anxious and apprehensive about the test itself and took more time over their answers. It was felt that an older age child could answer the tests more reliably due to the complexity of the reading level of the tests and the abstractions of the values with which the tests were dealing. The situations which were presented to the children were more likely to occur with older children.
so it was decided to test the next grade level of children for greater validity, namely the fifth grade.

The result of the pilot study then was that the shorter form of Bronfenbrenner's Moral Dilemma Questionnaire was selected to be used with fifth graders.

**Experimental Design**

In this study the effects of an intervention and a discussion on the attitudes of elementary school children are investigated. Four classes from two schools were tested in a pre-test, treatment, post-test, retention test experiment. Each class was given an alternate form of the abbreviated version of Bronfenbrenner's Moral Dilemma Questionnaire. The classes were presented with an educational intervention, namely the videotaped episode titled "I Dare You" from the *Inside/Out* instructional television series, and then given a second version of the test as a post-test. Two of the classes received a discussion to test the effectiveness of a treatment and a discussion on moral development. One week later a retention test was administered in which the classes were retested, without treatment or discussion, with a third alternate version of Bronfenbrenner's Moral Dilemma Questionnaire. The scores of the tests were analyzed to determine if significant changes occurred on the tests either as a result of the videotaped treatment alone or as a result of the combined
treatment and ensuing discussion. A chart outlining the design strategy will be found in Appendix C.

Data Reduction

Data were reduced to numerical values. Thus schools identified as School A and School B became subsequently referred to as School 1 and School 2 on the code sheet and in the discussion of the variables. Scores on the Moral Dilemma Questionnaire were summed in a positive direction so that those tests with the highest scores would indicate a strong positive attitude toward the value of honesty. Test scores were scored individually, compiled onto Fortran coding sheets and keypunched.

Sampling Plan

The population was defined as all of the fifth grade students in Administrative Area 8 of the Los Angeles City School system. Area 8 comprises the schools generally located in the Van Nuys, Sherman Oaks, Panorama City area of the San Fernando Valley. The sample of the population was a cluster random sample of the fifth grade children in this area. Schools were selected randomly from Administrative Area 8. The schools were similar socioeconomically and geographically. Fifth grade classes within these schools were then randomly selected. All the pupils involved in the study were members of intact, that is to say, self-contained classrooms. Research was restricted to classrooms structured in the traditional manner, that is,
the classes had one teacher who worked with the children most of the day in a single room.

Table 1 summarizes the characteristics of the sample used. The schools selected were racially integrated. Further details of the ethnic composition of the classes will be discussed in the chapter on results.

**TABLE 1**

General Information on Samples Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time of Testing</th>
<th>November, 1980</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Schools Tested</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Classrooms Tested</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially Integrated</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level Tested</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total No. of Subjects</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Limitations of the Design**

Due to the exigencies of time and numbers, a control group was not used. Early design strategy had included the device of a control group. The control group would see a non-value oriented film, receive a pre-test and a post-test, but no discussion. At the time of the study several factors precluded the use of a control group.

1. No school was available for testing in which there were sufficient classes to have a third group of subjects.
2. Because of the policy of busing that had been adopted in the Los Angeles City School District and the ensuing confusion accompanied by the displacement of teachers and reorganization of classes, it was felt that no consistent sampling of subjects would be available if the testing schedule were to be delayed to include a third group.

3. The investigator was unable to arrange for additional time to test a third group.

One suggestion for further research then would be the inclusion of a control group and taking the needed steps to assure a more balanced ethnic grouping. The implications of this problem will be considered further in the discussion in Chapter VI.

Demographic Data

Relevant demographic data collected were IQ, age, sex, class, school and ethnicity. Because of existing stringent regulations in the Los Angeles City School District regarding the release of information concerning students, additional information regarding factors such as socioeconomic background or scores on intelligence tests were not considered in this study. Cognitive ability was stated in terms of gifted, high, middle and low, and was ascertained from the evaluations of the teachers. Ethnicity was identified by visual determination of the classroom
teachers in keeping with the survey procedures in current use within the school system itself.

Analysis of the Data

The attitude change scores were analyzed for the effects of the various independent variables. To test Hypothesis I, the mean scores of a post-test Moral Dilemma Questionnaire were compared with the mean scores of a pre-test of the same questionnaire after the program, "I Dare You," was viewed, using Student's t tests at the .05 level of confidence. In testing Hypothesis II, the mean score of a post-test of Bronfenbrenner's Moral Dilemma Questionnaire was compared with the mean score of retention tests, given after the children's viewing of the program, "I Dare You," and participating in a discussion. This comparison was also made using the Student's t test at the .05 level of confidence. Further discussion of the analysis will be presented in the chapter on results, Chapter V.

Summary

A design strategy was devised which would test the hypotheses that films which were intentionally designed to instruct in the area of values would cause an attitude change in those values. In this design a sample population of the children residing in the San Fernando Valley was tested with three parallel versions of the Moral Dilemma Questionnaire. The four classes were chosen from two schools and were tested with a pre-test, post-test and
retention test. The demographics which were taken into consideration were IQ, age, sex, and ethnicity. The value specifically investigated was the value of honesty and the film chosen to teach honesty was "I Dare You" from the television series Inside/Out.
CHAPTER IV

METHOD

As previously discussed in the chapter on design, the intent of this study was to measure attitude change in the value of "honesty" after children had viewed a videotaped episode, "I Dare You," from the television series Inside/Out. From the results of a pilot test the children were tested with Bronfenbrenner's Moral Dilemma Questionnaire and data was collected concerning the responses to this test.

Participants

Participating Sample

The participants in this study were composed of 124 children ranging from 9 to 11 years of age. The participants were fifth grade students from two schools in the Van Nuys area of the Los Angeles City Unified School District, administratively classified as Area 8. The children were identified ethnically through the visual discrimination of the classroom teacher. The ethnic determination was based on the guidelines of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the subjects were categorized as Hispanic, Black, Asian and White. Participants were 53% female and 47% male. Intellectual ability
was based on teacher determination based on pupil performance on district diagnostic tests, placement tests and classroom performance. Due to district policy, actual scores on intelligence tests were not available. Children who were placed in the State Mandated Program for the Gifted were identified as such. Intelligence ability was categorized as gifted, high, middle and low.

Selected Sub-sample

Following completion of the study, the sample of 124 was further reduced for analysis as 10 subjects did not take the retention tests and were not available for the information necessary to fully analyze the complete data. Therefore, 114 participants are considered in the analysis based on post-test and retention test performance.

Procedure

Scheduling

The study consisted of two intact classes of students from two schools in a lower to middle socioeconomic neighborhood. In each school one class was pre-tested, then presented with an instructional intervention in the form of showing a videotaped episode from Inside/Out, which was followed by a post-test. This group was given a retention test one week later. The second class in each school was tested in an identical manner with the addition of a discussion immediately following the videotaped intervention.
The discussion group took an additional ten minutes. The students were tested on Tuesday and Wednesday in order to insure test validity. The tests were conducted in November, 1980.

Experimental Setting

The study was carried out in the students' regular classroom as the only experimental requirement was the inclusion of a videotape recorder attached to the classroom television. The regular classroom teacher introduced the investigator and the investigator introduced the test. During the test the investigator and the regular classroom teacher supervised test taking. The general attitude of the classes was positive and cooperative since the experiment included watching television, something the children obviously liked doing, and because the children seemed to be intrigued with the experience of being involved in an experiment which would give information about the way that children think.

The atmosphere varied in the two schools. School A had most recently undergone a great deal of confusion and disorganization due to busing and the displacement of teachers. School B was involved in a PTA candy drive and although mandatory busing had been introduced at this school, the general attitude was positive due to the excitement generated by this event.
The instructor provided all testing materials--tests, pencils and erasers. One school was equipped with portable televisions. Since television sets were not available in the other school the investigator provided a color television that was moved from class to class. The testing materials were reproduced by high quality reproduction methods for maximum legibility (see Appendix D for samples of the tests). The three versions of the test were pre-coded to insure that each test was randomized and that each student received a different version of the test in each of the three test situations. The materials were distributed to each child with his or her name and sex already transcribed in order to verify that the children received the proper version of the test and that it was taken in the proper sequence.

Upon completion of the testing session, cover sheets with the names of the students were removed and an identification number substituted. This procedure was followed in order to insure confidentiality.

Pre-testing

As discussed in the chapter on design, the test selected for this study was partially decided upon because it was felt that the reading level was more appropriate for this grade and that the children would be more likely to understand the directions for marking the tests. The pre-tests were administered to test the extent to which these
pupils already valued honesty and to determine test reliability. The pre-tests were untimed and were selected to measure value decisions when faced with questions involving dilemmas. The tests were designed by Bronfenbrenner (1970), and statistical information concerning the tests' validity and reliability state that reliability ranged from .87 to .92 on the three versions and that the measure has a high degree of construct validity. The tests, which were designed for group administration, took approximately 15 minutes for completion.

Instructional Presentation

A pre-taped videotape episode from the television series *Inside/Out* was presented with brief introductory remarks. The tape was videotaped from the master film at AIT in order to insure maximum clarity of viewing. The students were informed that they had been selected to participate in a survey which was being conducted to determine the opinions of children on the behavior of other children. They were told that they would see a videotaped television program and that they would then be asked questions as to how children think and feel about certain behaviors. They were informed that the purpose of the viewing was to give them a sample of a lifelike situation involving dilemmas of children their own age. They were also told that their opinions would be private and confidential. A sample of the script may be found in Appendix E.
The videotaped episode lasted 15 minutes. It was ascertained that all students were able to view the videotape comfortably.

Discussion

Immediately following the presentation one class was involved in a discussion with the investigator. The second class in each school was selected as the discussion group since there was a longer block of time from recess to lunch and it was felt that additional time was necessary for any contingencies that might arise during the discussion period, that is, that the discussion might become involved to the extent that additional testing time would be needed. Questions were asked concerning the appropriateness of the behavior of the children in the film and what better ways dilemmas could be solved. This discussion was five minutes in length, after which the participants were given the post-tests. The script for this discussion can be found in Appendix F.

Post-tests and Retention Tests

The post-test and retention test were two alternate versions of the pre-test. The pre-test versions were randomly assigned and the post-test and retention test were assigned sequentially depending on the original version received by the subject. The total time allowed for the post-test and retention test was 20 minutes each including a review of directions for marking the tests.
The retention test was administered one week subsequent to the post-test. The test required 20 minutes. In-depth instructions were given in order to reacquaint the students with marking procedures and with the purpose of the tests.

**Materials**

**Independent Measures**

The independent variables in this study were the individual differences which the students bring with them to the experiment, namely sex, ethnicity, IQ and age, and the treatment conditions to which the groups were assigned, that is, class, school, discussion, or no discussion. The independent measures supplied demographic data (i.e., sex, ethnicity, IQ, and age) and assessed prior value attitudes.

**Dependent Measures**

The dependent measures in this study are the value assessment scores gathered at the three different time points in conjunction with their respective reliability scores, that is, the Y variables.

**Reliability Tests**

Reliability is defined by Borg and Gall (1971) as the level of consistency of the measuring device. Reliability in tests is computed by administering a test to a sample of individuals and then after a delay the same measure is again administered to the same sample. Scores from the two
administrations are then correlated in order to determine the coefficient of stability, sometimes called test-retest reliability. The reliability tests (YPRE, YPOST and YRET) were analyzed by first establishing that the mean scores for these tests were within the range necessary to conclude that the pre-test, post-test and retention test were reliable. Upon establishing such reliability, relationships between the reliability check scores and the various independent variables (or groups) were analyzed to discover if test reliability was indeed independent or unrelated to these independent variables or groupings (such as sex, ethnicity, IQ and age) and assessed prior value attitudes.

Reliability scores were broken down into sex categories and correlation coefficients were obtained between the resulting reliability scores and continuous independent variables such as age and IQ. For the four independent variables consisting of categorical or nominal data (sex, ethnicity, school and the discussion/no-discussion variable) the categories of each independent variable served as the groupings in a separate one-way analysis of variance investigating differences in the reliability scores as the dependent variables.

Finally, analyses of variance were conducted on the change in reliability scores over time as a function of the independent variables or groups to insure that the attitude measures remained reliable over the course of the study.
Analysis of Attitude Change

Once it was confirmed that the reliability of the test scores did not differ or change between groups of subjects, the attitude change scores were then analyzed for the effects of the various independent variables. The analysis was conducted by employing one-way analyses of variance using each of the three separate dependent variables: the difference in attitude scores between the pre-test and the post-test, the difference in attitude scores between the post-test and retention test, and the difference in attitude scores between the pre-test and the retention test. In the event that the independent variable or grouping assumed only two values (such as school, sex and presence versus absence of a discussion), the one-way analysis of variance was equivalent to a t-test using independent groups. Ethnic composition was initially studied as a four-level factor, but was later regrouped as "white" versus "non-white."

Thus the data were analyzed to reveal differences in attitude change or difference scores of the tests, as a function of factors such as age, IQ, ethnicity, school and presence versus absence of a discussion. Note that there was no variable which checked to see if the videotape in and of itself produced attitude change; any change in attitude scores attributable to an exposure to the videotape could not be interpreted unambiguously due to the
absence of a control (no videotape) group for this variable in this study. However, the design of the study did allow for the assessment of the effect of the discussion by comparing the results of the discussion group with the no-discussion group.

Finally, it was determined that the differentiation of classes within schools could not be demonstrated statistically. Classes were then grouped together as a single new independent variable consisting of four levels, one for each of the two different classes within the two different schools, to analyze classes irrespective of school groupings. The new class variable was then included into three more one-way analyses of variance to determine differences in attitude change scores which might be attributable to this new grouping.
CHAPTER V
RESULTS

Introduction

The information contained in this chapter deals with quantitative and statistical measures resulting from an analysis of the data obtained in the test situation. The discussion of the implications of this material will be detailed in the next chapter.

The chapter is divided into two sections. The first is a description of the data obtained which is limited to reporting the descriptive data in terms of the independent variables: sex, ethnicity, IQ, age, class, school and discussion versus no discussion and their relationships to validity. The first section describes scores on measures, assignments to treatments and test versions, and differences between pre-test, post-test and retention tests. The second section deals with the effects of the independent variables and describes various comparisons between the results arising from the dependent variables.

Description of the Data

The data were statistically analyzed by using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner & Bent, 1975).
Statistical procedures were used which could most accurately describe the sought-for outcomes. The data were first reduced to key-punch cards and then run on-line. As in some instances a complete set of data was not available for every case or a response was not entered correctly, a missing data indicator was used which was termed the missing value.

The test measures were compared by using a variety of analysis procedures available in the SPSS package. To facilitate programming, a set of codes was assigned which is described in the coding sheet in Appendix G. Variations of the Moral Dilemma Questionnaire were coded as XPRE for the pre-test, XPOST for the post-test and XRET for the retention test versions respectively. A reliability test was also given to determine reliability and was coded with the "Y" prefix. The total number of cases equaled 114, which included allowance for the programming device of missing values. In the SPSS system the investigator may specify missing values so that files containing cases with incomplete data may still be processed.

**Reliability Tests**

As is explained in Chapter IV, the chief purpose of the "Y" measure was to serve as a reliability check on the respective "X" measures so that the data for the given independent variable would be meaningless with respect to a particular X unless:
1. a statistical significance was demonstrated between the X score and the independent variable; and

2. the reliability of the X scores as indicated by the corresponding Y score and its correlation with the X score were sufficiently strong.

Table 2 shows the correlations between the reliability scores and the continuous independent variables, IQ and age. These correlations show that reliability is not affected by either of these two factors although the reliability of the retention test is an exception to this

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>probability level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YPRE and IQ</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPOST and IQ</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET and IQ</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPRE and AGE</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPOST and AGE</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET and AGE</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant, p < .05
in that it is related to age. In general, however, the results may be interpreted as indicating no systematic relationship between the IQ and age variables and reliability.

Table 3 presents analysis of variance of the reliability tests with the categorical independent variables and shows that reliability is not significantly changed by any of these subgroups, that is, sex, ethnicity, school or discussion.

**TABLE 3**

Analysis of the Statistical Significance (F-values) of the Reliability Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyses of Variance</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>probability level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YPRE by SEX</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPOST by SEX</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET by SEX</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPRE by ETH</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>(3,102)</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPOST by ETH</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>(3,102)</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET by ETH</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>(3,102)</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPRE by SCH</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPOST by SCH</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET by SCH</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPRE by DISC</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPOST by DISC</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET by DISC</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPRE by CL</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPOST by CL</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET by CL</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reliability, then, is not affected by any of the independent factors within the present experimental design at any of the three measurement points in the study. There is, consequently, no empirical basis for concluding that any of the test results are less reliable or useful in any of the experimental subgroups. Table 4 similarly fails to show any significant associations of the independent variables

TABLE 4

Differences Between the Reliability Scores Over Time as Functions of the Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyses of Variance</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>probability level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YPRE - YPOST by AGE</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>(2,110)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET - YPOST by AGE</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>(2,110)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET - YPRE by AGE</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>(2,110)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPRE - YPOST by IQ</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>(3,109)</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET - YPOST by IQ</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>(3,109)</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET - YPRE by IQ</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>(3,109)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPRE - YPOST by ETH</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET - YPOST by ETH</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET - YPRE by ETH</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPRE - YPOST by SCH</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET - YPOST by SCH</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET - YPRE by SCH</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPRE - YPOST by DISC</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET - YPOST by DISC</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET - YPRE by DISC</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPRE - YPOST by CL</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET - YPOST by CL</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET - YPRE by CL</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>(1,112)</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with reliability scores across time, that is, the dependent variables in these analyses are the three possible difference scores formed by the three reliability checks at different time points. The lack of significant associations in Tables 2, 3, and 4 indicates that reliability is not affected by any of the independent variables both when viewed at one single point in time and when viewed across time spans. Hence, reliability is stable across subgroups as well as measurement points.

The interrelationships among the independent variables are summarized in Table 5. Here it can be seen that the

TABLE 5
relationships between the independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variables</th>
<th>chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CL by ETH</td>
<td>20.12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL by SEX</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL by AGE</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL by IQ</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH by ETH</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE by ETH</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ by ETH</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX by ETH</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX by AGE</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX by IQ</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH by SEX</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE by IQ</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE by SCH</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH by IQ</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*variables are significantly associated
only significant associations between the independent measures are those between 1) class and ethnicity, 2) IQ and ethnicity and 3) school and IQ. Note that in this table, chi-square variables are obtained by converting continuous measures such as IQ and age to categorical variables and thereby producing a contingency table with other categorical measures such as class, sex, school, etc. The significant chi-squares indicate 1) that races are not homogeneously distributed within the classes, 2) that more gifted children are in the White and Asian subgroups, and 3) that one school had higher IQ students than another. The significant sex by age interaction is a peculiarity of the sample of students.

Description of Effects

For the Y variables to be considered a valid reliability check they must correlate highly with their respective X score counterparts. Since the description of effects includes all relationships with the X (dependent) variables, the correlations of the X and Y (reliability) variables are reported here first. Table 6 shows that XPRE correlates with YPRE more highly than with any other variable except one (although the difference between the two is not significant). For XPOST and YPOST there are higher correlations within their rows and columns than the correlation between XPOST and YPOST itself, indicating a possible problem with the reliability check of this scale. Finally, the correlation between XRET and YRET is higher
than are any of the other correlations in their respective rows and columns.

**TABLE 6**

Correlation Coefficients of Dependent Measures with Reliability Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>XPRE</th>
<th>XPOST</th>
<th>XRET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YPRE</td>
<td>r = 0.51</td>
<td>r = 0.54</td>
<td>r = 0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPOST</td>
<td>r = 0.10</td>
<td>r = 0.22</td>
<td>r = 0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET</td>
<td>r = 0.52</td>
<td>r = 0.57</td>
<td>r = 0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
<td>p = .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summarizing the X and Y variables, the means and standard deviations of these measures are presented in Table 7. Because the X measures and Y measures had different total scores, that is, the X measures scored a total of 42 while the Y measures scored a total of 29, the means and standard deviations of X and Y scores are different. Within each grouping the means and standard deviations of the X and Y variables are quite similar, although it is evident that the X variable group and the Y variable group have means and standard deviations which are closer to being equal within the X group or Y group than across groups. Table 7 lists descriptive statistics only and is not intended for inferential statistical comparisons.
TABLE 7

Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XPRE</td>
<td>29.19</td>
<td>7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPOST</td>
<td>29.36</td>
<td>7.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRET</td>
<td>27.81</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPRE</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YPOST</td>
<td>20.92</td>
<td>8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YRET</td>
<td>20.04</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Separate analyses of variance were conducted to test the effect of each of the independent variables on the means of the X scores. Note that date and time are not presented in these tables as independent variables because of their lack of a theoretical basis as predictors. Consequently, seven independent variables are examined in the investigation of the dependent X variables. Since the X variables assume three values, Pre-test, Post-test and Retention test measures, the number of possible analyses of variance is twenty-one. The means and standard deviations from these twenty-one analyses of variance are shown in Table 8. Each line of the table provides the mean and standard deviation of a particular dependent measure within a subgrouping of a particular independent variable. In Table 8 the two statistically significant outcomes (based on a probability cutoff level of .05) are denoted with an
asterisk. Those independent variables which showed no significant impact on any of the X measures were ethnicity, age and sex. The IQ variables differed substantially on XPOST (p = .09) and XRET (p = .06), but failed to reach the .05 level of significance. Those variables with significant relationships were school on XPOST and class on XPOST.

TABLE 8

Means and Standard Deviations of Dependent Measures in Terms of Independent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XPRE/SCH 1</td>
<td>28.16</td>
<td>6.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH 2</td>
<td>29.73</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPOST/SCH 1</td>
<td>27.78*</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH 2</td>
<td>30.73*</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRET/SCH 1</td>
<td>26.48</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH 2</td>
<td>28.48</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPRE/IQ 1</td>
<td>27.44</td>
<td>9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ 2</td>
<td>28.88</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ 3</td>
<td>29.01</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ 4</td>
<td>28.69</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPOST/IQ 1</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ 2</td>
<td>29.85</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ 3</td>
<td>28.36</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ 4</td>
<td>31.53</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRET/IQ 1</td>
<td>23.11</td>
<td>7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ 2</td>
<td>26.26</td>
<td>7.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ 3</td>
<td>27.77</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQ 4</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPRE/SEX 1</td>
<td>28.15</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX 2</td>
<td>29.53</td>
<td>5.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPOST/SEX 1</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX 2</td>
<td>28.79</td>
<td>6.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XRET/SEX 1</td>
<td>26.74</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX 2</td>
<td>28.07</td>
<td>6.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPRE/ETH 1</td>
<td>28.87</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH 2</td>
<td>30.78</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH 3</td>
<td>29.77</td>
<td>5.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH 4</td>
<td>28.31</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPOST/ETH 1</td>
<td>31.57</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH 2</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH 3</td>
<td>28.31</td>
<td>7.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH 4</td>
<td>28.06</td>
<td>6.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRET/ETH 1</td>
<td>28.87</td>
<td>6.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH 2</td>
<td>31.11</td>
<td>8.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH 3</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH 4</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPRE/DISC 1</td>
<td>28.19</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC 2</td>
<td>29.12</td>
<td>7.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPOST/DISC 1</td>
<td>28.86</td>
<td>6.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC 2</td>
<td>29.14</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRET/DISC 1</td>
<td>28.12</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISC 2</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPRE/CL 1</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td>7.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL 2</td>
<td>31.29</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XPOST/CL 1</td>
<td>26.31*</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL 2</td>
<td>30.12*</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XRET/CL 1</td>
<td>27.81</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL 2</td>
<td>29.93</td>
<td>7.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*means are significantly different, \( p < .05 \)

In Table 9 it can be seen that only "short-range" effects were demonstrable for the class and school variables; attitudes are significantly different immediately.
after exposure to the videotape, but this effect vanished after a week as indicated by the fact that the group differences for XRET were not statistically significant. Since the XPRE variable was not significantly different between

### TABLE 9

**Difference in Attitude Over Time as a Function of the Independent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyses of variance</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>probability level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. XPOST - XPRE by DISC</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. XRET - XPOST by DISC</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. XRET - XPRE by DISC</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. XPOST - XPRE by AGE</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. XRET - XPOST by AGE</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. XRET - XPRE by AGE</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. XPOST - XPRE by IQ</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. XRET - XPOST by IQ</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. XRET - XPRE by IQ</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. XPOST - XPRE by ETH</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. XRET - XPOST by ETH</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. XRET - XPRE by ETH</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. XPOST - XPRE by SCH</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. XRET - XPOST by SCH</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. XRET - XPRE by SCH</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>(1,104)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. XPOST - XPRE by CL</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>(3,102)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. XRET - XPOST by CL</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>(3,102)</td>
<td>0.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. XRET - XPRE by CL</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>(3,102)</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant, $p < .05$
class and school groups, but later a statistically significant difference between class and school was observed in XRET, it can be inferred that measurable statistically significant changes occurred in these groups since there were no pre-existing differences in the attitude measures. These conclusions can be seen by referring to the XPRE, XPOST and XRET scores for class in Table 9.

The IQ variable seems to indicate that attitude change follows different patterns in high versus low IQ groups, with the former displaying a progressively less favorable attitude as time passes, while the latter appears to drift toward a more favorable position. For example, the group means seem to show a decrease for the highest IQ group as one progresses from XPRE to XRET while the lowest IQ group tends to show the opposite pattern. These results must be taken as suggestive rather than conclusive since the statistical probability of the F-ratio never "breaks the .05 barrier" for XPRE, XPOST or XRET in Tables 8 and 9.

Separate analyses of variance performed on the various attitude change scores are shown in Table 9. It can be seen that the basic results indicated that class groupings represented the only significant influence on attitude change scores. It is apparent that this influence was not completely due to either the discussion accompanying the videotape (since the F-ratios in lines 1 to 3 showed no statistical significance) nor was it due to influences
conducted (since the $F$-ratios in lines 13 to 15 showed no statistical significance. Thus, the differences in attitude change due to class groupings are attributable to a variable which was specific to the class groupings.

Since the probability levels associated with class were appreciably below .05, the findings of class groupings may be considered to be indicative of a much stronger than chance relationship between attitude change and the class groupings (see lines 17 and 18 in Table 9).

Both Tables 2 and 9 contain evidence that increased age improves the capacity to maintain a stability of attitudes between the pre-test and the retention test. Table 2 indicates that YRET scores were significantly higher in those with increased age, and line 6 in Table 9 shows that the attitude change was substantially different between the pre-test and retention tests for the different age groups although the probability level of .10 is not considered statistically significant in this study.

Finally, though the difference between discussion groups does not achieve significance at the .05 level (see lines 1 to 3), the substantial $F$-value of 3.01 suggests that there may exist a partial contribution to the difference noted between class groupings. In conclusion, it is apparent that very little of the obtained data is statistically significant.
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

Summary of Results

The interrelationships among the independent variables indicated that the only significant associations between the independent measures are those between:
1) class and ethnicity, 2) IQ and ethnicity, and 3) school by IQ. Thus, some of the incidental findings that the statistical measures revealed were that races are not homogeneously distributed within any given class, that the greater number of gifted children were to be found within the white and Asian subgroup, and that one school has higher IQ students than the other. Although none of these findings were of statistical significance, they provided information to consider for further research.

Reliability is not affected by any of the independent factors within the experimental design at any of the measurement points of the study. Attitudes were significantly different for school and class groupings immediately after exposure to the videotape, but these effects did not persist over time (differences in XPOST were significant between class and school groupings but not for XRET). Attitudes did not differ significantly
between any groups except for class, suggesting that the critical variable is as yet an undefined aspect of the class groupings not measured here.

**Rejection of Hypotheses**

As no statistically significant results were obtained in measuring attitude change, the hypotheses must be rejected. The first hypothesis that attitudes toward honesty would be changed positively after viewing a film did not prove valid. Although there were some measurable changes in some groups, such as school and class, these changes did not remain over time. The second hypothesis, that is, that the attitude toward the value of honesty would be changed by a discussion following a viewing of a film, also proved to have no validity statistically.

**Implications**

The means from the analyses of variance for age, though not statistically significant, suggest that older age group children are not as easily influenced by persuasive measures (older children tended to have larger values of XRET - XPRE). Attaining values such as honesty may be important for the younger child because he or she has to adapt to a conformity-oriented adult system or
because social conformity is a transitional phase necessary for movement to the acceptance of a more mature ethical system (Kohlberg, 1969).

In the grouping of intelligence, children of higher intelligence appeared to be more consistent in the direction of their scores, which suggests that brighter children would be less susceptible to influence through an intervention. Studies in this area propose that gifted children are superior to average children not only in their problem-solving capabilities as measured by IQ instruments, but also in traits deemed socially desirable, that is, in moral and social conformity (Kohlberg, 1967).

The composition of the classes varied greatly in ethnic balance due to the busing policy which had been adopted in the Los Angeles City Schools in September, and the large groups of Hispanics which are moving to the Los Angeles area. One of the schools was directly involved in busing, which led to a racial imbalance in one of the classrooms, that is, in School A there was a population of which 35% of the children were white, while in School B only 12% of the children were identified as white. Table 10 indicates the racial composition of the schools.

**Implications of Ethnicity**

Although the analyses of attitude change in ethnic groups were not statistically significant, the scores of these groups were of some interest. The variable of
TABLE 10
Racial Composition of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Groups</th>
<th>School A</th>
<th>School B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethnicity was originally broken down into groupings of Hispanic, Black, Asian, and White. It was noted that the White group tended to score higher than Hispanics, Asians, or Blacks, while Asians scored higher than Hispanics or Blacks. Much research has been done in the area of ethnicity and its impact on learning. One theory in the current literature is that learning is strongly influenced by teacher expectations and that as a whole, such expectations are lower for ethnic minorities, resulting in lower achievement within ethnic groups (Bronfenbrenner, 1975; Gorsuch, 1971).

**Teacher Influence**

One problem that became evident from an analysis of the test outcomes was that the design for this study failed to allow for the impact of the effect of the classroom teacher. The scores on the measurement instrument
varied from class to class, although no statistically significant inferences could be drawn due to the analyses of the variables. There were, however, diverse factors involving the teachers of the respective classes.

The teacher for Class A had been ill for the previous month, which had led to a series of substitute teachers. The children in this class had originally lost their first teacher due to the displacement of teachers which occurred in September, and this group of children expressed their unhappiness concerning this experience. The children expressed resentment about not having their regular teacher, about having had so many substitute teachers, and although the class had a high percentage of students who were known to be bright and cooperative, the class was gaining a reputation for being disruptive and uncooperative. The class was attentive and cooperative during the testing situation, but there was an air of hostility between the class and the substitute teacher of that day.

Class B in the same school was cooperative and friendly, but was being taught by a first semester student teacher who did not seem to provide any sense of leadership, or bring to the classroom a strong personality with which the class could identify.

Class C had started the year with no regularly assigned teacher and had also had a succession of substitute teachers. The week prior to the testing, a teacher
had been assigned permanently to the class. It appeared that the children responded positively to the environment that this teacher provided. The investigator noted that the children appeared to be happy to have a teacher to relate to. These children proved to be especially cooperative and enthusiastic in their test-taking, were interested in the experience of watching the program, and in the dynamics of the test itself. There was evidence that the teacher was organized and involved with the class. She had begun to develop the class as a group and to motivate them toward learning. The scores for this class tended to be in a more positive direction than the other group which leads to the conclusion that teacher effect predominates over subject content impact or radically influences how learners react to moral instructional content.

Class D was composed of a large number of students who were bused in from a central Los Angeles school. The teacher of this class was apathetic and disinterested. He volunteered that he was happy to participate in the testing program as it relieved him from teaching duties. He did not participate in giving information to students, did not express any enthusiasm concerning the test experience, or display any interest in any of the proceedings. The investigator noted that the class itself was disorganized and exhibited few signs of direction, motivation,
or guidance, though the children were cooperative during the first testing situation. On the day of the retention test, the teacher did not trouble to inform the investigator that the class was to see a PTA film following the retention test session. The children were cooperative during this test period but finished the test very quickly and questioned the classroom teacher about the PTA film.

Literature in the area of teacher influence emphasizes that the teacher and the student are involved in a transaction that is part of an ongoing behavioral flow and that changes occur as a result of this transaction (Gorsuch, 1971). The results obtained in this study seem to indicate that such a condition existed as a factor in the test situation.

**Suggestions for Further Study**

The results of this study did not definitively answer the questions and problems that were posed in the early chapters of this study. Although some changes in attitude in the variables of school and class do occur through the use of a filmed intervention, problems with the homogeneity of the population that was sampled, and the effect of teacher influence, both appear to have skewed the results of this study. Further research in which populations are more evenly balanced both as regards ethnicity and IQ should be conducted. Research also needs to be
undertaken regarding the other values dealt with in the series Inside/Out. A possible approach might be to evaluate the impact of the entire series over one semester and to study the program on the merits of instructing in moral development in general rather than on a specific value. A more valid assessment of moral development could be determined in such a strategy.

Further research is also necessary to evaluate the effectiveness of Bronfenbrenner's Moral Dilemma Questionnaire in assessing attitude change in values, and how effective the Questionnaire is in measuring other values. Perhaps an instrument could be developed which deals with the specific problems posed in the series Inside/Out, and dealing with situations which might be geared to a particular socioeconomic group and to a population exposed to recent social changes in our society, such as greater permissiveness, the fragmentation of the extended family, and the resulting dependence of children on the informal peer group.

This study collected no data regarding the source of subgroup differences nor information regarding the non-school sources of value pressures. Peers from outside the school, parents, adult relatives and friends, proximity to disruptive influences, divorce, and a variety of other variables are relevant to the formation and change in a child's values. The research in this study, however,
confined itself to the school setting and the variables deemed possible to evaluate. A study which would be designed to take into account the impact of this type of data would have much greater value to the understanding of attitude change in values and could perhaps be carried out if the school, vis-a-vis the principal and the teachers, and the parents themselves, could become participants in such a study. An alternative design strategy is proposed which will incorporate some of these ideas and be of greater scope.

**Alternative Design**

In this alternative design the research would be conducted as a field study with a sample population consisting of students of the fourth, fifth, and sixth grades from a middle to upper-middle socioeconomic group, from a school system in the Southern California area. The school system would be selected on the basis of a minimal transciency rate of the pupils so that a more stable sample population could be tested, and on the basis that the school qualify in terms of socioeconomic conditions and be in a suburban setting. Research by Bronfenbrenner (1979) indicates that the ability of children to function well in the schools is seriously impaired by such forces as poverty and family disorganization, as well as broken homes, overcrowded housing and the low educational level of the head of the household.
The experiment would be conducted during the first semester of the school year with retention tests a week following the last episode that is viewed. A delayed retention test would be given to the participants at the end of the school year.

The teachers would report as much information as possible concerning the individual students, to provide more extensive demographic data. In a smaller, more stable community, more information would be available to the researchers concerning outside factors such as socio-economic status or factors such as disruptive divorces or family breakups.

A control group of two classes from each of the three grade levels, namely fourth, fifth and sixth grades, would be selected from each of the schools in the district. One class from each grade in each school would regularly see only a neutral series of films, while the other control group would participate in a discussion involving moral development following the viewing of that neutral film. In each school a fourth, fifth and sixth grade class would be selected randomly which would view the first semester episodes of the series *Inside/Out*. A fourth group of fourth, fifth, and sixth grade classes would be sampled which would view the same episodes as the other classes with a discussion involving moral development following
the viewing of the videotaped films of the episodes from the series *Inside/Out*.

The participants of this study would receive alternate versions of a test constructed especially to test attitude change in values where the test items themselves would be based on the series *Inside/Out*. The tests would be administered in a pre-test, post-test, retention test design strategy. The testing measure would be based on the format of the Moral Dilemma Questionnaire and scored in the same method. Children would be given tests of four parallel versions of situations which would present dilemmas which a child could possibly be involved in. Dilemmas presented to the children would be related to the experiences viewed in the television programs. The test questions would be directed toward specific values that had been dealt with in the programs themselves.

Since the episodes of the first semester are to be shown, possible values which might be tested are loyalty, patriotism, fairness, reaction to peer approval, and reaction to parental pressure. A summary of the design objectives may be found in Appendix I.

The testing would be conducted in the classrooms of the participants in order to provide as natural a setting as possible. The students would be tested by an experimenter with two assistants who would assist in distributing and collecting tests, in monitoring the viewing schedule,
and in facilitating testing in any way deemed necessary. All tests would be randomized with four alternate forms, and would be coded and marked with the participants' names. All materials would be provided by the researchers.

The children would be advised that the viewing of the series was a part of the regular curriculum. Approval to participate in the research phase of the study would be requested of the parents of the participants.

Regularly scheduled episodes from a program such as Big Blue Marble would be shown to the control group at the same time each week. These programs would be presented by the experimenters in the classroom without the presence of the classroom teachers. The episodes from Inside/Out would be shown to the research groups under the same conditions.

The teachers would be involved in the experiment in that they would be requested to evaluate the effectiveness of the programs in terms of observed behaviors of the participants in the week following the viewing of the program. Their opinions would be correlated with the scores on the measurement scales that are taken by the participants.

At the conclusion of the study, a survey form would be distributed to the parents of the children involved in the research to determine if the parents are aware of any difference in behavior or any changes in opinions expressed
by their children in terms of moral development. An out-
line for this design has been included in Appendix J.

Social institutions, such as the schools, need to be rebuilt and revitalized in order to provide for effective growth in areas previously considered to be the responsibility of the family unit. Since the schools are now being called upon to provide for the moral development of children, ways of meeting this challenge must be resolved. A thorough investigation into the effectiveness of the methods which we employ to instruct in moral development is necessary to our understanding. A study such as the one proposed, although costly in time and resources, is one way, perhaps, by which we can determine if these goals are being reached.


Corder-Bolz, C., & O'Bryant, S. Teachers vs. program. *Journal of Communications*, 1978, 28(1), 97-103.


APPENDIX A

CONTENT ANALYSIS RATING FORM
Content Analysis Rating Form*

Categories: What value or social behavior is changed by whom with what method or reason leading to what outcome?

I Who: Main Character

A. Prominence in the program (Choose one)

1. 1___ 1. Active/Subjective Role
2. 2___ 2. Passive/Objective Role
3. 3___ 3. Observer

B. Sex (Choose one)

4. 1___ 1. Male
5. 2___ 2. Female

C. Age (Specify)

6. 1___
7. 2___

D. Interpersonal Interaction

8. 1___ 1. Assertive - Character has attitudes and expresses them through his behavior.
9. 2___ 2. Non-assertive - Character does not express attitudes through his behavior.
10. 3___ 3. Presence of attitudes not demonstrated by behavior of character.

* an instrument devised by the investigator
E. Role Portrayed (Choose one)

11. 1__ 1. Student
12. 2__ 2. Parent
13. 3__ 3. Friend
14. 4__ 4. Teacher
15. 5__ 5. Other ________________

II. Value or Social Behavior Portrayed (Choose one)

A. Possible Values

16. 1__ 1. Honesty is expressed in the behavior of one of the characters to indicate that he is truthful and candid, and does not condone or participate in lying, cheating or stealing.

17. 2__ 2. Patriotism is expressed by the behavior of characters who express or manifest a feeling of loyalty towards country.

18. 3__ 3. Loyalty is indicated through the behavior of one or more of the characters who expresses or displays faithful adherence to a promise, pledge, word, person, or cause.

19. 4__ 4. Duty is expressed in the behavior of characters who perform according to how they feel they should in terms of completion of tasks rather than following their desires or preferences.

20. 5__ 5. Responsibility is expressed in the behavior of character(s) who indicate(s) that they are capable of fulfilling an obligation or trust.

21. 6__ 6. Fairness is expressed in the behavior of the character(s) who act(s) in a manner which is free from bias, fraud, or injustice.

22. 7__ 7. Other (Specify)
B. Possible Social Behavior Portrayed (Choose one)

23. 1. Altruism is expressed in the behavior of characters in which regard for others as a principle of action is displayed.

24. 2. Control of aggressive behavior

25. 3. Delay of gratification or task persistence

26. 4. Explaining feelings of self or others

27. 5. Reparation for bad behavior

28. 6. Resistance to temptation

29. 7. Sympathy is expressed in the behavior of character(s) who indicated that they are entering into or sharing the feelings of others.

30. 8. Others (Specify)

III. Value of Social Behavior in Film

A. Changed by Whom (multiple responses acceptable)

31. 1. Peer

32. 2. Sibling

33. 3. Rival

34. 4. Parent

35. 5. Teacher

36. 6. Authority Figure (Specify)

37. 7. Other (Specify)
B. Value Motivated by What (multiple responses acceptable)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Material benefit - Character receives some reward or benefit due to behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2. Self-preservation - Character is motivated by desire to save self from harm or loss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3. Affection - Character is motivated by love or liking for someone or something.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4. Power and prestige - Character is motivated by desire for reward in terms of popularity or influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5. Competition - Character is motivated by desire to win, or to achieve more than others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6. Psychological (Specify) - Character is motivated by psychological problems such as feeling unloved or unwanted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7. Sentiments - Character is motivated by feelings directed toward others such as pity, kindness. (Specify)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8. Other (Specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Value or Prosocial Behavior Achieved By: (Multiple answers acceptable)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1. Legal means - Character arrives at decision according to rightness or wrongness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2. Nonlegal means - Character arrives at decision and in so doing is violating law; however, no attempt to injure or damage is involved in this decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3. Economic - Character is changed by economic reasons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4. Organization, negotiation, or compromise - Character achieves change by one of the above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
50. 5__  5. Escape - Character achieves change by attempting to or avoidance of facts.

51. 6__  6. Chance - Character does not seek a specific method of change, however it occurs coincidentally.

52. 7__  7. Other (Specify) __________________________

D. Specific Incident Which Leads to Change

53. 1__  1. Specify __________________________

IV. In What Context (Choose one)

A. Predominant Type of Scene

54. 1__  1. Serious - Film is portrayed realistically and seriously so that comedic incidents are shown only when they are appropriate to the context of the story.

55. 2__  2. Comic - Purpose of the film is to entertain and instruct through the use of humorous incidents.

56. 3__  3. Fantasy - Film is depicted as imaginings of character rather than as real happenings.

B. Location of Main Activity (Choose one)

57. 1__  1. Home

58. 2__  2. School

59. 3__  3. Neighborhood

60. 4__  4. Playground

61. 5__  5. Movie

62. 6__  6. Party

63. 7__  7. Other (Specify) __________________________
C. Type of Situation (Choose one)

64. 1___ 1. Accident in which injury occurs.
65. 2___ 2. An experience which is extremely frightening emotionally to the character.
66. 3___ 3. Positive experience in which the character gains insight or knowledge.
67. 4___ 4. Bitter lesson in which character learns through a negative, unpleasant experience although no fright or injury occurs.
68. 5___ 5. Other (Specify) ________________________

D. Time (Choose one)

69. 1___ 1. Past
70. 2___ 2. Present
71. 3___ 3. Future

E. Intended Perception (Choose one)

72. 1___ 1. Realistic - The intent of the film is to depict material in a realistic or factual manner.
73. 2___ 2. Imaginary - Intent of the film is to depict that which might happen but not in terms of the probable.
74. 3___ 3. Other (Specify) ________________________

V. Outcomes (Multiple answers acceptable)

A. Value is explicitly expressed - editorialized by:

75. 1___ 1. Peer
76. 2___ 2. Sibling
77. 3___ 3. Rival
78. 4___ 4. Parent
79. 5__ 5. Teacher
80. 6__ 6. Authority figure (Specify) ________________
81. 7__ 7. Other (Specify) ________________

B. Reversal in Behavior of Subject
82. 1__ 1. Explicit change in behavior - happens immediately.
83. 2__ 2. Implied change in behavior - happens in future.

C. Reversal in behavior of other characters
(Choose one)
84. 1__ 1. Explicit change in behavior - happens immediately.
85. 2__ 2. Implied change in behavior - happens in future.

D. Depiction of reward (Choose one)
86. 1__ 1. Physical - Character receives some type of material benefit.
87. 2__ 2. Psychological - Character receives some type of emotional or psychological reward.

E. Depiction of punishment (Choose one)
88. 1__ 1. Physical - Character receives some type of physical retribution.
89. 2__ 2. Psychological - Character receives some type of emotional or psychological repayment.

F. Other
90. 1__ 1. Specify _____________________________
APPENDIX B

TREATMENT SUMMARY
"I Dare You"

The program deals with the experiences of Clarissa, a new girl in the neighborhood, who wants to join the other children in the neighborhood who have formed a secret club or "gang." To be accepted as a member, she must carry out a potentially dangerous dare. She is instructed that she must jump out in front of an oncoming car to frighten the driver. In a series of flashbacks, the gang members recount the activities of the gang. Clarissa is torn between her desire for social acceptance and her realization that she should not participate in the gang's activities. Although she feels that she should tell an adult of her dilemma, she is intrigued by the daring of her new friends. She fantasizes the possible consequences and argues with herself about what she should do. When the moment of decision arrives, she is urged on by the gang. As the tension reaches its highest point the program ends. What has Clarissa decided to do?
APPENDIX C

DESIGN STRATEGY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SCHOOL A</th>
<th></th>
<th>SCHOOL B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion Group (n=30)</td>
<td>No Discussion</td>
<td>Discussion Group (n=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>A (10)</td>
<td>B (10)</td>
<td>C (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>(same)</td>
<td>(same)</td>
<td>(same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td>B C A</td>
<td>B C A</td>
<td>B C A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retention Test</td>
<td>C A B C</td>
<td>A B C A</td>
<td>C A B C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

TESTS - VERSIONS A, B, C
Version A

Name ______________________________

School ______________________________

Grade ______________________________

Teacher ______________________________

Your age ______________________________

Your sex (circle one) boy girl
The Babysitter

You are playing a game with a bunch of kids in the neighborhood. One of the kids says, "I guess I won't be able to play with you because I have to stay home to watch my little brother this afternoon." You could go on playing with your friends or stay with this kid while he watches his little brother. What would you really do?

NOT LEAVE MY FRIENDS

STAY WITH THE KID

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.
The kids you go around with have a special way of talking that you like very much, but your parents don't really like it. They haven't forbidden you to talk that way, but it's obvious they'd like it better if you didn't do it. Your friends don't see anything wrong with it and think it's a lot of fun. What would you really do?

---

**TALK LIKE MY FRIENDS DO**

**STOP TALKING LIKE MY FRIENDS DO**

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely

certain certain so so certain certain

---

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.
The Class Picnic

Your class had some money left over at the end of the year and the teacher said you could use it to have a class picnic next Saturday. One kid whom nobody likes was absent that day and didn’t hear about the picnic. The other kids suggest not saying anything about it, so that this kid won’t be there. What would you really do in this situation?

GO ALONG WITH THE REST OF THE KIDS

REFUSE TO GO UNLESS THIS KID IS INCLUDED

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.
The Rubber Snake

There's a teacher in the school that nobody likes. Some of the kids you go around with suggest playing a trick on this teacher by hiding a very real-looking rubber snake in her desk drawer. They want you to help by watching in the hall and giving a warning if anybody comes. What would you really do?

Would you tell your friends they shouldn't do it, or let each one do what he wants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LET EACH ONE DO WHAT HE WANTS</th>
<th>TELL MY FRIENDS THEY SHOULDN'T DO IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>absolutely</strong></td>
<td><strong>fairly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>certain</strong></td>
<td><strong>certain</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suppose the kids decided to go ahead. Would you help your friends by watching in the hall as they asked you to?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REFUSE TO HELP MY FRIENDS</th>
<th>WOULD HELP MY FRIENDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>absolutely</strong></td>
<td><strong>fairly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>certain</strong></td>
<td><strong>certain</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next day the teacher asks you in private if you had anything to do with putting the snake in the drawer. After you answer, the teacher asks you for the names of the other kids involved. What would you really do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOT GIVE HER THE NAMES</th>
<th>GIVE HER THE NAMES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>absolutely</strong></td>
<td><strong>fairly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>certain</strong></td>
<td><strong>certain</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.
The New Kid

A new kid has recently joined your class. This kid is sort of sloppy, and some of the others tease him a bit. One day after school, as you are standing around with some of your friends, the new kid comes along. Someone says, "Here comes you know who - sloppy as ever." They start making remarks. What would you really do in this situation?

GO ALONG WITH MY FRIENDS

TELL MY FRIENDS I'LL LEAVE IF THEY DON'T STOP

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.
Kids Playing Together

When a bunch of kids are playing together, they may do something which probably wouldn't do any real harm but which grown-ups might not approve of.

a) During the past year about how often has anything like this happened with the kids you go around with? (Check the answer that fits best.)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
VERY OFTEN FAIRLY OFTEN SOMETIMES HARDLY EVER NEVER

b) In these situations, what do you usually do?

1) I'm the one who suggests it. (Check one).

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
NEVER HARDLY EVER SOMETIMES FAIRLY OFTEN VERY OFTEN

2) If the rest of the kids do it, I do it too. (Check one.)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
VERY OFTEN FAIRLY OFTEN SOMETIMES HARDLY EVER NEVER

3) I try to talk them out of it. (Check one.)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
NEVER HARDLY EVER SOMETIMES FAIRLY OFTEN VERY OFTEN

4) If they do it anyway, I tell a grown-up about it before it goes too far. (Check one.)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
VERY OFTEN FAIRLY OFTEN SOMETIMES HARDLY EVER NEVER

c) Think of some time when you did something with a group of friends which you knew you should not be doing. How did you feel about it afterwards? (Check the answer that fits best.)

I never really gave it another thought.
I felt it was not so bad because the other kids were doing it too.
I felt it wasn't right and worried a bit about it.
I felt pretty bad about it for a while.
Version B

Name _________________________________

School _______________________________

Grade _________________________________

Teacher _______________________________

Your age ______________________________

Your sex (circle one) boy girl
The Sick Friend

You and the kids you go around with have just started a game of cards with a friend who has been sick when someone remembers that it is the last day of the fair. None of you has had a chance to see it and it's supposed to be very good. If you all leave right away there would still be time to get there. The sick friend wouldn't be able to go, but the rest of your friends all seem to be going. They want you to go with them. What would you really do?

REFUSE TO GO WITH MY FRIENDS

GO ALONG WITH MY FRIENDS

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.
The Backwards Sweater

One day one of your friends whom everybody likes came to school with his sweater on backwards. This caught on, and soon all your friends are wearing sweaters the same way. They want you to do it too. Your parents don't say you can't do it, but you can see they'd like it better if you didn't wear your sweater backwards. What would you really do in this situation?

STOP WEARING THE SWEATER :: DRESS LIKE MY FRIENDS DO
LIKE MY FRIENDS DO ::

absolutely fairly I guess:: I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so :: so certain certain

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.
In your neighborhood a new family has moved in. They are from a foreign
country and have one child who is in your class at school. This kid understands
your language but doesn't say very much. In a few days it'll be Halloween and
you plan to go trick and treating with other kids in the neighborhood. Someone
asks if you should take this foreign kid along, but most of your friends are
against it. They say: "He doesn't know what it's all about yet; we'll take him
later when he speaks our language better." What would you really do in this
situation?

REFUSE TO GO ALONG WITH MY FRIENDS UNLESS THIS KID WAS INCLUDED
GO ALONG WITH THE REST OF MY FRIENDS

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain
The Broken Window

You and your friends are playing ball in a vacant lot next to a big building when one of the windows gets broken. The kids don't want to tell anyone about it so that they won't get into trouble. What would you really do?

TRY TO TALK:: LET EACH ONE DO
THE OTHERS INTO:: WHAT HE WANTS
REPORTING IT::

absolutely fairly I guess:: I guess fairly absolutely

certain certain so:: so certain certain

Now suppose all your friends start to go and want you to come with them. What would you really do?

GO WITH THEM:: REFUSE TO
:: GO WITH THEM

absolutely fairly I guess:: I guess fairly absolutely

certain certain so:: so certain certain

The next day the school principal calls you into his office. After asking about your part in it, he asks you for the names of the kids who were involved. What would you really do?

NOT:: TELL HIM THE NAMES

absolutely fairly I guess:: I guess fairly absolutely

certain certain so:: so certain certain

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.
The Movie

There's a movie playing downtown that all the kids think is real good. You and the rest of your friends are planning to see it. When you mention it to your parents, they're not very happy about your seeing this particular show. They haven't said you can't go, but it's obvious they'd like it better if you didn't. What would you really do?

TELL MY FRIENDS
I'D BETTER NOT GO

GO TO THE MOVIE
WITH MY FRIENDS

absolutely fairly I guess
absolutely fairly I guess
absolutely fairly absolutely

certain certain so
certain certain certain

certain certain certain

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.
Kids Playing Together

When a bunch of kids are playing together, they may do something which probably wouldn't do any real harm but which grown-ups might not approve of.

a) During the past year about how often has anything like this happened with the kids you go around with? (Check the answer that fits best.)

   ( )   ( )   ( )   ( )   ( )   ( )
   VERY OFTEN  FAIRLY OFTEN  SOMETIMES  HARDLY EVER  NEVER

b) In these situations, what do you usually do?

   1) I'm the one who suggests it. (Check one).

      ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
      NEVER  HARDLY EVER  SOMETIMES  FAIRLY OFTEN  VERY OFTEN

   2) If the rest of the kids do it, I do it too. (Check one.)

      ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
      VERY OFTEN  FAIRLY OFTEN  SOMETIMES  HARDLY EVER  NEVER

   3) I try to talk them out of it. (Check one.)

      ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
      NEVER  HARDLY EVER  SOMETIMES  FAIRLY OFTEN  VERY OFTEN

   4) If they do it anyway, I tell a grown-up about it before it goes too far. (Check one.)

      ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
      VERY OFTEN  FAIRLY OFTEN  SOMETIMES  HARDLY EVER  NEVER

c) Think of some time when you did something with a group of friends which you knew you should not be doing. How did you feel about it afterwards? (Check the answer that fits best.)

   ______ I never really gave it another thought.
   ______ I felt it was not so bad because the other kids were doing it too.
   ______ I felt it wasn't right and worried a bit about it.
   ______ I felt pretty bad about it for a while.
Version C

Name ________________________________

School ______________________________

Grade _______________________________

Teacher ______________________________

Your age ______________________________

Your sex (circle one) boy girl
You are playing an exciting game with some of your friends when suddenly you remember that you still have a little homework to do. If you stop playing now you will have time to do an extra good job. If you keep on playing you'll just barely be able to finish it. But if you stop now, you'll be disappointing your friends because it will break up the game. What would you really do?

NOT BREAK UP THE GAME

BREAK UP THE GAME

absolutely fairly I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so certain certain
The Old Sneakers

The kids that you go around with all like to wear old sneakers wherever they go. Your parents don't forbid you to wear sneakers, but it's obvious they'd like it better if you didn't. Your friends want you to keep on wearing them. What would you really do?

WEAR SNEAKERS LIKE MY FRIENDS DO

STOP WEARING SNEAKERS LIKE MY FRIENDS DO

absolutely  fairly  I guess  I guess  fairly  absolutely
certain   certain   so    so    certain   certain

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.
The Weird Kid

While you are on vacation you are staying near a big playground. You've made friends with some of the kids and are having lots of fun. While playing you notice a weird-looking kid your own age standing around watching you. He seems to want to join in. When you ask the other kids about him they say, "He's no fun." What would you really do in this situation?

TELL MY FRIENDS I WON'T PLAY UNLESS THIS KID IS INCLUDED

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely certain certain so so certain certain

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.
The Half-Fare Ticket

You are going to the movies with a bunch of your friends. Prices are cheaper for children under twelve. Some of the kids are a little over twelve and some under. Somebody says: "Let's all say we're under twelve and get the cheaper tickets." What would you really do?

Would you tell all the kids they should give their real ages, or would you leave it up to each one to do what he wants?

Let each one do what he wants: 
Tell them to give their real ages:

Absolutely fairly I guess: I guess fairly absolutely
Certainly certain so: so certain certain

Suppose all your friends decide to say they are under 12. You just had your twelfth birthday a couple of days ago. What would you really do?

Go along with the rest of my friends: 
Refuse to go along with the rest of my friends:

Absolutely fairly I guess: I guess fairly absolutely
Certainly certain so: so certain certain

You are the last one to get your ticket. The rest of the kids have already gone in when the ticket taker stops you. He asks you whether you are over twelve. After you answer, he says: "Some of the rest of your crowd looked over twelve to me." He asks which of the kids who went in are over twelve.

What would you really do?

Tell him which ones are over 12: 
Not tell him:

Absolutely fairly I guess: I guess fairly absolutely
Certainly certain so: so certain certain

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.
The TV Program

Tonight there are two TV programs showing at the same time. One of these is a program about your favorite hobby. The other is a comedy show that your friends like very much. You think it's O.K., but you don't learn anything from it. Your friends are all getting together to see the comedy show tonight, and they want you to come too. But if you do, you'll miss the program about your hobby. What would you really do?

SEE THE PROGRAM ABOUT MY HOBBY
SEE THE PROGRAM WITH MY FRIENDS

absolutely fairly I guess I guess fairly absolutely
certain certain so so certain certain

PLEASE DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL TOLD TO DO SO.
Kids Playing Together

When a bunch of kids are playing together, they may do something which probably wouldn't do any real harm but which grown-ups might not approve of.

a) During the past year about how often has anything like this happened with the kids you go around with? (Check the answer that fits best.)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
VERY OFTEN FAIRLY OFTEN SOMETIMES HARDLY EVER NEVER

b) In these situations, what do you usually do?

1) I'm the one who suggests it. (Check one).

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
NEVER HARDLY EVER SOMETIMES FAIRLY OFTEN VERY OFTEN

2) If the rest of the kids do it, I do it too. (Check one.)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
VERY OFTEN FAIRLY OFTEN SOMETIMES HARDLY EVER NEVER

3) I try to talk them out of it. (Check one.)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
NEVER HARDLY EVER SOMETIMES FAIRLY OFTEN VERY OFTEN

4) If they do it anyway, I tell a grown-up about it before it goes too far. (Check one.)

( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )
VERY OFTEN FAIRLY OFTEN SOMETIMES HARDLY EVER NEVER
e) Think of some time when you did something with a group of friends which you knew you should not be doing. How did you feel about it afterwards? (Check the answer that fits best.)

I never really gave it another thought.
I felt it was not so bad because the other kids were doing it too.
I felt it wasn't right and worried a bit about it.
I felt pretty bad about it for a while.
APPENDIX E

SCRIPT AND DIRECTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATOR
Moral Dilemma Questionnaire

Introduction

We are conducting a survey in which we want to find out the opinions of boys and girls your age. You will see a television film about boys and girls and situations in which they are involved. We would like to know your opinions about what children do in some situations. This is not a test. There are no right and wrong answers. We just want to know how children your age think and act. No one will see your answers except the people giving this test and then computers will figure out the results for us.

Before we begin, here are some important things to remember:

1. Answer for yourself. We want to know what's true for you, not for somebody else.

2. Don't look around. Even if you don't intend to you might see someone else's answer and be influenced by it and it's your opinion that we're interested in.

3. If at any time you don't understand what to do, or if we are going too fast, raise your hand and someone will come to you. Ask your questions quietly though, so as not to bother anyone else.
4. Sometimes a page may be missing. If you have any questions be sure to raise your hand and someone will come to help you.

First we want to get some simple information. Turn over the questionnaire on your desk. Let's start with the cover page. (Have the children complete the cover sheet information, reading each item aloud.) As you can see, we have written in your names. Please check to see that your name is the name on the questionnaire you have. Next fill in the name of your school. It is written here on the board so you can be sure that you are spelling it correctly. Next write in your grade, your teacher's name, and your age. Circle the word that tells if you are a boy or girl. Do not turn to the next page until you receive instructions to do so.

(When you see that the class is finished with the cover sheet, continue to the next set of directions.)

There are times when you get in a spot where it's hard to make up your mind but you still have to decide. We want to find out what kids do in cases like this. Here are some choices that kids might have to make. I will read an example to you and then ask you to say what you would really do.
(Read the practice story and write the scale on the board, and demonstrate the responses on the scale on the board.)

It's Saturday night, your parents are out and you don't expect them to come home before one o'clock in the morning. They told you that you could watch television until eleven o'clock and then you should go to bed. But at eleven o'clock you have just gotten really interested in a movie they are showing, which will run until after midnight. What would you really do?

GO TO BED RIGHT AWAY

| absolutely certain | fairly certain | I guess so | I guess | fairly certain | absolutely certain |

STAY AND WATCH LATE SHOW

On the board you can see a line with six spaces marked off on it and divided in the middle. On the left side, it says "Go to bed right away," and on the right side "Stay and watch late show."

You can think of this line as a kind of see-saw, with a balance point in the middle. You have to decide which side of this see-saw you would be on, and how far out from the middle. If it's hard to make up your mind, but you guess you would probably end up watching the late show, where would you mark your "X"?
(Go to blackboard and wait for correct answer from children.)

Yes. If you guess you would probably stay up, make an "X" or a check mark above "I guess so," to the right of the middle line. (Mark "X" in the appropriate place.)

The same rule would apply for the other side. For example, if you are fairly certain you would go to bed right away, but are not absolutely sure, where would you make your "X"? (Wait for child's response.)

Yes, then you would make your mark over "fairly certain," to the left of the balance point. (Mark "X" in the appropriate place.)

And if you were absolutely sure that you would stay up and watch the late show, where would you make your "X"? (Wait for a child's response.)

That's right; way over here, over "absolutely certain" on the side that says "Stay up and watch late show." (Make "X" in an appropriate place.)

Remember, first you decide which side of the see-saw you're on and then the surer you are about what you would really
do, the farther out on the see-saw you should make your mark. Now think about the situation we have just talked about, the television program and think about what you would really do.

Now you will read some of these, and each person will put down his or her own answers. If you have any questions, raise your hand. Turn the page now and read the next situation. If you need help raise your hand. Don't look at what the other children are marking on their papers. Just answer what is true for you. (Walk about room and answer any questions.) When you have finished all the pages on your questionnaire just turn the page over and wait quietly for the rest of the class to continue. (If acceptable to the classroom teacher, the children may read books that they have in their desks.) (Walk about the room and collect the tests when the class has finished the test.)

Now we are going to see a television program which shows some situations which might happen to children.

(Play videotape "I Dare You." At completion of the videotape pass out next set of questionnaires. If the class is participating in the discussion refer to the discussion script and conduct the discussion before distributing the
Now we are going to answer a questionnaire that is very similar to the first questionnaire. Remember we are interested in knowing what you think about situations in which children may find themselves. If you have any questions raise your hands. (Walk about class to answer any questions. Collect tests, thank class for their help and cooperation in this survey.)
Retention Test

(Tests should be distributed on the desks face-down.)

We were very interested in the opinions you expressed last week and thought you might help us with some further information. I'd like to review the way in which we mark this questionnaire. Remember these are your opinions. They have proved to be very valuable in understanding what boys and girls really think. They will not be shared with your parents or your teacher. (Write scale on board.)

Now remember that we think of this line as a see-saw. Start in the middle with "I guess so" and decide which way you want to have the see-saw balance. Let me read the sample question to you again and let's mark the opinion together. (Refer to the steps outlined on page 3 on administering the scale.)

Remember these are your private and personal questions. Do not look at your neighbor's ideas. There are different tests and your opinion may be influenced by another person's answers. If you have any questions please raise your hand and I will try to help you. You may go ahead until you finish the questionnaires and take as long as you need. (Walk around class to help when needed. Collect tests when all are completed and thank class for their cooperation.)
INSTRUCTIONS FOR ASSISTANTS

I. Before Entering the Classroom
1. Check with your administrator to be sure you have the three different
questionnaires and understand in which order they are to be used. Note
that all three questionnaires are not passed out at the same time.
questionnaire no. 2.
2. All questionnaires are to be passed out face down so that the children
do not begin to work on them until told to do so.
3. Questionnaires should be collected as soon as a child raises his hand
indicating he is finished. When collecting, make sure every questionnaire
has the child's name on it.

II. Before Beginning the Experiment
1. Put the dilemma scale, for the example, on the blackboard before the
session starts.
2. See that you have:
   a) Extra copies of each questionnaire
   b) A supply of sharpened pencils
3. Separate the children as much as possible. Leave space in the front of
the room so that the administrator and assistants can face the children.
4. Pass out Questionnaire no. 1, face down, a piece of scrap paper and a
sharpened pencil to each child.

III. During the Administration
1. In the event a child is missing a page from his questionnaire, tear out
a sheet from the extra questionnaires supplied each class, put his name
on it, and attach it to the main questionnaire with a paper clip.
2. In the event a child has an extra sheet, simply tear it out.
3. When a child raises his hand, go to him as quickly as possible. Have
him ask his question in a whisper and answer him in a whisper, so that
neither question nor answer can affect the responses of other children.
4. Watch for any child who is getting behind and help him. If more than
one child is getting behind signal the administrator that he is going
too fast.
5. If a child is copying say:
   1) The first time: "Don't look around so that you see other people's
      papers. We want to know your own answer. Besides the answer sheets
      are not the same."
   2) The second time: "If you look at other people's answers, we'll
      have to change your score." And from then on let him see you are
      watching him closely.
6. If a child has to leave, encourage him to finish materials. If necessary,
   go with him to finish up.
APPENDIX F
SCRIPT FOR DISCUSSION
Script for Discussion

You've just seen a program in which a girl is faced with a dilemma just as real boys and girls face in their lives at one time or another. Have any of you ever been in situations such as the one Clarissa was in? What did you do when you were in that situation? What do you think that Clarissa should have done in this situation? What do you think is the right way to handle situations in which you are faced with a choice of being honest or of going along with your friends? What could be the consequence of some of your actions if you didn't do the right things?

(Try to elicit answers from the children that will generate a positive slant toward prosocial values. When the children have discussed the questions of making positive choices at length, conclude the discussion period by saying...)

Thanks for giving me your ideas about the right way to handle difficult situations. You'll now be given a second questionnaire. Please keep the questionnaire face down until you're told to turn it over. Answer the questions in the same way you did in the first questionnaire. Remember there are no wrong or right answers. We are
interested in your answers. If you have any questions just raise your hands.
APPENDIX G

CODE SHEET
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial #</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1, 2, 3,</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 #'s</td>
<td>0 thru 124 (Student Values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SCH</td>
<td>School Code</td>
<td>1 - HZlt, 2 - Chs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ETH</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>1 - Hispanic, 2 - Black, 3 - Asian, 4 - Other White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1 - Male, 2 - Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1 - 9, 2 - 10, 3 - 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>IQ Estimate</td>
<td>1 - Gifted, 2 - High, 3 - Medium 4 - Low, 5 - EH, 6 - No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>DATEA</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>1 - November 19, 1980 2 - November 20, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TIMEA</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>1 - 8:30, 2 - 10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PRE</td>
<td>Pretest Form</td>
<td>1 - A, 2 - B, 3 - C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14</td>
<td>XPRE</td>
<td>Score X</td>
<td>0 thru 42, 99 = missing values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15, 16</td>
<td>YPRE</td>
<td>Score Y</td>
<td>0 thru 29, 99 = missing values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>TRT</td>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1 - Yes, 2 - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>DIS</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>1 - Yes, 2 - No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Post test Form</td>
<td>1 - A, 2 - B, 3 - C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20, 21</td>
<td>XPOST</td>
<td>Score X</td>
<td>0 thru 42, 99 = missing values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22, 23</td>
<td>YPOST</td>
<td>Score Y</td>
<td>0 thru 29, 99 = missing values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>Date Reten</td>
<td>1 - November 28, 1980 2 - November 29, 1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>Time Reten</td>
<td>1 - 8:30, 2 - 10:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>RET</td>
<td>Retention Form</td>
<td>1 - A, 2 - B, 3 - C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27, 28</td>
<td>XRET</td>
<td>Score X</td>
<td>0 thru 42, 99 = missing values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29, 30</td>
<td>YRET</td>
<td>Score Y</td>
<td>0 thru 29, 99 = missing values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

PROTOCOL INFORMATION
March 17, 1980

Dear Dr. Fox,

Dr. Donald Wood of California State University, Northridge has suggested that I contact you concerning the television series Inside/Out produced by NIT.

I am writing my Master's thesis on the effectiveness of this program in affecting attitude change and in influencing value formation.

I am interested in finding out what studies have been carried out, where I could obtain information regarding these studies, and what type of research has been conducted on this series.

I would like to call you on the morning of March 26 and would appreciate any information that you could give me.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
From: Robert W. Fox

Sharon Carney:

Here are your six programs and a teacher's guide from Inside/Out. I trust they will be useful to you.

When you see Don Wood please give him a personal hello from me.

Take care.

8-20-80
Dear Ms. Carney:

In response to your request for Dr. Bronfenbrenner's moral dilemma experiment, we are sending you the research packet. This packet includes the questionnaire forms for the dilemma experiment and instructions for its administration.

The experimental design eliminates possible confounding by schools, forms and order of condition. It is essential that Forms X, Y, and Z be given so as not to create a content bias in the experimental conditions. It is also important to administer the questionnaire forms X, Y, and Z to the same child under the three different conditions to obtain a true measure.

Please feel free to contact us in the future should you have any questions regarding the administration of the experiment or the analysis procedure.

Sincerely yours,

Elizabeth Kiely
Research Specialist

Enclosures
November 26, 1980

As principal of __________________ School I have familiarized myself with the work being performed by Sharon Carney. Recognizing the potential educational value of this work I have granted permission for Miss Carney to involve the fifth grade students of [deleted] and [deleted] classes as participants in Miss Carney's master's thesis research project conducted on November 18 and November 25, 1980.

__________________________
Principal

Note: Names of individuals have been deleted to preserve the confidentiality of participant population.
November 26, 1980

As principal of _________ Street School I have familiarized myself with the work being performed by Sharon Carney. Recognizing the potential educational value of this work I have granted permission for Miss Carney to involve the fifth grade students of _______ and _______ classes as participants in Miss Carney's master's thesis research project conducted on November 19 and November 26, 1980.

__________________
Principal

Note: Names of individuals have been deleted to preserve the confidentiality of participant population.
APPENDIX I

DESIGN OBJECTIVES FOR INSIDE/OUT
Design Objectives for Inside/Out

1. To promote the well-being of children.
2. To involve the student in valuing and decision-making rather than presenting rules for living.
3. To help the student understand that the way a person lives, the kinds of decisions he makes, and how he feels are important to his well-being.
4. To help children become aware of what positive action human beings must take to live their lives as well as they can.
5. To help children develop personal convictions.
6. To help children make wise decisions in the face of conflicting emotions and group pressure.
7. To help children decide questions involving a choice between risk and safety, personal belief and group pressure.
8. To help children recognize that freedom and responsibility are part of growing up.
APPENDIX J

ALTERNATIVE DESIGN STRATEGY
Sample Population

Fourth Grades
Pre-Test
Neutral Treatment
Post-Test
Teacher Evaluation
Retention Test
Delayed Retention
TIME - One Week

Fifth Grades
Pre-Test
Neutral Treatment
Post-Test
Retention Test
Delayed Retention
TIME - Five Months

Sixth Grades
Pre-Test
Treatment
Post-Test
Retention Test
Delayed Retention

CLASS A (control)

CLASS B (control)

CLASS C

CLASS D

TIME - One Week

Parent Evaluation