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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. Significance of the Problem

With the extensive and ever-expanding exposure of youth to motion pictures, a more sensitive value system, particularly in aesthetics, as well as sharpened skills in critical thinking become significant factors in the educative process. The basis for such a statement rests in the fact that at present we have a plethora of movie-goers; what we lack is a proportionate number of movie-critics. The change will be effected through a discriminatory faculty: the ability to appreciate and discern truth and beauty in the art of the cinema. Such a disposition presupposes learning and insights that establish criteria for forming a hierarchy of values and making judgments.

The value of this thesis rests on the basic assumption that motion pictures have a place in the high school curriculum. The specific area within the curriculum that seems most suited for the study of motion pictures is the English program. This is not a novel suggestion. As early as 1940 such a proposal was made by Hardy R. Finch who believed that

the time has come for the definite placement of the motion picture in the curriculum. Therefore, I propose that teachers of English who are interested in the motion picture develop courses on this
subject and incorporate them as part of the secondary school curriculum.¹

The movement to actually incorporate a course on motion pictures for approved credit has been flagrantly retarded. Up to the present, educators have been generally content to acknowledge a place to cinema study mostly in the area of extra-curricular study. Motion picture study clubs are common activities for after-school hours. Until it is a recognized area of study, however, the motion picture seems to be somewhat of an appendage for schools—and a presumably dispensable one at that.

It seems strange that as contemporary to our society as the motion picture is, it is relegated a secondary consideration in education in lieu of the medieval forms of the ballad, the epic, and other archaic art forms. Of course these latter forms have established their value as artistic expressions of and connoters of wisdom, beauty, and truth. At present, the motion picture is involved in establishing its credits. The task of researchers today is to determine the film's efficacy in changing values, accelerating achievement, modifying behavior, and influencing learning. The task of educators today is to study the findings of research, determine their relevancy to meeting our students' needs, and then pursue the course of action which will expeditiously fit research within the operative context of educational needs. Within this framework, the motion picture has some degree of legitimacy—the exact degree is still debateable.

At the outset it would seem wise to give the assurance that in considering

¹Hardy R. Finch, "Motion Picture Activities in the School," The English Journal (June, 1940), 469.
the motion picture as part of the secondary English program the value of literary study is not threatened. On the contrary, in some cases the value of works of literature may very well be enhanced by insights gleaned through study of the film. In other instances, study of the motion picture can be a response to Violet Edwards' challenge to find "vital things in our pupils' lives with which we can work, linking up these with the required subject matter of our so-called traditional or progressive courses." And then there is simply the value of the motion picture as part of an English curriculum for the sake of expanding the students' appreciation of an art form. Unfortunately, the movie as an art form is still in an embryonic stage of appreciation. Commenting on this state of affairs, E.J. Shoben observes:

... it is hard to find serious and sustained instances in which school curricula have given vigorous attention to the basic problem, the development in children of an informed and discriminatory taste for cinematic art. The appreciation of the film has seldom occupied teachers with anything even resembling the intensity with which the appreciation of literature, the visual arts, or music has; nor can one identify many schools in which... the words "art" and "movie" are used in the same sentence.

Although Shoben's comments were intended for the college situation, they seem just as pertinent, if not more so, for the secondary school. Just as we have borrowed his observation of the current state of affairs, so can we borrow his recommendation:

2Violet Edwards, "Developing Critical Thinking through Motion Pictures and Newspapers," The English Journal, XXIX (April, 1940), 302.

3E.J. Shoben, "Seeing and Hearing," Teacher College Record (October, 1964), 54.
The time is ripe for a novel and constructive revision of curricula that would contribute importantly to the building of a more informed and tasteful, and therefore, a more demanding and responsive audience for the cinema.  

In similar words the Vatican Secretariat voices the recommendation that there be established in schools, as in organizations for youths and adults, groups to study the art of the motion picture. By developing the critical sense, by refining the tastes and raising the cultural level of their members, these groups can render tremendous service in teaching how to judge films, and how to use them in a human and Christian manner.

Sensitive to the implications of the above recommendations and those of other authorities, a pilot study was initiated in a private high school to concretize an effort to realize that the cinema is an art, which more than any other, speaks for our age and to our age.

II. Statement of the Problem

Within the framework of this pilot study, an experimental design was structured to answer the following questions:

1. What are the patterns of values of a group of high school seniors who are typical of the general senior class population?
2. After a six weeks study of the motion picture, what changes, if any, were effected in the primary life values?
3. What changes, if any, were effected in critical thinking skills?
4. By the end of the course, what differences, if any exist between the experimental group and the control group?

Ibid., p. 55.

Vatican Secretariat, Pius XII.
5. Are there significant sex differences in value patterns and in critical thinking?

III. Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study two operational definitions must be presented, that of "critical thinking" and of "values." For a definition of "critical thinking" that proposed by Watson and Glaser seems most suitable. They view critical thinking as a composite of skills, attitudes and knowledge. The authors specify these components to be:

1) attitudes of inquiry that involve an ability to recognize the existence of problems and an acceptance of the general need for evidence in support of what is asserted to be true;

2) knowledge of the nature of valid inferences, abstractions, and generalizations in which the weight or accuracy of different kinds of evidence are logically determined; and

3) skills in employing and applying the above attitudes and knowledge. 6

The term "values" should be taken to mean basic interests or motives in personality, specifically six: theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political and religious. This classification, adopted by the authors of the "Study of Values" and based on Eduard Spranger's work, Types of Men, has its deficiencies as noted by the authors:

He (Spranger) does not allow for formless or valueless personalities, nor for those who follow an expedient or hedonistic philosophy of life. The neglect of sheeuly sensuous values is a special weakness

in his typology. His attempt to reduce hedonistic choices partly to economic and partly to aesthetic values seems unconvincing. If the present scale appears to the users to take a somewhat exalted view of the organization of personality—neglecting both the "baser" values and values that are not permitted to reach the level of conscious choice—the limitations must be regarded as inherent in Spranger's original formulation.7

Despite the limited sense of "values" within the confines of this taxonomy, such a definition is most functional for this study because of the instrument used to measure values.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Since the early part of the century there has been evidenced an interest in the motion picture as a valuable type of instructional medium. As the incorporation of the motion picture into the classroom has been effected, research studies have kept pace so as to relate to interested educators the value of movies within the curriculum. As early as 1915 considerations were given to the role of motion pictures in the classroom. The initial work in the field was given impetus by the work of L.A. Averill who indicated the inherent value of films. ¹ The general trends of investigation from that point to the present have been summarized in a number of synopses relevant to audio-visual educational use. Significant summaries in this area include the Kinder Summary of 1939, ² the report of the American Council Committee on Motion Pictures, ³ the 1950 Hoban-Van Ormer bibliography which summarizes instructional film research


from 1918 to 1950, and most recently, the 1964 work of MacLennan and Reid which summarizes the research on instructional television and films from 1950 to the present.

Research on audio-visual media has been particularly prolific during the last twenty years. In reviewing the literature related to this study, it would seem necessary for organizational clarity to divide the researched material into two areas: that research which deals with 1) the effectiveness of the film regarding special subjects, various grade levels, and achievement; 2) the effectiveness of films in developing attitudes or values and critical thinking. A dearth of research exists in studies which specifically examine the motion picture as a subject in the educational curriculum; that is, although the film has been researched as an adjunct to a particular subject, for example, history, scant evidence could be found of films being studied as a separate subject with covering measurement and evaluation.

Both Wendt and Cottle experimented in the acceleration of world history classes on the secondary level through the use of films. In Wendt's study the


5Donald W. MacLennan and Christopher J. Reid, Abstracts of Research on Instructional Television and Films (Stanford University: Institute for Communications Research, 1964).


experimental group was able to learn as much as the control group in just half the time: they were shown films and were able to cover the material of the course in one semester; the control group took one full year to cover the same material without the use of the films. Additional research by Cottle indicated that the effect of films was equally as good for high achievers and low achievers. This auxiliary study which Cottle made also involved 10th graders in a world history class.

Also in the area of achievement, Caspers found that achievement gains increased with the number of films used in a psychology course. In contrast, Homman who tested the relative effectiveness of film and non-film instruction of high school chemistry found that eleven of the twenty hypotheses tested indicated that non-film students' achievement scores were significantly higher than were film students' scores. The other nine hypotheses indicated no significant differences.

Perhaps the discrepancy between Caspers and Homman can be somewhat resolved by consideration of the intelligence factor. Can the increase or the inertness of achievement, in the use of films, be significantly influenced by I.Q.? One of the conclusions of Sister M. Jamesetta Slatterypertinent to the signifi-


10Sister M. Jamesetta Slattery, "An Appraisal of the Effectiveness of Selected Instructional Sound Motion Pictures and Silent Filmstrips in Elementary School Instruction" (Doctor's thesis, Catholic University, 1953).
cance of I.Q. in learning from films was that pupils of higher intelligence attained correspondingly higher scores in achievement. Also, with the fifth grade pupils she tested, filmstrips were significantly more effective than sound motion pictures.

Besides achievement in course material, the teaching of various skills is also a major context within which the motion picture has been researched. Film loops were used by Stein for instruction in a beginning typing class at the high school level. He found that the experimental group became more rapid typists, but the control group were more accurate. Harby, in determining the relative effectiveness of film loops with face-to-face demonstrations of tumbling, concluded that a filmed demonstration is at least as effective as a face-to-face demonstration. The findings of Drury, however, would not concede even that much effectiveness to films. He taught beginning tumbling to college freshmen using motion pictures but could find no significant difference in acquiring the skill of tumbling from using films than from any other method of teaching tumbling. Hirsch reported non-significant differences in the use


of films for the teaching of marksmanship when compared to the efforts of the best instructors teaching marksmanship.

In the realm of motion pictures and attitudes, Charters acted as chairman for a series of studies sponsored by the Payne Fund during the thirties. Conclusions included the assertion that attitudes of high school boys and girls can be changed by means of motion pictures.15

Lewin16 conducted a study for the National Council of Teachers in English. Sixty-eight groups of high school students in twenty-eight different cities participated in the study. He sought to ascertain:

1) if movie habits of adolescents can be improved significantly through the medium of the English class;
2) whether discussion of photoplays can develop more wholesome ideals and attitudes;
3) whether satisfactory literary experiences can be achieved through the cinema.

Results of the study indicated the experimental groups to be superior to the control group in three ways:

1) in answering the final questionnaire, the experimental groups were superior to the control group;
2) in ranking photoplays the experimental groups were closer to the teachers' criteria with a correlation of .59 as against .41 for the control groups;
3) in rating ten pictures at the end of the experiment, the experimental groups were closer to the teachers' rating with a correlation of .96 as against .63 for the control groups.

Wickline\textsuperscript{17} studied 10th, 11th and 12th graders and motivational films. He concluded that the experimental group, after seeing motivational films, showed a non-significant positive change from pretesting to posttesting. The attitudes of the control group changed significantly to a more negative position from pretesting to posttesting. Generally, there were no significant differences between pretesting and posttesting scores for males or females, except for the control group males who changed significantly more negatively.

Merrill\textsuperscript{18} experimented with attitude films' effect on attitudes. Attitude films were defined as films "devoted to sounds, speech and pictures intended to wake a mood, to give a sense of reality or to create suspense. Customarily, the attempt to shift or reinforce attitudes is developed through a dramatic plot ..." His findings indicate that the initial effect of attitude films is manipulation of the cognitive component of attitude. Attitude films do not communicate "pure" effect.

One reference that was found to a situation in which the motion picture was taught as a separate course within a junior high school English program was reported by Sister M. Luke.\textsuperscript{19} By means of a test in the middle of the unit and one administered at the end, Sister concluded that greater insights in

\textsuperscript{17}Lee E. Wickline, "The Use of Motivational Films to Favorably Change the Attitudes of High School Students toward Science and Scientists," USOE project #729 (Charleston, W. Virginia Department of Education, 1962).


\textsuperscript{19}Sister Mary Luke, "Shouldn't We Teach Them the Movies?" \textit{Education}, 84 (January, 1964), 310-312.
aesthetic appreciations and critical discrimination were achieved by the students. Upon closer investigation, however, through correspondence with Sister, it was found that her study was not executed within the limits of an experimental design; that is, there were no controls, no attempts to measure or evaluate, etc.

In 1955 Bledsoe²⁰ conducted a "Comparative Study of Values and Critical Thinking Skills of a Group of Educational Workers." The design of the study is strikingly similar to the study of this thesis, including the choice of measuring instruments and the procedure. There are, however, the following important differences: in Bledsoe's study the group observed was a class of graduate students enrolled in a research methodology course; the purpose of his study was to compare the value and critical thinking scores of the group of graduate students without comparing these scores to those of any control group. Results of the study included the fact that there was no appreciable gain in scores of the "Study of Values" but there was some significant gain in scores of the "Critical Thinking Appraisal."

From this review of the literature in the field, it can be seen that there has been research concerning the use of films in the classroom, moreover, this research is not in merely an embryonic stage of development, but its beginnings can be traced to the early part of the century. Research pertinent to the motion picture as a separate course of study, however, which is overviewed and evaluated in terms of an experimental situation, is not evident. The writings

that can be found on the subject of motion pictures as a separate course in the curriculum are in the line of encouragement for such courses, citing the values of such courses, the need for them, etc. Characteristic of such writings is that of K.G. Collier who sees using good films as a field and method of study which will contribute to moral growth of students in a form that "bites into the students' mind and provokes strong views and judgments of his own, and which can be studied under a system that builds mainly on discussion and independent work by the student."²¹ Shoben bemoans the fact that the motion picture's growth in our curriculum is retarded, but he realistically shows an awareness of the stumbling blocks involved in the use of films in the classroom, such as, the expense, the inconvenience of presenting a film, etc.²²

In a survey of motion picture appreciation conducted by Ohio State, 154 teachers were questioned and unanimously agreed that every child should be required to spend time in high school studying standards so as to help in choosing better standards. Of the group, 152 teachers felt it would make people critical of present movies. In considering the formulation of attitudes through films the researchers commented:

Controlled experiments in the latter area have been too few and too poorly organized to provide any convincing objective data. Of gen-


²² Shoben, p. 55.
eral opinions there are many and they point preponderantly to effectiveness of the film in helping to mold attitudes in such emotional-intellectual areas as racial-religious tolerance, international viewpoints, and social and economic sensitivity and understanding.23

It seems too that regard for the film's utilization in the classroom is not singular to our country alone. In England, for example, the government decided to double the budget on the British Film Institute. This was the Institute which during the summer of 1964 ran a seminar having as a thematic point suggestions for art and commercial films' useful approaches in our schools. It was reported at that time that British schools are doing little more than showing and discussing isolated films:

In universities almost nothing is being done, though at London, film can be studied in the Extra Mural Department. The most promising development is in the training colleges. The College of the Venerable Bede at Durham runs film as a main course, and as an optional subject it will begin next year at Eastbourne.24

The seminar was one definite effort to point to the actual state of affairs and then move in a direction of reassessment and reconstruction.

Although consideration of films as a course of study is too often limited to a kind of subjective treatment of educated conjectures and opinion-making, this type of writing has its place. It may be influential in encouraging the research of empirical data. The present study constitutes one small effort to assess movies as a curriculum unit and to contribute quantitative and qualitative data relevant to such assessment.


24The Times, Educational Supplement, August 28, 1964, 265.
CHAPTER III
ORGANIZATIONAL PLAN AND PROCEDURE

I. Hypothesis

The hypothesis for this study has been formulated as a null hypothesis. Acceptance of this hypothesis is to conclude that the observed difference is due to chance; rejection of the hypothesis is to conclude that the difference is real or nonchance. The specific null hypothesis proposed for this study is: at the completion of a six weeks course on the motion picture, no significant changes are effected in the participating high school seniors' pattern of values or skill in critical thinking. To reject the null hypothesis differences of mean scores from pretesting to posttesting must reach the 5% level of significance.

II. Sample

One hundred high school seniors were originally included in the study: fifty in the experimental group and fifty in the control group. At the school of the pilot study there were approximately two hundred seniors being taught the course on motion pictures. From this total senior class an experimental group of fifty students was randomly selected, using a table of random numbers.
The control group was selected from the senior class of a high school in a neighboring city. This high school seemed a valid population from which to select a control group that would be comparably matched with the seniors of the experimental group; both schools are co-educational, employ the same general four-year program for their English curriculum, and draw their enrollment from the same socio-economic strata.

The groups comprising the experimental design were equated on the basis of intelligence scores. The equating process reduced the original number of subjects to ninety-four-five in each group. There were twenty-three males and twenty-two females in the experimental group; there were twenty-one males and twenty-four females in the control group.

III. Experimental Design

The design of the study was set up according to the pretest-posttest technique. The variable represented in the design was that of student participation in a six-weeks course on the motion picture. Participation included adherence to standard academic requirements regarding regular attendance at lectures and discussions, the use of textbooks, and the submission of assignments.

IV. Instruments Used

As part of the pretesting both groups were administered the "Otis Quick Scoring Mental Ability Test" (Gamma Test, Form FM) which served as the instrument for equating the experimental group and the control group. The Otis is designed to measure mental ability, thinking power and mental maturity. Norms for the test are based on the distribution of scores for approximately 120,000
adults, 18 years of age and older. The test consists of eighty mixed items, some verbal, some arithmetical, and some spatial. There is a time limit of thirty minutes for the test.

The second test administered during the pretesting was the "Allport, Vernon, Lindsey Study of Values" (1960 edition). The purpose of this test is to measure the relative prominence of six basic interests or motives in personality: the theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious—a classification based on Eduard Spranger's Types of Men. The following statements summarize the descriptions of each type given by the authors of the "Study of Values":

Theoretical - This person has a keen interest in the discovery of truth. Characteristically he seeks to observe and to reason. His attitude toward life is cognitive; that is, there is a search for identities and differences. This person strives to order and to systematize knowledge.

Economic - This person is basically interested in what is useful and tends to regard unapplied knowledge as waste. He is likely to confuse luxury with beauty. Regarding persons this individual would be more interested in surpassing them with wealth than in dominating them.

Aesthetic - This person finds his chief interest in the artistic episodes of life. A characteristic tendency is toward individualism and self-sufficiency. When political activity represses the person's individuality, he would oppose such activity. This person is likely to confuse beauty with purer religious experience.

Social - This person prizes other individuals as ends rather than as means, and would probably think of economic and theoretical attitudes as cold and inhuman. This person can be described as kind, sympathetic, and unselfish with a tendency to regard love as the only suitable form of human relationships.

Political - This person shows leadership among peers. Competition and struggle play a significant part in this person's life. A primary personal interest is in power.
Religious - This person actively and eagerly participates in life. An attempt is made to comprehend the cosmos as a whole. The direction of this person is toward the creation of the highest value experience.¹

The test consists of a number of questions based upon familiar situations to which are provided two alternative answers in Part I and four alternative answers in Part II. In all, twenty responses are given for each of the six values. Preferences are recorded numerically for each alternative answer. The scores for each value are summed and then a simple correction is applied. The corrected score represents a score for that type of value. Twenty minutes is the usual time required for the test.

The last test to be administered during the pretesting was the 1964 edition of the "Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal" (form ZM). As described in the Manual, the test requires the "application of some of the important abilities involved in critical thinking ... consisting of five subtests designed to measure different, though interdependent, aspects of critical thinking."² Each form, YM and ZM, consists of 100 items. These items compose the five subtests: inference (twenty items), recognition of assumptions (16 items), deduction (25 items), interpretation (24 items), and evaluation of arguments (15 items). The time required for the appraisal is usually fifty minutes.

¹Allport, Vernon, Lindzey, p. 3.
²Watson, Glaser, p. 2.
During the posttesting the "Study of Values" was re-administered. As there is no alternate form to this inventory of interests, the test was identical to that of the pretesting. For the "Critical Thinking Appraisal," however, an alternate form was used during the posttesting.

The final test administered during the posttesting was a movie inventory constructed by the investigator. The inventory consists of twenty-five multiple choice items, 13 of which pertain to cognitive insights and 14 to affective preferences (see Tables 7 and 8 for division of items). Items were considered to be cognitive or affective on the basis of distinctions made by Krathwohl, Bloom and Masia:

Cognitive: . . . emphasize remembering or reproducing something which has presumably been learned, as well as objectives which involve the solving of some intellective task for which the individual has to determine the essential problem and then reorder given material or combine it with ideas, methods, or procedures previously learned. ²

Affective: . . . emphasize a feeling tone, an emotion, or a degree of acceptance or rejection. Affective objectives vary from simple attention to selected phenomena to complex but internally consistent qualities of character and conscience. ³

From the book Film and School information was found that contributed to


³Ibid., p. 7.
the construction of item 5, item 6, item 7, item 8, and item 11. Item 25 was based on information given in Dynamics of Film how to Do Its published by the Film Council of America provided material for item 4. From the readings and illustrations found in the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, item 4, item 15, item 16, item 20, and item 22 were constructed. The balance of the items, that is, items 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23 and 24, were constructed on the basis of general readings of the investigator.

The preferred response to each statement was determined by the investigator. These responses were not weighted. The results of the movie inventory

6Ibid., p. 122.
7Ibid., p. 123.
8Ibid.,
9Ibid., p. 135.
11Robertson Sillars, "How to Evaluate Films for Community Use," How to Do Its, pamphlet no. 7 (Chicago: Film Council of America, 1948), 10.
12Krathwohl et al., p. 137.
13Ibid., p. 137.
14Ibid., p. 141.
15Ibid., p. 149.
16Ibid., p. 153.
is represented by a raw score.

V. Course Taught

The course on motion pictures, required of all seniors, had as its broad objective: teaching the film as an art form. Among the more detailed objectives were acquaintance with basic terminology, technique and history of the film; development of skills to effectively criticize and evaluate films both orally and in written form. Procedures employed during the course included lectures, discussions, oral and written critiques. The course was taught jointly by a team of two teachers.

VI. Acquiring the Data

As the purpose of the experiment was to compare the pattern of values and the critical thinking skills of the students both before and after exposure to the course on the motion picture, arrangements were made for pretesting and posttesting. The pretest was given to the experimental group and the control group on successive mornings. This first battery of tests, that is, the "Study of Values," the "Otis Quick Scoring Mental Abilities Test" and the "Critical Thinking Appraisal" (form ZM), was administered to both groups by the investigator one week before the commencement of the course. The posttests were also administered by the investigator to both groups on successive mornings, during the final week of the six weeks course. Posttesting consisted of administering the "Study of Values," the "Critical Thinking Appraisal" (form YM), and the teacher-made inventory.

After the collection of the data, measures of central tendency and varia-
bility were computed on such variables as exposure to the course and sex.
Gains in scores from pretesting to posttesting were measured by differences in
mean scores. Results were expressed in terms of "t" values and levels of
significance.
As reported previously, the experimental group and the control group were equated on the basis of intelligence scores. Table 1 indicates further that the two groups were equated on the basis of a comparison of scores from the "Study of Values" and the "Critical Thinking Appraisal." Using the "t" test, the differences between mean scores for the experimental group and the control group were found to be non-significant. The only value showing a slight significance was "religious" on which the control group's higher mean indicated a 10% level of significance for differences on that particular subscale.

Data from the posttesting (Table 2) indicates that at the end of the period during which the variable, a course on motion pictures, was introduced to the experimental group, the experimental group and the control group remained comparable. There were no significant differences whatsoever in comparing mean scores for the "Study of Values" and the "Critical Thinking Appraisal," including that of the "religious" subscale which had showed a difference, slightly significant, on the pretest.

In contrast to Tables 1 and 2 which measured the differences between the
TABLE 1.—Comparison of the experimental group and the control group on the "Study of Values" and the "Critical Thinking Appraisal" (pretest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Exp. (N=45)</th>
<th>Mean Cont. (N=45)</th>
<th>S.D. Exp.</th>
<th>S.D. Cont.</th>
<th>Value of &quot;t&quot;</th>
<th>Level of significance *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study of Values</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Critical Thinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal (ZM)</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For a .05 level of significance a "t" value of 1.99 is needed; for a .01 level of significance a "t" value of 2.64 is needed.
TABLE 2.—Comparison of the experimental group and the control group on the "Study of Values" and the "Critical Thinking Appraisal" (posttest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study of Values</th>
<th>Mean Exp. (N=45)</th>
<th>S.D. Exp.</th>
<th>Mean Cont. (N=45)</th>
<th>S.D. Cont.</th>
<th>Value of &quot;t&quot;</th>
<th>Level of significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>non-significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal (YM)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For a .05 level of significance a "t" value of 1.99 is needed; for a .01 level of significance a "t" value of 2.64 is needed.
two groups at the time of pretesting and of posttesting, Table 3 shows the differences, within each group, from pretesting to posttesting. Regarding the "Study of Values," neither the experimental group nor the control group showed any significant differences between mean scores from pretesting to posttesting. On the "Critical Thinking Appraisal," however, differences from pretest to posttest were at the 1% level of significance for the experimental group and .1% level of significance for the control group. These levels of significance can be misleading, however, if attention is not called to the fact of the test constructors' procedure of equi-percentile equating in which a raw score on one form is considered to be equivalent to a raw score having the same percentile rank on the other form. It could happen, for example, that a difference in raw scores should be attributed to differences in the two forms of the test rather than to changes in the individuals tested with both forms.\(^1\) With this procedure of equating forms in mind, the differences between means takes on a new dimension.

The experimental group's mean for the pretest placed the group at the 58th percentile. Their score on the posttest was equivalent to that of the pretest so that their rank for the posttest remained at the 58th percentile. For the control group some gain did occur in percentile rank from pretest to posttest. On the pretest, their mean score ranked them at the 58th percentile, the same as the experimental group, but on the posttest their score was not equivalent to but higher than that of the pretest, thus raising their percent-

\(^1\)Watson, Glaser, P. 8.
TABLE 3.--Comparison of changes on mean scores from pretesting to posttesting for the experimental group and the control group on the "Study of Values" and the "Critical Thinking Appraisal"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP (N=45)</th>
<th>CONTROL GROUP (N=45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
<td>Pre Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For a .05 level of significance a "t" value of 2.02 is needed; for a .01 level of significance a "t" value of 2.70 is needed.
TABLE 4.—Changes in percentile rank on the "Critical Thinking Appraisal"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP</th>
<th>CONTROL GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre %ile</td>
<td>Post %ile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entire Group</strong></td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N = 22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Posttest percentile rank minus pretest percentile rank
tile rank to the 60th percentile.

Table 3 by itself, then, is misleading if one doesn't take into account the equating of raw scores by percentile rank. Although the table is valid for indicating differences in means by way of the "t" test, it can create a false impression of the actual gains effected.

To offset the incorrect impression that may be given by using only the "t" test to report differences in mean scores on the "Critical Thinking Appraisal," Table 4 shows these differences by way of percentile rank. From this table it can be seen that from pretesting to posttesting the experimental group remained at the same percentile level, even though there was an increase in mean scores. The control group's gain in mean scores effected a shift from the 58th percentile to the 60th percentile as well as a change from stanine 5 to stanine 6.

When dividing the groups according to sex, we note that the males of the experimental group lowered in rank by two percentiles from pretest to posttest while the control group's males raised their rank by two percentiles. In both groups the females scored a higher percentile rank from pretest to posttest—those of the experimental group raised their rank by four percentiles and those in the control group by eight percentiles. Considering the high standard deviations of the normative sample (10.5 for the pretest and 10.9 for the posttest) and the corresponding larger standard error of measurement, none of these changes in percentile rank seems significant other than those perhaps of the females.

For Tables 5 and 6 reference should also be made to Table 4 in regard to changes in scores on the "Critical Thinking Appraisal" from pretesting to post-
testing. The sex differences have already been commented on in terms of changes in percentile. Table 5 indicates these changes in terms of the value of "t" which is barely significant for males, and significant at the 5% level for females in the experimental group. Table 6 indicates the difference in means from pretesting to posttesting to be at the 5% level of significance for the males and to be very significant (1%) for the females of the control group. As for the changes in means on the "Study of Values," there were no significant changes from pretest to posttest for males or females in either the experimental or the control group. It appears fairly certain that a course of short duration is not likely to produce a significant change in basic values, that is, cause a restructuring of a hierarchy formed over a relatively long period of time. It may be, however, that the impact of such an exposure to the variable in question may not be immediately felt, and that the restructuring of values may take place gradually, thus escaping immediate measurement. Control of other variables, however, is not at all feasible, so such a hypothesis escapes testing.

A summary report of all the instruments used, broken down to male and to female differences, is represented in Table 7. Of the data on this table, consideration will be given initially to the "Study of Values."

Even a cursory examination reveals that expectations of common experience are met regarding the general pattern of values characteristic of males and of females; that is, the females are generally higher in Aesthetic, Social and Religious values whereas the males characteristically score higher on Economic,
TABLE 5.—Sex differences from pretesting to posttesting for the experimental group on the "Study of Values" and the "Critical Thinking Appraisal"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES (N=23)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;t&quot;</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>FEMALES (N=22)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>&quot;t&quot;</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For a .05 level of significance a "t" value of 2.02 is needed; for a .01 level of significance a "t" value of 2.70 is needed.
TABLE 6.—Sex differences from pretesting to posttesting for the control group on the "Study of Values" and the "Critical Thinking Appraisal"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALES (n=21)</th>
<th>FEMALES (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>68.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For a .05 level of significance a "t" value of 2.02 is needed; for a .01 level of significance a "t" value of 2.70 is needed.
TABLE 7.—Sex differences in mean scores on subscales of the "Study of Values" (pretest and posttest), the "Critical Thinking Appraisal" (pretest and posttest), the Otis I.Q., and the Movie Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study of Values (pretest)</th>
<th>EXPERIMENTAL GROUP</th>
<th>CONTROL GROUP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(N=23)</td>
<td>(N=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study of Values (posttest)</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aesthetic</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking Appraisal (pre)</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking Appraisal (post)</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otis I.Q.</td>
<td>114.8</td>
<td>110.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie Inventory</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For a .05 level of significance a "t" value of 2.02 is needed; for a .01 level of significance a "t" value of 2.70 is needed.
Theoretical and Political values. This consistency of pattern carried through for the experimental and the control group. As reported in Tables 5 and 6, there were no significant changes from pretesting to posttesting, so the pattern would remain stable. In noting the differences of mean scores between the males and the females, it can be observed that in almost every instance there is a significant difference between mean scores; that is, each sex has a tendency toward a definite value pattern that is significantly different from that of the opposite sex.

Because the measures of the six values are not independent of one another, that is, high scores on one subscale will effect a low score on another value, it does not seem appropriate to go into a discussion of specific value changes. It should be noted, however, that all the mean scores for the "Study of Values" fall within the range of 50% of all male or of all female scores on each value and can, therefore, be considered "average" in rating. These cut-off scores for the "average" range were determined by the test-constructors.

In contrast to the sharp sex differences, that is, the high levels of significance between male and female mean scores on the "Study of Values," there were no significant sex differences for either group on the "Critical Thinking Appraisal" on the pretest or on the posttest. For the experimental group's pretest, a 10% level of significance is reported for the difference between the male and female group, but this is not a significant level of difference.

For the Otis I.Q., used to equate the experimental group and the control group, there is reported a non-significant difference between the mean I.Q.'s
of the males and of the females in both groups. Not only are the experimental group and the control group equated on the basis of I.Q. but the males of both groups are comparable to one another and the females in both groups are comparable to one another.

The mean scores reported for the movie inventory represent a raw score computed on the basis of preferred responses. Table 7 reports no significant difference between means of males and of females in either group. In comparing the mean scores between the experimental group as a whole and the control group as a whole, it was also found that no significant differences existed.

Tables 8 and 9 represent an item analysis of the movie inventory which was constructed to present insights into the cinematic appreciations and understandings of the seniors tested. The analysis of the thirteen items pertinent to statements of the affective domain is reported in Table 8. From these data some insights can be gained into the students' decision-making to see a movie, their judgment of whether it was worth seeing, and what they feel they draw from movies.

Regarding the students' choice to see movies, item 9 indicates that both groups are much influenced by what others have to say about a particular film. Considering that a majority of responses indicated "ability to amuse" as a reason for liking or disliking a movie (item 2), it would seem possible that a great deal of the discussion of a movie might hinge on the humor present or absent in the movie. A substantial number of responses were given to "capacity for depicting life as it really is" as a reason for liking or disliking a
TABLE 8.—Item analysis of movie inventory (affective area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Exper. Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Exper. Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No. %</td>
<td>No. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* C</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>* C</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>* C</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* C</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>* C</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* C</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>* C</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>* C</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* B</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>* B</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* B</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Preferred response
movie (item 2). This was supported by item 17, constructed to indicate the students' choice of a kind of movie to see, and the large percentage of both groups (60%) that indicated the preferred response, "novel that was made into a film." The general discrimination of the students in selecting a movie to attend was not, however, particularly high for either group as shown by item 23. Slightly less than half the students in both groups indicated equal discrimination for their choice of a book as of a movie. An almost equal percentage of students, however, reported themselves to be more discriminating in their choice of a book than in their choice of a movie to attend.

Several of the items pertained to insights or awareness the students may draw from movies. Movies could be somewhat related to real-life situations for more than half the students of both groups (item 15), however, only one-fourth of either group saw "much relevancy or connection with real-life situations." The relevancy of movies to real-life, as perceived by the students, is further indicated in items 11 and 12. Half of the students in both groups felt that movies gave them insights in human behavior (item 11) occasionally, while only one-third of the students in either group felt that these insights were given them frequently through movies. Sixteen percent of both groups responded "rarely" to the frequency of receiving such insights, in contrast to only 7% of both groups responding "rarely" to the frequency of deriving insights from movies on the "beauties and problems of life" (item 12). It was on this item that 15% more of the control group felt they received these insights frequently; about half of both groups felt that these insights were received occasionally.
From item 24 it seems, though, that the students do prize insights into "the emotions and understanding of the thoughts of the characters" by the fact that two-thirds of the experimental group and almost as high a percentage of the control group chose this response to indicate what they value most in a movie. It's interesting to note that although such a high percentage of the students value much from a movie "acting that makes you feel the emotions and understand the thoughts of the characters," item 11 indicates that half of both groups felt that they received these insights rarely or never.

For these items of the affective area there was a close similarity in the pattern of responses to the various items. A few interesting deviations included the fact that almost half of the control group viewed movies with great enjoyment whereas only 20% of the experimental group indicated this (item 6). The experimental group, responding to "how" they attend a movie (item 7), showed a smaller percentage of them "paying some attention to plot and characterization" than the control group (44% experimental group; 67% control group), and a substantial percentage of them (40%) going to movies "just for the story" in contrast to only 27% of the control group going "just for the story."

Regarding discussion among friends of ideas contained in a stimulating movie, two-thirds of the control group reported doing this frequently whereas less than half (42%) of the experimental group reported doing this frequently. These deviations in pattern between the experimental and the control group show a tendency for the control group to be more interested in and attentive to the movies they see. These few items, however, do not warrant too broad or sweeping a statement that would relegate this distinction to the control group.
The responses to those items dealing with content of a more cognitive nature are analyzed in Table 9. An impression of the students' attitude toward movies as an art form is indicated in items 4 and 8. In responding to item 8, half of the experimental group and 40% of the control group reveal that in attending a movie it is usually with the idea that "it is some form of art, be it good or bad." The balance of each group are equally divided in choosing the responses "it has little to do with enjoying an art," and "it could be a work of art." This would seem to indicate that the students of both groups are generally of conflicting attitudes regarding movies as art, although a slightly higher percentage of the experimental group feel it is a form of art. Related to this item is item 4 in which the vast majority of students in both groups (82% of the experimental group and 71% of the control group) indicated that they felt a "western" could just as well be as good a work of art as a musical. That a "western" is not as good a work of art as a musical was thought to be true by one-fourth of the control group in contrast to the 11% of the experimental group that responded thus.

Some of the items gave insights into the students' views regarding the morality of movies and the need for a censoring index. Regarding the evaluation of movies, item 13 indicates that the majority of students in both groups felt that "the mass of moviegoers spend too little time evaluating the movies they see." Is this judgment made on the basis of their own habits? From item 7 in which 27% of the control group and 40% of the experimental group reported that they usually attend a movie "just for the story," the insinuation might be that it is on the basis of their own evaluation habits—particularly when
TABLE 9.—Item analysis of movie inventory (cognitive area)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Exper. Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Exper. Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*A</td>
<td>18 40</td>
<td>12 27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>4 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>5 11</td>
<td>6 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>6 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>10 22</td>
<td>14 31</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>8 18</td>
<td>10 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>*D</td>
<td>33 73</td>
<td>25 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12 27</td>
<td>11 25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4 9</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5 11</td>
<td>11 25</td>
<td></td>
<td>*B</td>
<td>26 58</td>
<td>23 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>3 7</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>7 16</td>
<td>13 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*C</td>
<td>37 82</td>
<td>32 71</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8 18</td>
<td>7 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>11 24</td>
<td>13 29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>7 16</td>
<td>6 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>11 24</td>
<td>14 31</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>4 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*C</td>
<td>23 52</td>
<td>18 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25 55</td>
<td>23 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>4 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12 27</td>
<td>8 18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*B</td>
<td>35 78</td>
<td>30 67</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22 49</td>
<td>34 75</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7 16</td>
<td>13 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>9 20</td>
<td>3 7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>24 53</td>
<td>16 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>14 31</td>
<td>8 18</td>
<td></td>
<td>*B</td>
<td>35 78</td>
<td>30 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>22 49</td>
<td>34 75</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*C</td>
<td>13 29</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>7 16</td>
<td>13 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>11 24</td>
<td>12 27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>6 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2 4</td>
<td>12 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>*B</td>
<td>36 80</td>
<td>34 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>19 42</td>
<td>18 40</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3 7</td>
<td>2 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*C</td>
<td>13 29</td>
<td>3 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4 9</td>
<td>3 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>11 24</td>
<td>12 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Preferred response
considering that only 6% of the control group and 16% of the experimental group indicated that they made a "detailed examination of the idea and structure of the movie."

Regarding an evaluating or censoring index for movies being necessary, three-fourths of the control group disagreed with this, that is, indicated that they did feel such an index is necessary; half of the experimental group felt a censoring index is necessary. Indicating an uncertainty in their opinion were 20% of the experimental group and 7% of the control group. The higher percentage of students in the experimental group indicating "uncertainty" could be attributed to the fact that, through the course, the students' thinking regarding a censoring index was challenged and new thinking is evolving.

To judge the morality of a movie (item 18), only a small percentage of both groups reported that they felt morality of a picture could be judged by billboards, advertising, or the fact that a movie is advertised for "adults only." About one-fifth of both groups felt that previews of the movie would be a basis for judgment, while 73% of the experimental group and 55% of the control group felt that none of the mentioned criteria were a basis for judging a movie's morality. For the majority of the students in both groups, a basic question to answer when evaluating a film dealing with such things as dope addiction or abortion or sex (item 21) is, "Did it give insights into real life?" Of the experimental group, 78% chose this response as indicating a basis for evaluating a film's morality and 67% of the control group. A negligible percentage of the students in either group felt that to judge a film's morality,
a basic question to ask is "Was more than 60% of the film devoted to this subject," or "How was it rated by the Legion of Decency?" A minority of either group (15% in the experimental group and 20% in the control group) felt that one should judge in terms of "Do I approve of that behavior?"

Regarding theme (item 20), half of the students in both groups valued themes that are "unusual, clever." This quality of "unusual" was also prized by half of the experimental group in evaluating the "directing" of films and 35% of the control group (item 22). One-fourth of either group would rank that movie on top which was "strikingly imaginative." From these responses it seems that the majority of students look for some quality of uniqueness or creativity in films. This seems to be supported by the fact that only 2% of the experimental group and 13% of the control group chose the response of "factually correct" as the norm for successful directing.

Item 22, dealing with successful directing, was one of the items which indicated a marked divergence in response patterns between the two groups. This divergence in pattern is true of item 14 as well which pertains to the need for an evaluating index. For the other items in the cognitive area, the response pattern was similar for both groups.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

I. Purpose

The purpose of this study was to measure the effectiveness of a course on the motion picture, incorporated into the English curriculum of a private high school, to increase scores in values and in critical thinking skills. A secondary objective of the experiment was to gain some insights into the appreciations and understandings of the students regarding the movies they see.

II. Procedure

A total population of ninety high school seniors participated in this study, forty-five in the experimental group and forty-five in the control group, the students of each group represented a random sampling of the total senior population at their respective schools. The approach to the study consisted of the following procedures:

1. Selecting a high school whose seniors would be comparably matched with the seniors of the experimental group. The school finally selected was matched with the school of the pilot study on the basis of their four year English program, the fact of being co-educational, and having a student enrollment from similar socio-economic strata.
2. Constructing a twenty-five item multiple choice inventory which dealt with students' attitudes and appreciations relevant to motion pictures.

3. Pre-testing all students included in the experiment.

4. Equating the experimental group and the control group on the basis of Intelligence Quotient; this process deleted ten from the original group of one hundred.

5. Presenting the course on motion pictures to the experimental group.

6. Re-testing the students after the completion of the six weeks course.

The instruments of the pretesting consisted of the "Otis Quick Scoring Mental Ability Test," the "Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal" (form ZM), and the "Allport, Vernon, Lindsey Study of Values." The posttesting consisted of administering an alternate form of the "Critical Thinking Appraisal," the "Study of Values," and a teacher-made movie inventory. After all pretests and posttests had been scored, the results were evaluated for their statistical significance. The data were studied in the following ways:

1. According to value patterns and critical thinking skills characteristic of the experimental group and of the control group before introducing the variable, a six weeks course on motion pictures.

2. According to value patterns and critical thinking skills characteristic of both groups after the experimental group's exposure to the variable.

3. According to sex differences in value patterns and critical thinking skills both before and after introduction of the variable.

4. According to attitudinal and cognitive factors indicated on the movie inventory.
III. Findings

The results of the experiment are as follows:

1. The differences in mean scores from tests of intelligence, values and critical thinking skills were statistically non-significant at the time of pretesting, indicating that the experimental group and the control group were equated prior to the introduction of the variable.

2. The differences in mean scores between the experimental and the control group on tests of values and critical thinking remained statistically nonsignificant after the experimental group's participation in the course on motion pictures, indicating that the variable produced no significant changes in the pilot group. On the basis of this data, the null hypothesis must be accepted.

3. When a test of significance was applied to the differences in scores within each group from the time of pretesting to posttesting, it showed that for both the experimental group and the control group there were no differences statistically significant in the area of primary life values. Significant differences were found, however, for both groups in mean scores of the "Critical Thinking Appraisal" from the time of pretesting to posttesting.

4. The difference in critical thinking mean scores, though statistically significant in terms of the "t" test, was only questionably significant when considering the test constructors' procedure of equating the raw scores of the two forms of the "Critical Thinking Appraisal."

5. For both the experimental group and the control group, a sex difference was noted in terms of differences in mean scores from pretesting to posttesting. It was found that for males and females in both groups the differences were statistically nonsignificant on subscales of the "Study of Values." Significant differences were found for critical thinking skills with the exception of males in the experimental group when employing the "t" test of significance.

6. After examining the changes in mean scores for both groups, noting sex differences, it was found that the females in both groups raised their percentile ranks on the "Critical Thinking
Appraisal": females in the experimental group by 4 percentiles and those in the control group by 8 percentile places. The males of the experimental group were 2 places lower at the time of posttesting than at the time of pretesting; the males of the control group raised their percentile by 4 places.

7. Raw scores of the movie inventory were compared and the difference in mean scores between the experimental group and the control group was statistically nonsignificant.

8. An item analysis of the movie inventory indicated that the pattern of responses was quite similar between the experimental group and the control group.

IV. Assumptions and Limitations

The following assumptions and limitations should be mentioned:

1. It is assumed that the instruments employed have content validity for the purposes of this study.

2. Cause and effect relationships (exposure to the variable and changes in values and critical thinking) are somewhat limited. This limitation is due in great part to the fact that the conditions could not be completely controlled. There were possibilities of many experiences and influences being operative upon both groups outside that of exposure or non-exposure to the variable. These uncontrolled situations, such as, other courses, may have augmented or detracted from changes produced by the experiences of the course on motion pictures.

3. It is assumed that the control group was comparably matched to the experimental group so that efforts to determine what growth or changes may have taken place by way of comparison, are valid efforts of comparison.

4. It is assumed that value patterns and critical thinking skills are important outcomes, and that the students were significantly concerned about giving accurate responses.

5. The duration of six weeks is a relatively short time within which to effect changes in value patterns that have been gradually defined by the students during a relatively long period of time.
V. General Conclusions and Recommendations

The outstanding fact which seems to be disclosed by this study is that values and critical thinking skills were not significantly altered after participation in a six weeks course on motion pictures. The significant differences that were found existed between mean scores of males and females on the "Study of Values," indicating a definite pattern of values for males which contrasted sharply with those of females. These differences were congruent with prior expectations. For the experimental group and the control group, statistically significant differences were also found on changes of mean scores on the "Critical Thinking Appraisal" from pretesting to posttesting. When considering these differences, however, in terms of the equi-percentile rating of the two forms used, it was questioned whether the differences on the "Critical Thinking Appraisal" were truly significant.

The fact that the course was of such short duration leads one to wonder what changes might have been effected if the course extended for a longer period of time, for example, one full semester. In conjunction with this, a more ideal testing situation would be desired for such an experimental design—a testing situation in which all variables could be more rigidly controlled than was the case in this study.

Added to these suggestions for further research, it seems that subsequent studies should include a delayed testing in addition to the immediate posttesting particularly in investigating the modification of value patterns. As the structuring of a hierarchy of values is a gradual and relatively prolonged process,
the evaluation of changes might only be adequately measured after some time is allowed for gradual restructuring of values. This comparison of immediate posttesting with delayed posttesting was not within the confines of this experiment but the value of such a procedure is recognized.

The tests involved in further research, teacher-made or standardized, would be more insightful and more adequate measures of evaluation if structured more specifically toward attitudes directly concerning motion pictures and the critical analysis of films. Because of the general nature of standardized tests now available on values and critical thinking, they lack this specificity to most accurately measure the effect of a course designed to treat motion pictures as an art form.
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THE PURPOSE OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IS TO DISCOVER WHAT YOU REALLY APPRECIATE AND THINK ABOUT THE MOVIES YOU SEE. CONSIDER EACH QUESTION CAREFULLY AND ANSWER IT AS HONESTLY AND FRANKLY AS YOU POSSIBLY CAN. THERE ARE NO "RIGHT" OR "WRONG" ANSWERS. IT IS NOT EXPECTED THAT YOUR THOUGHTS OR FEELINGS OR ACTIVITIES RELATING TO MOVIES SHOULD BE LIKE THOSE OF ANYONE ELSE.

ON YOUR ANSWER SHEET CIRCLE THE LETTER OF THE RESPONSE THAT YOU FEEL MOST CORRECTLY Completes THE PRECEDING STATEMENT.

1. After seeing a dramatic movie I evaluate its effectiveness to dramatize a story
   a. rarely.
   b. occasionally.
   c. frequently.
   d. never.

2. My liking or disliking a movie depends on the film's
   a. rating by reviewers.
   b. ability to amuse me.
   c. capacity for depicting life as it really is.
   d. moral.

3. For a novel to be successful as a movie it is essential that the story
   a. lends itself to pictorial presentation.
   b. have a lively, interesting dialogue.
   c. have interesting characters.
   d. have a moral.
   e. be exciting and suspenseful.

4. A movie that is a "western" is not as good a work of art as a musical.
   a. This statement would be true in most cases.
   b. This statement would be false in most cases.
   c. This statement could just as well be true as false.

5. After seeing a stimulating movie, I discuss its ideas with friends
   a. rarely.
   b. occasionally.
   c. frequently.
   d. never.

6. I see most movies with
   a. little or no enjoyment.
   b. an average amount of enjoyment.
   c. great enjoyment.

7. Usually I attend a movie
   a. just for the story.
   b. paying some attention to plot and characterization.
   c. making a detailed examination of the idea and structure of the movie.

8. When I attend a movie, it is usually with the idea that
   a. it has little to do with enjoying an art.
   b. it could be a work of art.
   c. it is some form of art, be it good or bad.
9. I decide to see a particular movie
   a. after spending little or no time considering what I will see.
   b. after first consulting movie reviews.
   c. after hearing it discussed by others.

10. After seeing a movie, usually I
    a. completely dismiss it from my mind.
    b. form a judgment as to whether it was worth seeing.
    c. spend many hours thinking about it.

11. Most movies give me insights into why people act as they do
    a. rarely.
    b. occasionally.
    c. frequently.
    d. never.

12. Most movies give me insights into the beauties and problems of life
    a. rarely.
    b. occasionally.
    c. frequently.
    d. never.

13. The mass of moviegoers spend too little time evaluating the movies they see.
    a. I agree with this statement.
    b. I disagree with this statement.
    c. I am uncertain of how I feel about this statement.

14. There is no need for an evaluating index or censoring index of movies.
    a. I agree with this statement.
    b. I disagree with this statement.
    c. I am uncertain of how I feel about this statement.

15. It seems to me that most movies
    a. have little relevancy or connection with real-life situations.
    b. have some relevancy or connection with real-life situations.
    c. have much relevancy or connection with real-life situations.
    d. have no relevancy or connection with real-life situations.

16. What is most basic for film art's success?
    a. Insightful and stimulating dialogue.
    b. A theme of depth and realism.
    c. Creative camera shot relationships.
    d. Caliber of acting.

17. If I had a choice to make concerning what movie I would like to see, I'd most often choose a
    a. Walt Disney film.
    b. novel that was made into a film.
    c. western.
    d. Biblical "spectacular."
    e. comedy.

18. The morality of a picture can be judged by
    a. billboards and advertising.
    b. the presence or absence of the phrase, "For Adults Only."
    c. previews of the movie.
    d. none of the above.
19. The test of a good musical score for a film is that the music
a. captivates an audience during the film so that they are very conscious of it.
b. blends into the creation of the film so that the audience does not hear it consciously as music.
c. possesses musical values that would merit it success if isolated from the film and placed on a concert program.
d. periodically fades out completely so as to emphasize the action on the screen.

20. If judging the value of a film by its theme, I'd rank that film on top which had a theme that was
a. light but suitable for enjoyment.
b. momentous, epical.
c. unusual, clever.
d. unrealistic but very delightful.
e. none of the above.

21. After viewing a film that dealt with dope addiction or abortion or sex, a basic question to ask when evaluating the film is:
a. Was more than 60% of the film devoted to this subject.
b. Did it give insights into real life.
c. How was it rated by the Legion of Decency.
d. Do I approve of that behavior.

22. When evaluating the Director's success in a film, I'd rank that movie on top which was
a. unusual, convincing.
b. smooth, good.
c. strikingly imaginative.
d. factually correct.

23. Which of the following is most often true of you?
a. I'm more discriminating in my choice of a book to read than of a movie to see.
b. I'm less discriminating in my choice of a book to read than of a movie to see.
c. I'm equally discriminating in my choice of both a book to read and a movie to see.
d. I am not very discriminating in either a book I read or a movie I see.

24. Which do you value most in a movie?
a. Acting that makes you feel the emotions and understand the thoughts of the characters.
b. A story that makes you feel good and light-hearted.
c. Scenery that is breathtakingly beautiful.
d. Excitement and suspense.

25. A movie review stated in part, "All the many people on the screen are at complete ease in every scene. The children are permitted to be children, not encouraged to be actors. There is no glamour of any sort..." From this statement would you infer that the film is
a. dull, drab.
b. humanly authentic.
c. third-rate.
d. unimaginative.
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