

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 049 415

AC 010 105

AUTHOR Robinson, Russell D.  
TITLE A Study of the Effects of Television Combined with Discussion Groups and Study Materials on the Changing of Attitudes in Social Issues.  
PUB DATE Feb 71  
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Adult Education Research Conference, New York City, February 2-5, 1971  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
DESCRIPTORS \*Changing Attitudes, \*Discussion Groups, Economic Disadvantage, Multimedia Instruction, \*Opinions, Participant Characteristics, Political Issues, Pollution, Questionnaires, \*Reading Materials, Research, Social Problems, Socioeconomic Influences, \*Television Viewing  
IDENTIFIERS Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

The objective of the study was to determine whether a carefully developed educational television series combined with organized viewing post discussion and specially prepared study materials would have any effect on social attitudes and opinions of participants. Data were obtained from a sample of 360 viewers at 22 posts randomly selected from more than 220 viewing posts at which a total of 4000 viewers participated. An opinionnaire was used to collect the data. The opinionnaire sought expression of opinion on 42 statements which were grouped into various categories according to subjects: people, poverty, pollution, politics and miscellaneous opinion statements. Socioeconomic characteristics data were also collected. Statistical analysis of the data showed that the multimedia method of television, discussion groups, and study materials was effective in changing expressed opinions about social and political issues. (PT)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDY OF THE EFFECT OF TELEVISION COMBINED WITH DISCUSSION GROUPS AND STUDY MATERIALS ON THE CHANGING OF ATTITUDES ON SOCIAL ISSUES

Russell D. Robinson, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of Education  
University of Wisconsin--Milwaukee

Objectives of the Study:

To determine whether a carefully developed educational television series combined with organized viewing post discussion groups and specially prepared study materials would have any effect on social attitudes and opinions of participants.

Description of Project

"Human Survival" was the central theme of the 1970 Project Understanding, a community education project combining television programs with participation groups meeting in homes and other locations. Specific human survival topics were people, poverty, pollution, and politics.

The series was conducted on Thursday nights, April 2, 9, 16 and 23 in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Sponsors were the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (Department of Educational Administration), the National Conference of Christians and Jews (Wisconsin Region), the Wisconsin-Milwaukee Religious Broadcast Ministry, University Extension (Institute of Human Relations), WMVS Channel 10, along with a host of other community organizations, churches, colleges, and groups that spearheaded the organization of viewing posts.

The project was made possible by a \$10,000 grant from Title I of the Higher Education Act, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The sponsors contributed an additional \$20,000 toward the total cost of \$30,000 for the series.

More than 4,000 persons formally enrolled in the series as members of officially registered viewing posts. Posts were organized in more than 200 locations located in 61 different postal zones in eight counties. Two-thirds of the posts were in Milwaukee County. One-half of the Milwaukee County posts were in the city of Milwaukee. Additional thousands of viewers (estimated at 100,000) saw the series but did not formally enroll in a viewing post.

Through the use of Viewing Posts, the project sought to bring together apathetic as well as concerned citizens to engage in an educational experience via television, written materials, and discussion in exploration of human survival concerns. The television programs and written materials provided a source of accurate information on such topics as recommendations of the Eisenhower Report on Violence (People), the social injustice suffered by millions which breeds hunger, despair, and swelling welfare roles (Poverty), the increasing specter of environmental doom (Pollution), and the challenge to our social, political and economic systems to respond to the challenges of these survival issues (Politics).

1. Paper presented the Adult Education Research Conference, New York City, February 4, 1971

ED049415

AC010105  
ERIC  
Full Text Provided by ERIC

The discussions in the Viewing Posts following the television presentations provided opportunity for participants to think through the implications of these issues and to examine their own opinions about them, to explore the possibility of changing opinions, attitudes and behaviors as they relate to these issues, and to commit themselves personally to taking citizen action in resolving these problems.

More than 40 persons were involved in the planning and development of the television series. Promotion of the series was achieved through two means: (1) distribution of brochures with supportive letters from various organizations arranged by the overall planning committee; and (2) a coordinated emphasis in various mass media: newspapers, radio and television.

Four ten-page fold-out pamphlets were prepared, one for each of the Project Understanding topics. These were distributed to the Viewing Posts so that each participant had one. Each pamphlet contained a five-page essay on the "survival issue," a series of discussion questions under the title "consideration and response," a list and description of films on the subject and where they could be obtained, a list of related books for adults and for children and youth, and several addresses of agencies from which further information on the topic could be obtained.

Detailed instructions were also prepared for each Viewing Post host and discussion moderator, and these were also included in the kits along with a supply of the pamphlets.

At the training sessions conducted for discussion moderators, after being coached on techniques of "moderating" a discussion without "leading" it, the moderators themselves participated in a discussion experience similar to that which they were expected to conduct using the same written materials and questions their groups would be using.

#### Procedure at Viewing Posts

Viewing Posts consisted of ten to twenty-five people. Seventy-three per cent of the posts were located in homes with the remainder located in churches, convents, schools, libraries, colleges, and other public locations.

Participants arrived at the Viewing Posts at 7:30 p.m. with time to get acquainted, get settled, exchange comments on the previous week, etc., before viewing the program.

At 8:00 p.m. the television set was turned on to view a half-hour "survival issue" documentary, after which the set was turned off.

The group then discussed the content of the program along with the written materials for one-half hour.

At 9:00 p.m. the set was again turned on to view a group in the television studio discussing the same issues for one-half hour.

At 9:30 p.m. the set was again turned off, and the local Viewing Post resumed its discussion with the added inputs from the television panel. This discussion was to conclude at 10:00 p.m., but many groups went well beyond that time.

### Development of the Television Segments

A television program committee was formed for the purpose of developing the television segments. Assisting the committee in determining content and format were four advisory panels of 12 persons each. Panels included acknowledged experts in the different areas. Their suggestions were most helpful in program development. Some of these persons later appeared on the television shows.

This general format was adopted for the program segments:

#### Part I - Survival Issue

1. An eye-catching, ear-catching opener to stimulate interest
2. Introductory remarks by the program moderator
3. A 20 minute segment of filmed interviews with connecting narration
4. Summary statement of the filmed interview segment
5. Closing remarks by the program moderator and raising of issues to be discussed

#### Part II - Consideration and Response

1. Opening statement by the program moderator
2. Discussion of the issues by a group of eight persons in a living-room setting
3. Closing remarks of the program moderator

Continuity for the programs closely followed the written pamphlets prepared for the series. Arrangements for filmed interviews in shopping centers and inner-city agencies were made. These included "men on the street" (those who happened to be at that place at that time), and a number of persons who were knowledgeable on the issues who were asked to appear for interviews. In addition to film shot on location, panelists were selected for each show and video-taped in discussion in studio.

The production of the shows as finally aired required one hour of production time for each minute of program. Viewing interview films and panel video-tapes, cutting, writing continuity, editing, timing, etc. required many hours. The eight programs were put together from enough material for more than three times the air time available. The result was the achievement of eight tightly edited, information-packed programs including widely varying views on the topics and a cross-section of people (with whom viewers could identify) ranging from the "man on the street" to professionals in the areas, from reformers to conservatives, and representing various ages, sexes, vocations and races.

### Data Sources

From a population of 4,000 participants in 220 Viewing Posts, a sample was randomly drawn of 22 posts, one from each of 22 randomly selected zipcode areas. All participants in the 22 posts were administered a pretest opinionnaire before seeing the first program and after seeing and discussing the last program.

Data were obtained from 360 participants. Two-hundred eighty-one completed the pretest and 183 the posttest. Matched responses were obtained for 104 individuals. These constituted the experimental group. Incomplete data (pre- or posttest only) were obtained from 256. A random selection of 104 "noncompleters" (out of 177) who completed pretest only was compared to the experimental group of 104 from whom complete data were available.

### Structuring of Opinionnaire

An opinionnaire with 42 opinion statements was constructed to attempt to measure whether the first three of the four objectives of the televised Project Understanding had been achieved. The objectives set forth were as follows: To help each participant to

- (1) obtain accurate information on human survival issues relating to people, poverty, pollution and politics;
- (2) think through the implications of these issues and examine his own opinions about them;
- (3) change his own opinions, attitudes and behavior as it relates to these issues; and
- (4) take more effective citizen action in bringing about improvement in his own community.

Evidence of accomplishment of the fourth objective and the part of objective three which relates to behavior was not a part of this study.

Sixty statements of opinion were drawn up, based on the written television materials as these were being developed. From these, forty statements were selected to be used in structuring a preliminary opinionnaire consisting of 10 statements dealing with opinions in regard to each of the four program topics of people, poverty, pollution and politics, respectively.

To these 40 statements were added twenty additional miscellaneous opinion statements not necessarily relevant to the issues being studied and which were to be discounted in the scoring. The preliminary opinionnaire thus constructed was administered to 42 persons, all adult graduate students ranging in age from 25 to 55, in three university classes. On the basis of an analysis of these responses two statements were eliminated in each topical category and some of the eight remaining statements were modified or revised. Statements receiving virtually 100 per cent positive response were eliminated. Statements about which there was too much ambiguity were changed. Ten of the miscellaneous opinion statements were also retained or revised for the final opinionnaire, making a total of 42 opinion statements in the final instrument administered to the study sample.

#### Administration of Opinionnaire

The opinionnaires were administered to the sample of viewing posts by graduate students who had been given instructions in procedure. All persons at the viewing post were given the pretest before the first program came on the air. The graduate student took the completed opinionnaires with him.

The posttest was likewise administered by the same graduate students immediately following the final television program.

#### Classification of Statements on Opinionnaire

The opinionnaire sought expression of opinion on 42 statements which for scoring purposes were regrouped into various categories as follows:

##### People

1. The rate of violent crime in the United States is probably no greater than any other country per unit of population.
- \*6. America has always been a relatively violent nation.
11. The violence of recent years in the United States is in stark contrast to the earlier history of our country.
16. Following the Kerner Commission Report on civil disorders in 1968, many new policies and programs were initiated and improvements made in the "inner city."
21. What we really need to do in order to combat crime is to crack down with greater law and order.
- \*26. The history of the labor-union movement in this country was just as violent as today's civil rights protests.

\* Indicates statements for which a positive response was "desireable." All others called for a negative response.

31. The rate of violent crime in large cities is probably no higher than in small towns and rural areas when size of population is considered.
36. Trends indicate that the greatest population growth will be in areas other than the cities since there is more room for expansion in outlying areas.

### Poverty

- \* 2. More poor people in the United States are white than black, Spanish-speaking, and American Indian put together.
7. Today a person can get a good job if he has an education no matter what color his skin.
12. Most of the poor people in the United States are black, Spanish-speaking or American Indian.
17. Very few people who are employed full time live in poverty.
- \*22. A family of four on AFDC (aid to families with dependent children) in Milwaukee receives less per year than the U. S. Dept. of Labor estimates a family of four needs to exist in the U. S.
27. There may be poor people in America but at least they don't starve.
32. Black workers with at least one year of college are no more likely to be unemployed than white workers with equivalent education.
37. Most people living in poverty could change their lives if they would just go out, get a good job, and fix up their homes.

### Pollution

3. Air and water pollution is primarily a big city problem and rural areas have little to worry about.
8. Scientists predict that technology will be able to solve nearly all of the air and water pollution problems within the next few years.
- \*13. Industry is not mainly responsible for pollution; the average citizen has much to do with causing the problem.
- \*18. There is no area left in the United States without air pollution.

- 23. So far, there has been no indication that air and water pollution have actually contributed to disease and deaths.
- 28. Thank goodness, there are still rural areas in the United States where there is no air pollution.
- \*33. Birth control and pollution cannot be treated as separate issues but must be considered together.
- \*38. Even with modern land-fill methods and incineration, disposal of solid wastes (garbage, trash, tires, automobiles), is a major problem.

### Politics

- 4. Urban problems are really not the concern of the rest of the state of Wisconsin. Milwaukee and other cities should solve their own problems.
- \*9. Most of us belong to several political pressure groups without realizing it.
- 14. There is really not much an average citizen can do since most politicians won't pay attention to what the average person wants.
- 19. One reason that taxes are so high in the city of Milwaukee is that city residents have many more and better services than residents of the suburbs.
- 24. The average citizen does not belong to organized groups that could bring effective political pressure to bear on government.
- \*29. Duplication of services in metropolitan areas leads to fragmentation and ineffectiveness of governing agencies.
- 34. Property taxes go mainly for property-linked services (streets, sanitation, police protection, etc.)
- 39. Most of the taxes raised in the cities go to support city government with lesser amounts going to support state and federal governments.

### Miscellaneous Opinion Statements

- 5. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.
- 10. When a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause, life becomes meaningful.



15. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world there is probably only one which is correct.
20. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.
25. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.
30. When it comes to differences of opinion in politics we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.
35. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.
40. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what is going on is to rely upon leaders or experts who can be trusted.
41. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary at times to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.
42. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and political problems don't really understand what's going on.

### Scoring of Questionnaires

The following instructions were given to the respondents:

"The following is a survey of your opinions about a number of social and political questions. There are many different answers. The answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. You may find yourself agreeing strongly about some statements, disagreeing just as strongly about others, and perhaps uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree you may be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

\*Please mark each statement according to how much you agree or disagree with it. Please mark every one. Write a +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case. Read every item carefully and respond as to how you feel about the statement."

- +1 I agree a little
- +2 I agree on the whole
- +3 I agree very much

- 1 I disagree a little
- 2 I disagree on the whole
- 3 I disagree very much

Responses were scored by adding +4 to every response. For most statements a low scoring response (disagree) was considered more desirable. For questions 2, 6, 9, 13, 18, 22, 26, 29, 33, and 38, a positive (agree) response was more desirable, and thus in scoring these answers were reversed so that all scoring responses were negative. Thus the lower the final score, the more favorable were the opinions in line with the purposes of the Project Understanding series.

The range of possible scores on each subject category was 8.0 to 56.0, and for the combined four categories a range of 32.0 to 224.0. The possible range of scores for the miscellaneous statements was 10.0 to 70.0.

### Research Hypotheses

For the purposes of this study eight null hypotheses were formulated.

#### A. To test the representativeness of the experimental group:

1. There is no significant difference between the experimental group and "noncompleters" in terms of demographic characteristics
  - a) political views
  - b) political affiliation
  - c) religion
  - d) education
  - e) age
  - f) family income
  - g) sex
2. There is no significant difference between the experimental group and the noncompleters in pre-test responses for
  - a) people
  - b) poverty
  - c) pollution
  - d) politics
  - e) combined scores of the above
  - f) miscellaneous items

#### B. To test whether differences occurred in the opinions expressed in the pretest and the posttest in the experimental group.

3. There is no significant difference between pretest and post-test scores of the experimental group, in opinions expressed on the separate survival issues of people, poverty, pollution and politics.
4. There is no significant difference between the pretest and post-test scores of the experimental group in the combined expressed opinions in regard to people, poverty, pollution and politics.

#### C. To test changes in responses on miscellaneous opinion statements not dealt with directly on the programs.

5. There is no significant difference between the pretest and post-test scores of the experimental group in regard to expressed opinions of miscellaneous statements.

- D. To test whether there is any difference between pretest and posttest when the experimental group is divided into sub-groups.
6. There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores in the combined expressed opinions in regard to people, poverty, pollution and politics when responses are compared on the basis of
- a) political affiliation
  - b) religion
  - c) education
  - d) age
  - e) family income
  - f) sex
  - g) geographic location

Null Hypothesis of No Difference Between Experimental and Noncompleter groups on Characteristics of Participants

Data were obtained as to the participants' political views, political affiliation, religion, education, age, family income and sex. The tables below show the distribution of both the experimental group and noncompleters on these variables. A chi-square test of significance supported the null hypothesis on all variables except those of education and age. (See Tables IV and V). The differences in these variables suggest that those with less education tended to drop out during the series so complete data (both pre-and posttest could not be obtained, and that those 25 and younger were also more likely not to complete the series. A Chi-square was considered significant for rejection of the null hypothesis at the .05 level.

Tables I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII show the results.

TABLE I. POLITICAL VIEWS

Political Views	Experimental Group	Non-completers Group	Totals
Very liberal	15	21	36
Somewhat liberal	39	37	76
Moderate	30	32	62
Somewhat conservative	19	13	32
Very conservative	1	1	2
Totals	104	104	208

Chi-square = 2.24 (4 df)

TABLE V. AGE

Age	Experimental Group	Non-Completer Group	Totals
25 & Under	17	33	50
26-35	47	27	74
36-45	17	22	39
46-55	11	14	25
56 and over	12	8	20
Totals	104	104	208

Chi-square = 12.33 \* (4 df)

\*Significant at .05 level

TABLE VI. FAMILY INCOME

Family Income	Experimental Group	Non-completer Group	Totals
Under \$5,000	11	17	28
5,001-10,000	23	29	52
10,001-15,000	51	37	88
15,001 and over	19	21	40
Totals	104	104	208

Chi-square = 4.31 (3 df)

TABLE VII. SEX

Sex	Experimental Group	Non-completer Group	Totals
Male	38	47	85
Female	66	57	123
Totals	104	104	208

Chi-square = 1.27 (1 df)

TABLE II. POLITICAL AFFILIATION

Political Affiliation	Experimental Group	Non-completer Group	Total
Republican	16	21	37
Democrat	32	31	63
Independent	52	40	92
Other	4	12	16
Totals	104	104	208

Chi-Square= 6.26 (3df)

TABLE III. RELIGION

Religion	Experimental Group	Non-completer Group	Total
Catholic	51	37	88
Jew	4	2	6
Protestant	42	52	94
Other	7	13	20
Totals	104	104	208

Chi-square = 5.76 (3 df)

TABLE IV. EDUCATION

Education	Experimental Group	Non-completer Group	Total
College Graduate	53	35	88
Some College	31	27	58
Some High School	14	26	40
No High School	2	1	3
Totals	104	104	208

Chi-square = 14.26 \* (4 df)  
\* Significant at .01 level

On the basis of the foregoing data, one may draw the following profile of the typical Project Understanding participant: The participant was more likely to be a female between the ages of 26-35 with family income of over \$10,000. She was probably a college graduate, or at least had some college. She was about as likely to be Protestant as Catholic. She was more likely to be a political independent or a Democrat than a Republican and was much more likely to consider herself a liberal or moderate than a conservative.

Null Hypothesis of No Difference Between Experimental and Noncompleter Groups on Responses to the Pretest

Pretest data had been obtained from a sizeable number of persons for whom posttest data were not available because the persons were not present at their viewing post at the final meeting when the posttest was administered. A logical question was whether pre-test responses differed significantly between the two groups: The Experimental Group and the others who were "Noncompleters."

Separate comparisons were made for each subject matter category and for the four combined. Also a comparison was made on the miscellaneous statements. An analysis of variance was made and an F-ratio obtained. As the following tables indicate, no statistical significance was found and on this basis the null hypotheses were supported. The responses on the pretest for the Noncompleters were not significantly different from those of the Experimental Group as indicated in Tables VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, XIII.

TABLE VIII, Analysis of Variance  
Between Experimental and Noncompleters on "People" Pretest

Source of variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	1	98.31	98.3	
Within Groups	206	11795.60	57.3	
Total	207	11893.91		1.717

TABLE IX, Analysis of Variance  
Between Experimental and Noncompleters on "Poverty" Pretest

Source of variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	1	.57	.57	
Within Groups	206	11731.42	56.94	
Total	207	11731.99		.010

**TABLE X. Analysis of Variance  
Between Experimental and Noncompleters on "Pollution" Pretest**

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	1	3.00	3.00	
Within Groups	206	10517.18	51.05	
Total	207	10520.18		.809

**TABLE XI. Analysis of Variance  
Between Experimental and Noncompleters in "Politics" Pretest**

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	1	58.17	58.17	
Within Groups	206	9459.81	45.92	
Total	207	9517.98		1.267

**TABLE XII. Analysis of Variance  
Between Experimental and Noncompleters on Total of  
Four Variables: People, Poverty, Pollution, Politics Pretest**

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	1	274.58	274.57	
Within Groups	206	103217.40		
Total	207	103491.98		.460

**TABLE XIII. Analysis of Variance  
Between Experimental and Noncompleters on Miscellaneous  
Statements in Pretest**

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F-ratio
Between Groups	1	90.23	90.23	
Within Groups	206	13326.45	64.69	
Total	207	13416.68		1.395

Null Hypotheses of No Difference Between Pretest and Posttest Scores of the Experimental Group

Null hypotheses three and four were rejected. Table XIV indicates that on each separate program category and on the combined categories a significant mean difference was obtained by applying a t-test for correlated data. Expressed opinions about people, poverty, pollution, and politics, as measured by the instrument, were changed as a result of the television-discussion group series.

Null hypothesis five, however, was supported. There was no significant change of opinion in relation to the miscellaneous statements. This fact would tend to strengthen the importance of the significant change in the categories in which attempts to change were made.

TABLE XIV. Significance of Difference Between Pretest and Posttest Scores of Opinions in Experimental Group

Category	Pretest		Posttest		Mean Difference	t-score
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
People	23.38	7.245	19.46	7.613	3.923	6.240*
Poverty	24.07	7.203	18.91	7.686	5.154	7.636*
Pollution	22.18	6.677	18.49	7.090	3.692	5.867*
Politics	23.71	6.721	21.71	6.390	2.000	3.341*
Four above Categories	93.35	21.24	78.58	22.79	14.77	10.39 *
Miscellaneous	38.35	8.385	37.74	8.722	.6058	1.041

n = 104  
df = 103

\* Significant at the .01 level



Null Hypotheses of No Difference Between Pretest and Posttest Scores  
When the Experimental Group is Broken Into Sub-Groupings

Null hypotheses six was rejected for virtually all demographic groupings, as can be seen in Table XV, when the t-test for correlated data was applied. Significance was obtained in every case except with small n's. This would indicate that changes in expressed opinions occurred in virtually all groups.

TABLE XV. Significance of Difference Between Pretest  
and Posttest Scores on Total for People, Poverty,  
Pollution and Politics on the Basis of  
Grouping Participants by Demographic Characteristics

Characteristic	n	df	Pretest		Posttest		Mean Difference	t-score
			Mean	SD	Mean	DS		
<u>Political</u>								
<u>Affiliation:</u>								
Republican	16	15	103.6	18.17	87.56	23.21	16.00	3.813*
Democrat	32	31	92.69	23.16	82.72	27.18	9.97	4.264*
Independent	52	51	90.96	19.67	73.75	18.80	17.21	8.929*
Other	4	3	88.75	32.09	72.25	20.39	16.50	1.750
<u>Religion:</u>								
Catholic	51	50	97.57	19.54	84.63	22.91	12.94	5.882*
Protestant	42	41	91.00	21.90	72.86	22.17	18.14	9.080*
Jew	4	3	93.75	24.21	78.25	22.90	15.50	2.101
Other	7	6	76.43	21.67	69.00	16.39	7.43	1.751

\* Significant at the .01 level

TABLE XV. (Continued)

Characteristic	n	df	Pretest		Posttest		Mean Difference	t-Score
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
<u>Education:</u>								
College Graduate	53	52	88.23	19.96	74.58	20.83	13.64	7.583*
Some College	31	30	93.81	20.57	79.68	20.25	14.13	6.480*
H.S. graduate	14	13	105.1	20.77	79.57	25.98	25.50	7.403*
Some High School	4	3	104.5	24.93	98.50	30.18	6.00	.3539
No High School	2	1	117.5	24.75	120.5	33.23	- 3.00	- .5000
<u>Age:</u>								
25 years & Under	17	16	103.5	12.35	82.35	17.63	21.12	5.532*
26-35 years	47	46	85.55	20.85	71.19	18.40	14.36	8.429*
36-45 years	17	16	90.35	15.21	77.12	20.56	13.24	3.369*
46-55 years	11	10	103.5	25.53	92.73	30.87	10.73	1.587
56 and Over	12	11	104.5	24.19	91.25	29.64	13.25	4.305*
<u>Family Income:</u>								
Under \$5,000	11	10	107.4	14.59	95.45	19.59	11.91	2.825*
5,0001 - 10,000	23	22	101.5	19.88	86.48	27.20	15.00	4.816*
10,001-15,000	51	50	88.08	21.24	73.43	20.48	14.65	6.873*
Over \$15,001	19	18	89.53	20.72	73.05	18.08	16.47	5.502*
<u>Sex:</u>								
Male	38	37	94.55	20.01	79.05	19.89	15.50	7.743*
Female	66	65	92.65	22.04	78.30	24.44	14.35	7.432*

\* Significant at the .01 level

TABLE XV. (Continued)

Characteristic	n	df	Pretest		Posttest		Mean Difference	t-score
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Geographic:								
Milwaukee Northside	21	20	101.4	16.83	85.00	23.21	16.43	5.019*
Milwaukee Southside	40	39	99.52	17.93	88.12	22.15	11.40	4.787*
Western Suburbs	25	24	80.96	18.48	63.36	16.14	17.60	7.721*
Northeast Suburbs	18	17	87.39	27.34	71.00	18.74	16.39	4.307*

\* Significant at the .01 level.

Summary of Findings and Discussion

The research conducted in connection with Project Understanding would indicate clearly that the multi-media method of television, discussion groups, and study materials is effective in changing expressed opinions about social and political issues. Insofar as the opinionnaire was an appropriate measure representative of the content and purposes of the program, the research findings demonstrate that Project Understanding accomplished its purpose in considerable measure.

The tests on the null hypotheses designed to ascertain the representativeness of the experimental group were supported. The experimental group appeared representative of the larger population taking part in the series.

The null hypotheses that the program series would make no difference in opinions on the various subjects covered were rejected. Posttest responses were statistically significantly different from pretest responses and all in the direction aimed for in the program series. This was true for the total experimental group and for its sub-groupings.

There was a statistically significant difference (.01 level) between pre- and post-test responses for the experimental group on opinionnaire items related to the content of the programs. There was no significant difference between pre-test and post-test responses in the experimental group on miscellaneous opinion statements.

There was no statistically significant difference between the experimental group and the "non-completers" group when pre-test responses were compared, and no significant difference between groups on demographic facts except for education (.01 level) and age (.05 level).

Scientific and Educational Importance of the Study

The study suggests that television can be effective in changing opinions and attitudes on social issues when combined with discussion groups and study materials.

ERIC Clearinghouse  
MAY 3 1971  
on Adult Education