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ABSTRACT

This thesis - equivalent consists of a 42 minute educational television production and an accompanying document. The television production was designed for first-year Cegep students in either mass media or introductory history courses, and consists of a mixture of actual film footage, graphic animation sequences and studio segments, featuring an on-camera commentator. The completed programme was shown to a test group consisting of 61 subjects, who responded to a questionnaire. Results of the questionnaire are contained in the document accompanying the thesis-equivalent.
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PREFACE

The following document is not a thesis, it is meant to accompany a forty-two minute educational television programme which is on file in the University film and video archives. The document cannot be recommended to those who have not seen the programme, as certain chapters were designed to elucidate programme objectives, facets of the programme style, and other integrally related points.

I wish to thank Professors John Harrison and Tom Allan for helpful suggestions in the developmental stages of the project. I also am grateful to Professor C. Rodney James for his technical advice and assistance during the shooting of the graphic animation sequences and to J. Neil O'Brien for his constant technical aid during the video recording of the programme. Lastly, I wish to thank those of my friends who suffered through my countless long-winded verbal outbursts on either Dreyfus, the press, or educational television.

Rimouski,
March, 1973
INTRODUCTION

In making this programme, I have attempted a marriage of academic history and educational television, in a way that uses the visual capabilities of the latter while attempting not to dilute the former beyond recognition. Producers of educational television have a tendency to neglect the script and expend most of their energies on producing beautiful visuals. Even when the producer is assisted by a subject consultant, the result is generally not a happy medium. The programme either reflects the producers' taste for visual bombardment, fast pacing and flagrant oversimplification, or (depending on money and the institutional power structure) becomes a dull pedantic televised lecture with a few slides thrown in, to remind the audience that T.V. has visual potential.

Good historical programming can be produced by a few individuals working alone, but is more likely to be created by production teams. These teams should be comprised of producers, specifically trained in the structure and methodology of the discipline, and academics somehow endowed with new educational and visual sensibilities. History programming would then take on more complicated dimensions as scripts are carefully written to reflect the discipline's complexity and visuals are chosen according to the demands for historical integrity. The problem of historical inte-
grity will be complicated by the simplicity imposed by television fixed pacing, and by limited visual and financial resources.

Fixed pacing and limited resources were the problems this author faced in the production of "The Press and the Dreyfus Affair". However, I did not hesitate in tackling the subject; because both my academic training in the history of the Third Republic and my television background seemed best suited to this thesis-equivalent choice.
THE THIRD REPUBLIC

AN INTRODUCTORY BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Before one can read fruitfully on the Dreyfus Affair, a knowledge of French history from 1789-1870 would prove helpful, but a knowledge of the Third Republic is a necessity. Several basic books will provide a good foundation: Georges Bourgin's short history of the Republic, and Guy Chapman's *The Third Republic, The First Phase*, are solid and uncomplicated. For those interested in the political parties and their development, François Goguel's *La politique des partis* explains the evolution of the French "party system". Two works are essential to an understanding of Opportunism: Chastenet's biography of Gambetta and Pierre Sorlin's monumental piece of scholarship, *Waldeck Rousseau*. Sorlin's book provides not only a thorough history of Opportunism but also a good analysis of Radicalism and Socialism and their development within the French political spectrum in the last two decades of the 19th century. Since Waldeck Rousseau was Minister of the Interior on two separate occasions, and as such was responsible for "Cults" and Labour, Sorlin deals with both the religious question and the social question in some detail. In 1899 Waldeck Rousseau became Premier of a government of "republican defence" formed to liquidate both the Dreyfus Affair and what
remained of the "Ralliement". Thus a study of Pierre Waldeck Rousseau's political career provides one with crucial information for an understanding of the origins and eventual resolution of the Dreyfus Affair.

The socialists and syndicalists are thoroughly treated in two books by Georges Lefranc. More specific however, are the works of Claude Willard on the Guesdist and Jean Maitron on the Anarchists and on Ravachol. Jacques Kayser's *Les grandes batailles du Radicalisme* provides a mine of facts and analysis on the Radical Party. Though it is not overwhelmingly biased, the book treats the Radicals rather kindly. This kindness is not surprising since Kayser was a prominent member of the Radical Party.

The religious question in France gave rise to many studies. There are several standard works of which the best known is Dansette's *A Religious History of Modern France*, in two volumes. More detailed works include: Evelyn Acomb's thesis on *The French Laic Laws*, Mona Ozouf's delightful look at *L'église l'école et La République*, and the works of Abbé Capéran, beginning with the first moves against the Church in 1878 and ending with the anti-clerical reaction that followed the Dreyfus Affair make worthwhile reading. Although Joseph Sedgwick's *The Ralliement* deals with a specific aspect of the clerical question, it is important to an understanding of the political climate in the France of the 1890's. The preceding importance can also be attributed to a work on the Boulanger Affair by Frederic Seager of the
University of Montreal.

Georges Dupeux's description of French society in the 19th century contains a wealth of information on the changing structure of French social and economic life and how changes in the political elite reflected this socio-economic evolution. Aside from Dupeux work, there are several useful compendiums which also provide overviews of the period in question. Pierre Barral's *Les fondateurs de la Troisième République* presents, in topical arrangement, the major political and social conflicts faced by the Third Republic in its formative years. The excerpts from speeches and newspaper articles are short and judiciously selected. Girardet's *Le nationalism de 1871-1914* is of equally fine quality. Girardet has chosen his excerpts from Alphonse Daudet's *La dernière classe*, debates in the Chamber of Deputies on colonial policy, articles in the press on General Boulanger, and other such events, articles and literary works. There are several extensive passages from Maurras, one from Maurice Barres, and a few choice paragraphs from Drumont's *La France Juive*.

Having digested some of the material listed above the reader will be able to face an extensive Dreyfus bibliography with sufficient knowledge to prevent the Affair from being totally incomprehensible.
A HIGHLY SELECTIVE DREYFUS BIBLIOGRAPHY

Immediately after the Dreyfus Affair, there was a great proliferation of books on the case and its ramifications. For academic purposes most of these books are full of badly documented conjecture and thus only a few need interest us. The most important of these "few" is the multivolume work of Joseph Reinach, a prominent Dreyfusard. Reinach's study, published in the early 1900's emphasizes the role of a clerical-military conspiracy in the Affair, and presents other theories which have not been supported by more recent research. The 7 volumes however, contain a mine of information on press and public opinion. Shortly after Reinach's work appeared, two army officers, using the pseudonym Dutrait-Crozon, presented an anti-Dreyfusard response. This work is still a basic source for those who somehow cling to the belief that Dreyfus was guilty. Since this author could not accept the Dutrait-Crozon thesis, the book was not referred to in the final preparation of the programme script.

Of the works published immediately after the Affair, perhaps the most useful are the memoirs, and collections of speeches or articles, of those who were intimately involved. The memoirs of Maurice Barres, Peguy's Notre Jeunesse, Leon Blum's Souvenirs sur L'Affaire, and the comments of
Charles Maurras, were closely examined. Also consulted were the articles of Georges Clemenceau published in book form as \textit{L'iniquité} and Jaures' attacks on the authenticity of the "faux Henry", and the reticence of some socialists to support Dreyfus, published as \textit{les Preuves}. Zola's articles on the Affair including his eloquent attack on anti-semitism were published in a volume called \textit{La vérité en marche}. This phrase was taken from an article Zola wrote for \textit{Le Figaro} in 1897. A recent paperback edition of this work has made it readily available to students of the Affair and Zola's prominent role in it.

Zola, among other contemporary novelists based some of his fiction of the Affair. Unfortunately, \textit{Vérité} was one of Zola's least memorable efforts. Barres based part of the second book of his renowned trilogy on the Affair and Anatole France and Marcel Proust also refer to the case in their work. However, the best fictional treatment of the Dreyfus Affair, and in particular the exhilarating sense of purpose displayed by some Dreyfusards was written by Roger Martin du Gard. Martin du Gard has managed to integrate the Affair into a study of the religious and moral dilemmas of a scientist in his search for absolute answers to life's basic questions. \textit{Jean Barois} is a biologist, turned activist journalist, in the forefront of the movement for revision of the Dreyfus trial. The Affair is described in the novel through the eyes of Barois and his collaborators and through the use of actual documents. These
features make the book essential to an understanding of the Dreyfus Affair.

The First World War interrupted publication of Dreyfus material, and interest in the Affair declined until the 1930's, when Schwartzkoppen, the German military attaché in Paris in 1894, published his recollections of the Affair. This publication established that Esterhazy was the real author of the bordereau, but the probability that Schwartzkoppen was less than candid about other matters created a stir among those involved in the search for information about Esterhazy and possible accomplices. The thirties also saw the publication of Jacques Kayser's book on the Affair. This book advances the theory of a clerical military conspiracy, and thus follows in the footsteps of Reinach and classical partisan Dreyfusard interpretation.

The majority of the secondary sources used in the development of the script for "The Press and the Dreyfus Affair" have been published since the Second World War. Among more simple explanations for my choice is the supposition that the 50 years between the end of the Affair and the end of the war increase the likelihood of a more balanced historical interpretation. This supposition, however, does not reflect all the recent historiography of a field in which there will always be sharp axes to grind. The recent historiography has naturally been motivated in part by events that took place long after the Affair. Vichy and the rise of facism have led certain historians and political scien-
tists to focus on the ideas and actions of anti-Dreyfusards like Maurras and anti-semites like Edouard Drumont. Increased awareness of the role of media in society has led to one book specifically on the role of the press in the Dreyfus Affair. McCarthyism was, unfortunately, the motivation for an American book on Dreyfus published in 1955. The proliferation of paperback series on historical subjects fed by an almost absurd academic publication rat-race has left its mark on the historiography of the Third Republic and thus almost inevitably on the Dreyfus bookshelves. Many of these books will be commented upon below.

Basic information on the Affair was provided by five general histories of Dreyfus all published within the last twenty years. These books were checked against one another and against available primary sources. The worst of these five books from an academic standpoint is the work of Nicholas Halasz, an American. Published in 1955, the book tends to draw thinly disguised parallels between the Dreyfus Affair and the McCarthy era in the United States. These parallels are symptomatic of the book’s main flaw, a lack of understanding of French politics and culture. Aside from this failing, the book is also marred by an attempt to present solutions to all the riddles in the Affair, by linking events and personalities with tenuous shreds of evidence. Halasz does, however, present some valuable information on public opinion, and his quotes from American and British newspapers and his use of U.S. State Department documents
shed interesting light on the Affair.

There are two works by British historians that take a position and reflect a style of historical scholarship most unlike those of Nicholas Halasz. The first of these is the product of Guy Chapman. Chapman's takes great issue with those who see the Affair as a conspiracy, particularly an anti-semitic conspiracy, planned and carried out by the French General Staff. In order to support his viewpoint, Chapman describes the Affair as a long series of errors and minimizes the role of anti-semitism. Those who have seen the General Staff as the symbol of evil and the Dreyfusards as the symbol of all that was good and just are roundly attacked by Chapman. He uses the argument that Dreyfus had liaisons with women and that he was occasionally boastful in an attempt to explain why Dreyfus' fellow officers seemed to dislike him, and presents similar facts to support his arguments throughout the book. Although the book is laudable as an antidote to Halasz's flowing journalism, Chapman's views are somewhat extreme and simplistic and were therefore rejected by this author.

Douglas Johnson, the second of our British professors, has produced a somewhat more balanced viewpoint than that of Chapman. His book displays a clarity and analytical skill that is admirable. Johnson's view of Picquet as a man initially protecting himself rather than playing the hero is refreshing in its probable accuracy. Johnson however, self-righteously
attempts to destroy too many "misconceptions" about the
Affair, and in a few instances merely replaces the pre-
vailing theory with an equally dubious one.

Two French works are included among the five general
texts used extensively in the development of my script,
the first of these is Marcel Thomas' _L'Affaire sans Dreyfus_
from which Douglas Johnson borrowed a great deal. As cura-
tor of the Bibliothèque Nationale in France, Thomas made
himself supreme master of the various sources of the Affair.
With his bibliographic arsenal, he was able to attack those
historians who would have us believe that Externhazy had a
high ranking accomplice in his spying endeavors. The other
French work to be considered is an extraordinarily concise
study of the Dreyfus Affair published in the "Que sais-je"
series. Pierre Miquel has managed to compress the Dreyfus
Affair into 100 clear pages, placing the emphasis on public
opinion. Miquel's history places a welcome stress on the
crucial role of the press in the Affair and was therefore
mined extensively in my development of a thematic position
on the subject for the programme.

To the five books mentioned above, I must add the
works of two historian editors, Leslie Derfler and Roderick
Kedward. Derfler's work in the Problems in European Civi-
lization series contains a well-balanced group of extracts
from a variety of books on the Dreyfus Affair encompassing
Reinach and Dutrait-Crozon, Jacques Bainville and Nicholas
Halasz. Included in the selections are several that try to
place the Affair in the larger context of 20th century history. The extracts are concise probably because they are selected from the conclusions or introductions of those authors included in the survey. Kedward's work is a collection of primary sources extracted from the press, mémoires, pamphlets etc. Maurass, Jaurès, Drumont and Clemenceau take their place beside less militant partisans on either side, e.g. catholic priests who supported Dreyfus. Kedward introduces each extract with a brief explanatory note, and in a lengthy introduction, explains his division of the Affair into a series of topical conflicts as an attempt to explain that the Affair cannot be understood outside the context of French societal tensions.

There are several books that deal, in whole or in large part, with the press in the Dreyfus Affair. The most general of these is the survey of the Press in the Third Republic written by Raymond Manevy. Aside from a few statistics on the effects of high speed press development and the growth of the 5 centimes newspaper, Manevy's book has little to offer those doing a detailed study of the press and Dreyfus. The preceding cannot be said for Patrice Boussel's book *L'Affaire Dreyfus et La Presse*. The book's chronological order is cleverly designed to give one some of the feelings shared by avid newspaper readers in the 1890's. Boussel reports the incidents in the Affair in the order in which they appeared in the press, adding little explanation to excerpts selected from French and foreign
newspapers. This lack of explanation is the book's main flaw, it suffers from an almost total lack of analysis of the motives behind the actions of certain newspaper editors, and thus can hardly be called the definitive book on the role of the press in the Affair.

Several books dealing with specific newspapers, editors, or writers fill some of the gap left by Boussel. Pierre Sorlin's *La Croix et les Juifs* incisively traces the development of anti-Semitism and anti-republicanism in the Assumptionist mass daily (La Croix), which played a prominent role in the Anti-Dreyfus press. Robert F. Byrnes deals with the development of Edouard Drumont's journalistic personality in his study of *Anti-Semitism in Modern France*. Hannah Arendt deals with the world Catholic press in her highly debatable analysis of the Dreyfus Affair and anti-Semitism, while Michael Marrus studies the minute Jewish press in France, in his recent study of the French Jewish community and the problems of assimilation in late 19th century French society.

Emile Zola originally began his career as a journalist, reviewing the arts for *L'Evenement* and continued throughout his life to write for the press. His career as a journalist is traced by Henri Mitterand in a book published in the "kiosque" series. The book will no doubt come as revelation to those who believe that Zola was first driven to the press by his desire to have "J'Accuse" reach as wide an audience as possible.
Perhaps the most crucial of those books needed to supplement Boussel's incomplete study is a small volume entitled *Dreyfusards*, edited by Robert Gauthier, the former assistant editor of *Le Monde*. The book contains the mémoires of Mathieu Dreyfus, Alfred's older brother and staunchest defender. Mathieu describes his desperate attempts to convince newspaper editors (those editors who would receive him) that his brother was innocent. He describes his encounters with Yves Guyot, Henri Rochefort, and then details his life within the friendly confines of *L'Aurore*’s editorial offices. The mémoires, however, understandably omit mention of the financial assistance Mathieu is supposed to have given to certain newspapers.

Several other books deserve mention because they elucidate the roles of individuals or political groups in France. Eugen Weber and Edward Tannenbaum have both written books on the Action Française. In their opening chapters these books provide insight into the mind of Charles Maurras who began his rise to prominence during the Dreyfus Affair. At the opposite ideological pole, Harvey Goldberg's excellent biography of Jaurès provides glimpses of the socialist press, in particular *La Petite République*, during the Dreyfus Affair.

The foreign press is treated indirectly in Maurice Baumont's study of the diplomacy surrounding the Affair. Baumont quotes extensively from French Embassy reports that outline press and popular antipathy toward France in many
countries. The French foreign ministers generally insisted that their ambassadors launch unofficial protests. The replies to this insistence make informative and at times amusing reading.

A description of sources used for a television script would hardly be complete without some mention of visual material. The majority of the cartoons were photographed from two books by John Grand Carteret: the larger of the two is called *L'Affaire Dreyfus et L'Image* and is available on inter-library loan from the University of Alberta. The smaller collection, aptly named *Heureux les peuples qui n'ont pas d'affaire*, contains cartoons, postcards and reproductions of other objects that contained Dreyfus drawings. Grand Carteret did an admirable job selecting newspaper cartoons but should have contented himself with the occasional comment on the cartoons, instead of attempting to suggest that the newspapers in France would not have had as much impact if the supply of newsprint had been controlled.

Microfilm from the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris and the Library of the University of Toronto provided negatives for many more graphics, the number of which was increased with the copying of pictures from over forty books on French history. The films which began and ended the programme were provided by the Conservatory of Cinematographic Art at Sir George Williams University and the Library of the City of Montreal. Editing of the films was done by transfer
to videotape.
A PARTIAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE ON E.T.V. AT THE UNIVERSITY

The literature on teaching and learning at the university is in the sensori-motor stage of infancy, and the literature on the use of media in the university teaching of social sciences and humanities is still in embryo. The situation may be described by suggesting that we know what we don't know, i.e. almost everything. For a long time researchers were concerned with comparison between film, television and conventional teaching. Cogent criticisms have however, discredited this approach to research. In many of the projects, the final exam was used as a basis for comparison of media effectiveness. This method did not control for the student who felt that he was at a disadvantage because of his assignment to the t.v. or conventional group and so studied harder to compensate. There was also no control for the student who never came to class and borrowed lecture notes.  

A leap ahead of the above style of research is contained in a report of a project by George Gropper entitled, "An Experimental Evaluation of Methods for Improving Conventional Television Lessons." The experiment was designed to see whether the application of the principles of programmed instruction would improve the effectiveness of
Educational T.V. programmes. Conventional programmes were placed in segments, and each segment was placed in sequence so that it subsumed the previous segment. Pauses were introduced in the lesson to encourage "anticipatory responding", and confirmation was provided immediately after each response. Although Gropper and his team were thus able to improve the instructional effectiveness of these two conventional programmes, he was not impressed with the results, which compared unfavourably with the high standards of effectiveness normally set for programmed instruction.3

There are several basic problems with Gropper's approach. A study of conventional T.V. programming cannot be replicated without use of the exact same programme, because every professor or producer has idiosyncrasies that, for research purposes, defy being generalized under the catch-all of convention. This notion obviously holds for classroom teaching, which is equally at the mercy of the vagaries of human character. However, to argue about what constitutes convention (if it exists at all) is to deal in an irrelevant way with the issue of media's place in the university. This issue should revolve around a student centered instructional context, in which the whole nature of university teaching and learning will change. "Conventional teaching", transmitted through T.V. film or any other medium, is still the same inadequate response to the needs of the learner. It is only when curricula are re-designed around clearly delineated goals and objectives,
that we will be able to point to a new system of university education. This approach will take into consideration the media hypothesized as best able to serve the individual educational function required. With a somewhat limited selection of media, the above educational approach is presently being used by the Open University in England, but the work of the course teams has yet to be evaluated in detail. 

Innovation is difficult in any large institution and university professors, and administrators seem particularly reticent about the adoption of fundamental educational change. If the teacher of a university course is to justify his position as a teacher, rather than solely as a scholar (Mackenzie points out that there is no real data to support the assumed connection between the good researcher and the good teacher), he must be prepared to apply the same intellectual standards to his teaching that he applies to his research.

University media producers have little in the way of useful psychological data at their disposal. Little is known about the effects of visuals (except in science and medicine where it is obvious that camera close-ups can help the demonstrator in a large class or in an operating room where the students would not be permitted to crowd
around the table). In general, it is suggested that visuals can be used to cue responses, but surely any stimulus can serve that purpose. Tests have tended to show that T.V. with elaborate visuals is no more effective than bare bones television, i.e. lecturer and camera. The results of these tests are of dubious value for two reasons: there was no control over the quality of the programming, and no way of knowing whether the visuals used were really relevant or useful. In any case, there is justifiable doubt about the ability of conventional verbal test to measure learning that comes from visual stimuli. Almost nothing is known about the transfer of visual stimuli to a verbal mode. Equally dubious tests have also shown that intellectual ability doesn't seem to make a difference in the relative effectiveness of T.V., while other tests have indicated that T.V. is less effective the more abstract the subject.

General findings seem to indicate that television is less effective in university than it is in high school, and much less effective than it is in elementary school. Rather than tying these results to factors like a continuing lack of sufficient interest in teaching methodology, psychologists persist in emphasizing the difficulty of teaching
the more abstract material found in university arts curricula. This approach has some validity, particularly in reference to television and film use. Gropper points to the fixed pace character of television and the lack of feedback inherent in the medium, as distinct educational handicaps. These problems can be alleviated. Review sections integrated into a T.V. programme can provide consolidation of learning within a tightly packed lesson. However, the feedback and fixed pacing problems will only be satisfactorily solved with the integration of television into what Trotter and Mackenzie call "a systematized approach to curriculum". In this approach, the problem of media selection and use would not be one of choosing a medium and adapting the subject matter, but rather one of using the entire range of instructional methods and media, if necessary, to suit the subject matter, the audience, and the environment. Whatever the methods and media selected, precise specification of objectives, rigorous formative evaluation, and a certain human intuitiveness, warmth and enthusiasm must play their part in the learning process at any level in our educational structure.
FOOTNOTES


3 Gropper, Glasgow, p. 9.


5 Trotter, p. 6.


8 McKenzie, p. 85.

9 McKeachie, p. 263.

10 McKeachie, p. 263.

11 Gropper, p. 119.

12 Trotter, p. 51; Mackenzie, p. 35.
NOTES ON EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES

Aimlessness is the single most important cause of ineffectiveness in teaching and of frustration of educational effort.¹ Paul Klapper

In the fifties and sixties educators began to recognize the validity of the ideas expressed in the above statement. The methodology for establishing objectives, and an attempt to overtly categorize objectives that may have been either covert or even subconscious, became a prime concern of those studying and working in education.

The publication of the Taxonomy of Educational Objectives by Bloom and Kratwhol was an important event in the above educational awakening. Bloom defines objectives as "explicit formulations of the ways in which students are expected to be changed by the educational process"², and divides them into three areas, the cognitive, affective and psycho-motor. The cognitive is divided into two fields for "discussion purposes": the first of these is simple behaviour, i.e. remembering or recalling knowledge, the second covers the more complex behaviours manifested in abilities and skills.³ Bloom's cognitive taxonomy moves along a continuum from the simple to the complex, from the concrete to the abstract. Although Bloom emphasizes the need for knowledge, he feels that it is "frequently emphasized as an educational objective out of all proportion to its usefulness..."
or its relevance for the development of the individual. Teachers, however, tend to take the easy way out. Fulfilling knowledge objectives is the major goal of most education systems; abilities and skill play a secondary role. The preceding is only acceptable in a relatively static society; but Bloom suggests that in the twentieth century industrial society, rapid change necessitates an emphasis on generalized way of attacking problems, and on knowledge which can be applied to a wide range of new situations.

In the affective domain Bloom and his associates see a desperate need for more precision in objective selection. In this domain they have accepted a continuum based on internalization of attitudes, values, appreciation and interests. One begins by trying to make the person aware as a first step on the long road to making the attitude value or appreciation his life's outlook. Affective objectives require their own learning experiences according to Bloom, who claims that there is a general myth in education that states that affective behaviour comes automatically with the acquisition of knowledge. Not many educators are, however, willing to suggest methods of eliciting affective behaviour. One of the few is Jerome Bruner who concentrates on the development of an attitude toward learning and inquiry.

Bruner emphasizes the necessity of teaching the structure of a discipline, its fundamental ideas. Learning should not only take us somewhere, it should allow us later to go
further more easily." A person must learn to take the basic ideas and see whether they apply to new situations, and to do this he must understand the nature of the phenomenon with which he is dealing. In certain disciplines, a consensus on the "nature of the phenomenon" doesn't exist, and even in those disciplines where it does, there may not be a clear relation between the usefulness of a structure for scholars and its usefulness and meaningfulness for students.

Bruner suggests that mastery of the fundamental ideas of a field involves not only the grasping of general principles, but also the development of an attitude toward learning and inquiry. Education does not know enough about the creation of such attitudes, but Bruner feels that one of the elements that must always be present at the creation is a sense of excitement about discovery. He discusses the "lure" of challenging a student to use his full powers to gain intrinsic rewards, an inner feeling of competence and accomplishment which normal teaching brings only rarely.

The Brunerian approach has been criticized by David Ausubel, who argues that the emphasis on problem solving seems to preclude the inclusion of the acquisition of knowledge as a legitimate educational objective. "Students do not independently have to solve the intellectual problems they perceive in the content of the learning materials in order for the solutions to have meaning and transferability for them." Ausubel in fact suggests that students would
never learn enough content for future applications, if they spent all their time problem-solving and discussing. He believes that in presenting established material, a teacher can use an inductive approach, and the student can accept the material critically, as the best available approximation of the truth.\textsuperscript{12}

A quick glance at the script will be sufficient for a reader to note that my approach in this programme was essentially that of Ausubel. The programme is designed to inductively present a large amount of material from which the student is expected to grasp the outline of the role of the press in the Dreyfus Affair. If the programme is successful it will hopefully create the attitude that Bruner spoke of, an attitude that would lead the student toward the desire to "discover" more about the topic in question and the problems raised.
FOOTNOTES


3Fenton, op. cit., pp. 22-26

4Ibid.

5Fenton, op. cit., pp. 51-53

6Fenton, op. cit., p. 49.

7Fenton, op. cit., p. 83.

8Ibid.

9Fenton, op. cit., p. 90.

10Fenton, op. cit., p. 137

11Ibid.

12Ibid. Ausubel seems to carry Bruner's argument to its logical extreme. A considerable amount of knowledge would be brought to bear on most problem-solving situations that Bruner might design. Bruner does not eliminate knowledge or negate its importance to the extent that Ausubel implies.
PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of the programme is to bring the student to an understanding of the role the press played in the Dreyfus Affair. This objective coincides with those on level 2 of Bloom's cognitive taxonomy. Subsumed on level two is "Comprehension" and "translation" as the programme aims to achieve what Bloom has called "interpretation". At this level the student should be able to "grasp the thought of the work [programme] as a whole at any desired level of generality." In order to reach this level, the student is called upon to absorb certain facts about the Affair that are presented and emphasized in the programme: e.g. divisions in French society, persistent publication of misleading, distorted information, the role of the press in kindling and rekindling the Affair both before and after "J'Accuse". The student's absorption of this material was tested in two short essay question: the first of these asks the student to synthesize a theme for the programme while the second asks him to weigh certain elements in pronouncing judgement on the role of the press.

The programme also contains affective objectives, the nature of the subject matter demands them. Elimination of such objectives would imply that the writer-producer had no
attitude toward the role the press played in the Affair. To have no attitudes in this case would almost imply having no understanding of the nature of the material.

In my juxtaposition of sections of the script and shots, and in the caustic tone of certain segments, my contempt for parts of the French press is very evident. I doubt that students can come away from the programme thinking highly of men like Rochefort and Drumont, or thinking that most French newspapers acted in a manner consonant with the trust that the public placed in the information they presented.

The level reached on Bloom's affective scale vis à vis the above objectives should be "willingness to respond". The viewer is, at this level, sufficiently committed to the ideas to respond voluntarily with the beliefs expressed above. 2

My secondary affective objective is my intention to impress the student with the persistence of the need to examine information he receives from the news media. "Willingness to respond" will again be called upon. This somewhat long-term objective is tested with one question, designed more to reinforce the programme than to arrive at a conclusion about the realization of the objective. Studies seem to indicate that a test immediately after a presentation seems to aid retention. 3

Bloom himself has pointed out that the division between the two "domains" is somewhat artificial, and that each affective behaviour has its cognitive counterpart. Each do-
main is sometimes used as a means to the other, although
the more common route is from the cognitive to the affective;
this is the route my programme has taken. My affective ob-
jectives rely on cognition of the programme material for
their realization.
FOOTNOTES

2 Fenton, *op. cit.*, p. 53.
PROGRAMME USE AND POST-USE SUGGESTIONS

The programme was designed for an audience of first year university students, and can be integrated into several courses. It is equally relevant to courses in mass media and courses in either Modern European History or French History since the Revolution.

For mass media students the programme was conceived as a starting point for discussion and analysis of problems related to objectivity, reliability and public reaction to the press. (In fact, the programme served as such a catalyst in Professor Boyd's course.) Students interested in the role of media in history should be attracted both to the content and approach taken by the programme and post viewing suggestions for these students would naturally include the analysis of other more recent events in which the role of the press was crucial.

In using the programme, the history professor can simply integrate it into a course on Modern France building lessons on the Dreyfus Affair around the presentation. A professor who takes a more topical approach to the study of the historical discipline can easily link the programme to a more general discussion on the development of the institution of the press in modern European History. The pro-
gramme lends itself equally well to the specific study of political cartooning in the 19th and 20th centuries.

The student of history can be encouraged to use the programme's approach to analyze other specific events in French or European History. For example, the role of the press in the Boulanger Affair or in the outbreak of World War I. A history professor could suggest other topics dealing with, for example, the role of music, propaganda films, etc. in the historical development of peoples and governments.

Whatever use the programme is put to, the activities must be organized in order to present the student-learner and the teacher with material and time sufficient to pursue the ideas emanating from the viewing of a programme such as "The Press and the Dreyfus Affair."
SCRIPT OUTLINE

Robert M. Gagné has uttered what should be a truism in audio-visual education. The arrangement of instructional conditions is still the key to effective instruction regardless of the medium or media employed. Gagné points to a series of "events" that should be included in instruction. Four of these "events" are particularly relevant to my thesis-equivalent. The first "event" consists of gaining the attention of the audience. The second calls for the instructor to insure recall of previously learned knowledge. Guiding the learning through verbal or pictorial material that provides cues is Gagné's third "event" and the closely allied fourth event is the establishment of conditions for remembering and transfer of learning. In the script outline that follows, the above four "events" will be emphasized because each forms an integral part of the programme concept.

The script begins with a superficial film dramatizing a few of the major events in the Dreyfus Affair. The film is designed to serve several functions. Because of its age (it was produced in 1906) the film serves easily as an attention getter. A music track composed by Warren Cohen with an assist from Chopin, edits that shortened the film and in one instance made it more humorous, and a tongue-in-cheek commentary add
to the film's attractiveness. The film is also used to point to the low level of present general knowledge about the Dreyfus Affair and the superficiality of many film and literary analyses of the Affair. These analyses generally concentrated on the dramatic detective aspects while excluding the role that French public opinion and the French press played in this bizarre aberration of the idea of national justice and national human decency.

The next section is partially designed to review material that the student should cover before viewing the programme. This section outlines the tensions in French society during the 1880's and 90's. However, this portion of the programme also introduces the French press. Particular emphasis is placed on newspaper editors. Edouard Drumont, who played an important role in the Dreyfus Affair, is singled out for specific analysis. This first section sets the style for the programme, with its intercuts between film sequences and an announcer in the studio. Cues, in Gagné's terminology, are provided by the narrative which tells parts of the story and the graphic animation which provides impressions and information which fill in the detail. The animation technique allows one to hide certain information, "cue" the viewer and spring it upon him with a split second precision that no other technique approaches. If surprise is not desired, the technique offers unparalleled control of programme pace to those who understand visual pacing.
Further information and analysis is provided by a studio announcer who adds an analytic historical perspective that would have been impossible to present voice over, because of a limited number of available prints, and the difficulty of presenting an analysis with contemporary visual material not designed to fit into a programme on the press. As well, the fixed pacing imposed by an all-visual programme would have made detailed analysis impossible.

There are those who would argue that the "talking face" has no place on a visual medium with television's technological capabilities. This is utter rubbish! Hal Holbrook's "Mark Twain Tonight" stands as a monument to the talking face and visual simplicity in television. I am not arguing that the "talking face" should abound on educational television, but where rapport, or the fixed pacing of film material, pose difficulties for a producer whose aim is effective learning, a capable on camera announcer can be a great asset to an E.T.V. presentation.

In my programme the two longest on camera sections were broken by quick, humorous cutaways designed to elucidate a point being made by the narrator. The on-camera sections are also used for reviews. These reviews coincide with part of Gagné's fourth event which insists on the necessity for providing aid in the recall of learning. The review built into my programme is both visual and aural. While the announcer on camera is summing up a section of the programme, the camera pulls back to reveal a large rear screen, where
slide copies of selected cartoons and prints that appeared in the graphic animation sequences are presented in a montage, that reinforces what the announcer is saying.

Gagné's fourth "Event" also insists upon a transfer of learning, and this provides a difficult problem for the academic historian-producer. In dealing with a specific historical question, the historian must be careful to elucidate the problems peculiar to that question and only generalize about other historical events with the utmost care. Facile comparisons only do the study of history a great disservice. Therefore I have limited my secondary affective objective to the eliciting of thought about the role media has played in past events, and can play in those of the future.

After the initial review section, the introduction to the Third Republic, and the beginnings of the case, the remainder of the programme deals with the role of the press in the movement for revision of the verdict. Announcer on camera sequences become shorter and there are two graphic animation sequences that run for seven minutes each. The Dreyfus Case became an "affair" in late 1897 and early 1898, the flames being truly fanned by Zola in "J'Accuse". The great proliferation of political cartooning that greeted Zola's article provided a mine of vivid visual material. The cartoons speak partially for themselves, but in many instances the narrative explains the context of the drawing. In no case, however, was a cartoon totally described.
necessary repition does not aid programme quality, and can be an insult to the student-viewer.

The graphic animation technique is used throughout the programme until the final minute when documentary footage of Paris in the "Belle Epoque" is used. This footage serves two purposes: it provides a light balance to the old footage at the beginning of the programme, and to the serious tone of the animated sections, it also suggests that the programme has progressed from the superficial dramatization of the opening film to a somewhat more realistic view of French history. After the announcer makes his final comments, there is a short montage of shots from Lumière films. In this brief segment, shots of marching soldiers and charging cavalrmen are cut together with a frenzied group of Parisians grasping for newspapers. As the crowds in the shot surge down the sidewalk, the frame is frozen and the programme titles are superimposed. The juxtaposition of these short film clips was designed to serve as a visual reminder that the military and the newspaper-reading public were two of the most important elements in the Dreyfus Affair. The elements as depicted in the Lumière segments also share an irrational elan, typical of those Frenchmen who refused to recognize the possibility of a judicial miscarriage.
FOOTNOTES


2 Ibid., p. 313-314.

3 This idea was presented by none other than the Vice Chancellor of the Open University in conversation with the author at a McGill University Conference.
THE PRESS AND THE DREYFUS AFFAIR

June, 1972

Thesis Equivalent Television Production

Produced and Directed by
Ronald Elliott Spivock
In 1894, Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish army captain, was arrested for treason, tried, and quickly convicted.

Stripped of his rank, among other things, Dreyfus was sentenced to life imprisonment on Devil's island.

After a few years of vegetation in prison, he was granted a new trial, pardoned and eventually cleared of all charges.

You may have noticed that the film excerpts you saw didn't exactly give you an in depth analysis of the Dreyfus Affair. The French film maker showed you some of the main actors in a Dreyfus Drama, that seemed to take place in a vacuum. He only left out French politics, the French press and French public opinion. So he neglected to tell you that the attempt to clear Alfred Dreyfus of a treason conviction shook much of French society. But films at the turn of the century were a novelty made for entertainment. The French people were supposed to be receiving reliable information and analysis on the Affair from the French press. What we are going to do in this programme is examine the way the press handled the Dreyfus Affair. We'll look at France before the Dreyfus Affair and point to possible explanations for the mental outlook of French society at the time of Dreyfus' arrest, a mental outlook that was of course reflected and played on in the French
press. Many papers stressed nationalism and militarism. Others wooed their readers mainly with anti-clericalism or anti-semitism. All these isms played their part in the Dreyfus Affair. For certain historians, anti-semitism was the most crucial. They usually begin their story by talking about Edouard Drumont.

Drumont was a leading anti-semite and gutter press editor who became a celebrity in 1886 when this book was published. The book, and others that followed, described how Jews had been controlling France and leading her to disaster. Public response was enthusiastic and La France Juive alone went through 201 editions. In 1892 Drumont founded La Libre Parole, an anti-semitic, anti-government mass daily. One of its first features was a study of Jewish officers in the French Army.

Drumont and his writers attacked everything they didn't like and blamed it on the Jews. A story about a poor starving family became an attack, not on capitalism in general, but on the Rothschilds in particular. La Libre Parole's readers were told that all Jews were wealthy, powerful, potential traitors. For those readers not completely convinced, the arrest of Alfred Dreyfus may have been a decisive factor. In any case, the
arrest boosted Drumont's circulation. But the few historians who argue that anti-semitism was the basis of the Dreyfus Affair are being too simplistic. Anti-semitism was important, but we have to look at other factors that also helped to mold the outlook of the average French newspaper reader.

The French were crushed in the Franco-Prussian War, but defeat couldn't be blamed on cowardice. French troops didn't shy away from rushing at the Germans. So Frenchmen concluded that spies, bad leadership, lack of morals, or one or two foreign plots, must have caused the defeat of the invincible French Army. Conspiracy theories had been a handy part of French political life since before the Revolution of 1789. The Third Republic kept up this time-honoured tradition. Republicans accused Catholics of trying to poison the minds of the young in schools run by priests, while Catholics screamed that the Republic was trying to dechristianize France.

The French bourgeoisie was afraid that anarchists and socialists were trying to destroy French society and most Frenchmen were worried that the Kaiser had hired French traitors.

The basic message was that France had to be on guard. Crooked poli-
ticians, spies, and subversives were everywhere. The government, the war minister in particular, and the army, the pride of the nation, had to be watched. The job of public watchdog fell mainly to the press. The newspapers loved it. They featured long, involved reports from their parliamentary editors, and from their military correspondents. Mass newspapers, a few with circulation in the millions, were generally read by wage earners and the lower middle class. These papers competed with one another for the best insults or for the juiciest scandals.

IRATE MALE VOICE: What! no scandals today, give me back my two sous, you're robbing me!!

In the years before the Dreyfus Affair, the hungry reader wasn't cheated too often. Newspaper editors had lots of material

From the 1880's, an economic recession affected wage earners already disillusioned with an ineffective and corrupt parliamentary system, with employers who paid low wages for long hours, and with governments that used police and soldiers to harass strikers and protect factory owners. General Boulanger was going to get rid of the corruption, change the constitution, and stand up to Bismark, Europe's bully. But Boulanger lost his nerve, his mistress, and his mind, and disappointed his followers, left and right. Soon the Panama scandal added to the
growi ng distrust for parliamentary government.

Politicians of all parties and seven newspaper editors were bribed to support the Panama Company. When the Company collapsed, taking the savings of many people with it, investigations were launched; but the courts, and the government, were lenient with those implicated. The Republic and its politicians lost a great deal of respect, while the press quickly recovered from its involvement in the scandal.

Public suspicion remained high as the papers continued to deliver their daily dose of indignation against Germans, Jews, Freemasons, priests, the working class or the bourgeoisie.

By 1894 everything was ready for the Dreyfus Affair. The French Army obliged by arresting the wrong man.

14 days after the secret arrest of this man, Captain Alfred Dreyfus, the public got a hint that an arrest had taken place. The government confirmed this story in vague terms. On October 31, 1894, Dreyfus' name was leaked to the press. As you can see La Libre Parole made the most of the headline, but Dunois was worried that the War Minister, General Mercier, might hush the whole thing up because Dreyfus
was a Jew. His article also said that Dreyfus had made a complete confession, when faced with the evidence. The mass circulation Le Petit Journal, Le Matin and the highbrow Le Figaro spread equally ridiculous rumours. Most papers took Dreyfus' guilt for granted, and tried to outdo each other in dreaming up motives for the crime. In his popular rag L'Intransigeant, Henri Rochefort carried on an attack on General Mercier, accusing him of being responsible for the treason.

Meanwhile in the army's secret investigation, this letter was the only piece of supposedly solid evidence against Dreyfus. Experts couldn't agree on whether Dreyfus had written it, but the General Staff still believed that Dreyfus was guilty.

The leak of Dreyfus' confess caught the government, and the war minister just as they were deciding whether to order Dreyfus to stand trial. At this point, pressure from the press was probably quite crucial. After all, the government was put on the spot by false reports in the press that claimed Dreyfus had confessed to selling vital secrets to the Germans. A few historians argue that someone purposely leaked information to the press, either to protect himself, or to force the government's hand. It's a possibility, but we really don't know. What we do understand is that newspaper comments that the Jews were bribing General Mercier, or that the cabinet didn't care about spying, put the government on the defensive.
It had to show that it was living up to its patriotic duty, a duty that included not being openly pro-Jewish. If Dreyfus hadn't been indicted, many papers would have screamed that Mercier was incompetent for having had him arrested in the first place, while Drumont, and other overt anti-Semites, would have dreamed up a story about Jewish bribery. The government instability in France meant that mishandling of the case could easily cause the defeat of the cabinet and could make or break the career of General Mercier. So despite some reservations, Dreyfus was indicted. The army and the state had begun to put themselves on the line.

Mercier must have lost the evidence wrote La Libre Parole, why else would the trial be delayed. Trying to solidify his popularity, the war minister replied that the army had absolute proofs when he gave a scoop interview to Le Figaro. Only a few newspapers, including Paul de Cassagnac's L'Autorité protested this blatant intervention in a case about to go before a court-martial. Edouard Drumont praised the war minister. Finally on December 19, 1894, Dreyfus' trial began behind closed doors. The prosecution and only a few papers like La Croix and Le Petit Journal demanded and got a secret trial, in the interests of national security. Demange, Dreyfus' lawyer, wanted the press and the public to know that a letter was the only piece of evidence. Many Frenchmen didn't find out till 1906. In 1894 the unanimous guilty verdict was praised by the press.
and newspapermen joined a large, angry crowd at Dreyfus' degradation. Soon after the degradation, some papers began calling for the expulsion of all Jews from France, but anti-Semitism gradually died down; because, after seeing Dreyfus off to Devil's Island, the French press went on to other stories and scandals, and became oblivious to the ex-captain, except La Libre Parole. Drumont just couldn't drop a case that seemed to confirm his wildest anti-Semitic charges, so he took to printing stories which said that Dreyfus was living in luxury, and could escape any time he wanted to. In fact, Devil's Island was a maximum security hell.

Fade to black
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Moyes for revision of the verdict started right after the degradation ceremony, but there were overwhelming problems involved in trying to change press and public opinion. There seemed to be no way of getting at the truth. The newspapers never had it.

The secrecy surrounding the arrest, evidence and trial meant that the press had to depend on supposedly reliable leaks of information or their own imaginations.

They used both pretty freely. After all, it's not everyday you find a German spy on the French general staff, especially a wealthy Jewish one at that! The public had to know all the details.

Even after the verdict, a few prominent newspaper editors weren't
private convinced of Dreyfus' guilt. But how in the misinformed France of the 1890's could you publicly question the unanimous verdict of seven honorable army officers? This was the question Mathieu Dreyfus had to answer.

Alfred's older brother was determined to use his family money, and connections, to try and gain entry to the fashionable salons where society and government, the military and the press, mixed. Mathieu also tried desperately to keep his brother's name in the press. This trial was designed to do just that. La Libre Parole was always willing to believe an escape story. One minor problem, both the captain and the escape ship were fictitious. But Alfred Dreyfus existed, and part of the press was to become aware of him again. An article in L'Authorité expressed slight doubts about his guilt. L'Eclair, using leaked information, responded by printing a long and false rehash of the Affair. The article though, did make public the fact that during Dreyfus' trial, evidence was passed to the judges without the defence seeing it.

So now some of the public and the press were informed that the minister of war had done something illegal at Alfred Dreyfus' trial. Few people believed the information, and
most of those that did dismissed the whole thing as a mere procedural point. So in 1896 and early 1897, the occasional article in the press confirmed Dreyfus' guilt. To get more attention, Mathieu published a book claiming that his brother was innocent. He got some publicity for the book by convincing a few editors to review it in their papers. They all attacked the book. Still, through the press reviews, the book was able to attract a few people who became disturbed by inconsistencies it pointed out.

It's autumn 1897. Scheurer Kestner, an elderly moderate senator from Alsace, was attacked in the press for trying to convince the government that Dreyfus was innocent. The gutter press called him an agent in the pay of the Jews, and even the more responsible press wasn't much kinder. Many papers spoke of a Jewish-German conspiracy.

The case became more heated when Mathieu Dreyfus discovered that this man, Esterhazy, was the real author of the letter for which his brother was convicted. The yellow press thought that Esterhazy was being used as a scapegoat for the Jews, and called the War minister a traitor for not protecting him. In *La Libre Parole*, Drumont screamed that the army would deal with the syndicate of Jews who were trying to destroy France. So despite a dubious background, Esterhazy became such a popular hero that a sarcastic cartoonist suggested promoting him. Instead, the general staff began protecting and
helping Esterhazy, and this angered at least a few Frenchmen. The pro-Dreyfus paper L'Aurore, edited by Georges Clemenceau, opened its doors to Mathieu Dreyfus. Les Droits de L'Homme, Le Figaro and Le Siècle followed, but these papers seemed to be fighting a losing battle for public support. Pressure from subscribers forced Le Figaro to abandon Dreyfus; and so only a few papers contradicted idiotic anti-Dreyfus charges, repeated by Rochefort and others. Rochefort informed the public that the Kaiser wrote letters to Dreyfus while Dreyfus was on the general staff. The Germans responded by suggesting that Rochefort be sent to an asylum.

Esterhazy and Dreyfus occupied the front page pretty often during November and December 1897, which figures; partly because the public is keenly interested in the things it fears, and the public always fears conspiracy. The anti-Dreyfus Press played on fears of a German-supported secret Jewish conspiracy that was spending millions of dollars trying to dishonour Esterhazy and the French Army. The French public believed, while the press in the rest of the western world generally watched in amazement. It was quite clear to most editors outside France, that Esterhazy was not an honourable officer.

FEMALE VOICE My goodness your sheets are always soiled! Just wait till I get my hands on the little rascal who's doing this.

The Germans, the English, the Aus-
The camera zooms back to include rear screen on which several review slides are flashed and then zooms back in to announcer.
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Esterhazy, realizing that he was fully protected, asked to be court-martialed, and he was acquitted behind closed doors. Dreyfus supporters seemed defeated, but this man realized that authority would have to be coerced into action. A revolutionary act was needed; it came through the press.

Fade to black
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Zola accused the General Staff of keeping Dreyfus on Devil's Island, even though they knew he was inno-
cent. He accused the army of acquitting Esterhazy, even though they knew he was guilty. He accused the army of attempting to manipulate public opinion, through newspapers like L'Eclair. And he didn't exactly endear himself to most Frenchmen by charging that it was only the gutter press and the Paris scum that supported the General Staff.

Zola's all-out attack on the General Staff made the Dreyfus Affair the center of French attention, and created a great deal of excitement in Paris, both in the press, and on the streets. There were anti-Semitic riots in many parts of France, the parts coloured black on the map. The riots occurred mostly in Catholic areas, where La Croix and La Libre Parole sold well.

The mass newspapers generally attacked Zola as a prize agent of the Triple Alliance: the Germans, the Austrians and the Italians. He was also attacked as a tool of the Jews. Clemenceau, his editor, was accused of being an English spy. Editorial and cartoon polemics became more savage and stereotyped than was usual, as the anti-Dreyfus Le Psst and the pro-Dreyfus Le Siflet were founded. The attention given the Affair created a tense atmosphere in certain homes, slightly exaggerated in this cartoon. "Above all let's not talk about the Dreyfus Affair" says the father, "but they spoke about it" -- so did they.

After J'Accuse, Zola was the center of French and foreign discussion. He was laughed at and denounced by
most Frenchmen. His supporters were also ridiculed, but as this German cartoon suggests, the more Zola was insulted in France, the more he grew in the esteem of his many admirers in the Western world. Americans, Germans, Belgians applauded Zola's fight for justice, his courage, and his anti-clericalism. England also joined the somewhat self-righteous chorus.

Within a month of J'Accuse, Zola was brought to trial for libel, and was mocked for not being able to present proofs for his allegations. The anti-Dreyfus press, and large, riotous crowds cheered Zola's conviction. Dreyfus supporters were not enthused. During the trial, the chief of the General Staff threatened to resign if Zola were not convicted. When Zola was convicted, the pro-Dreyfus press couldn't resist commenting on the pressure tactics used. The anti-Dreyfus press saw the Zola trial in a totally different light.

Is it a cross or a sword? The Dreyfusard press began to present the theory of a clerical-military conspiracy against justice, the Republic, and Dreyfus who supposedly represented both. According to the theory, the General Staff egged on by the Jesuits was responsible for the Affair and associated evils. Our two favourite editors, Rochefort and Drumont, were attacked for providing major support for the conspiracy. They were pictured as a new general staff, as deacons of a religion that put the state before justice, as great lovers of the army, and as undertakers trying their best to bury the Dreyfus Affair.
As you may have noticed, visual clichés played an important part in Dreyfus cartoons. Here is a sample of recurring themes: truth rising from the well, the Affair as a knot that couldn't be untied, the key to the Affair, the pen and the sword, David and Goliath, France the cry baby, la France and her dirty laundry, France crumbling, as witnessed by the United States, and finally Dreyfus as the last nail in the French coffin. The most widespread clichés were those associated with Dreyfus, either as a martyr for justice, or as a member of a dishonourable, sneaky and ambitious race. The anti-Dreyfus press fought desperately to stop any growth in sympathy for the Jewish captain.

With most Frenchmen, they succeeded. The public was solidly anti-Dreyfus, and since 1898 was an election year, only a few of the politicians who had doubts about Dreyfus' guilt had enough guts to express them. So until September of 1898, the pro-Dreyfus campaign was carried on in the salons and cafés of French society, and, above all, in the press by men like Clemenceau. Clemenceau, the Radical politician was not a member of the Chamber of Deputies at that time, and so could take an unpopular stand in favour of Zola, without the Radical party holding him back.

It was the press that kept the Affair from dying after Zola was convicted. The anti-Dreyfus forces continued to shriek about the honour of the army and the Jewish plot, while the Dreyfusards wrote
and talked about justice and truth, and screamed about a clerical-military conspiracy. Drumont and Rochefort demanded that the Army defend itself openly. So the new war minister, Cavaignac, opened the defence by making public some of the documents in the case.

Jean Jaurès, and other Dreyfusards, publicly denounced the documents as a pile of forgeries. Cavaignac was puzzled. The pressure from the press caused him to examine the documents. He discovered that one of them was forged by this man, Colonel Henry, who cut his throat soon after his arrest. Dreyfusards were jubilant. Esterhazy fled to England. The chief of the General Staff resigned, and the government finally asked the Appeal court to hear the Dreyfus Case. But despite this cartoon from Punch, the Affair was hardly over. The generals continued to believe that Dreyfus was guilty, continued to suggest that more evidence could be produced, and continued to demand unquestioning faith from the French people. The Army and its supporters would accept only one type of revision for Dreyfus. Trying hard to keep the lid on, they began the most concerted press campaign of the Affair, in order to discredit the government and the judges, hearing the appeal. Drumont began to collect money for Colonel Henry's widow, while he joined the nationalist press in screaming that revision would mean the destruction of France.
During the fall and winter of 1898-99, there were many public meetings organized by pro- and anti-Dreyfus leagues. At these meetings, the future of France was discussed in terms of the outcome of the Dreyfus Affair. Despite large turnouts, the press was still the main platform for such discussions.

The nationalist author Maurice Barres wrote that Dreyfus' worst crime was to be the tool of a campaign attacking the French Army, and the French nation.

Georges Clemenceau countered in L'Aurore, the nation and the army had to be just in order to be worthy of anyone's devotion.

For Charles Maurras, the Royalist, an individual's fate was immaterial, the idea of injustice was irrelevant. Faith in hierarchy and authority were the basis of a nation's survival.

From the editorial offices of La Petite Republique, the great socialist Jean Jaurès replied, the economic basis of the social hierarchy must be destroyed, while basic human freedoms are a great heritage that must be preserved.

Another new government, this one conscious of anti-Dreyfus public opinion, refused to defend the judges. The generals still enjoyed great popular support. So, despite the fact that the Affair seemed to be drawing toward Dreyfus' exoneration, and despite the fairy tale quality of these cartoons, Dreyfus' more lucid supporters were worried. They had good reason to be concerned. Though it was shaken the General Staff never crumbled; not even after
hearings before the appeal court
disclosed new irregularities in
the original Dreyfus trial, or af-
ter the judges quashed the 1894
verdict, and ordered a new court-
martial.

There was no reason for it to crumble.
Despite the new evidence, presented
in only some newspapers, the average
Frenchman still believed that Drey-
fus was guilty.

For five years most newspapers had
been telling him just that. So what if
there was something illegal about the
first trial, the generals were
still convinced of Dreyfus' guilt,
and where the army saw smoke there
had to be fire.

The nationalist press continued to
make the case a choice between Drey-
fus and the army, or between the
Jews and France. While the growing
pro-Dreyfus forces made the issue
a choice between Jesuits, generals,
and a just Republic.

The reading public in France, and
Dreyfus' new court-martial, opted
for the army, but with extenuating
circumstances. There was a sym-
pathy for Dreyfus, who looked like
a broken man. There was the fear
of a secret government of priests,
but above all, people were just
tired of the Affair. France wanted
to return to normal.
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So after a new government pardoned Dreyfus, most newspapers dropped the whole issue, and the press finally stopped being crucial to an affair it was instrumental in creating in the first place.
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EVALUATION

Bloom, Hastings et. al. in their book on evaluation distinguish three general types of evaluation procedure. The first of these is the least crucial for this project. "Initial Evaluation" deals with the student's previous knowledge and aptitudes. Since the programme contains a highly specialized subject matter, previous specific knowledge is considered very unlikely. The programme is based on the assumption that a student with sufficient aptitude to enter university and with a little background in French history should have no trouble understanding the material in the presentation.

Bloom's second general type of evaluation is called "Formative evaluation" and is in my opinion the most important evaluation procedure. Formative evaluation consists of an attempt to isolate what still must be learned and the methods that have failed to produce results, as prescribed in the objectives set for a particular section of a curriculum. The impetus for the development of formative evaluation has come from men like Gagné, Mager, Stolyrow and Glaser all of whom have shown an interest in why as opposed to whether an instructional programme worked or didn't. This type of approach must characterize evaluation procedure for educational
television if the medium is ever to reach its potential as an educational tool. Certain questions in my test were therefore designed to test features of the programme's teaching methodology i.e. the use of visual communication only, or the effectiveness of the review sections.

The requirements of the thesis-equivalent are nested under the third heading "summative evaluation", a procedure used at the end of a unit of instruction to ascertain "the extent to which each learner or class of learners, has attained the specified objectives." The Education Department at Sir George is naturally interested in whether the subjects learn from a thesis-equivalent, an interest that must be shared by the student-producer. However, anyone interested in continuing to work in educational television should endeavor to make his evaluations as formative as possible. The Thesis-equivalent regulations do not require programme correction and retest and I would be the last person to advocate such an added burden. However, an analysis or attempted analysis of the sections of a programme that were effective and those that were not should be crucial to the student and is in general important for the development of a body of knowledge about educational television production techniques. A heavily qualified generalization, formed from the results of questions about important teaching hypotheses built into a programme, will provide educational television producers with more information than they seem to possess at present.
FOOTNOTES


TESTING PROCEDURE

Some students learn in spite of "bad" teaching and others fail to learn in spite of "good" teaching. The amount and quality of learning are thus neither the sole nor necessarily the most important criteria of teaching effectiveness. When dealing with human beings one can be confronted with an infinite number of variables that may at one time or another impede learning, despite teaching methods that are generally effective. Although these variables can never be completely discounted, they should not stand in the way of learning evaluation, which is still the most important method for giving us a useful indication of teaching effectiveness.

An evaluation procedure used in education should provide the student with an outlet for expression of his views on the teaching methods and his attitudes toward the material presented. These attitudes may provide an accurate indication of future comprehension in the general subject area e.g. mathematics. They may also reflect the teachers inability to stimulate the student and the student's attitude toward school learning in general.

The preceding indicators cannot be gathered solely through the use of an objective test, a more varied form of testing is necessary. There are other difficulties involved.
in the use of a straightforward objective test. Objective tests can generally satisfy the needs of evaluation in simple cognitive areas but are obviously deficient in testing a student's ability to create hypotheses of his own without being provided with a list from which to choose.\(^1\) The objective test also reflects a rigid attempt to specify all outcomes in advance, presumptuously suggesting that the teacher has anticipated them all. Even the best teaching can lead to misconceptions and misinterpretations. Open-ended questions are the only method of discovering the variety of ways in which supposedly unambiguous statements and concepts are viewed by those less familiar with the subject matter being taught i.e. the students. There are interpretative dangers involved in evaluating "supply answers". Extraneous considerations such as a student's difficulty in expressing a concept that he may understand or the biases of a person reading the answer can cloud the results. Question objectives must be clearly delineated and a uniform set of evaluation procedures must be instituted to limit or virtually eliminate the bias.\(^2\)

The test used for this project combined both subjective and objective techniques. Some questions were designed to elicit responses about programme style and structure, while others examined the depth of student comprehension of the material and the extent of retention of facts presented both visually and aurally.
FOOTNOTES

1 Bloom, Handbook, p. 487.

2 Ibid, p. 490.
THE TEST

The test consisted of 18 questions 11 of which were objective questions, requiring either checks or one word answers. The 11 objective questions were designed to ascertain the level of factual retention from the programme and therefore attention was paid to a selection of questions covering the beginning (eg. question 5), the middle (eg. question 7), and the end (eg. question 8) of the programme. The questions also varied in the estimated degree of difficulty. I anticipated, for instance, that students would have little trouble with question 2 on Henry's suicide and a great deal of trouble with question 8 on Barres' philosophy. My hypothesis was based on what I felt to be a clearer presentation in the programme of relevant cues for responding to question 2.

The objective questions were also divided into 3 categories according to the mode in which the response had been presented in the programme. Questions were designated A.V. when the response was presented both visually and aurally, V when the response was presented visually and A,aurally. The author does not maintain that this division constitutes a valid test of the very complex mode problem inherent in the work of Severin, Fleming, and others. A valid comparison test can only be made if the modes transmit the same information. Since the programme was designed to discuss and analyse the role of the press in the Dreyfus Affair, the
message took precedence over the medium, and a truly valid research design was not created. The comparison attempted in the test was merely expected to give the author a general indication of the effectiveness of his communication of selected facts. Generalizations from the results can form the hypotheses for future research or can certainly force the author to justify and analyse his use of one mode as compared to another in future productions. The preceding theme will be pursued in the results section.

Two of the objective questions (numbers 4 and 6) demanded that the respondents synthesize a response based on their interpretation of the programmes orientation. These questions constituted the only two interpretative questions scored on an "objective basis" and were supplemented by two questions requiring answers of a sentence or more. The four interpretative questions were designed to test the student's understanding of the programme themes as opposed to his retention of certain facts. As suggested above it is this author's firm belief that the testing of interpretative learning is best achieved by allowing the student to express his interpretation or misinterpretation. Questions 1 and 13 provided an opportunity for student expression and thus for the formative evaluation necessary for modifications in production technique and programme content.

As the author has suggested in his general comments on testing, an evaluation procedure should allow the subject to express his views on the subject and presentation style of
an educational communication. The test therefore asked the student whether he found the programme interesting (Question 15), whether he liked the on camera announcer (Question 16) and whether he thought the content of the programme was important (Question 18). The student was also requested to express any additional comments about the programme.

Statistical treatment of the results focused only on the objective part of the test. A total out of 11 was tabulated for each student and the percentage of correct answers was tabulated by computer for each question. A reliability test was run on the basis of the total scores on the objective portion of the test. The 61 subjects were randomly divided into two groups of 30 subjects and the groups were compared by computer. Percentages were also computed for the mode comparison discussed above and for questions 9, 14, 15, and 16 which elicited student attitudes on programme style and content.
THE SUBJECTS

The student group chosen as subjects for this experiment consisted of sixty-one students in the introductory Social Science mass media course at Sir George Williams University. The students were to begin a unit on the press and its influence on society, and so the instructor offered to show my programme, which fitted conveniently into the curriculum. The students were first year CEGEP students with little or no background in history, and because of the predominant historical emphasis, I was concerned that the students might be bored with the programme. As the test results show, boredom did not develop, and many students were quite attracted to the historical nature of the subject matter.

The students saw the programme individually in study carrels at specified hours. They were then asked to pick up a questionnaire, fill it in immediately and hand it in to their conference leader, who had announced that students would get a perfect score that week for merely handing the test in.
RESULTS

The results of the factual section of the test demonstrate that the students learned facts presented in the programme without a great deal of difficulty. As table no 1 shows the average for the 61 respondents was 8.0% out of a possible total of 11; 27.9% of the students got 10/11, 23.0% 9/11 and 13.1% 8/11. As tables 2 and 3 demonstrate, the reliability test by random division presents two groups that are almost identical, suggesting that the objective test can be accepted as statistically reliable.

The results of the mode comparison are contained in tables 4, 5, 6. The audio-visual questions were answered correctly in 93% of the responses, most students scoring 4 out of 4 on the A.V. questions. The relatively strong audio-visual score is not surprising if one accepts either the theory of additive effects or the point in Severin's "cue summation theory", which argues that when information presented in one mode is supported (not repeated) by either clarification or additional cues, the result will be a net gain in learning.1 Considering Severin's theory or the theory of additive effects, the fact that the Audio score was 19% lower that the A.V. score should not be disturbing. The large amount of verbal information in the 42 minute programme should also be taken into consideration in an interpretation of this score.

The video questions posed the most difficulty for
the students and thus provided the author with a totally unexpected result. The video questions were not considered to be among the most difficult factual questions, and because the subjects were "children of the television era," I was led to overestimate their visual learning abilities, utilizing the hypotheses of men like McLuhan and Gattegno. As table 6 notes, 32.8% of the subjects scored 0 on the video section, 42.6% scored 50% and only 24.6% got a perfect score.

RESULTS ON INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

Table 7 indicates that the subjects had very little difficulty answering question 2 (How did Cél. Henry commit suicide?). The near perfect response (96.7%) can be explained by the fact that the subjects were given quite a few verbal and vivid visual cues. The students were shown an image of Henry lying dead in his cell, while the commentator mentioned that he had cut his throat after his arrest. The next image begins with a close-up of a razor.

Question 3 (What newspaper was forced by its subscribers to abandon Dreyfus?) was expected to pose greater difficulty than Question 2. As table 7 notes, 88.5% of the subjects got the correct answer. My expectation of greater difficulty was based on the fact that the programme only made passing reference to Le Figaro's failure to maintain its integrity and on the fact that the visual used was a line drawing of the office of Le Figaro with the name of the newspaper
printed in barely legible letters in the window. The visual, in which the letters were the only useful cue, was not expected to be as effective as the image showing Henry's razor, however this hypothesis was based more on intuition than on the results of a confused body of research on the subject of retention from audio-visual presentations. According to Severin, the mere display of the word *Figaro* should not have aided learning. Severin argues that when the video is a mere repetition of what is presented in the audio, there will be no gain in learning over presentation via only one channel. Those who support the theory of additive effects do not agree with Severin, they argue that there is a gain in learning whenever information is presented simultaneously in both channels.

Question 4 (Anti-semitism was the most important cause of the Dreyfus Affair) was designed to probe the student's understanding of a basic point of view presented by the programme. Instead of demanding straight factual information, the subject was asked to synthesize some of the information and analysis in the programme, in order to conclude whether or not anti-semitism was the most important cause of the Dreyfus Affair. 'Nowhere in the programme was the subject presented with a direct affirmation on the issue. The programme, however, spent a considerable amount of time pointing out that the affair was the result of a number of historical developments, with which anti-semitism became intertwined. As expected, the percentage of correct answers (32.8%) was considerably lower that for the two preceding questions.
(see table 9). This lower score may be explained by several factors: there are certain historians who maintain that antisemitism was the most important cause of the Affair and their theories cannot be dismissed as total nonsense; therefore, some subjects could have very well used the information presented in the programme, perhaps combined with their own predisposition, to reject the programme arguments. The second possible explanation for the above score is the gap I sense between the fact, retention ability of freshmen university students and their relative inability to synthesize interpretations from factual information presented. In discussions with students who saw the programme, I found support for this hypothesis.

Question 5 (What newspaper headlined the story about Dreyfus' escape from Devil's Island?) was expected to pose no difficulty for the majority of subjects. The images of *La Libre Parole* were held for approximately twenty seconds while the announcer explained the situation; 88.5% of the students got the right answer (see table 10).

Although question 6 was an interpretative question similar to question 4, the programme hardly mentioned the church and thus left little doubt in the subject's mind vis-à-vis question 6. Eighty-six and nine tenths percent correctly responded that the church was not "most responsible" for the opposition to the Dreyfus Affair (see table 11).

My hypothesis for question 7 (In *J'Accuse*, Emile Zola suggested that the support for the General Staff came
from which of the following groups?) was that it would provide subjects with greater difficulty than they had encountered in other factual questions. The information needed to respond to this question was presented solely in the audio channel, by the commentator who was on camera in the studio. Furthermore, the commentator was holding a facsimile of the January 13, 1898 edition of L'Aurore, the edition in which Zola's J'Accuse appeared. If Severin is correct, the easily readable headlines could have caused a distraction, reducing the possibility of retention of the information presented via the audio. Only 63% of the subjects checked both the "Paris scum" and the "gutter press", the two right answers (see table 12).

Question 8 (Who said that Dreyfus' worst crime was to have been the tool of a campaign aimed at destroying the French Army and the French nation?) demanded another response for which the information was presented solely in the audio channel. While the commentator spoke of Barres, the camera vertically panned a picture of him. The image, however, provided nothing in the way of useful visual information and I therefore designated this question an "audio question". Results were better than those for question 7, but were still lower than results on factual questions in which information was presented in both the audio and video channel. Seventy-two and one tenth percent of the students identified the words in question 8, as those of Barres. I had expected the question to pose a greater degree of difficulty for the sub-
jects because of the density of audio information transmitted in the section which contained short resumes of the thoughts of Jaurès, Barres, Clemenceau and Maurras. 13.1% of the students were confused enough to check Clemenceau’s name. The views of Clemenceau and Barres were totally opposite (see table 13).

Because the review sections of the programme were designed to both aid retention and clarify programme interpretation, it was felt that the subjects should be requested to give their opinion as to whether the sections were helpful. The results, as presented in table 14, show that these sections did not fully serve their intended purpose. The majority of students (72.1%) found the sections only partly helpful. Both commentary and visuals can be improved in these sections to insure greater usefulness.

The results of question 10 (Which one of the following was not a cliché used in the Dreyfus Affair?) were quite surprising. I had postulated that most students would be able to respond correctly, but I did not expect a percentage as high as 98.4%. The percentage indicates that the subjects paid close attention to the section on visual clichés; not surprisingly, this section was one of the lighter, more diverting segments of the programme (see table 15).

If the results on question 10 were considerably higher than my expectations, I found the percentage of correct responses to questions 11 and 12 astonishingly low. Both questions required responses for which the information
was presented solely in the visual channel. Question 11 (What type of revision were the anti-Dreyfus forces willing to provide Dreyfus with?) had two distinct visuals of a firing squad associated with it. The visuals were introduced in the programme with a statement using wording almost identical with that in the question itself. Thus the comparatively low score on this question cannot be explained by suggesting that the answer was obscure, it was, in fact, anything but obscure. Several students misread the question, and responded by speaking of opposition to revision, or of the slander campaign against the judges of the appeal court. Other students responded with the word "hanging", I presume they were using the word as a synonym for the general term "execution". No other explanation springs to mind because it was not difficult to notice the firing squads in the two graphics shown (see table 16).

For question 12 (What did the sarcastic cartoonist suggest Esterhazy be promoted to?), I accepted three responses, Napoleon, Emperor, or dictator, using Napoleon as example. The graphic that provided the information for the response used symbols like Napoleon's hat or a sceptre with an E on it, parodying Napoleon's constant use of his first initial N. These two signs have become visual clichés, and I was therefore surprised to see that so many students didn't recognize the reference to Napoleon. Quite a few students responded General or General Staff, while an equal number left the question blank (see table 17).
Question 1 asked students to write a sentence outlining what they thought the theme of the programme was. Most students went no further than a general statement about the influence of the press on society, or a more specific statement about the role the press played in the conviction and persecution of one man, Alfred Dreyfus. The responses to question 1 demonstrate that the subjects did not attain the objectives this author had set before making the programme. The students seem only to have grasped the programme on a factual rather than on an analytical level. Few subjects seemed to understand the idea that relations between the press and the public consist of a two-way communications network, in which the public state of mind is both constantly reflected and constantly influenced by the press. One of the few students who understood this notion wrote:

The main theme was how the press can influence the opinions of their readers and also vice-versa in a situation where the press is operated to make money.

The above point of view was expressly stated only once in the programme, however the producer did take great pains to establish the fact that late 19th century France was a country riddled with political conflict and general suspicion, pointing out that this situation was reflected in the press.

The results of the questionnaire imply that the above points were presented in too subtle a fashion and that the demand for synthesis seems to have posed a more difficult task than the author had anticipated. Other producers and researchers seem to have arrived at the same conclusion.
about the level of subtlety in a film. For example, a Prix Jeunesse study of the award-winning "Baft" states the following:

From an examination of the comprehension of specific sequences it appears that a considerable majority in all countries (Prix Jeunesse tests are administered in several countries) completely misunderstood the messages. Clearly then, Wiegand had failed to communicate his message even to the more sophisticated 16 year olds and in view of the reported popularity in all countries of the far less subtle Biafra/poodle sequence (a contrasting juxtaposition) it might seem that yet a more direct and obvious approach is necessary to make an impact on a young audience.

It is this author's contention that the above conclusion can be applied to all audiences, including the subjects of this thesis, whose average age was 17.2 years (see table 18).

Question 13 asked the subjects whether the statement "the public gets the type of press it deserves" was a fair way to describe the relationship between the press and public. Forty-nine and two tenths percent of the subjects responded "yes" and supported their answer by claiming that the press has no choice, it must print what the public wants to read or go out of business (see table 19). Those who responded "no" generally approached the problem philosophically, suggesting that the public deserves the truth but that the press just doesn't give it to them. Students were also divided in their choice of a specific or general approach to the question. Approximately half the students mentioned the Dreyfus case while the other half of the subject group spoke of the press in general. However, whether the students chose a specific or general approach they were unable to look at
the press from an analytical standpoint suggesting, for example that the public may have been bigoted or ignorant but that this hardly justifies a journalistic attitude which merely adds fuel to the flame. In the light of the "Baff" research cited above and my encounters with many of the subjects of this test, it would seem that my desire to see the subjects reach Bloom's "interpretation" level failed because the programme point of view was not presented clearly enough.

Question 14 asked the students for an opinion on whether they would be "more wary of information received via the media as a result of having seen this programme". Fifty-seven and four tenths percent answered affirmatively, 14.8% responding "definitely yes" and 42.6% responding probably yes (see table 20). However, the purpose of this question was not to gather statistics, (which are meaningless, because of the virtual impossibility of verification) but to present the students with a reminder that a more wary attitude toward the media was a secondary affective objective of the programme. As has been mentioned previously, the preceding tactic was based on findings that a test immediately after an educational communication seems to improve retention.

Question 15 asked the subjects whether they found the programme interesting. The results were as follows: 19.7% found the programme very interesting, 62.3% quite interesting, 15.1% quite boring and 4.9% very boring. The above statistics indicate very clearly that students were attracted by the programme style and content i.e. they liked the pro-
gramme (see table 21). The next question asked students whether they liked the "on-camera announcer". This question was included for several reasons, among which were the comments of a few people who previewed the programme and suggested that the "talking face" was boring, unprofessional, and should not be seen on television. In fact only 11.5% of the subjects stated that they did not like the announcer, but this attitude or reaction in no way affected their results on the test. Another reason for including the question on the announcer was the fact that the script took a committed, informal approach specifically designed to parallel neither C.B.C. National News or the Queen's Christmas Message. It is this author's firm belief that one communicates more effectively with subjects if one's message is phrased in a language and style similar to that used by the subject (see table 22).

The two final questions asked the subject to comment on the importance of the programme and on any other aspect of the programme. Responses to questions 17 and 18 were almost always in line with those of 15, and thus most students emphasized the importance of the programme in responding to question 18, and many students complimented the producer in responding to question 17. Certain subjects responded to question 18 by suggesting that the theme of the press was important, but that the programme should not have been designed around a specific example. Because of the nature of the subject population this lack of enthusiasm for
the historical discipline is understandable. As one subject succinctly put it "if you are a history freak then you would like the programme". His classmates, however, for the most part tolerated the programme's historical orientation.

SUGGESTIONS FOR PROGRAMME IMPROVEMENT AND BETTER PROGRAMME USE

The results of the objective section of the test suggest that students learned factually from the programme, despite what I felt to be a great density of factual material. The amount of fact does not seem to need reduction, but rather seems to require better organization, because students seemed unable to form interpretations on the basis of facts learned. The organization and interpretation was supposed to have been facilitated by the review sections, but as suggested in the results enumerated above, most students found the review sections only "partly helpful". The author's interpretations and syntheses were either too subtly presented, or were lost in a maze of more or less useful fact. The presentation of the review visuals could also be improved by taking them in close-up and eliminating the announcer from camera. The cut-aways could have thus been placed in teleciné which would have resulted in a clearer image.

The review sections were an attempt to alleviate the problems associated with the programme's fixed pacing and the lack of opportunity for consolidation of learning.
In discussion with students, the programme length was criticized several times and therefore in future the guide to programme use would suggest that the programme be shown in sections and stopped, for discussion, in between sections, generally after comments from the on-camera announcer. The discussion would have to be lead by a competent and knowledgeable animator prepared to answer the questions posed by students, and prepared to stimulate discussion on themes in the programme.

The student's interpretative abilities may have been hindered by a lack of preparation in the history of the Third Republic. Despite the fact that the programme reviewed the French political and social problems that were linked to the Dreyfus Affair, the students do not seem to have grasped the realities of late 19th century French history, either from lack of interest, as suggested by some students, or lack of historical background. In the future if the programme is used in courses other than history, the user will be advised to provide the class with an introduction to French history 1870-1894.

If the programme were to be remade, the author would be wary of relying on the ability of visuals to communicate without verbal cues or clarification as in the case of the firing squad or Esterhazy as Napoleon. This "mise en garde" is the only conclusion one could possibly draw from the mode comparison added to the programme testing procedure.

As the results section notes, the students "sort
of" liked the on-camera announcer, and thus a change is not necessary. The students in general thought the programme was interesting, and I would thus argue against modifications in presentation style. Students were particularly pleased with the use of old film footage, cartoons, and with the music, all of which were consistently mentioned in discussions the author held with those who had seen the programme. Perhaps the questionnaire should have contained questions which asked the student what he liked least about the programme, and what he most enjoyed. The responses would probably have been more relevant in the consideration of changes to be made in a future version of the programme.
FOOTNOTES


4 McKeechie, op. cit., p. 297.
APPENDIX A

SOCIAL SCIENCE 001.1       29 September GMB

PROBLEM SHEET

YOUR NAME

(bring this to
section ___ class FRIDAY,
late sheets don't count)
age___ male___ female___

1) Write a sentence outlining what you thought the main theme of the programme was.

2) How did Col. Henry commit suicide?

3) What newspaper was forced by its subscribers to abandon Dreyfus?
   a) La Libre Parole___
   b) L'Eclair___
   c) Le Figaro___
   d) Le Petit Journal___
   e) L'Aurore___

4) Anti-semitism was the most important cause of the Dreyfus Affair.
   yes___ no___

5) What newspaper headlined the story about Dreyfus' escape from Devil's Island?
   a) La Libre Parole___
   b) L'Eclair___
   c) Le Figaro___
   d) Le Petit Journal___
   e) L'Aurore___

6) The church was most responsible for the opposition to revision of the original Dreyfus Verdict.
   yes___ no___

7) In J'Accuse, Emile Zola suggested that the support for the General Staff came from which of the following groups?
   a) the working class___
   b) the Paris scum___
   c) the church___
   d) the gutter press___
   e) the bourgeoisie___
8) Who said that Dreyfus' worst crime was to have been the tool of a campaign aimed at destroying the French Army and the French nation?
   a) Jean Jaurès
   b) Maurice Barres
   c) Charles Maurras
   d) Georges Clemenceau

9) Do you find the brief review sections very helpful
    partly helpful
    very useless
    useless

10) Which one of the following was not a cliché used in the Dreyfus Affair?
    a) the pen is mightier than the sword
    b) the light at the end of the tunnel
    c) the well of truth
    d) the last nail in the coffin

11) What type of revision were the anti-Dreyfus forces willing to provide Dreyfus with?

12) What did the sarcastic cartoonist suggest Esterhazy be promoted to?

13) It has been suggested that the press merely reflects the society in which it exists, i.e. the public gets the type of press it deserves. Do you think this is a fair way to describe the relationship between the press and the public?
    yes
    no

14) Do you think that in the future you will be more wary of information received via the media (T.V., press, etc.) as a result of having seen this programme?
    definitely not
    probably not
    probably yes
    definitely yes

15) Did you find the programme
    very interesting
    quite boring
    quite interesting
    very boring

16) Did you like the on-camera announcer? not at all
    sort of
    very much
17) Please add any comments you may have on the programme on the sheet you used to answer the longer questions.

18) Do you think that the content of this programme is important?
### APPENDIX B

#### TABLE 1 - TOTAL SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 61 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

---

**Mean** | 8.066  | **Std error** | 0.246 | **Median** | 8.607  |

**Mode** | 10.000 | **Std dev**   | 1.922 | **Variance** | 3.696  |

**Minimum** | 3.000  | **Maximum**  | 11.000 | **Range** | 8.000  |

**Valid observations** | 61  |

**Missing observations** | 0  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 7.900  Std error .366  Median 8.500
Mode 10.000  Std dev 2.096  Variance 4.024
Minimum 3.000  Maximum 10.000  Range 7.000

Valid observations 30
Missing observations 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj. freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 8.167  Std error: .339  Median: 8.643
Mode: 10.000  Std dev: 1.859  Variance: 3.454
Minimum: 4.000  Maximum: 11.000  Range: 7.000

Valid observations: 30
Missing observations: 0
# TABLE 4 - AUDIO VISUAL QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 3.721 Std error .067 Median 3.837
Mode 4.000 Std dev .521 Variance .271
Minimum 2.000 Maximum 4.000 Range 2.000

Valid observations 61
Missing observations 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq. (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 2.230  Std error 0.122  Median 2.576
Mode 3.000  Std dev 0.956  Variance 0.913
Minimum 0.000  Maximum 3.000  Range 3.000

Valid observations - 61
Missing observations - 0
### TABLE 6 - VIDEO QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: .918  
Std error: .097  
Median: .904  
Mode: 1.000  
Std dev: .759  
Variance: .577  
Minimum: 0.000  
Maximum: 2.000  
Range: 2.000

Valid observations: 61  
Missing observations: 0
### Table 7 - Question No. 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**: 1.033  
**Std error**: .023  
**Median**: 1.017  
**Mode**: 1.000  
**Std dev**: .180  
**Variance**: .032  
**Minimum**: 1.000  
**Maximum**: 2.000  
**Range**: 1.000

**Valid observations**: 61  
**Missing observations**: 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>La Libre Parole</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Figaro</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Petit Journal</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Aurore</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.115  Std error: .071  Median: 2.819
Mode: 3.000  Std dev: .551  Variance: .303
Minimum: 1.000  Maximum: 5.000  Range: 4.000

Valid observations: 61
Missing observations: 0
### TABLE 9 - QUESTION NO. 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 1.333  
Std error: .061  
Median: 1.250

Mode: 1.000  
Std-dev: .475  
Variance: .226

Minimum: 1.000  
Maximum: 2.000  
Range: 1.000

Valid observations: 60

Missing observations: 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative Adj. freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>90.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 1.361  Std error: 0.136  Median: 1.065
Mode: 1.000  Std dev: 1.065  Variance: 1.134
Minimum: 1.000  Maximum: 5.000  Range: 4.000

Valid observations: 61  Missing observations: 0
### TABLE 11 - QUESTION NO. 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 1.869  Std error .044  Median 1.925
Mode 2.000  Std dev .340  Variance .116
Minimum 1.000  Maximum 2.000  Range 1.000

Valid observations - 61
Missing observations - 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The working class</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The working class &amp; Paris scum</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Paris Scum</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Paris Scum &amp; the Church</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Paris Scum &amp; the Gutter Press</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>63.9</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Church</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gutter Press</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>96.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Bourgeoisie</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 26.787  Std. error: 1.032  Median: 25.609
Mode: 24.000  Std. dev: 8.058  Variance: 64.937
Minimum: 10.000  Maximum: 50.000  Range: 40.000

Valid observations: 61
Missing observations: 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jean Jaures</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice Barres</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Maurras</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georges Clemenceau</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 2.356  Std error .096  Median 2.148
Mode 2.000  Std dev .737  Variance .544
Minimum 1.000  Maximum 4.000  Range 3.000

Valid observations  59
Missing observations  2
### TABLE 14 - QUESTION NO. 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Adj freq (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly helpful</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very useless</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useless</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean       | 1.948              | Std error                    | 0.083                       | Median                        | 1.932                         |
| Mode       | 2.00               | Std dev                      | 0.633                       | Variance                      | 0.401                         |
| Minimum    | 3.943              | Maximum                      | 4.000                       | Range                         | 3.000                         |

Valid observations - 58

Missing observations - 3
### TABLE 15 - QUESTION NO. 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency</th>
<th>Adjusted adj freq</th>
<th>Cumulative freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**: 2.016  
**Std error**: .016  
**Median**: 2.008  
**Mode**: 2.000  
**Std dev**: .128  
**Variance**: .016  
**Minimum**: 2.000  
**Maximum**: 3.000  
**Range**: 1.000  

**Valid observations**: 61  
**Missing observations**: 0
### TABLE 16 - QUESTION NO. 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency</th>
<th>Adjusted adj freq (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Mean**: 1.541
- **Std error**: 0.064
- **Median**: 1.576
- **Mode**: 2.000
- **Std dev**: 0.502
- **Variance**: 0.252
- **Minimum**: 1.000
- **Maximum**: 2.000
- **Range**: 1.000
- **Valid observations**: 61
- **Missing observations**: 0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorrect</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 1.541  Std error: .064  Median: 1.576
Mode: 2.000  Std dev: .502  Variance: .252
Minimum: 1.000  Maximum: 2.000  Range: 1.000

Valid observations: 61
Missing observations: 0
### Table 18 - Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative /adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>91.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>98.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 17.246  Std error: 0.21  Median: 18.000
Mode: 18.000  Std dev: 4.069  Variance: 16.555
Minimum: 16.000  Maximum: 21.000  Range: 21.000

Valid observations: 58
Missing observations: 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 1.508  Std error: 0.065  Median: 1.516
Mode: 2.000  Std dev: 0.504  Variance: 0.254
Minimum: 1.000  Maximum: 2.000  Range: 1.000

Valid observations: 61
Missing observations: 0
### TABLE 20 - QUESTION NO. 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted adj-freq (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj-freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>definitely not</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably not</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably yes</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>definitely yes</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>MISSING</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 2.683  Std error .102  Median 2.692  Mode 3.000  Std dev .792  Variance .627  Minimum 1.000  Maximum 4.000  Range 3.000

- Valid observations - 60
- Missing observations - 1
### TABLE 21 - QUESTION NO. 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted adj freq (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very interesting</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite interesting</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite boring</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very boring</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Mean: 2.033
Std error: .093
Median: 1.987
Mode: 2.000
Std dev: .730
Variance: .532
Minimum: 1.000
Maximum: 4.000
Range: 3.000

Valid observations: 61
Missing observations: 0
### Table 22 - Question No. 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Adjusted Frequency (percent)</th>
<th>Cumulative adj freq (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sort of</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 2.689  Std error: .086  Median: 2.878  Mode: 3.000  Std dev: .672  Variance: .452  Minimum: 1.000  Maximum: 3.000  Range: 2.000  

Valid observations: 61  Missing observations: 0
BIBLIOGRAPHY


