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ABSTRACT

Video as a Process Tool with the Emotionally Disturbed and Learning Disabled Adolescent

Irving Rother

The difficulties of the Emotionally Disturbed (E.D.) and the Learning Disabled (L.D.) adolescents derive from a multitude of factors stemming from poor feeling of self and their surroundings. It is the self-concept which enables the individual to meet new experiences positively.

This thesis-equivalent presents the format for the design and production of video-material by the students as a means of stimulation to increase their understanding of themselves and interpersonal relationships.

Since this material was process-oriented the treatment and control of the television material was largely left in the hands of the students.

Using a modified version of the Baily test (Heller and Polsky, 1976) this study examined the relationship of the production process to problem areas of self, peers and family. The theoretical basis of this project incorporated principles of abnormal psychology, cognitive and affective learning behaviours as well as theories of audio-visual communication.

The evaluation design was a Non-Equivalent Control Group, Pre-test Post-test Design (Fitz-Gibbon and Morris, 1975). The population who participated in this study were
26 senior high-school students enrolled in Short-Vocational and contained or partially contained Special Education Classes in a rural high school.

The effects of the television process on Learning Disabled and Emotionally Disturbed Adolescents was tested according to five hypotheses using a double multivariate design. The video process was found to have a significant effect whereby the subjects' feelings were reduced about self-guilt (i.e. - punitiveness).
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction to the Media Presentation

1.1 The Educational Problem

Since observational learning is a particularly important component of behavior acquisition, the extent to which the mass media - specifically television - can exert an influence on the acquisition and maintenance of the behaviors, norms, and values of children need to be determined. Moreover, research is clearly needed among those segments for whom television has its greatest impact - the alienated and the frustrated. (Donohue, 1978, p. 187).

Much of the research concerning television and the young has focused on its impact as a product to motivate behaviour and as a source of modelling. Donohue (1978) suggested that many of the investigations have centered around television violence and violent behaviour. While studies such as these have added to the wealth of television knowledge, there are still questions to be asked and answered regarding other aspects of television and its specific audiences. This thesis-equivalent examined the use of television as a tool in which the underlying process of producing the video material fostered a more favourable self-concept.

The students for whom the project was conducted were identified by the labels "Emotionally Disturbed" and "Learning Disabled". The students were enrolled in a
regular high school setting although they attended either Short Vocational and Partially or Contained Special Education classes. Placement into such classes is decided by psychological testing, recommendation by teachers, counsellors, and psychologists. Permission into Special Education classes must be granted by the parents or guardians. These students acted as both producers and audience of the video-material during the process of this study.

The author of this study has been a Special Education teacher of English, Life Skills, Workstudy, and Mass Media for the past nine years. While it was not the intention of this research to go into detailed definitions of the L.D. and E.D. adolescent, the nature of the subjects and the aim of this research make it necessary to outline some of their characteristics. It must be stated at the start that both terms - L.D. and E.D. - are at best, ambiguous. There are as many definitions for each as there are misconceptions. The term "Learning Disabled" is used in this paper to refer to:

those children of any age who demonstrates a substantial deficiency in a particular aspect of academic achievement because of perceptual or perceptual-motor handicap regardless of etiology or other contributing factors. (Hobb, 1977, p. 478).

Upon closer examination of this definition one realizes that it encompasses as much a developmental problem as any other. (Cruickshank, 1977).
There are many "classifications" of Emotionally Disturbed children, few if any are accepted by the specialists. All too often the diagnosis is based upon the individual's "disturbing behaviour" rather than on more ethical and psychological criteria. The identification follows a routine of testing, interviewing and observation by psychologists and counsellors. Chandler (1982) suggested that this variety in referral and assessment is the result of the lack of a firm definition of emotional disturbance. The E.D. student in a regular classroom is in a precarious situation. While not ill enough for institutionalization or special care counselling, they are expected to behave in a manner contrary to their emotional stability. The result is usually one of constant aggravation to the student and classroom environment. A false "macho" image hides a poor self-image.

The instruction of the E.D. and L.D. adolescent has been for the most part aimed at improving academic achievement by using a behaviouristic approach. There is however, a related area which in essence is a pre-requisite to enabling these students to achieve academic gains. They must first have confidence in themselves and others. This can only be realized with a secure self-concept. Silverman and Zigmund in *Self-Concept in Learning Disabled Adolescents* (1983) state:

One of the prevailing assumptions in the learning disabilities literature is that the adolescent student
who has a learning disability will invariably have a poor self-concept. The basis for this assumption appears to be sound: a learning disabled student has an average or above average intelligence and is probably aware that he or she is not learning as well as parents and teachers expect or as well as age mates. By adolescence, this student has an accumulation of failure experiences in school and cannot help but feel less competent than normally achieving peers. (p. 483).

In the case of the E.D. adolescent the situation reveals a greater need. The education system is able to offer these individuals little in the way of improving their academic skills, let alone helping them cope with interpersonal and social skills. These persons often become a "loner" and an "exile" by peer pressure or self imposed. Chandler (1982) points out:

with the new push to concentrate public school efforts on the untroubled and untroubling child who is academically goal oriented, there is little reason to expect funds for improving programs for emotionally disturbed children. (p. 563).

Still, it is not only the task of the educational system to improve intellect, normal or otherwise, but it is the added responsibility of the educational process to provide an environment which fosters for a better coping with the self.

The L.D. and E.D. adolescents have been chosen as a
combined population since most Special Education classes encompass both groups. For this reason this study will consider these individuals as an intact group.

1.2 The Educational Objective

The educational objective of the process was to influence an attitude change in the subjects in those areas which most affect their daily routine, toward the self, peers and family. This was attempted by having the students produce video material depicting situations that presented coping difficulties. The individuals' "feelings" played an important role in this process. Munn (1961) defined the subjective nature of feelings as "affects".

The tendency in Educational Technology Literature has been towards product development, such as Elias' study (1979) which utilized videotape and discussion programs, to enhance existing services for socially and emotionally troubled youngsters" (p. 218). However, video has been profitable as a process tool. Baggaley (1982) showed the applications of the "Fogo Process" as a methodology which allows people to control and shape their environments via film and video-tape.

A study by Gill (1976) examined The Improved-Self Concept Through Visual Means. The study focused on the relationship between the self-concept of minority Afro-American students and media. In reality Gill researched the creation of "self-enhancing learning environments through visual communications". (p.4). This research illustrated the positive aspects of involving
underachieving students in the process of making the
learning material.

Gill’s observations indicated that the disadvantaged
student is:
1) oriented to the physical and visual rather
than to the aural;
2) inclined to communicate through actions rather
than words;
3) content-oriented rather than form-centered;
4) externally-oriented rather than introspective;
5) lacking in experiences of receiving approval
for success in task. (p. 8).

Gill concluded that the exceptional student may be
affected in the educational environment through:
1) group activities enjoying mediated approaches;
2) participation in the media as producers rather
than consumers;
3) instruction through visual literacy. (p. 15).

The above characteristics and conclusions can also be
applied to the subjects in this thesis-equivalent.

While behaviour change as a result of process-oriented
material may last for only short periods of time, it
indicates the potential of such a procedure. Baggaley
(1975) spoke of the need to intellectualize television
content — unless there exists a reason to do so what has
been transmitted is soon forgotten. If the individual is
made part of the overall process, there is reason to
believe that some long term effects may persist.
For the most part video-tape has been used as a means of self-confrontation in clinical settings (Braucht, 1970) or in modelling behaviours (Kimball and Cundick, 1977) and as professionally produced commercial programs to engage the viewer in the portrayals of troublesome aspects of life. (Inside Out Series, Agency for Instructional Television, 1973). Few studies have used video-tape in the manner suggested in this research. Maruit, Lind and Molaughlin (1974) in their study of delinquent adolescents, stated that:

no matter what the therapeutic conditions, no behaviour of attitude change will occur unless there is a motivational apparatus. (p.999).

By being involved in the production of the television material — and the hands on and viewing experiences it encompasses — the subjects in this study received the "motivational apparatus".

1.3 Rationale for the Media Selection

Many of the objectives discussed so far have been tackled in the traditional psychodrama methods. That is to say, the individual expresses how he feels not only verbally but also "through gestures and movements" (Moreno, 1946, p. 181). Psychodrama because of its spontaneous nature involves the subject totally — i.e. privately and socially. However, television has been incorporated into this study since it was the intention to investigate the effectiveness of video with L.D. and E.D. students in an affective manner. Also, it was observed that television
plays an important part in the lives of many L.D. and E.D. students.

...television is our window on the world providing a vast array of images that reflect the complexities of human life and experiences. Its potential for broadening horizons and helping youth acquire insights about "real life" far outweighs the portrayals of violence or sexual suggestions. (Van Hoose, 1978, p. 674).

In studies involving an attitudinal change, there exists little room for predicting what elements will in fact initiate the effect. Reeves (1977) stated:

There are few studies which examine the extent to which prediction of attitudes and behaviours from exposure to media content can be enhanced by accounting for mediating contingent conditions. (p. 662)

One of the necessary conditions in this thesis-equivalent was a high sense of reality since no matter what the subjects were intended to perceive, the final evaluation was one of personal interpretation. Reeves (1977) pointed out that subjects exposed to content labelled as real were more aggressive than those shown fictional content. Television has been widely documented as a medium which can supply this element of reality. Furthermore, since the content material was highly personal it reflected real life situations.

Television has been regarded as an influential tool
for the "normal" child and is therefore, a seemingly logical learning tool for the disturbed. Schramm (1961) noted that it is more important to understand what the child brings to television than what television brings to the child. This underscores the importance of using video in a process-oriented manner. Research by Elias (1979), Donohue (1978) and VanHoose (1980) supported the theory that television can add to the present "service" for the emotionally disturbed.

Del Vecchio and Dundas (1970) pointed out that video: 
...is explicit in its communication, capable of carrying the simplest to the most complex ideas and information. In McLuhan's terminology videotape is a 'mosaic', a multi-level, multiperspective medium which engages all the senses, directly or indirectly, and thereby involves its audience totally. Thus, videotape is a highly personal medium for the individual viewer; it demands and obtains his participation. Videotape also communicates rapidly--with refined programming and editing an hour's worth of lectured information can be televised in 10 minutes and usually with improved understanding and retention by the audience.... (p.254)

1.4 Outline of Content and Form of Production Activity

The video content for this study was based on material produced by the students in the experimental group. The emphasis was on presentations to simulate social situations both to evaluate performances within specific incidents and
as a basis for reflection and problem solving.

The study was concerned with the problems the students have in three areas: self, peer and family. These themes reflected past experiences associated with members of the experimental group. Self focused on the way the student viewed himself. In the actual video taping, the student involved reenacted an incident in which her reading disability resulted in pressure by the substitute teacher (who did not know of her difficulties) and ridicule by her classmates.

Problems in the peer area were concerned with the individual's feeling of inadequacy with age mates and classmates. The video segment portrayed by the subjects for this area demonstrated the adolescents poor relationships with those their own age.

Difficulties in the family were illustrated by the lack of communication between the adolescent and his parents. The family reenactment involved the hurt and disappointment experienced by a student in conversation with her mother. Each segment lasted eight to ten minutes.

It was the intention that each subject be involved in the video production either as an actor or as a member of the television crew or both. Dowrick (1977) noted that early applications of role-playing target behaviours was unsuitable since the subjects had difficulty in reproducing the desired behaviours. Therefore, this research utilized the technique similar to that of Miklich (1970) in which recordings were made of both the problem area as
remembered by the student and a follow-up recording implementing the "self as model strategy" showing the subject in a more controlling behaviour.

Bandura's (1969) Social Learning Theory indicates that modelling influences act by their "informative function" in which the focus of observation is a symbolic rather than specific stimulus. This theory stresses that the observers act as "active agents". Based upon this assumption Bandura formulated four subprocesses which rule over modelling behaviours.

Firstly, Bandura pointed out that merely demonstrating modelled behaviour to an observer does not presuppose that the intended behaviour will be learned. Rather it is necessary that the audience attends to specific "attention controlling behaviours" such as the appeal the model has to the learner. The model and the learner in this thesis-equivalent are either the same person or at the very least a classmate. (Negative behaviours should have been minimized by post-viewing discussion and the self as model strategy previously described.)

Secondly, Bandura noted the ability to reproduce the behaviour without repetition of the modelling event. Bandura's experiment (1966) pointed out that children who verbally coded information were able to respond to modelled patterns to a higher degree than children who merely viewed the modelled behaviour. The students of the experimental groups used both cognitive and verbal processes during the video-taping. Bandura's theory then postulates that these
students could in retrospect experience flashbacks when confronted with similar incidents as those portrayed on video-tape.

Bandura's third component in the Social Learning Theory is referred to as the "motoric reproduction". This area most closely follows Miklich's (1970) self as model theory as it involves the learning of new elements. In this case the students observed the incidents as it more or less actually happened. The next step was to use this and alter it so that the individual was able to find more constructive behaviours.

The final element in Bandura's theory is that reinforcement of the modelled behaviour is reliant upon positive feedback. While the learner may acquire the desired behaviours, putting these into action is dependent on positive stimulus. This underlies the need for home and school cooperation.

Structured scripts and production techniques were minimized so as to put the emphasis on the problem areas. In order to allow for post-viewing discussion, the segments were open-ended.
Chapter 2

Process Evaluation

This chapter presents the formulation of the hypotheses and definition of the variables as well as the description of the procedures used in this study.

2.1 Purpose of the Evaluation

The motivation of this thesis-equivalent was to prepare educational television material in a matter capable of influencing an attitudinal change and producing a more positive self-image in the student.

The evaluation question is thus as follows:
Can television be used effectively to influence attitudes of L.D. and E.D. students?

The purpose of the evaluation is thus consistent with Elias' attempt (1979) to use television:
to teach children cognitive problem solving techniques that would enable them to deal with personal and interpersonal relationships (p. 217).

2.2 Definitions of Measures

In Mass Media and Children, L. Bailyn (1959) examined the relationship between exposure of different forms of mass media and their influence on normal children's thought processes. Her analysis focused on the pictorial media such as television, comic books and film. Results were based on exposure to these and other forms of mass-media and sub-divided into boys' and girls' preferences.

Specifically, Bailyn first studied psychological
factors assumed to be stable elements of one's environment:

- self,
- peers,
- and family.

Problems in the self area (hypothesis number one) examined the child's dissatisfaction with his abilities and appearance. Scores were based on such questions such as:

Suppose that, just by wishing, you could be any age at all. Put a circle around the number in front of the age you would like to be.

1. under 5.
2. 5 to 9.
3. over 9, but under 13.
4. 13 to 19.
5. 20 or over.

and

Circle the number that fits you best:

1. I am too tall.
2. I am too short.
3. I am just about right.

Problems in the peer area focus on the child's feelings of inferiority about his relations with others of his own age (hypothesis number three). An example from the test is:

In this question put a "1" in front of your first choice, a "2" in front of your second choice, and a "3" in front of your third choice: If you were going to the circus who would you want to go with?

a) your father.

b) your best friend.
c) your brothers and sisters.

d) a group of friends.

e) your mother.

f) by yourself.

The family area studies the child's concerns (hypothesis number four) about his relationship with his parents. This is illustrated by such questions as:

Do you think your parents try to find out how you feel about something if you and they disagree? Circle the number of the answer you think is right:

1) Yes, almost always.
2) Sometimes they do.
3) Usually they don't.

Secondly, Bailyn measured cognitive attributes such as stereotyping and perception of threat. The results for stereotyping showed the child's ideas concerning specific classifications of people. An example from Part II of the questionnaire is:

Do you think it is more important to know if a person is good or bad before having anything to do with them?

1) I think it is very important.
2) I don't think it is very important.

Perception of threat examines the child's concerns about personal frustrations and global insecurities. For example:

People are either good or bad.

1) I think this is true.
2) I think this is false.
and:

Do people live here who are really enemies of this country?
1) Yes, many do.
2) Yes, some do.
3) No, not many do.
4) No, hardly any do.

The results in this study utilized the same scoring and coding procedures as those used by Bailyn (See Appendix B). The hypotheses that follow were formulated on the areas previously described.

Samuel Heller and Melvin S. Polsky (1976) used a modified version of the Bailyn measure in their *Studies in Violence and Television*. This modified version measured personality factors of under-achieving and delinquent adolescents relative to television viewing in particular. For these reasons, the latest version of the Bailyn instrument was used as a measure of the process in this research. (See Appendix A). It should be noted that the instrument used in this study is neither standardized nor has it been analyzed for reliability. However, after having investigated other measures of self-concept, it was decided that the Modified Bailyn Test was the only one relevant to the concerned problem areas. Further, it was the only one that had been used in a major study such as that by Heller and Polsky for the American Broadcasting Company (1976).

The independent variable was the use of the television
production process. The dependent variables were the five sets of scores measuring hypotheses previously tested by Heller and Polsky (see next section).

2.3 Hypotheses

The study allowed for a number of hypotheses which tested for the presence of interactive affects between the factors involved:

Hypothesis 1) Since the video tapes will re-enact situations in which the subjects view themselves as they might be, it is expected that the process will promote a more positive feeling of self. Bettelheim (1960) referred to "walking corpses" in Nazi Concentration camps who lost their self-esteem as a result of their horrid environment. While the E.D.'s and L.D.'s surroundings are not relative to that referred to by Bettelheim, the sense of inadequacy to function as others exists. Using self as model may enable the subjects to change this.

Hypothesis 2) It is expected that as a result of the process the subjects will tend to blame themselves less for situations of conflict because they will realize that there may be other intervening causes. The experimental group will become in Bailyn's terms more extrapunitive and less "intrapunitive" (p. 5). As actors, the students may express themselves more openly and as viewers of the same material may see a new meaning to the motive or intentions of the others involved in the situation.

Hypothesis 3) Being process oriented (requiring the subjects to interact), the study should generate an
increased desire to relate with peers. Video tape has been used as an effective tool to portray realistic social situations in which the subjects are able to interact. (Doyle, Smith, Bishop and Miller, 1980).

Hypothesis 4) It is hoped that the emphasis on family problems will lead to an improvement in the subjects' view of their own family problems. Neither Bailyn (1959) nor Heller and Polsky (1976) found such effects on subjects' family-related views. However, one cannot be sure that these investigators gave sufficient emphasis to family situations.

Hypothesis 5) The active part in which subjects will play as television crew and actors should yield a more socially active individual.

Hypothesis concerning two other aspects of the Bailyn test (Stereotyping and Perception of Threat) were not investigated and therefore are not included.

2.4 Evaluation Design

The testing design was a Non-Equivalent Control Group Design (Fitz-Gibbon and Morris, 1978). The reason for the non-equivalent design was that the subjects cannot be randomly assigned to the groups. We cannot allocate the students to programs, but must work with intact classrooms. Some classes which are not getting the experimental program can form non-equivalent control group for the classes which are in the experimental program (Fitz-Gibbon and Morris, 1978 p. 55).

The control group was necessary because the length of
time between the pretesting of the experimental group and the post-testing allowed for the possibility that the subjects' attitudes might change as a simple function of time. A control group, completing the pre and post test without the treatment, was used to indicate the likelihood of such maturation effects (Cohen and Manion, 1980).

...In evaluations where only the experimental group is measured, interpretation of the results is difficult and often unconvincing, without any comparison group it is hard to know how good the results are. (Fitz-Gibbon and Morris, 1978, p. 23)

2.5 Production Facilities
1 - Panasonic Mini T.V. Studio Console.
2 - Panasonic Black and White Video Cameras WV-341P.
3 - Electrohome TV Monitor.
4 - Boom microphone stand with cables, microphones and patch cords.
5 - Shure Microphone Mixer.

2.6 Sample
As indicated in the evaluation design (Section 2.4) two groups were involved in this study. The experimental group (n=15) participated in the video-process. The control group (n=11) received only the pre and post test. The subjects for this study comprised two classes of E.D. and L.D. students (previously described). Male and females between the ages of fifteen and nineteen participated. The socio-economic levels of these students varied and, their status was not considered a factor in this study. The
group allocated to the experimental condition was that currently taught by the investigator.

2.7 Procedures

Prior to pretesting of either the experimental or control group, a letter of introduction and permission was sent to all parents and guardians. Pre-testing and post-testing occurred in the students' regular classrooms and during the early morning sessions thus lessening possible intervening variables that could have affected the students' responses, such as fatigue and daily irritations. Instructions were kept simple. In view of the low reading and comprehension levels of some individuals in the experimental group, assistance was given to those who needed it without influencing responses. The tests were regarded as interest inventories and were explained as such.

The video-process with the experimental group spanned 3-4 weeks. The first session began with a discussion of three problem areas: self, peers and family. In order to ensure confidentiality, it was necessary to create an environment open to sensitive and personal discussions. For this reason the process took place in a classroom which provided a more relaxed atmosphere (in this case the home economics room).

Discussion slowly led to the actual use of the video equipment in creating a visual and auditory record of the three themes. Renae, Dowrick and Wasek (1983) suggested routines which lessen fears of having such personal
information on a permanent record such as video-tape. Firstly, preparation of the subjects to the project yielded information to their "potential reactivity" to video-taping. Secondly, "familiarization" with the video equipment and the television studio prior to the start of the study took place. Short hands on productions were allowed on the first day thus enabling "adaptation" to actual recordings. This created a sense of working together in a group activity with a common goal.

Renae, Dowrick and Wasek (1983) also advised on scripting which provided for a "direct influence" by the subjects creating a participatory effect. Students were asked to volunteer real life experiences that related to the earlier discussions. (Again, confidentiality was ensured). The scripts based on these experiences were not written nor were any involved instructions given on television production since it was believed that this would only create a sense of return to the classroom routine and also complicate and overstructure spontaneous dialogue. Rather, rough open-ended scenerios were drafted as a method of providing for participation and direction, and post productions and viewing discussion.

The re-enactments were kept as true to the memory of the subjects as possible. Those who volunteered the incidents were offered the "starring" roles. Other acting parts and crews were chosen by the remaining students. As it was expected that early tapings would not be equal to the students' expectations, production guidelines were
offered limiting and simplifying shots, audio and the length of the segments (8 to 10 minutes). Two classes were scheduled for each of three problem areas with a third day for viewing and discussion of the psychological aspects of the material. A fourth and fifth day were used for altering the productions to meet the self as model technique. The last day in the process focused on a comparison of reactions to the two recordings. Post-testing followed at least one day following this final discussion.

The television process was discussed with the subjects once the results were analyzed. The comments by the students have been included throughout the discussion and conclusion sections.
Chapter 3

Results

3.1 Analysis

A multivariate analysis of variance was conducted in which the dependant variables were the five hypothesis (1 to 5), and the independent variables were: a) the subject groups, T.V. vs. control, and b) the two tests, pre vs. post. The latter variable involved repeated measures. The total analysis represents a double multivariate design.

The mean pre/post-test scores for the two subject groups are in Table 1. The results of the multivariate analysis of variance are presented in Table 2. No generalized effects are observed for the subject groups across the five hypotheses, nor for the two tests. The interaction effect between Groups and Tests, however, is significant at the 5% level, indicating a differential effect from pre- to post-test in the two subject groups. Univariate F-tests were then conducted on two variables and on the interaction between them (Table 3). None of the group effects on the five hypotheses was found to be significant. The pre/post-test difference on Hypothesis # 5 was significant at the 5% level. The interaction between Groups and Tests was significant at the 5% level on Hypothesis # 2.
Table 1

Mean Scores Relating to a) TV Vs. Control Groups, and b) Tests of the Five Experimental Hypotheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>TV Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre  -</td>
<td>Pre  -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Self-perception</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>6.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Punitiveness</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>9.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Peer-perception</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>7.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Family perception</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>8.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Passivity</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Multivariate Analysis of Variance of a) T.V. Vs. Control Groups, and b) The Five Experimental Hypotheses.

Multivariate tests of significance:

a) Group Effect (TV vs. control)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx F</th>
<th>Hypoth. D.F.</th>
<th>Error D.F.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks'</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Test Effect (Pre vs. post)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx F</th>
<th>Hypoth. D.F.</th>
<th>Error D.F.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>2.985</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks'</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Interaction Effect (Group x Test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Name</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Approx F</th>
<th>Hypoth. D.F.</th>
<th>Error D.F.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pillai's</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotelling's</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>2.984</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilks'</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy's</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Univariate Analysis of Variance of a) TV vs. Control Groups, and b) The Five Experimental Hypotheses.

Univariate F-tests with (1,24) D.F.:

a) Group Effect (TV vs. control)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypoth. sum of squares</th>
<th>Error sum of squares</th>
<th>Hypoth. mean sq.</th>
<th>Error mean sq.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyp/1</td>
<td>10.560</td>
<td>863.921</td>
<td>10.560</td>
<td>35.997</td>
<td>.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/2</td>
<td>5.288</td>
<td>358.655</td>
<td>5.288</td>
<td>14.944</td>
<td>.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/3</td>
<td>3.135</td>
<td>675.558</td>
<td>3.135</td>
<td>36.482</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/4</td>
<td>24.235</td>
<td>426.073</td>
<td>24.235</td>
<td>17.753</td>
<td>1.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/5</td>
<td>1.763</td>
<td>47.563</td>
<td>1.763</td>
<td>1.982</td>
<td>.690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Test Effect (Pre vs. post)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypoth. sum of squares</th>
<th>Error sum of squares</th>
<th>Hypoth. mean sq.</th>
<th>Error mean sq.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyp/1</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>279.958</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>11.685</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/2</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td>133.830</td>
<td>1.558</td>
<td>5.576</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/3</td>
<td>3.769</td>
<td>390.321</td>
<td>3.769</td>
<td>16.283</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/4</td>
<td>11.077</td>
<td>148.655</td>
<td>11.077</td>
<td>6.194</td>
<td>1.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/5</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>17.285</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>4.513</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Interaction Effect (Group x Test)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypoth. sum of squares</th>
<th>Error sum of squares</th>
<th>Hypoth. mean sq.</th>
<th>Error mean sq.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hyp/1</td>
<td>18.369</td>
<td>279.958</td>
<td>18.369</td>
<td>11.685</td>
<td>1.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/2</td>
<td>34.112</td>
<td>133.830</td>
<td>34.112</td>
<td>5.576</td>
<td>6.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/3</td>
<td>2.910</td>
<td>390.321</td>
<td>2.910</td>
<td>16.283</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/4</td>
<td>9.269</td>
<td>148.655</td>
<td>9.269</td>
<td>6.194</td>
<td>1.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/5</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>17.285</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>1.340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The univariate pre/post-test effect relating to Hypothesis #5 reflects a tendency to less activity by the subject groups in general on the post-test. The significant interaction between Groups and Tests on Hypothesis #2 (Figure 1) supports the unidirectional prediction that the T.V. treatment would reduce the students' feelings of Punitiveness.

---

**Figure 1.** Significant interaction between Groups and Tests on Hypothesis #2 - Direction of Punitiveness.
Post hoc comparisons of the data related to Figure 1 showed no significant differences (Table 4).

Table 4

Post hoc analysis of data related to Figure 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre) TV vs Control</td>
<td>t(Independent groups)</td>
<td>-1.815</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post) TV vs Control</td>
<td>t(Independent groups)</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV) Pre vs Post</td>
<td>t(Related groups)</td>
<td>-2.031</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control) Pre vs Post</td>
<td>t(Related groups)</td>
<td>1.513</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Discussion of Results

This study found that only one of the five hypotheses outlined was statistically significant. This was Hypothesis Two-Direction of Punitiveness ($p < .05$).

**Hypothesis 1: Self**

It was hypothesized that the process would promote a move positive feeling of self. This hypothesis was not supported despite the fact that it was discussed before, during and after the tapings. The group means for the video subjects tended to increase following the treatment, although not significantly. A danger is indicated that such a process might increase the subject's negative feelings about themselves. The L.D. and E.D. adolescents have created many defenses and like many others, they have rarely looked at themselves with any real sense of self criticism. Video tape lowers these defenses and presents the observer with sheer reality. Those who would gain the most from video feedback are individuals whose ego systems can rationalize the more negative aspects and who have benefitted by personal success in the past. The subjects in this thesis-equivalent did not fit this description and have at the outset low defense systems and therefore responded more negatively. This is not to imply that video-feedback does not increase the accuracy of one's self-concept. In fact it does. (Brauht, 1970). As evident by the results in this study, the reaction to it can be disturbing or at least ineffectual in improving one's feelings towards the self. It is possible that in
some instances the E.D. and L.D. subject do not possess the necessary experience or cognitive skills that enables them to deal with the new insight.

In view of Bandura's Social Learning Theory (1969) overt actions are influenced by self-concept which accompany cognitive actions. This research attempted to deal more with the person's affective feelings as a whole, rather than just the bodily image. Self was seen as an integral part of the whole person. It would seem that the observers in this process viewed themselves and classmates more closely than they did in everyday social activities or in looking at one's self in a mirror and therefore more critically. The E.D. and L.D. adolescents in this study seemed to have difficulty in separating the actor from the self, i.e. objectivity. To some extent they then were intent on observing themselves rather than the situation in which the actor was placed. If this is considered in relationship to what Fenigstein, Scheni, and Buss (1975) describe as the private self, the results for this area may become more clear.

Hypothesis 2: Direction of Punitiveness

It was hypothesized that the subjects would tend to blame themselves less for situations of conflict because they would become, as Bailyn termed, extrapunitive, looking outward for other possible causes. This hypothesis produced means that were statistically supported. The group means for the experimental group increased indicating that the subjects became less intrapunitive.
At the beginning of the process the motivation for the students was the novelty in the handling of the equipment and the acting. One member of the video group stated, "Using the equipment was something out of the ordinary and challenging. It was something to look forward to during the day". Shortly, the purpose of the process took on a new dimension. It became an opportunity for the students to visually illustrate and verbally express common academic, social and personal concerns. It was one hour in their day in which they could release bottled up anxieties. Fear of exposure to others was overcome by the chance to make a personal and common front comment on issues they deemed important. The video process became a method for the subjects to reflect in a concrete way. Freire (1972) suggested that this type of reflection is a form of liberation. The subjects could for a moment step away from the actual incident and perhaps for a short time see it from a different perspective.

The video process gave the L.D. and E.D. adolescents an opportunity to experience three things.

Firstly, the taping and video-playback enabled the students to relive the conflict that produced the feelings of guilt (in this case it involved a confrontation with a parent). In doing so the subject became an actor and was therefore removed from the actual environment into a simulation. As one subject volunteered, "The acting became normal, it let the anger and the tension out." It is believed that in doing so the student was able to
relinquish some of the negative emotions produced during the real life situation. If this is so then the subjects could observe the video-playback and attribute the cause of the incident away from themselves.

Secondly, in watching the tape, the subjects were able to become less subjective and for a relatively short time observe the reactions and behaviours of the actors in the role of other people. Maybe by doing so the L.D. and E.D. adolescents became more aware of negative personality elements in others.

Thirdly, if the above two did in fact occur, then it is possible that the L.D. and E.D. subjects had received a lesson in problem-solving techniques. This is unfortunately an element of instruction that is all too often ignored or left to occur by osmosis. Hopefully, the subjects would when confronted by similar incidents reflect back to the process and consider alternative behaviours and experience less intrapunitive emotions.

The ability to redirect feelings of anxiety away from the self open up new avenues by which positive attributes may enter. For example the subject who reenacted her reading problem explained how as a result of the video process she became less anxious about the problem. In doing so she was less competitive with siblings and thus indirectly, tensions at home eased. The learning disabled and emotionally disturbed individuals are in a constant state of readiness to defend any of their actions (often responding negatively to a positive comment). By becoming-
less defensive they could become less negative and more flexible in their attitudes.

**Hypothesis 3: Peers**

It was hypothesized that since the subjects were required to interact during the video process, there would be an increased desire to relate with peers. This was not discussed with the students but rather left to develop spontaneously. However, it was not supported. The groups means were even higher for this area than self, therefore their feelings towards peers was even more stringent. The lack of a difference for the experimental groups in the pre- and post-test means supports this.

L.D. and E.D. adolescents occupy a less popular social position than the regular student. The irony of being learning disabled and or emotionally disturbed is that the public at large find it difficult to understand and to accept an individual whose intelligence in general or specific areas is weak or whose emotional stability is not of the norm. People find it easier to accept handicaps that are visible, such as blindness but are less tolerant of those whose disabilities are hidden as in the case of the learning disabled. It was later pointed out by the subjects that, "The T.V. stuff made you more aware of the ignorance of others. They really don't understand what short voc. or sp.ed is."

The L.D. and E.D. students are forced back into their own classrooms to find some form of security amongst their peers. Within the partially contained, contained special
education and short vocational classes can often be found an unconscious form of social hierarchy built upon degrees of academic abilities, physical attractiveness and physical abilities. While this may be true of any classroom situation, it is more pronounced in the special classroom due to the often heterogeneous groupings, i.e. - placement based on a specific learning disability or emotional disturbance. What is thus found is a subsociety within a larger society. Evidence of this was seen in the reaction of some of the subjects when it became obvious that the video project required a mixing of the groups. However, as the process matured this became an issue of no particular significance and while this hypothesis was not supported there was evidence of peer interaction.

It is further believed that the area on self and peer must be considered in relationship to one another. Since the video-feedback as measured by the self hypothesis was ineffective, (therefore not improving the subjects' self concept), it is not surprising that the subjects' relationships with peers outside of the classroom was also ineffective. Logically, if an individual is distressed about being confronted with the stark reality that he or she is not what they believed, then this is reflected in how one is now seen by others.

Herein lies the catch-22. The Bailyn Questionnaire tested the subjects' feelings about inadequacies with relation to people of his own age (ages of students in special classes may vary by as much as two to four years)
and a feeling of wanting more friends. As previously stated, while the social climate within the class may have improved as a result of the process, the underlying intention of improving anxieties towards peer relationship as it applies to the larger school population did evidently not change. The subjects related more positively with class mates and not with age mates.

Hypothesis 4: "The Family"

This hypothesis predicted that the subjects attitudes towards their families, i.e. - parents, would improve. Although discussion did take place concerning their apprehensions about parental control, this hypothesis was not supported. There was almost no change in the pre- and post-test group means indicating subjects opinions toward their families were strong making changes in attitudes via the process more difficult.

Even though this area was not statistically significant, it is related to some extent with Hypothesis 2 - Direction of Punitiveness. The video-segments depicting the family focused on the subjects' illustration of pressure by and disappointment in the parent over the adolescent.

By tradition many adolescents feel that their parents do not understand them and experience emotions of distress. For the most part it is accepted and expected by both parent and child. However, the L.D. and P.D.'s situation is to a large extent magnified both in number and severity. The support systems in many of the families have been
weakened by personal history and fatigue. The parents become disappointed in the child's social and academic progression while the child is just as over wrought by a lack of the personal success in those same areas. In time the opposing forces collide. The parent feels helpless and thus frustration gives way to negative treatment, while the child looks outward for support.

It may be that while Hypothesis 2 accomplished its objective to have the students become more "extrapunitive" (Bailyn, 1969, p. 4), i.e. - looking outward for causes of conflict, the result could be more negative than beneficial. Confrontations between parent and child happen, as a rule, with some regularity (perhaps more so for the L.D. and E.D. adolescent). If the subject as a result of the video process seeks to find fault in others alone for the difficulties, the result in the family could worsen. Teachers of L.D. and E.D. students find that the student will sometimes respond negatively to a male or female instructor depending on who is the disciplinarian at home. By finding an erroneous source in which to transfer their feelings of inadequacies, the individual moves away from positive changes in attitude. The cognitive skills necessary for the L.D. and E.D. adolescent to find the proper causal effects may not be available.

Hypothesis 5: Passivity

It was hypothesized that the process would yield a more socially active individual. In view of the group means, it can be seen that the scores decreased therefore
indicating that the subjects active behaviour actually lessened. This area should be considered in light of the discussion in the peer area. Passivity as was the section on peer relationship left to occur as a result of the experiment.

It only stands to reason that if the subjects were not made more comfortable with their peers outside of the classroom environment, then they would also not be more socially active within the rest of the school community. Being more socially active requires one to be more confident and outgoing. Therefore, the prerequisite to this is moving outside of known circles. However, one girl reported how she had developed a closer relationship with a boy who also had a learning disability. She stated that she felt more at ease being with him since they could now both openly discuss their problem. In post-observation by this investigator the participants did not leave their classmates and returned for the most part to the same social hierarchies developed within the classroom that existed before the process began.

It should be noted that it was observed that within the classroom the more inhibited participants gradually became more comfortable in stating technical opinions pertaining to the aesthetic quality of the video tape and more open in discussing personal experiences to the point of volunteering to act them in front of the cameras. However, this does not fit the criterion of being a more social person over all. In retrospect, passivity as
defined by Bailyn would require a more extended form of treatment.
CHAPTER 4

Conclusions and Recommendations

The last chapter focused on examining the results as they have related to the video process as a means of stimulation to increase the Learning Disabled and Emotionally Disturbed Adolescents' understanding of themselves and their relationships with those around them.

The present chapter will deal with the implications of these results and the suggestions and questions for future research that they raise.

In particular the comments here will address the teacher of the exceptional adolescent and those involved in educational technology research.

In retrospect, the results could have been to some extent anticipated. The process incorporated two things - the special nature of the subjects and the unique qualities of video.

Firstly, the subjects in the experimental and control groups were on the one hand very different in personalities while still sharing the same academic and social barriers. Their part in this study was not just as components in a stimulus-response model. They were more than observers reacting to exposure of various forms of media and television content. (Bailyn, 1959; Heller and Polsky, 1976). The subjects were part of what Combes and Tiffin (1978) called the "man-machine" (p.3). As part of the content these individuals reacted to the most powerful
stimulus available themselves.

Secondly, this research made use of video not as a delivery system bringing television programmes to an intended audience, but as a source of technology in which the user and observer were one in the same.

In marrying these two factors the L.D. and E.D. adolescent were removed from the pressures of their present and past life and allowed to make use of a device and a method that was both imaginary and real. The subjects were offered the means of leaving the self and doing what many (people of any ability) would like to do - change how one feels about oneself. Video was used as a vehicle to record and evaluate one's own "personal motives and history" (Biggs, 1979, p. 221). The resulting interaction that developed was both a revelation and a cautious lesson in the potential use of video as an instrument for studying the altering attitudes in selected audiences.

Although the statistical results did not support four of the five hypotheses postulated, the fact that it was significant for Hypothesis Two, Direction of Punitiveness, suggests reason to believe that within a modified form, the video-process can be effective. During the discussion section it became apparent that a pattern was developing amongst the different areas, self, peer, family, direction of punitiveness and passivity. Each one was in some way dependant on the other. Self was a pre-requisite for how the subjects' felt about peer relationships and passivity, while direction of punitiveness was characterized by the
family area. Logically, if any one of these was significant, then it could be assumed that residual effects would be spread over some or all of the variables. Raw data may not have given evidence of this but in the day by day behaviours of the subjects during the study, observed changes did occur. This is supported by the comments in the post discussion. The subjects reported being "made more aware of things around them and more open about being in special education".

Within the true pedagogical framework, the video process supplied the learning disabled and the emotionally disturbed with a valuable agent for learning and exploration. L.D. and E.D. students need and want an immediate and clear response to their actions — regardless if this feedback is positive or negative. They must know how they stand within the present realm of things. Once more this feedback must come from a source that is not so much authoritarian as it is meaningful. Video provided almost an instantaneous response that was untouched by any outside elements. The actions were theirs and the evaluations of these actions were theirs. Often individuals deny that which they know is really true of their own personalities. The L.D. and E.D. (as previously stated in this paper) have even more difficulty in accepting this. Whether openly admitted it or not the subjects could not deny that which they observed. Many students commented after viewing the video material how they did not remember having said certain things or
having behaved in a particular manner.

As an exercise in affects, this research made use of emotions as a motivator. Emotions are the organisers and the trigger that bring the inner self to the fore-front. They expose the inner values of the self and therefore the behaviours of the true self. In this way the video process was a catalyst for behaviour change. The subjects seemed to want to finally expose at least one embarrassing, troubled moment in their lives to themselves and a select group. It was their opportunity to follow along the lines of Peter Finch's suggestion in the motion picture Network and scream "I'm mad as hell and I'm not going to take it anymore". Some did, some didn't. An incident that illustrated this point occurred when this individual attempted to get the "star" in one of the video segments to tone down her reactions during the tapings. This was met with irritation on the behalf of the subject who wanted to know, "Why do you want to change how it really happened?"

This affective approach brought to the learner a wide range of cognitive skills that perhaps were never really allowed to surface before. Being learning disabled or emotionally disturbed carries with it the aura of helplessness and therefore the feeling by the self and others (within the school faculty and the general public) of having a lack of survival skills. To fully understand this notion one must refer back to Schramm's (1961) idea that it is more important to realize what the child brings to television rather than what television brings to the
child. In order to use the process for their own means the subjects soon realized that they would have to use skills that were either not apparent to themselves or thought to be acquired only by outside forces. The subjects were forced by their own emotions to interpret abstract impressions into audio-visual impressions thus requiring a taxing of their own cognitive and perceptual powers.

Further, the project required the subjects to exercise skills of group dynamics. "We trusted each other more," was the way one subject described the social change. This involved not just conversational techniques but elements of persuasion, negotiation and submission. Also, it was necessary that the group learned the basis of task analysis thus organizing and sequencing the various technical aspects of the video productions. Evidence of this comes in the comment by one of the video group, "We acted as a team. We knew that if one of us didn't do our job the whole thing would be a mess."

The L.D. and E.D. student need a form of communication that is three dimensional. Reading, writing and listening skills give to these students the aural elements of communication but lack in the visual dimension that gives understanding for the spoken or printed word. The L.D. and E.D. student learn by actions and this was provided during the process.

When totally analyzed, it becomes apparent that the skills brought out during the course of the video process are those same skills which are most valuable in day to day
living. It would seem that there are sound arguments for using the video process with the L.D. and E.D. individuals. Still, one must ask if the means justifies the ends. The danger lies in providing the subjects with a methodology that could be potentially negative or even ineffectual. One unintentional warning by a video group member was that, "it could make you feel better or worse. It gives you something to think about". As was shown in the results section and pointed out in this chapter, the process was at least partially effective but this does not necessarily mean that the outcome is the desired one. How does one allow a process to take shape with little intervention and yet be sure that the output will be the right one? Obviously one cannot be sure.

The heightened awareness of the self and group identifies that results (from access) can certainly be beneficial. But when controls are relinquished, the distortions that television produces may lead to an introspective crisis that the users have no opportunity to resolve. (Baggaley, 1975, p.89).

One subject put it this way, "If I was in control, they would be less in control". The "they" in this comment apparently referred to those with whom the subject was in conflict. This may be a somewhat auspicious referral. Even when controlling factors are initiated there is concern that those doing the controlling may not realize in time that the direction the process is headed is not the desire one. The L.D. and E.D. students are rarely given
the chance to develop their own skills and to devote themselves to any personal cause. To put the brakes on during the process would result in revolt and a self-fulfilling prophecy of failure both in themselves and in the system.

There was evidence in this study of the possible negative impact of the video-feedback on L.D. and E.D. adolescents. For the most part the subjects did have complex and contradicting personality traits within themselves and amongst themselves. By exposing them to replays of personal conflicts, it could have supported those elements that they suspected to be true and brought forth those negative elements that lay dormant until the video process. For some the video process was perhaps just little more than a visually biographical statement. Even when the subjects were offered the chance to change their negative image in the segments to a more positive self, there appeared to be little change in the outcome of the reenacted incident. Either the subjects did not possess the problem solving skills necessary for the change or were uncomfortable with the idea of controlling the event. Ironically, while the results of Hypothesis Two - Direction of Punitiveness was as postulated, it is possible that the anxiety they no longer felt had not really lessened but merely been attributed to a new cause.

In view of these conclusions several recommendations are suggested. Firstly, it is proposed that this video process be repeated incorporating students from both the
regular stream and the special classroom into random experimental and control groups. One of the failings of this study is that the behaviour and attitude change that was at least observed within the classroom could not be said to carry over into the larger population.

Secondly, if the process is repeated with only L.D. and E.D. subjects, it is probably wiser to concentrate efforts on changing attitudes in one area only. The slower learner acquires knowledge in smaller portions than those in the regular classroom. The content should be singular and simple. For instance, it may have been more fruitful to isolate only one of the areas (such as the physical self-image) and putting the emphasis on changing the subjects feelings towards this rather than the entire self-concept.

Thirdly, the students should be made aware of objectivity. The subject must be able to differentiate between the self as an actor responding to environmental factors and the self as the object of change. In other words the individual must be able to become a critical observer analyzing video feedback in terms of self-evaluation. Sartre (1956) considered this possible only when the self is viewed as an object.

Fourth, the subjects should participate in desensitizing lessons involving personal and interpersonal skills. This should be done prior to the video process and not in front of any visual or auditory recording devices. This may lessen some of the emotional impact that occurs.
with the video process.

Finally, structural guidelines should be outlined from the beginning of the process. It should be made clear that the instructor will intervene only to ensure that these guidelines are being met. Assurances should be reinforced that while the basic format and content will be the subjects' responsibilities, the topic and direction of the video segments will be controlled by the authority figure.

It is strongly believed that the basic concept of using video in a process with L.D. and E.D. students is valid. This is evident in the fact that none of the students refused to be a part of the process even though it meant personal exposure. This is supported by Gill's (1978) research suggesting that disadvantaged students "are inclined to communicate through action rather than words, are externally oriented rather than introspective, and are lacking in experiences of receiving approval for success in task". (p. 8)

In the final get together of the experimental group that took place a few months later, the students were asked if the video process should be changed in any way.

The consensus was that "it didn't last long enough". It was felt that it should be spread over more of the school year. (This may not be practical, keeping in view the school curriculum). However, it does illustrate the positive feelings about the project.

Also, it was believed that the population be expanded to the junior classes and to the regular stream, not just
the short vocational and special education classes.

When questioned as to the content the general feeling was that the material should be "kept real". There seemed to be a new awareness of the way in which they perceived commercial television. The suggestion was to avoid any themes that were related to or sought to parallel popular television programs.

In these comments and suggestions by the students can be found support for the video process. Whether supported statistically or not, the study is believed to have affected their personal lives and their sense of reality both on and off the television set.

The success and dangers of this study have been outlined. The success lies in its potential and its dangers lie in the need for control. Still the video process under any theme is vital. To ignore its use could leave a valuable resource idle.
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Appendix A

Bailyn Questionnaire

(As modified by Heller and Polsky, 1976)
PART I

1. Which of these two things would you rather do? Circle the number of the one you would rather do:
   1. Go on an outing or picnic for the afternoon with your friends.
   2. See a movie with your friends.

2. Suppose that, just by wishing, you could be any age at all. Put a circle around the number in front of the age you would most like to be:
   1. Under 5.
   2. 5 to 9
   3. Over 9 but under 13
   4. 13 to 19
   5. 20 or over

3. In this question put a "1" in front of your first choice, a "2" in front of your second choice, and a "3" in front of your third choice.
   If you were going to the circus would you want to go—
   A - with your father?
   B - with your best friend?
   C - with your brothers and sisters?
   D - with a group of friends?
   E - with your mother?
   F - by yourself?

4. Which of these two things would you usually rather do? Circle the number of the one you would rather do:
   1. Be asked to join a club.
   2. Start a new club.
5. Circle the number of the answer that fits you best:
   1. I am too tall.
   2. I am too short.
   3. I am just about right.

6. Which of these two things would you usually rather do?
   Circle the number of the one you would rather do:
   1. Read a book.
   2. Read a comic book.

7. What would you most like to be when you grow up? Put down the three types of work you would most like to do:
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 

8. Circle the number of the answer that fits you best:
   1. I am too fat.
   2. I am too thin.
   3. I am just about right.

9. How many friends do you have? Put a circle around the number of the answer that fits you best:
   1. I don’t have very many friends and like it that way.
   2. I don’t have very many friends and wish I had more.
   3. I have a few good friends and don’t want any more or less.
   4. I have a few good friends and would like to have more.
5. I have many friends and enjoy it.
6. I have many friends but would rather have just a few good ones.
7. I have many friends and would like to have even more.

10. Suppose you got a bad mark on your report card. How would you feel? Circle the number in front of the answer that fits you best.
   1. I would feel it was my fault because I didn’t work hard enough.
   2. I would feel that mostly it was not my fault.

11. How often do you go to the homes of other kids in your class? Put a circle around the number of the answer that fits you best:
   1. Very often (almost every day).
   2. Sometimes (once a week or so).
   3. Hardly ever.

12. A boy sits down at the table to eat his soup. His mother says, “It’s too bad that the soup is cold.” What do you think the boy answers? Circle the number of the answer you think the boy gives to his mother.
   The boy says:
   1. “Can’t you heat it some?”
   2. “That’s all right.”
   3. “I should have started eating sooner.”
13. Do you ever get hit at home nowadays?
   1. Yes, quite often.
   2. Sometimes.
   3. No, hardly ever.

How old were you the last time you were hit at home?
   1. 4 years or less.
   2. 5
   3. 6
   4. 7
   5. 8
   6. 9
   7. 10
   8. 11 years or over.

14. Suppose you and your friend were talking to each other and then you find out that your friend is unhappy about something that was said. Would feel this was your fault? Circle the number in front of the answer that fits you best:
   1. I would feel it was definitely my fault.
   2. I would feel it might be my fault.
   3. I would feel it probably was not my fault.
   4. I would feel it was definitely not my fault.
15. How much difference does it make to your parents what marks you get in school? Circle the number in front of the answer that you think is right:
   1. It is very important to them for me to get good marks.
   2. They are pretty much satisfied with any marks I get.

16. How often do other kids in your class come to your house? Put a circle around the number of the answer that fits you best:
   1. Very often (almost every day).
   2. Sometimes (one a week or so).

17. Do your parents ever keep you from doing the things you want to do? Put a circle around the number of the answer that fits you best:
   1. Yes, quite often.
   2. Sometimes they do.
   3. They hardly ever do.

18. Which of these two things would you usually rather do? Circle the number of the one you would rather do:
   1. Go to someone else's party.
   2. Give a party.

19. Circle the number in front of the person who punishes you when you do something wrong:
   1. Usually my mother.
   2. Usually my father.
Does anyone else punish you? If yes, write here who it is:
1. 
2. 
3. 

20. A boy is playing marbles with his friend. The friend says, "I'm sorry I pushed your marble by mistake." What do you think the boy answers? Circle the number of the answer you think the boy gives his friend.
   The boy says:
   1. "I should have move it out of your way."
   2. "Let's keep playing."
   3. "Can't you be more careful."

21. Do you think your parents try to find out how you feel about something if you and they disagree? Circle the number in front of the answer you think is right:
   1. Yes, almost always.
   2. Sometimes they do.
   3. Usually they don't.

22. Which of these two things would you usually rather do? Circle the number of the one you would rather do:
   1. Play a game indoors.
   2. Watch television.
23. Suppose you could just have 3 of the wishes below, which would you want to come true? Read them all, then put a "1" in front of your biggest wish, a "2" in front of your second biggest wish, and a "3" in front of your third wish.
I would like:
A. To have more friends.
B. To be stronger than I am now.
C. To see the world.
D. To get along better with my father and mother.
E. To be thinner than I am now.
F. To go to a ball game.
G. To be better looking than I am now.
H. To have my father and mother be more like other people's parents.
I. To be taller or shorter than I am now.
J. To play a musical instrument.
K. To get along better with other kids.
L. To have a private plane.
M. To have my father and mother pay as much attention to me as they do to my brothers and sisters.
N. To be smarter than I am now.

24. Which of these two things would you usually rather do? Circle the number of the one you would rather do:
1. Decide yourself which games to play.
2. Let others decide which games to play.
25. Suppose you are talking to a friend and something the friend says makes you unhappy. Would you feel that this was your friend's fault? Circle the number in front of the answer that fits you:

1. I would feel it was definitely my friend's fault.
2. I would feel it might be my friend's fault.
3. I would feel it probably was not my friend's fault.
4. I would feel it definitely was not my friend's fault.

26. Suppose that just by making a wish you could change yourself into any of the people below. Read them all, then put a "1" in front of the person you would most want to be changed into, a "2" in front of your second choice, and a "3" in front of your third choice.

I would like to be changed into a:

A. King
B. Cowboy
C. Movie Star
D. President
E. Prince
F. Detective
G. Reporter
H. Inventor
I. Superman
J. Space Cadet
K. Queen
L. Animal Breeder
M. Explorer
N. Princess
O. FBI agent
P. Knight
Q. Person from Mars
PART II

1. Do you think it is important to know if a person is good or bad before having anything to do with them?
   1. I think it is very important.
   2. I don't think it is very important.

2. Why do some people become bums?
   1. Because they are naturally lazy.
   2. For some other reason.

3. Do you think this country is in danger?
   1. I think it is in great danger.
   2. I think it is in little danger.
   3. I don't think it is in great danger.
   4. I don't think it is in any danger.

4. It is possible to tell by a person’s face whether he is honest or dishonest.
   1. I think this is true.
   2. I think this is false.

5. How often does something stop a person from doing the things he wants to do?
   1. Almost always.
   2. Quite often.
   3. Not usually.
   4. Hardly ever.

6. Circle the number of the person you think gets along better in this world:
   1. A weak but nice person.
   2. A strong but not quite so nice person.
7. Why do people who commit crimes do so?
   1. Because they are naturally bad.
   2. For some other reason.

8. Do you think there is danger that people on this earth will be harmed by beings from another planet?
   1. Yes, quite likely there is.
   2. It is always a possibility.
   3. Most likely not.
   4. No, definitely not.

9. Lazy people are all alike and quite different from people who work hard.
   1. I think this is true.
   2. I think this is false.

10. Can most people be trusted?
    1. Almost all people can.
    2. Quite a lot of people can.
    3. Only some people can.
    4. Hardly any people can.

11. Do criminals ever become good?
    1. Sometimes they do.
    2. No, they usually don't.

12. Some people always get pushed around. Why is this?
    1. Because they are naturally weak.
    2. For some other reason.
13. Do people live here who are really enemies of this country?
   1. Yes, many do.
   2. Yes, some do.
   3. No, not many do.
   4. No, hardly any do.

14. People are either all good or all bad.
   1. I think this is true.
   2. I think this is false.

15. It is hard for a person to be what he wants to be in life?
   1. It is very hard.
   2. It is quite hard.
   3. It isn't very hard.
   4. It isn't hard at all.

16. Are good people usually strong?
   1. Yes, usually.
   2. Not necessarily.

17. Why do some people tell lies?
   1. Because they are naturally dishonest.
   2. For some other reason.

18. Do you think something may destroy the world some day?
   1. Yes, I definitely think so.
   2. I think it might happen.
   3. Most likely not.
   4. No, I definitely don't think so.
18. There are only two types of people in the world, the weak and the strong.

1. I think this is true.
2. I think this is false.

20. Can a person usually find help if he needs it?

1. He almost always can.
2. Quite often he can.
3. He seldom can.
4. He hardly ever can.
Appendix B

Scores and Procedures

for the Modified Bailyn Questionnaire

The appendix includes all items from the Modified Bailyn Questionnaire which related to the Hypotheses tested in this project. (N.B. The only question not coded was item number 3 as it appeared in the Family Hypothesis. The question used in this context demanded personal information about the domestic status of the students' parents which was felt unethical to request.)
**Hypothesis 1: Self**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Subject's Response</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boys-3: Girls-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boys-5: Girls-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>3rd Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 2: Direction of Punitiveness**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 3: Peer**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F but not</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B or D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Hypothesis 3: Peer Cont'd)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Subject’s Response</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 and 16 combined</td>
<td>3 and 1 respectively</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 and 2 respectively</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>3rd Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hypothesis 4: Family)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 and 16</td>
<td>1 and 3 respectively</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 and 3 respectively</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23</th>
<th>1st Choice</th>
<th>2nd Choice</th>
<th>3rd Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Hypothesis 5: Passivity)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Guidelines for the Video Process Animator
I) Procedures for Using the Video Process

1) The Population

It is assumed that the students for whom this process is to be used are identified as Learning Disabled and/or Emotionally Disturbed and have been placed in Special Education or Short Vocational classes. Further, it is advised that the animator be someone who has been trained in Special Education.

Still, there are other criterion which must be considered. Firstly, one must know the ages of the students and in particular the range of their ages. This could play a part in how well they relate to each other before and after the process.

Secondly, the degree and kind of disabilities must be known in order to decide on the extent to which the television hardware can be used by the individuals.

Thirdly, their intellectual levels will to some degree dictate the conceptual boundaries that can be used during the course of the process.

Fourthly, knowing the motivational level of the students will provide information about how long and to what degree the process can be taken.

Fifthly, one should find out about the group dynamics. How do you think they will react to working as a unit?

Sixthly, inquire as to what their television viewing habits are. The amount of time they watch, the types of programs, what days of the week and the times of the day in which they view television.
2) Rationale Behind Using the Process

Once the population is known, the animator should question their own motivation for using the video process.

One must ask if what is intended could be accomplished without the use of video equipment (as in the case of psychodrama). It is important to remember that the intention of the video process is to have the students learn how to handle real life situations and not necessarily learn concrete bits of information. The type of learning should involve items such as problem solving techniques and decision making.

3) Decide on the Topic

Having decided on the rationale for using the video-process it now becomes necessary to decide on what it is exactly the students are to gain, keeping in mind that the results are affective. As such, the content should be kept real and of importance to the students. This can be discovered by discussion or by merely listening to the students' conversations. The issues could be personal matters very close to the individual (such as those used in this thesis-equivalent) or of a more social nature dealing with current events.

The topic is of extreme importance as it is the stimulant that draws the students into the project.

4) Discussion of the Topic

Before introducing the students to the television hardware it is wise to discuss the chosen topic in some length. This will give the animator a feeling for the
direction that the video segments might follow as well as a chance to discover the amount of information the students have on the subject. It will also be an opportunity for the individual ideas on the topic to emerge thus allowing for differences of opinion to be resolved. Personal experiences related to the content may also surface.

5) Introducing the Video Idea

Now it may be time to introduce the students to the video idea. This can first be done by discussing their attitudes towards being actors or using television equipment. The discussion might revolve around their favorite television programmes, movies, and actors.

6) Familiarization with the Video Equipment

At this point the students should be made familiar with the video hardware. Each student could be allowed to experience working both behind and in front of the camera.

One or two days might be spent on allowing them to interview each other or to create short skits.

7) Combining the Topic and the Video Process

The students should now be given the suggestion of using the video-equipment more purposefully. Reviewing the previously chosen topic is now at hand. Discussion should focus on the use of realism and personal experience. Guidelines should be given as to the scripting and technical aspects.

Precautions

It must be reinforced that the animator of this process be one who has been especially trained in the areas
of Learning disabilities and emotional disturbance.

The following is a list of precautions to be taken in order that the video-process accomplishes what it was intended to do.

1) The most important element to keep in mind is that while the students will have a say in the video-content, it is the animator who will have the final comment on the direction that the content is taking. That is to say that, if it is felt that the video segments are taking on negative connotations the animator will suggest alternate approaches to the material. This must be stipulated and agreed to by all concerned.

2) The video segments should be no more than eight to ten minutes in length.

3) The topic should be singular and simple.

4) Scripting as a written exercise should not be considered since the L.D. and E.D. students have difficulty with this during the regular school day anyway. Also, this would tend to create a return to classroom routine atmosphere.

5) Technical considerations such as types of shots and reasoning behind them should be limited.

6) Sensitive the students to comments concerning physical attributes and abilities during the process.

7) Explain and reinforce the concept of confidentiality within the classroom.

8) Do not try to overly influence any individual who does not want to be an actor in front of the camera.