



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et  
des services bibliographiques

395 rue Wellington  
Ottawa (Ontario)  
K1A 0N4

## NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

## AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

**The Production and Evaluation of a Videotape on Parent Participation and  
Involvement in Primary Education**

**Leslie Graeme Lyons**

**A Thesis  
in  
the Department  
of  
Education**

**Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Arts (Educational Technology)  
Concordia University,  
Montreal, Quebec, Canada**

**February, 1993**

**© Leslie Graeme Lyons, 1993**



National Library  
of Canada

Acquisitions and  
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa, Ontario  
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale  
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et  
des services bibliographiques

395 rue Wellington  
Ottawa (Ontario)  
K1A 0N4

Author's Consent

Author's Consent

**The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.**

**L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.**

**The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.**

**L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.**

ISBN 0-315-84659-3

**Canada**

## ABSTRACT

The Production and Formative Evaluation of a Videotape on Parent Participation and Involvement in Primary Education.

Leslie Graeme Lyons

An instructional videotape on parent participation and involvement in primary education was produced and evaluated for use with pre-service teacher education students using a two stage formative evaluation procedure.

A draft presentation was tested with individuals and a re-edited, near final version produced. Stage two was a formal evaluation of the re-edited version with a random sample from the target population. Subjects were randomly allocated to two groups to view the presentation. A questionnaire covering the content of the presentation, production variables and suggestions for worthwhile changes was then completed and the data analyzed.

The analysis identified two further changes that could be made to improve the production for use with the target audience. The first change, shortening the length, may be achieved by reducing and eliminating some segments of repetition. The second, a possibly more difficult change, is to find music that does not produce a strong negative response in any member of the target audience.

This study also indicates the need for careful attention to obtaining high quality audio in work place interviews.

To test the effectiveness of the presentation in improving the attitude of the target population towards parent participation and involvement, the target of the treatment groups (N=13) was compared with a random sample (N=12) from the target population which saw an alternative presentation

Subjects in both groups completed a pre-viewing questionnaire (pre-test), saw their respective presentations, completed the questionnaire on pre-knowledge of the content in the videotape being evaluated, and engaged in a discussion about a unit of work on parent participation and involvement. One week later both groups completed the pre-viewing questionnaire again as a delayed response post-test.

Comparison of the pre-to post-viewing attitude change gain scores on individual items revealed no significant differences between the control group and the treatment group.

This study indicates the need for caution in drawing conclusions on the possible contribution of a particular treatment to attitude change in a target population when using the pre-test, delayed response post-test design. In this instance, the content of the presentation being evaluated had suddenly become the subject of a major and acrimonious public debate that both polarized opinions and caused dramatic shifts in attitude amongst the target population.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to thank Dr Gary Coldevin for the long distance guidance, advice and encouragement throughout the development and completion of this thesis.

He also wishes to thank Ethne´ Ramage, Tony Booth and Marilyn Peterson for their invaluable assistance.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER I - THE PROBLEM	1
Context of the Problem	1
The Problem	5
Purpose of the Media Presentation	9
Hypothesis	10
CHAPTER II - LITERATURE REVIEW	11
CHAPTER III - EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT OF THE PRESENTATION	14
Educational Objectives	14
The Target Audience	15
Form of the Presentation	16
Content Outline	16
Rationale for Media Selection and Production Design	17
CHAPTER IV - PRODUCTION DETAILS	19
Production Costs	19
CHAPTER V - PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION	20
Specific Questions for the Evaluation	20
Operational Definitions of the Variables	22
CHAPTER VI - PROCEDURES	25
Testing Design	25
Sample of the Target Population Tested	25
Instrumentation and Data Gathered	26
Sample Testing Procedures	28

CHAPTER VII - ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	30
Stage 1 - Testing the Draft Presentation with Individuals	30
Stage 2 - The Formal Evaluation	32
CHAPTER VIII - THE CONCLUSION	43
REFERENCES	48
APPENDICES	51
Appendix 1A - Pre-viewing Questionnaire - Personal Details	52
Appendix 1B - Pre-test and Delayed Response Post-test	54
Appendix 2 - Post-viewing Questionnaire	59



## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>		<b>Page</b>
1.	Characteristics of the Target Population	15
2.	Characteristics of Sample Drawn Compared to Target Population	26
3.	Level of Awareness of Presentation Information Prior to Viewing Presentation	32
4.	Attitude Towards Production Variables	35
5.	Rating of Quality of Production Variables	37
6.	Means and Gain Scores for Treatment and Control Groups on Individual Items	42

## CHAPTER I

### **THE PROBLEM**

#### Context of the Problem

To state that all parents are concerned about the development and education of their children is to present a truism - parents are after all the first teachers of their children. In raising their children up to school age parents learn a lot about how children think, test themselves, tackle problems, re-act to new situations, master physical skills and develop language capabilities. For most parents the physical and intellectual growth of the child is a source of pride because it has been accomplished under their untrained guidance - a guidance that has been learned through on-the-job experience and trial-and-error methods. In the process it strengthens the bond between parent and child.

Yet, for all the benefit this relationship has for both parent and child, the vast amount of knowledge of the child the parent has gained and the vast amount of knowledge and skill in teaching the parent has developed, our society demands that when a child reaches a certain age it must be handed over to learning experts and the parent is then required to adopt a minor and largely peripheral role in the formal process of education. It is assumed that, for the most part, the trained expert - the teacher - is capable of providing for the learning needs of between twenty and thirty children with little or no assistance. Only in rare circumstances does the parent have a voice in what the child learns and how that learning is to occur. For the most part the parent is excluded from the learning program and from participating in and sharing the continuation of the learning process with the child.

While such an approach may appear to strengthen the position of the teacher and make the organisation of teaching and learning somewhat easier to control, it is

difficult to argue that a parent, as a client of education, does not have rights when it comes to decisions regarding what happens to his or her child. It is also hard to justify excluding the parent from continuing to play a significant role in the intellectual development of a child.

In Victorian primary schools parents have long been largely observers of the education process - belonging to parent organisations that raised funds and looked after the tuck shop or, for relatively few, being on the School Council and overseeing the school's administration and financial matters. Although there had long been pressure from the parents groups for a greater voice in schools, nothing much occurred at the ministerial level to bring changes to the traditional exclusionist approach adopted by most schools, prior to 1978.

In 1978, the Liberal Government in the state of Victoria, Australia, released a Green Paper which outlined the policy and plans for the proposed progressive decentralisation of the State's educational bureaucracy to the regional offices of education. This transfer of bureaucratic power had just commenced, when, in 1981 an election brought the opposition Labor Party to Government on a promise of change through greater community involvement in Government agencies. One of the areas in which reforms were promised was Education

The Education policy of the Labor Party appears to have been influenced quite significantly by the Third International Community Education Conference which was held in Melbourne in August, 1979. The clear message that came from the conference papers and workshops was that the community, and parents in particular, ought to have, and indeed wanted, a much greater say in education. A resolution to this effect was passed by an apparent unanimous show of hands at the final plenary session on Friday, 24 August, 1979.

In 1980 the proceedings of the conference were published as a series of six books under the title 1980 FLUS - Community Participation and Learning. These

books were widely disseminated throughout the education community and the recommendations they contained were generally endorsed by the two key parent organisations associated with government schools - the Victorian Council of State Schools Organisations and the Victorian Federation of State Schools Parents' Clubs.

Decision-making in Victorian Education (Ministry of Education, 1983a) was the first of a series of Ministerial Policy Papers on Education released by the Labor Government. This first Ministerial Paper details how the philosophy of opening decision-making within the education system to public discussion will be achieved. This philosophy has, as one of its underlying principles, a belief in the:

“... process of participative, collaborative decision making involving the school community on the basis of shared responsibility.”  
(Ministry of Education, 1983a, p3)

In expanding upon this theme the Paper notes that:

“It is the Government’s intention to encourage and extend decision making relating to school level choice, content and methods in order to further involve parents, other community members and, where appropriate, students.”  
(Ministry of Education, 1983a, p3)

It is further expected that:

“As the school community responds to this task it will, in the process, build its expertise to respond continually and adapt its curriculum to the changing needs of students, the neighbourhood, and the community.”  
(Ministry of Education, 1983a, p6)

In sum, decision-making power was to be transferred to the local school level by placing it under the control of an elected school council, consisting of parent elected parents, teacher elected teachers and nominated or co-opted community representatives. This elected school council will become the responsible government body of the school (Ministry of Education, 1983d).

Much public and professional debate followed the release of each of the six Ministerial Papers. Although the governing body of the school council’s organisation,

the Victorian Council of State Schools Organisations (VICCSO) expressed strong support for the devolution of power, through its monthly journal, School Bell, there has been considerable antipathy among parents, particularly in rural areas. Parent concerns, as expressed in multiple signature letters appearing in the School Bell (eg August, 1983; November, 1983; February, 1984) and in numerous letters to the editors of Melbourne's three daily newspapers (The Age, Sun and The Herald) in summary are:

1. That the new responsibility involves too many areas in which the vast majority of parents lack knowledge and expertise;
2. That responsible governance at the local school level is too time consuming; and
3. That schools which attract unenthusiastic parent and community representation will most likely become educationally poorer by default (Maslen, 1984).

Teacher groups in rural areas are also vocal in expressing their reservations about, or downright opposition to, the devolution of power to the schools councils. They too express concern about the additional demands upon their time, the lack of knowledge and experience in some areas, and the conflict that is likely to arise because of the "ultraconservatism" in rural areas (Hannan, 1984).

With a further 12 months of little or no progress to resolve the issue of greater responsibility being accepted by school communities the Minister for Education, Mr Ian Cathie established the Ministry Structures Project Team in January, 1986. The team report Taking Schools into the 1990s (April, 1986) was to be "a discussion paper leading to informed debate and a final series of recommendations" (Cathie, 1986). It never got a hearing! The report was shelved as a result of the opposition to its recommendations from the central authorities of the Parents' Federation, VICCSO and the teacher unions. (Maslen, 1986; Cathie, 1992).

As a consequence changes in the relationship between schools and their communities and the participation of parents and community members in educational decision-making and the wider involvement of parents in other aspects of school programs have continued to develop in a piecemeal fashion, largely at the whim of school principals and teachers. While the policy for changes may be in place, organisational resistance can ensure that very little actually happens.

However, with the election of the Liberal and National Parties as a coalition government in October, 1992, pressure is being placed on schools to move rapidly into local, largely autonomous, self government (Hayward, 1992). It seems that what the previous government could not achieve by negotiation, the Liberal-National government will achieve by the force of legislative power. Already the complaint that it is asking too much of school communities is being heard again.

It is in this climate of change and conflict, and the uncertainty it generates, that university Faculties of Education are attempting to adequately prepare a new generation of teachers who are capable of meeting the demands of new and unclear educational roles and responsibilities.

### **The Problem**

La Trobe University College of Northern Victoria is a polytechnical institution serving the post-secondary educational requirements of central and northern Victoria. Students entering the primary school teacher training program offered by the Faculty of Education are overwhelmingly from rural areas. In 1992, slightly less than 89% were from non-metropolitan areas. This means that their schooling, to a large extent, has been relatively unaffected by the changes which have quietly occurred in many urban schools during the 1980s.

Throughout this period many urban schools began to adapt their organisation and programs in directions which more closely reflected the needs of their particular

students. In particular, the needs of ethnic and other minority groups were recognised, and representatives from these community groups became involved in the re-designing and conduct of local formal and informal school programs. Parent volunteers, who in the past had played a minor support role - helping supervise excursions, doing typing, repairing books and making teaching materials requested by teachers - were, in the most advanced schools, such as Brunswick North West, Altona North and Richmond, advising, guiding and helping teachers on a regular basis as unpaid teacher aides. The principals and teachers recognised that the volunteers were meeting quite specific learning needs of pupils that the single teacher in a classroom could not possibly attend to. Parents and teachers were forming partnerships designed to strengthen the learning of the children.

In contrast, a stable and ageing staff in most schools situated in rural districts, combined with generally conservative rural attitudes, has resulted in mostly cosmetic changes in the school curriculum and very little community involvement in discussion on school programs. Parent/community participation in decisions about the content of the curriculum and teaching methods is almost unheard of. Teachers are the 'experts' in curriculum and information nights are accurately so-named. Parents rarely enter the school or classroom except by invitation or on official business. Helping children at home means hearing reading, supervising the activities set by the teacher and signing the completed effort rather than working with the children. It is an expectation that any learning problems will be reported to the teacher who will take remedial action.

This means that students enrolling at the University College from these areas have a narrow view of teaching and the school curriculum. With five school experience practicum placements spread over the three years of training, and all of these in schools chosen by the students in non-metropolitan areas, there is little likelihood that the majority of students will see and experience anything markedly different from what occurred in their own school days. Anything in the training

program that contradicts their experience is viewed by many students as largely irrelevant to their immediate goals, which are concerned with completing the academic requirements while preparing for, and doing well on, the school experience practicum.

The annual appraisal of student attitudes towards the curriculum studies units and school organisation issues consistently reveals that most students believe that these studies are theoretical and of little practical value. The units are variously described as 'dry' and 'boring' and consisting largely of 'book study' and 'being lectured to'. While the book study and being lectured to has decreased significantly in recent years, being replaced with student conducted seminars, a student completing the three year Diploma of Teaching (Primary) in 1992 will have no real knowledge of the participation and involvement of parents and other community members in school or classroom decision-making and/or activities. This group of newly qualified teachers will enter the teaching service with, for the most part, barely 2 hours of official class time devoted to the issue of parents in schools. With little evidence from most of the teacher training schools associated with the University College that there has been any marked change in the teacher/parent relationship or in the roles that each plays in the learning program, students see many other issues concerned with classroom organisation, management and discipline as being more deserving topics for the time that is available. Many students see little need for spending time on anything other than reporting to parents via the conventional end of term written reports delivered to parents via a parent-teacher interview.

The view generally expressed by students is that the curriculum is the responsibility of curriculum experts, and possibly experienced teachers. It is a common assumption that proposals for change come from outside the school, and that they are introduced to schools as part of the in-service education program through the regular visits made to schools by regional curriculum consultants, or through Ministry



of Education publications. At the school level, the Principal is usually seen as the initiator and the controller of any proposed changes. Once changes are decided upon and are to be introduced, parents are generally 'informed' of the changes and possibly invited to attend an 'information night', if they would like to know more, via a newsletter. There is little understanding of what is required in conducting curriculum workshops for parents. Indeed, most assume that these will be run by the Principal and senior, experienced staff.

The concepts of parent/community participation and involvement in the curriculum, other school decisions and classroom programs is largely unrecognised. When introduced to this approach most students are apprehensive and express concern over their lack of experience in teaching and their lack of confidence in dealing with curriculum issues with parents and other community members. Some students express outright opposition to the idea, claiming that it is parent interference and a loss of professional responsibility which will mean that teachers will no longer be in control of their teaching.

These negative attitudes appear to be reinforced by stories of bad experiences with parents passed on as part of the teachers' folklore when students are engaged in the teaching experience practicum. Unfortunately, bad examples are often described in reports that generally present an otherwise positive picture of school activities. McRae (1988) in his report on participation and equity, Teachers, Schools and Change, included a description that reflected the worst type of relationship

“... the administration and staff of a school as believing only the thinnest membrane separates them from community incursions that will wreck what has been set up. Members of the community on the other hand, have described the school as completely impenetrable” (McRae, 1988, p12).

McRae notes that similar descriptions are to be found in other reports on community-school relations. He does, however, conclude that many of the problems arising from community-school relations are ones of perception

Preparing new teachers for working with parents and other community members seems to be a logical part of a pre-service training program. Knowledge of what will be required, as well as the identification and practise of skills required for communicating with parents and conducting curriculum workshops should go some way towards enhancing the student's attitude toward working with parents upon entry to the teaching profession. It might strengthen the objective set in 1980:

“ Our task is to create a network of educational opportunity that draws on and of the community at large, but if it is to be successful we must replace the present fear of teachers and administrators about the role of parents in education with instead a commitment to recognise their fundamental significance to a healthy education system, a system that on another plane should provide not just an opportunity for the second chance, but rather the continuing chance, for life enhancement .  
(Fordham, 1980, p44)

### **Purpose of the Media Presentation**

The purpose of the media presentation is to give all students undertaking the primary teacher training course an opportunity to see parent participation and involvement as positive approaches to improving teaching and learning in primary schools.

The presentation is a videotaped production containing information on the range of ways that parents may become partners and share in school activities and the decision-making processes. A documentary-style has been used to allow principals, parents, a curriculum consultant and a teacher to explain approaches, roles, problems and how programs are developed. Content was selected which would emphasise that parent participation was underpinned by assumptions which arise from the belief that the educational programs offered by a school should be the outcome of decisions which have not only involved community representatives, but which also have broad community support (Ministry of Education, 1983a).

The speakers used in the presentation were selected after consultation with the Assistant Regional Manager for the Ministry of Education. They were chosen because they were well respected in the local educational community and their natural ability to convey a positive message on the importance of professional knowledge and expertise that teachers must contribute for the process of teacher-parent interaction to be successful.

The video presentation is designed to be used as an introduction to a unit of study on the topic of parent participation and involvement. It is intended that students will commence the unit with a shared knowledge base which will be adequate for them to participate in a discussion to decide the unit of study's objectives, content and learning activities.

Although some theorists (eg. Gagne, 1977; Mieckel, 1970) assert that television can effectively convey affective messages, Nugent, Tipton and Brooke (1980) note that there has been little basic research undertaken in this area. Studies by Mortimer (1983) and Nugent, Tipton and Brooks (1980) support the belief that television is an effective medium in promoting both cognitive and affective learning among college students.

### **Hypothesis**

For the purposes of the statistical analysis the researcher hypothesized that the video presentation on Parent Participation and Involvement would bring about a significant improvement in attitudes towards this topic amongst first year pre-service teacher education students.

## CHAPTER II

### LITERATURE REVIEW

Although the coining of the term, formative evaluation, to describe evaluation that is undertaken during the development of an educational program for the purpose of improvement, is ascribed to Scriven (1967), writers such as Borich (1979), Bratten (1969) and Parsons and Lemire (1986), cite examples which clearly demonstrate that developmental evaluation was practised well before 1967. On a much larger scale, the subjecting of instructional systems and components to intensive research and development, prior to their inclusion in training systems, appears to have been a widely accepted practice in the armed services and industries producing defence systems, during World War Two (Bratten, 1969).

Formative evaluation now appears to have become an accepted and integral part of the process for improving communications and instructional materials during the developmental phase (Schumm and Porter, 1983; Weston, 1986). Weston (1986) cites a review by Andrews and Goodson (1980) which found that 38 out of 40 instructional design models studied included a recommendation that the materials be tried out and revised before being implemented. Indeed, instructional designers such as Locatis and Atkinson (1984), Romiszowski (1981) and Rowntree (1981) emphasise the importance of systematic evaluation throughout the developmental phase of all materials. Their faith in formative evaluation seems to be borne out by the research, as Weston (1986), on the basis of an extensive study of the research, concludes that:

“There doesn't seem to be any doubt that formative evaluation of instructional materials improves the effectiveness of the final product.”  
(Weston, 1986, p6)

With regard to instructional materials for presentation via the medium of television, formative evaluation plays a major role in production improvement for the Children's Television Workshop in New York, USA (Ball and Bogatz, 1972; Lesser, 1972) TV Ontario in Toronto, Canada (Parsons and Lemire, 1986) and the Open University in Australia (Maslen, 1992).

Although Coldevin's (1976) review of the research into television production effects led him to conclude that the results were inconsistent, possibly because of poor control of experimental variables or the lack of follow up research, the research, in general, has established the value of formative evaluation designed to test the effectiveness of a production and its production variables on the specified target audience (Baggaley, 1982, Ball and Bogatz, 1972; Bratten, 1969; Parsons and Lemire, 1986; Schramm and Porter 1983). However, as Baggaley (1982) reports, the research does show that production factors do have a predictable effect on program credibility and, consequently, on its educational worth. The variables noted as being of particular concern are verbal techniques, visual techniques, and performer factors (Baggaley, 1982; Schramm and Porter, 1983).

In 1972, Tuckman wrote that:

"Techniques for formative evaluation are varied and not quite as systematic as those for summative evaluation."  
(Tuckman, 1972, p325)

It seems that little has changed, as Weston (1986) draws much the same conclusion when she notes that the guidelines offered for formative evaluation are both variable and at times inconsistent. There appears to be only two common aspects to most of the formative evaluation models studied. These common elements are:

- a. an accurate description of the target audience, and
- b. a try-out of the materials for revision purposes with someone other than those involved in the development (Weston, 1986).

Generalised procedures for formative evaluation (eg. Romiszowski, 1981; Dick and Carey, 1985) specify that data are collected for the purpose of product revision during the developmental phase of the production. While data may be collected from a number of worthwhile sources, including subject experts, colleagues and learners, there appears to be agreement that the most valuable data will be obtained from samples of the target population (Locatis and Atkinson, 1984; Weston, 1986).

A formative evaluation model, which has been widely accepted for the development of instructional materials is presented by Dick and Carey (1985). Dick and Carey (1985) recommend three stages in the evaluation. Stage one is the testing of the draft materials with individuals and the making of any revision which appears to be suggested. The second stage is the more formal testing of the revised and almost final version with groups of learners, and again making revisions, if they are required. The third and final stage of the evaluation is the testing of the final prototype with a sample of the target audience under conditions which closely match those in which the production is intended to be utilised.

## CHAPTER III

### EDUCATIONAL CONTEXT OF THE PRESENTATION

#### Educational Objectives

##### **General Objective**

After viewing the presentation the students would be aware of how parent participation and involvement and the development of a partnership between teacher and parent, are contributing to teaching and learning in many Victorian primary schools.

##### **Affective Objectives**

After viewing the presentation the students would recognise the need for the study of participation and involvement to be extended in the pre-service teacher training course.

This was considered to be a particularly important objective for students with an initial negative attitude towards early involvement in parent participation and involvement programs, shown by low scores on a particular cluster of questions in the previewing questionnaire.

After viewing the presentation the students would have enough knowledge and awareness of the importance of the topic to be willing to participate in a group discussion to make decisions regarding:

- a) The objectives for a unit of study on parent participation and involvement in schools.
- b) the content to be included.

- c) the relative emphasis that ought to be given to each of the agreed content areas.
- d) the teaching and learning activities to be adopted.

**The Target Audience**

The primary target audience for the media production is trainee teachers enrolled in the Bachelor of Teaching (Primary) at La Trobe University College of Northern Victoria, Bendigo, Victoria, Australia.

The characteristics of the target audience in 1992 are shown in table 1. These data were derived from enrolment forms and a questionnaire completed for the subject Educational Technology I.

TABLE 1	
CHARACTERISTIC OF THE TARGET AUDIENCE - 1992	
SEX	
Female	77%
Male	23%
AGE	
18 Yrs 21yrs	82%
> 21 Yrs	18%
HOME	
Metropolitan	11%
Rural Centre	43%
Rural Area	46%
COURSE ENTRY	
Previous Tertiary Study	4%
High School Qualification	75%
Mature Age	22%
Tertiary Orientation Program	1%
CHILDREN	
Yes	16%
School Age or Older	(14%)
Below School Age	(2%)
No	84%
TELEVISION VIEWING	
Regular Viewing (Average a program per day)	87%
Irregular Viewing (One or two programs per week)	12%
No Viewing	1%



### **Form of the Presentation**

The form of the near final presentation evaluated in this study is a 23 minutes colour video.

Its title is:

#### **Parent Participation and Involvement - It's About Learning**

The style is that of a current affairs documentary with a scripted voice over to link the segments and interviewees.

The on-camera presenters (interviewees) were unrehearsed. They included two principals, a curriculum adviser, two classroom teachers and two parents. All were initially recorded on location in their respective work places.

### **Content Outline**

The key issues addressed in the presentation are:

- a) Clarification of the concepts of parent/community participation and involvement in a primary school.
- b) The forms of participation and involvement that have been adopted by some Victorian schools.
- c) The roles of the participant in parent participation and involvement programs, with emphasis on the areas of knowledge and skills required by teachers.
- d) The importance of parent participation and involvement in improving learning by the children.
- e) The benefits to be gained from encouraging parent participation and involvement programs.
- f) Why parent participation and involvement programs has been endorsed by government policy in Victoria.

- g) Suggestions from those involved in parent participation and involvement programs

“The presentation of real situations and the use of reports given by those involved in an activity are believed to be important factors in catering to the cognitive and affective objectives of the production.” (Doll, 1982; Fleming and Levie, 1979; Schramm and Porter, 1983)

By letting the presenters say what they wanted to say in non-contrived settings, it is intended that their shared values, goals, teaching standards, enthusiasm and problems will be obvious and need arousing for the audience (Schramm and Porter, 1983). Fleming and Levie, (1979) suggest that the research supports the belief that the attractiveness and credibility of the source of a message are important factors in bringing about attitude change, and that any change is more likely to persist if the receiver of the message can identify with the source and share a similar belief system.

The presentation has built into it a range of production variables which research studies reported by the literature (eg. Doll, 1982; Fleming and Levie, 1979; and Schramm and Porter, 1983) suggest are more likely to increase the probability of the stated learning objective being achieved.

### **Rationale for Media Selection and Production Design**

A review of the research on changing attitudes, undertaken by Fleming and Levie (1979), suggests that the desired changes are more likely to be brought about in members of an audience, when the desired attitude messages are presented in person, by credible members of a relevant reference group, in situations where interaction between presenters and the audience is possible. The organising of a series of live presentations, for a number of sessions spread throughout a week, is an impossible task given the imposed time limit for the presentation - 30 minutes - the distance the most likely presenters are away from the College in Bendigo, and the number of presenters required to ensure that the views of the range of participants are covered.

Video was chosen as the medium for this production because it provides the target audience with a mediated experience which is the closest, realistic representation of the desired live presentation, with the following advantages:

- a) The final product can be utilised in a variety of desirable learning situations, including classrooms and individual private study carrels.
- b) It is cheap and easy to produce the several copies that will be required.
- c) It offers versatility for utilisation by users who do not need to view the entire presentation.
- d) Post production editing is relatively simple and cheap. This is an important feature if the production is to be improved, through subsequent evaluation, and kept relevant to student course needs and the changing circumstances in the schools.
- e) The utilisation of portable video taping equipment allows a range of credible presenters to be shot in the ideal setting of their own schools and classrooms. Synchronised sound and visuals are important production variables for conveying personality, credibility, and attitudinal messages (Fleming and Levie, 1979).
- f) The low costs, convenience, and minimal technical expertise required for video taping allows the shooting of additional interviews, thus allowing a selection to be made that is appropriate to the objectives of the presentation. Costs are always an important consideration for a production which is to be used infrequently for in-house viewing.
- g) Portable videotaping equipment does not create intrusion problems when it is used for unrehearsed office/classroom interviews and in meetings.
- h) Video editing allows the addition of post location-shooting graphics for the repetition of important messages and the identification of locations and presenters (Kemp, 1985).

## CHAPTER IV

### **PRODUCTION DETAILS**

The production was shot by the researcher on location in four primary schools - three in Bendigo and the fourth, Brunswick East, a suburb of Melbourne with a very high (90+%) ethnic population. The location shooting was done with 1/2 inch V.H.S. portable video taping equipment available from the University College's Media Services Department. While 3/4 inch video tape was the preferred choice of medium, the equipment for this was only available where the services of a technician are paid for. The cost for this production would have been prohibitive.

A draft presentation was edited onto 3/4 inch tape using the University College's editing suite. Additional audio, including the presenter's narrated voice-over and music were produced in the studio. Text graphics for titles, credits and personnel were prepared on a computer using Topfont program.

In the revised presentation the logo and additional colour graphics were created by the researcher using Windows Paintbrush program.

An interviewee appearing in the presentation was re-shot in the studio.

The copy of the presentation used for evaluation purposes was dubbed onto a high definition VHS 1/2 inch video cassette to minimise the loss of image quality.

#### **Production Costs**

As the production was for teaching purposes within the La Trobe University College of Northern Victoria, all costs were borne by the Department of Education Studies within the Faculty of Education. The only cost to the department was a departmental transfer of \$160 for 8 hours of technical assistance in the editing suite.

## CHAPTER V

### **PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION**

A formative evaluation of the video-taped production was undertaken as part of the development process. The purpose of the evaluation was to measure the effectiveness of the production to achieve the intended effects, or objectives, with the primary target audience and to gather relevant information providing a more complete profile of the target audience, to assist in the improvement of the production. Responses from the measuring instruments were used to decide what modifications were required to improve the production prior to it being used for instructional purposes.

#### **Specific Questions for the Evaluation**

Data obtained from the responses by the subjects were used for investigating the following questions:

Question 1: Did the production convey enough information on parent participation and involvement for members of the target audience to feel that they could participate in a group decision making forum to decide the objectives, content and learning activities for their own unit of work on this topic

Rationale: The main purposes of the presentation were to give members of the target audience enough information and the confidence to undertake this task. A study of the effectiveness of a videotaped production by Mortimer (1983) with a sample of pre-service teachers found that television was an effective medium for cognitive learning with this population.

Question 2: Did the production give members of the target audience, who had previously expressed doubt or uncertainty with regard to their own and/or

parent/community involvement in schools (interpreted as a negative attitude), a more positive attitude towards parent participation and involvement?

Rationale: Resistance factors are significant blocks to the acceptance of change by many people (Doll, 1982). Studies by Mortimer (1983) and Nugent, Tipton and Brooks (1980) suggest that television is an effective medium for changing attitudes among college students.

Question 3: Were the messages contained in the presentation appropriate for the target population?

Rationale: Schramm and Porter (1983) report that the tailoring of instructional messages to suit specific target audiences is well supported by the research. This question was designed to test the effectiveness of the instructional messages presented in the production.

Question 4: Were the segments suitably matched to the message content and the target audience?

Rationale: Borich (1979) suggests that each of the components contained in a presentation, and the interrelationships between the components, are important aspects for message acceptance by a target audience. This question was designed to test the component segments and their interrelationships.

Question 5: Was the form of the presentation - a colour videotape - an appropriate means for presenting the intended messages to the target audience?

Rationale: Simonson (1984) reports that mediated instruction is often received more favourably than non-mediated instruction. This question is to test whether the use of a videotaped production, presented via the medium of television, is an acceptable combination with regard to the stated objectives.

Question 6: Was the content presented both coherent and cohesive?

Rationale: Schramm and Porter (1983) report that perceived inconsistencies and omissions in the content result in poor message comprehension. This question

was to establish whether the production contained significant omissions and/or inconsistencies in the content.

Question 7: What degree of viewer involvement was achieved and what were the limitations (if any) of the production?

Rationale: The capacity of a production to attract and hold the interest of the intended audience is vital if the messages it contains are to reach that target audience (Fleming and Levie, 1979; Goodman, 1982). This question was also concerned with need arousal in the audience (Fleming and Levie, 1979). The identification of the characteristics of any subjects in whom the presentation appears to cause little or no improvement in a pre-viewing negative attitude may be an essential part of the evaluation process.

Question 8: What degree of match between variance in the target population and a variety of production variables was achieved?

Rationale: In relation to the stated objectives for the production, this question sought to establish the most suitable match between variance in the target population on a number of variables (sex, age, previous education, home area, etc.) and a variety of production variables.

Question 9: What were the key characteristics of the target population?

Rationale: This aspect of the evaluation was designed to establish an accurate profile of the target audience for the purpose of studying the relationship between the subject variables and a range of production variables and instructional messages.

### **Operational Definitions of the Variables:**

Negative attitude: an expression of fear, doubt, uncertainty or unwillingness to either accept or participate, with regard to a proposal for adopting a certain course of action, as measured by responses to particular clusters of statements on a questionnaire.

Positive attitude: an expression of approval, acceptance or willingness to participate, with regard to a proposal for adopting a certain course of action, as measured by responses to particular clusters of statements on a questionnaire.

Messages: cognitive learning, consisting of concepts, facts, procedures and principles, and affective learning, consisting of values and attitudes, in the form in which they are presented in the production.

Production segment: a section of the presentation that deals with a specific issue.

Presentation form: a 30 minute colour videotape.

Coherent: that the content was presented in a consistent and orderly manner designed to avoid any misinterpretation or confusion by members of the target audience.

Cohesive: that the content presented was perceived as a unified whole by members of the target audience.

Viewer involvement: the capacity of a presentation to attract attention and hold the interest of the target audience.

Production limitations: identification of individuals and/or groups within the target audience for whom the presentation may have less than the desired effect, that is, the measure of attitude indicates a deterioration from pretest to posttest results.



Target population variance: the range in the target population on a number of characteristics including sex, age, where brought up, and previous television viewing habits.

Production variables: the elements or factors that are combined to create a particular video presentation. They include verbal techniques, such as pacing, rhythm, repetition, review, order of segments, balance between segments and the use of silent periods; visual techniques, such as colour or monochrome, settings, screen compositions, screen image size, camera angles and camera movements; and performance variables, such as age, sex, appearance, eye-contact levels and mannerisms.

## CHAPTER VI

### PROCEDURES

#### Testing Design

Stage 1: testing of draft presentation with individuals.

Stage 2: subjects (N=40) were randomly assigned to one of three test groups. Subjects in each test group completed an identical pre-viewing questionnaire (pre-test). Two groups then saw the presentation (treatment), one group (control) saw an alternative production. All subjects then completed a post-viewing questionnaire. One week after viewing the presentation all subjects completed the pre-viewing questionnaire as a delayed response post-test.

#### Sample of the Target Population Tested

For Stage 1 of the evaluation: individual viewing by four subjects from the target population, one colleague, one school principal, two curriculum advisers, and a parent representative.

For Stage 2 of the evaluation: a random sample of 40 students enrolled in the first year of the Bachelor of Teaching program at the La Trobe University College of Northern Victoria was generated using random numbers.

The characteristics of the drawn sample were compared with those of the general target population of first year Education students to ensure that a representative sample had been drawn. Characteristics compared were age, sex, educational background, course entry, home area and children (Borg and Gall, 1983). Of the 40 subjects drawn as a sample, 36 attended at the designated times. The characteristics of the sample were compared with those of the target population. Table 2 shows the comparison of the characteristics. While there were clear discrepancies in

the percentages, none was greater than 10%. The researcher concluded that the sample drawn adequately represented the target population.

TABLE 2		
CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE DRAWN COMPARED TO TARGET POPULATION		
	TARGET POPULATION	SAMPLE
<b>SEX</b>		
Female	77%	82%
Male	23%	18%
<b>AGE</b>		
18 Yrs 21yrs	82%	73%
> 21 Yrs	18%	27%
<b>HOME</b>		
Metropolitan	11%	11%
Rural Centre	43%	52%
Rural Area	46%	37%
<b>COURSE ENTRY</b>		
Previous Tertiary Study	4%	0%
High School Qualification	75%	71%
Mature Age	22%	29%
Tertiary Orientation Program	1%	0%
<b>CHILDREN</b>		
Yes	16%	14%
School Age or Older	(14%)	(14%)
Below School Age	(2%)	(0%)
No	84%	86%

### **Instrumentation and Data Gathered**

Three measuring instruments were devised for this evaluation.

Instrument 1: a questionnaire providing a comprehensive entry description of the subjects across a number of variables considered to be relevant in determining the value to be derived from any possible changes in the presentation to suit identified classes of subjects. The information sought by the questionnaire included age, sex, educational background, where educated, hometown, parents' occupations and prior work experience. This instrument was constructed by the researcher and required that subjects write answers to a series of written questions. Please see Appendix 1, Part A.

Instrument 2: a pre-viewing questionnaire (pre-test) to measure the subjects' awareness of parent participation and involvement and their perception of the issues associated with these concepts. The instrument also surveyed subjects' attitudes and opinions on parent participation and involvement. This instrument was researcher constructed and consisted of statements which required subjects to respond on a 5 point Likert scale of measurement. Please see Appendix 1, Part B. This instrument was used in its original form as the delayed response post-test.

Instrument 3: a post-viewing questionnaire designed to generate subjects' reactions to the presentation. This questionnaire sought reactions in four areas:

- a) new information obtained from the presentation,
- b) program or production variables,
- c) an optional section for suggesting production improvements, and,
- d) an open-ended section for opinions and questions.

Please see Appendix 2.

Post-viewing questionnaire - Part 1: to determine what (if any) new information was obtained from the presentation. A checklist of prior awareness of the information content was used. Statements were given, to which subjects responded by checking an appropriate point on a 5 point Likert scale.

Post-viewing questionnaire - Part 2: to obtain subjects' reactions to a number of production variables, with regard to their contribution to the achievement of the stated production objectives. A series of statements was generated to which subjects responded by checking an appropriate point on a 5 point Likert scale.

Post-viewing questionnaire - Part 3: this section provided subjects with a range of options to suggest possible modifications to the content and production variables, indicate their degree of involvement and identify the appropriate target audience.

Post-viewing questionnaire - Part 4: this section was open-ended and allowed subjects the opportunity to express opinions on the production and to generate questions that may have come to mind during the viewing.

### **Sample Testing Procedures**

Stage 1: consisted of viewing of the presentation segments and rough edited version of the production by individual subjects from the target population (4), curriculum advisers (2), a colleague, a primary school principal and a parent representative. In a post-viewing discussion with the producer these subjects were asked to give ideas, suggestions and general comments to guide improvements .

Stage 2: each subject selected in the randomly generated sample (N=40) from the intended primary target population was randomly assigned to one of the three test groups. Although forty subjects were originally selected and assigned only thirty-six actually attended. No changes were made to the original assigned test groups. Group sizes were:

- Treatment group A - N=13
- Treatment group B - N=11
- Control group - N=12.

The two treatment groups were randomly assigned to time of day, late morning and middle of the afternoon. This was necessary to control the effect of time of day and the psychological conditions of the learner. These times also matched the usual times that tutorials in which the production was to be used were conducted.

The control group was assigned a middle of the afternoon viewing time

Each session was conducted by a colleague using a scripted introduction to explain the purpose of the presentation, what was required of the subjects and the procedure to be followed. The pre-viewing questionnaire was then completed by each of the subjects.

The video presentation was screened. The control group saw an alternative video presentation - a humorous look at Media Studies.

Immediately after the viewing the post-viewing questionnaire was unsealed and completed while all subjects in the treatment groups completed the four sections in the post-viewing questionnaire, subjects in the control group only completed section A of the post-viewing questionnaire - prior knowledge of the content covered in the presentation. Treatment and control groups then engaged in a short discussion (10-12 minutes) on the possible development of a unit of work on parent participation and involvement.

A post-questionnaire open discussion was initiated by the instructor to see if ideas about a possible unit of work and content were identified as a development emanating from the videotaped presentation.

Viewing conditions were those normally encountered in the typical University College lecture/tutorial classroom.

The time allowed was the 50 minutes normally given to a single teaching session. The time actually required by the production viewing groups was 40-45 minutes. The time required by the control group was 35 minutes.

One week later subjects in the larger of the treatment groups and in the control group completed the delayed response post-test.

## CHAPTER VII

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Stage 1 - Testing the Draft Presentation with Individuals

Four students from the target audience, one lecturing colleague, one school principal, two curriculum advisers and one parent representative were invited to view the draft presentation individually and offer suggestions for improvement. This process was undertaken over a period of ten working days.

At the outset each previewer was informed of the intended purpose and audience for the presentation. Each was also advised that the presentation was a rough draft for both content and format and that all the original material was readily available for re-editing purposes.

After this introduction the presentation was viewed in the company of the researcher. A discussion took place immediately after the viewing with the researcher taking notes and, where necessary, prompting for responses from a prepared list that included the following production variables: segment content, segment length, visual images, audio, talent appeal, perceived talent attitude, graphics, linking of segments, cohesiveness of the production, sustaining viewer interest and overall value of the presentation.

At the conclusion of this process the recorded comments from each reviewer were plotted on a chart against each variable for comparison. Where a similar criticism or suggestion was made by three or more previewers it was noted as a possible change.

Eight possible changes were identified by the above procedure. These are listed below in the order of the number of times mentioned.

1. That there is a need for more material like this on other topics in the teacher education program.
2. The ethnic schools should be seen as a separate topic.
3. That it needs to be identified as a L.T.U.C.N.V. Faculty of Education production at the beginning.
4. Some sort of introduction to the speakers who appear in the presentation.
5. Something that gives a general picture of the content.
6. Fix up the audio (buzz) on the segment featuring the Parents' Federation representative and the classroom noise behind the other parents.
7. Shorter segments with more variety in the interviewees.
8. Include more graphics and more varied graphics to re-inforce the points made in the narration.

After consultation with the technician in the Media Services Department of the University College the following changes were made in a re-edited version of the presentation.

1. The interview with the Parents' Federation representative was re-shot in the studio.
2. All references to schools with a large proportion of ethnic groups were removed.
3. The researcher taught himself how to use Microsoft Windows Paintbrush program to create an opening logo and a variety of coloured graphics for inclusion in the presentation.
4. A segment consisting of a single comment from each of the interviewees was constructed as an 'opener' to the topic.
5. Where possible segments with each interviewee were shortened and a linking narration added to strengthen the continuity and enhance the content.



6. The suggested need for more presentations like this was taken up and the opening segments remodelled to make this presentation the pilot for a possible series of programs to be produced under the title of The School Report. Other possible topics are identified.
7. To increase the visual appeal more special effects were added.
8. The running time was reduced from 29 minutes to 23 minutes.

**Stage 2 - The Formal Evaluation**

**Part A** of the post-viewing questionnaire sought information on the subjects prior awareness of the selected content areas in the video presentation. For the purposes of this analysis the two treatment groups were collapsed into one (N=24). Table 3 exhibits the summarized responses. This reveals that 6 of the 18 content areas were either very well known or known by over 50% of the respondents. Six content areas were also identified as either uncertain or completely unknown by over 50% of the respondents. In a further 4 areas the largest percentage of respondents indicated that they knew a little about the area. Only 4 areas had combined responses of below 20% for uncertain and completely unknown.

With 12 of the 18 content areas identified as less than known by the majority of the respondents it seems reasonable to conclude that the presentation contained an appropriate quantity of new information on the selected topic.

TABLE 3				
LEVEL OF AWARENESS OF PRESENTATION INFORMATION PRIOR TO VIEWING PRESENTATION				
very well known	known	knew a little about it	was uncertain	completely unknown
1. That participation means making formal decisions, usually in committees				
8%	17%	38%	29%	8%

very well known	known	knew a little about it	was uncertain	completely unknown
2. That involvement means helping by doing something at someone's request.				
	46%	29%	21%	4%
3. That parent representatives participate in the selection of school principals.				
17%	17%	20%	17%	29%
4. That parent representatives participate in the selection of staff in some schools.				
	29%	17%	25%	29%
5. That parents and teachers have worked together to completely design their new school.				
4%	12%	17%	17%	50%
6. That parents participation and involvement in schools are required by government policy.				
	21%	8%	17%	54%
7. That parents and principals don't expect the classroom teacher to provide for all the learning needs of the children, single-handed.				
8%	71%	13%	8%	
8. That it is a parent's right to be informed and consulted about any decisions a teacher makes concerning her/his child.				
50%	29%	13%	8%	
9. That teachers are expected to run curriculum workshops for the parents of the children she/he teaches				
4%	17%	25%	25%	29%
10. That a range of specially prepared materials is available for use in curriculum workshops for parents.				
4%	17%	13%	33%	33%
11. That conducting curriculum workshops for parents generally requires skills and techniques that are not normally part of a teacher training course.				
	33%	21%	29%	17%
12. That parents are sharing with teachers the decision-making on curriculum content and teaching methods.				
8%	33%	33%	25%	
13. That parents have both the knowledge and willingness to help teachers to devise and present classroom activities.				
4%	62%	13%	21%	

very well known	known	knew a little about it	was uncertain	completely unknown
14. That in many schools parent-assistants make many of their own decisions about what the group or individual they are in charge of should be doing.				
4%	13%	16%	38%	29%
15. That parents have much higher regard for teachers who are willing to openly share their professional knowledge.				
21%	67%	12%		
16. That research shows that parent interest in a school is a factor in improving a child's learning.				
33%	38%	25%	4%	
17. That most parents are only too willing to help a school, but they expect teachers to ask them for assistance.				
4%	42%	33%	21%	
18. That it is a mistake to assume that parents who don't attend meetings and other school activities are not interested in their children's education.				
29%	42%	8%	13%	8%

**Part B** of the post-viewing questionnaire sought responses to items that addressed a range of production variables. For the purposes of this analysis the two treatment groups were collapsed into one (N=24). Table 4 exhibits the summarized responses.

Examination of this table reveals positive responses (over 50%) for 14 of the production variables. The two variables for which strong negative responses (over 50%) were recorded were the related areas of the length of the production (54%) and whether some segments were too long or irrelevant (50%). There was also some concern over the appeal of the music used, with 29% finding it unappealing and a further 21% uncertain.

A similar problem was identified with the quality of the sound. Although sound and picture were included in this item (No. 9) a large proportion of those who wanted improvement circled sound. Thirty-seven percent wanted better sound and pictures with a further 8% uncertain.

The conclusion which may be drawn from this table is that for the most part the production variables are appropriate for the target audience. There is, however, support for reducing the length of the production and a change to the theme music.

One item in this section that wasn't a production variable, but was included out of researcher curiosity was item 11, student use of video material for assignment purposes. This produced an unexpected result, with 54% of the respondents indicating that they wouldn't normally look for and use video material for assignment purposes and a further 13% being uncertain. This suggests that a large proportion of teacher education students don't see video material as a source of information.

<b>TABLE 4</b>				
<b>ATTITUDE TOWARDS PRODUCTION VARIABLES</b>				
<b>strongly agree</b>	<b>agree</b>	<b>uncertain</b>	<b>disagree</b>	<b>strongly disagree</b>
1. That open-ended documentary (current affairs) style used isn't appropriate for the content being presented.				
4%	13%	4%	66%	13%
2. The production's opening sequence captured my attention immediately.				
33%	46%	21%		
3. The music used during the opening titles and closing credits didn't appeal to me.				
8%	21%	21%	50%	
4. The Education Faculty identifier should be left out.				
		17%	66%	17%
5. The opening barn doors effect to introduce the series of programs is a good attention-grabbing device.				
38%	45%	13%	4%	
6. The short segment containing a single comment from each of the interviewees helped me to focus on the program topic.				
25%	58%	13%	4%	

strongly agree	agree	uncertain	disagree	strongly disagree
7. A video is the best way to introduce a topic that needs information from different people located in different places.				
33%	59%	8%		
8. It is necessary to see and know who is providing the information in the voice-over links between interviewees to decide if they know what they are talking about.				
21%	42%	29%	8%	
9. The interviews should have been taped in the studio for better sound and pictures.				
8%	29%	8%	46%	8%
10. The program was too long, given the amount of new information it contained.				
4%	50%	13%	33%	
11. I wouldn't normally look for and use a video to find information on a topic set for an assignment.				
8%	42%	13%	29%	8%
12. The studio presenter's voice over is essential for linking the comments by the interviewees.				
38%	58%	4%		
13. The school principals are the best sources for the information they present.				
4%	42%	21%	25%	8%
14. Some of the interview segments were too long or irrelevant				
	50%	13%	37%	
15. The visual images didn't change often enough to hold my attention.				
4%	17%	17%	54%	8%
16. There was too much information in the program.				
	21%	4%	67%	8%
17. The graphics (diagrams and writing) are very important because they add variety to the images appearing on the screen				
38%	67%			
18. The graphics make the information being heard easier to follow				
33%	67%			
19. All the interviewees were enthusiastic supporters of parent participation and involvement.				
25%	54%	21%		
20. The interviewees were too old for me to really relate my future to what they were saying.				
8%		4%	42%	46%

**Part B** (Item 21) of the post-viewing questionnaire required the respondents to rate the quality of a number of variables in the presentation. For the purposes of this analysis the two experimental groups were collapsed into one (N=24). Table 4 presents a summary of the responses.

A perusal of these statistics indicated that 10 of the 12 variables were rated very good or good by 70% of the respondents.

Two areas of concern were identified. The quality of the sound was rated poor by 8% of the respondents and fair by a further 46% of the respondents. The music was rated poor or very poor by 21% of the respondents with a further 29% rating it fair. A perusal of the characteristics of the respondents who rated the music fair or below revealed no patterns. Music, it seems, is a matter of personal taste.

These findings confirmed the conclusion drawn from the analysis of Table 4 with regard to sound quality and the music.

TABLE 5					
RATING OF QUALITY OF PRODUCTION VARIABLES					
	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
Quality of the pictures	29%	46%	25%		
Interest level of the pictures	8%	67%	25%		
Quality of the sound	4%	42%	46%	8%	
Flow of the program	21%	58%	17%	4%	
Focus on the topic	50%	42%	8%		
Speed of the narration	33%	42%	25%		
The use of pauses	25%	63%	8%	4%	
Quality of the titles	5%	42%	4%		

	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
Quality of the graphics	58%	25%	12%	4%	
Suitability of music	17%	33%	29%	17%	4%
Variety of effects	25%	46%	25%	4%	
Selection of interviewees	33%	38%	29%		

**Part C** of the post-viewing questionnaire sought information on the value of the video production and suggestions for possible modifications. The response required for each item was a written comment. Again the two treatment groups were collapsed into one group (N=24) for the data analysis.

Items 1 and 2 sought information on the use of video for assignment purposes. Ninety-six percent of the respondents said that they would use the video and recommend it to a friend. The most common reasons given were because it was "... current information", "from local sources", "it gives information that you can't get in books", "better to hear it from the people involved", and that you "can't chase up all those people by yourself". The negative respondent said that video information "is too hard to follow for an essay".

Item 3 sought information on the use of the program in the typical university college setting of an introductory lecture or tutorial on participation and involvement. Eighty-three percent felt that it was suitable for this purpose. The most common comment accompanying this opinion was that it should be accompanied by a class discussion rather than a lecture. The 17% who felt that it was unsuitable for either setting stated that it was too long for the purpose for which it was intended.

Item 4 sought opinions on the potential use of other video productions of a similar style and quality.

Ninety-six percent of the respondents indicated that they would use videos on other topics if they were available. Four percent (1 respondent) said No, giving as a reason that "... too many videos of similar style would lose their impact".

Item 5 sought information on the natural audience for the program. Only 17% of respondents saw the audience as being limited to student teachers. Student teachers were named by 100% of respondents, 82% included parents and 58% listed teachers.

Item 6 offered the possibility for re-editing the presentation.

While 33% wanted nothing added, another 33% wanted more from parents. Seventeen percent thought that the opinions of some children whose parents had worked in classrooms at some previous time would be worth hearing.

In response to the question of what should be cut out, 42% left this section blank or added a dash. It was assumed that this meant no deletions. Twenty-nine percent recommended that where points were repeated by different interviewees that these should be deleted. This lends support to the finding noted from Table 4 on the need for a reduction in the length of the presentation. Other suggestions were minor changes mentioned by single respondents.

Item 7 sought comments on changes to the graphics. While 67% wanted no changes, 33% wanted either the unstable images brought under control, or parts of the text to be clearer, or both.

Item 8, which sought suggestions for making the program more interesting to a wider audience, proved to be redundant. All suggestions were repetition of the responses given to Item 6 (above).

**Part D** invited other comments and questions.

For Other Comments, 29% of the respondents left the space blank. Others wrote a variety of comments. The positive comments were: 'was well done'; 'I enjoyed it and found it very informative'; 'really good'; 'interest[sic] and



informative'; 'very professional and educational'; 'not bad'; 'good effort'; 'positive and worthwhile'; 'interesting - my knowledge has been broadened'; 'good video with vital information that I have never thought about before'.

The only negative comment concerned the logo. This respondent thought the eagle in the logo looked a bit sick.

The section inviting questions only elicited responses from 33% of the respondents. There was no pattern to questions. Most dealt with the content of the presentation. They included: 'why haven't we heard about this?'; 'is this going to be a subject in the future?'; 'why don't we know anything about it?'; 'why aren't we doing it?'; 'what about gender balance?'; 'what do we need to know about running workshops?'; 'is there more information on content somewhere?'; 'who's got the workshop material shown in the video?'.

Both items in **Part D** have elicited responses which appear to confirm that in general terms the presentation is an acceptable product for the purpose for which it was intended with the designated target audience.

### **Statistical Tests**

The analysis of the data for testing the experimental hypothesis consisted of comparing the gain scores of the treatment and control groups.

The hypothesis for this section of the study, as stated in Chapter 1, is the following:

.... that the video presentation on Parent Participation and Involvement would bring about significant improvement in attitudes towards this topic amongst first year pre-service teacher education students.

Prior to the analysis the 6 distraction items included in the pre-test/post-test questionnaire were removed. These were items 1, 4, 6, 7, 14 & 21.

After entering the coded information for the remaining 20 items, responses to negative statement items were recoded to ensure that gain score changes were in one direction.

Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences Computer program at the La Trobe University College of Northern Victoria for t tests to determine the significance of the differences between the means of the treatment and control groups, the researcher tested the significance of the changes in the scores at the .05 level of significance.

Upon examination of the pre and post test scores on individual items, table 6, it was learned that there was no significance in the treatment group's gain score on any item at the .05 level. However, there was a gain by the treatment group on 14 of the test items that exceeded the gain by the control group. The statistical analysis of the gain scores revealed that the standard deviation for the control group was .34, while that for the treatment group was .36.

This table also shows that for 7 of the test items the treatment group's gain scores were negative. Six of these items were matched with negative gain scores by the control group. Overall, however, the control group showed a greater decline in attitude with negative gain scores for 9 items.

TABLE 6						
MEANS AND GAIN SCORES FOR TREATMENT AND CONTROL GROUPS ON INDIVIDUAL ITEMS						
TREATMENT GROUP				CONTROL GROUP		
Item	Pre-test mean score	Post-test mean score	Gain score	Pre-test mean score	Post-test mean score	Gain score
2	3.77	3.77	0.00	4.08	3.91	0.17
3	2.08	2.31	0.23	2.00	2.17	0.17
5	1.85	2.15	0.31	2.02	2.33	0.32
8	3.46	3.92	0.46	3.17	3.58	0.42
9	1.62	1.69	0.08	1.67	1.92	0.25
10	3.69	3.93	0.24	3.83	4.00	0.17
11	2.08	2.00	-0.08	1.92	1.92	0.00
12	3.31	2.54	-0.77	3.17	2.50	0.67
13	2.15	2.31	0.15	2.17	2.58	0.42
15	2.92	2.54	-0.39	2.92	2.50	0.42
16	3.92	4.62	0.69	3.58	4.08	-0.50
17	3.08	2.92	-0.15	2.67	2.42	0.25
18	2.15	1.92	-0.23	2.50	2.25	-0.25
19	3.39	3.62	0.23	3.08	3.17	0.08
20	2.38	2.08	-0.31	2.53	2.00	0.53
22	2.46	2.62	0.15	2.17	3.08	0.92
23	2.00	2.08	0.08	2.00	1.92	0.08
24	2.54	2.54	0.00	2.33	2.25	-0.08
25	4.46	4.62	0.15	4.50	4.58	0.08
26	3.54	2.92	-0.61	3.25	2.92	-0.34
<b>GRAND MEAN</b>	<b>2.84</b>	<b>2.85</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>2.80</b>	<b>0.02</b>

## CHAPTER VIII

### THE CONCLUSION

This study was designed to evaluate a researcher produced video presentation for the purpose of improving the production prior to its utilization with the target audience. A two stage evaluation procedure was used. In the first stage of the evaluation, individuals viewed and commented on the presentation. Eight changes were identified and made during re-editing.

In stage 2 a formal evaluation of the presentation was conducted with a random sample drawn from the target audience. Subjects completed a post-viewing questionnaire that sought information on the presentation's subject content, production variables and suggestions for possible improvements. The analysis of the data obtained provided answers to the questions for investigation that were posed in Chapter 5.

Question 1 was concerned with the issue of information on the topic. With 12 of the 18 key areas of content contained in the presentation identified as being less than known by the majority of the respondents, the researcher concluded that this was a satisfactory level of information transmission for a presentation designed to introduce the topic to students.

The second part of this question was concerned with whether the presentation adequately prepared students for participation in a group decision-making forum to design a unit of work on the topic of parent participation and involvement. On the basis of the comments/questions appearing in section C of the questionnaire and the post-viewing discussions reported verbally by the colleague who supervised the evaluation sessions, the researcher concluded that the presentation was suitable for this purpose.

Question 2 was concerned with the appropriateness of the presentation for bringing about a more positive attitude in students towards parent participation and involvement. The comparison of growth scores of the experimental and control group's revealed that the video presentation produced no significant attitude gains over the control group although an improvement on 14 of the 20 items was noted.

Question 3 was concerned with the appropriateness of the messages in the presentation for the target audience. Nothing inappropriate was identified in the analysis of the data.

Question 4 addressed the issue of the matching of the segments to the message content and the target audience. Using the ratings given to the Flow of the Program and Focus on the Topic for evaluating this question, nothing inappropriate was identified.

Question 5 was concerned with the appropriateness of the form of the presentation - a colour videotape - for presenting the intended messages to the target audience. The video presentation was endorsed by a majority of the respondents as appropriate for the intended purpose.

Question 6 was concerned with the coherence and cohesiveness of the content. The analysis of the comments respondents wrote for the items that sought suggestions for additions, deletions and other suggestions revealed no major changes were required.

Two sections of the analysis strongly supported further shortening of the presentation. Most support for how this could be achieved was for the elimination of segments where information was being repeated by different interviewees.

While a sizeable minority wanted to hear more from parents, the researcher concluded that this may be difficult to accomplish without increasing the length of the presentation. Such a change would be undesirable given that the major change identified in this analysis was for the presentation's length to be reduced.

Question 7 was concerned with the level of viewer involvement achieved by the production. Comments and questions recorded in the open section of the questionnaire were used to assess this issue. The analysis led the researcher to conclude that the presentation would hold the attention and interest of the target audience.

Question 8 was concerned with the match between target population variance and production variables. Scanning of the responses by an independent party and the researcher led to the conclusion that mismatches were both random and minor.

Question 9 was concerned with establishing the key characteristics of the target population. This was achieved through analysis of the data on student admission forms and a questionnaire completed at the commencement of the academic year for the subject Educational Technology I. The data obtained from the sample drawn for this study showed no major variance from the target population.

The results have shown that a 2-stage formative evaluation procedure can result in significant changes being made to a video production. The first stage of the evaluation - viewing of a rough draft and suggestions by individuals resulted in major changes being made prior to the formal evaluation of stage 2. Stage 2 demonstrated that the production was only in need of minor changes - in particular a reduction in length which can be achieved by reducing or eliminating segments of repetition.

While the music was considered to be unappealing by a significant minority of the respondents, it would probably be difficult to find something that has high universal appeal, given that this is a production variable that depends upon personal taste.

The low quality of the audio in the work place interviews was noted as another area for attention. While a high quality planet microphone was used, the harshness of voices in hard-walled offices and the distraction of children's voices behind an

interviewee need to be more consciously addressed. The use of a personal microphone should significantly reduce this problem.

While the MicroSoft Windows Paintbrush program produced well-detailed and attractive graphics for the production, the discovery that there was incompatibility between the computer system and the video system was a cause for concern. This incompatibility resulted in slightly unstable images in the video production that were distracting. It appears that this problem may be solved by the purchase of a relatively inexpensive conversion box.

By comparing the gain scores of the experimental and control groups on an attitude questionnaire, the researcher tested the hypothesis that the video presentation would bring about a significant improvement in the attitude of pre-service teacher trainees. Examination of the experimental group's gain scores on individual items did not reveal a significant difference at the .05 level over the control group's on any item. However, the gain scores for the experimental group were slightly higher than the control group's for 14 of the 20 items.

Of particular interest are the negative gain scores. While both the experimental and the control group recorded a number of negative gain scores (experimental group 7, control group 9) for 6 of the 7 items for which the experimental group showed a negative gain there was also a negative gain score for the control group. A scrutiny of the relevant questionnaire items reveals no particular pattern in the content. However, consideration of the general issue of education in the community at the time this study was conducted is most revealing and relevant.

Over the period in which this study was undertaken educational issues were a major item in the mass media, with major changes being announced by the newly elected state government resulting in protests and demonstrations by teachers, parents, and students. Many of the announced changes were dealing with issues associated with the content of the video presentation.

The announced closure of 52 schools, the redundancy of up to 7,000 Ministry of Education personnel and proposed changes to teacher work conditions resulted in daily news items and lead articles on the issues, the protests and the new changes that were concerned with what was labelled as 'The Victorian Revolution' by the press. Of particular concern was that the day after the pre-test, over 2,000 teachers, including some students who were participants in this study, marched in protest through the streets of Bendigo and held a 2 hour meeting. Given these circumstances the researcher is reluctant to draw any conclusions about the contribution the video presentation may have made to the subjects' attitudes. It is perhaps surprising that the gain scores didn't fluctuate more than they did.

The researcher believes that this study has added to the research that demonstrates the value of formative evaluation as a means to improve the quality and suitability of instructional video productions for specified audiences.



## REFERENCES

- Andrews, D.H. and Goodson, L. A. (1980). A comparative analysis of models of instructional design. *Journal of Instructional Development*. Vol 3 (4), 2-15.
- Baggaley, J. (1982). TV production research and media development. *Media in Education and Development*. 15 (1), 46-48.
- Ball, S. and Bogatz, G.A. (1970). *Educational Research*. 4th ed. White Plains, New York: Longman Inc.
- Borich, G.D. (1979). A systems approach to the evaluation of training. In O'Neill, H.F. Jr. (ed), *Procedures for Instructional Systems Development*. New York: Academic Press.
- Brady, L. (1990). *Curriculum Development*. 3rd ed. Sydney: Prentice Hall.
- Bratten, J.E. (1969). A systems approach to the improvement of instruction. In Unwin, D. (ed), *Media and Methods - Instructional Technology in Higher Education*. Maidenhead, Berkshire: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.,
- Bremer, J., et al. (eds), (1980). *1980 PLUS - Community, Participation and Learning*. Melbourne: The Australian Association for Community Education and the Planning Services Division of the Education Department of Victoria 6v.
- Individual titles are:
- |        |                |
|--------|----------------|
| Book 1 | Who?           |
| Book 2 | How?           |
| Book 3 | Where?         |
| Book 4 | What?          |
| Book 5 | International. |
| Book 6 | Why?           |
- Campbell, D.T. and Stanley, J.C. (1986). *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Skokie, Illinois: Rand McNally.
- Cathie, I. (1986). School Reform is a Community Issue, Melbourne *The Age* 27 Apr., p.18.
- (1992). How 'three orgs' thwarted school reforms. Melbourne. *The Age* 3 Nov., p.15.
- Coldevin, G. (1976). Comparative effectiveness of TV production variables *Journal of Educational TV*. No. 2
- Dick, W. and Carey, L. (1985). *The Systematic Design of Instruction*. 2nd ed. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company
- Doll, R.C. (1982). *Curriculum Improvement Decision Making and Process*. 5th ed. Boston: Allyn andBacon Inc.
- Fleming, M. and Levie, W H. (1979). *Instructional Message Design*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications

- Fordham, R. (1980). Citizen participation, politics, and education. In Bremer, J. et al. (eds). *1980 PLUS - Community, Participation and Learning, Book 6: Why?* Melbourne: An AACE and Planning Services Publication
- Gagne, R.M. (1977). *The Conditions of Learning*. 3rd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Goodman, R.I. (1982). Evaluate your media just like the pros. *Instructional Innovator*. Vol. 26, October 27-31.
- Hannan, W. (1984). They're waiting in the wings! *The Secondary Teacher*. Vol. 24 (4), 2.
- Hayward, D. (1992). *Giving Students a Chance*. Melbourne: Liberal National Coalition.
- Kemp, J. (1985). *Planning and Producing Audio Visual Material*. 5th ed. New York: Harper and Row.
- Lesser, G.S. (1972). Assumptions behind the production and writing methods in Sesame Street. In Schramm, W. (ed.). *Quality in Instructional Television*. Honolulu: The University of Hawaii Press.
- Levin, R.I. (1987). *Statistics for Management*. 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Locatis, G.N. and Atkinson, F.D. (1984). *Media and Technology for Education and Training*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing.
- Maslen, G. (1984). Chalkboard. Melbourne: *The Age*. 24 Aug., p.28.
- (1986). Education forum. Melbourne: *The Age*. 11 Apr., p.19.
- (1992). University for early risers. Melbourne: *The Age*. 25 Feb., p.19.
- McRae, D. (1988). *Teachers, Schools and Change*. Richmond: Heinemann Educational Australia.
- Mickle, K.W. (1970). Media message interactions in TV. *Viewpoints*. Vol. 46, 15-32.
- Miller, W.M. and Dhand, H. (1973). *The Classroom Teacher as Curriculum Developer for Project Canada West*. Edmonton, Alberta: The Canadian Studies Foundation. Reported in ERIC No ED 081 657.
- Ministry of Education. (1983a). *Decision Making in Victorian Education - Ministerial Paper No. 1*. Victoria: Education Department.
- (1983b). *The State Board of Education - Ministerial Paper No 4*. Victoria: Education Department.
- Mortimer, R. (1983). The Production and Evaluation of an ITV Utilization Tape. Unpublished Thesis, Concordia University, Montreal.

- Nugent, G.C., Tipton, T.J. and Brooks, D.W. (1980) Task, learner and presentation interactions in television production. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*. Vol. 28 (1), 31-38.
- Palmer, E.L. (1972) Formative research in educational television production: the experience of the Children's Televisio Workshop. In Schramm, W. (ed.). *Quality in Instructional Television*. Honolulu: The University Press of Hawaii.
- Parsons, P. and Lemire, A. (1986). Formative evaluation: the TV Ontario perspective. *Canadian Journal of Educational Communications* Vol. 15 (1), 45-52.
- Romiszowski, A. (1981). *Designing Instructional Systems*. London: Kogan Page.
- Romiszowski, A. (1984). *Producing Instructional Systems*. London: Kogan Page.
- Rowntree, D. (1981) *Educational Technology in Curriculum Development*. London. McGraw Hill.
- Schramm, W. and Porter, E. (1983). *Men, Women, Messages and Media Understanding Human Communication*. 2nd ed. New York. Harper and Row.
- Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. In Tyler, R.W. et al. *Perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation*. Chicago. Rand McNally.
- Simonson, W.R. (1984). Media and persuasive messages. *Instructional Innovator*. Vol. 28, February, 23-48.
- Skilbeck, M. (ed.). (1984). *Evaluating the Curriculum in the Eighties*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Tuckman, B.T. (1972) *Conducting Educational Research*. New York. Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich Inc.
- Victorian Council of the State Schools' Organization (1984, 1985). Letters. *School Bell*. Vol. 34, 35.
- Weston, C.B. (1986). Formative evaluation of instructional materials: an overview of approaches. *Canadian Journal of Educational Communication*. Vol. 15 (1), 5-17.

**APPENDIX 1A**

**PREVIEWING QUESTIONNAIRE**

**PERSONAL DETAILS**

**APPENDIX 1B**

**PRE-TEST AND DELAYED RESPONSE POST-TEST**

# VIDEO EVALUATION

## PART A - Personal Details

1. Subject ID Code \_\_\_\_\_
2. Male \_\_\_\_\_ Female \_\_\_\_\_
3. Age Group  
below 21 yrs. \_\_\_\_\_  
21 - <25 yrs. \_\_\_\_\_  
25 - <30 yrs. \_\_\_\_\_  
30 yrs. plus \_\_\_\_\_
4. Home Address  
Melbourne metropolitan area \_\_\_\_\_  
Large rural city - pop. 5,000+ \_\_\_\_\_  
Rural area \_\_\_\_\_  
Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. Requirement for Admission to this Course  
Completed H.S.C. or V.C.E. \_\_\_\_\_  
Tertiary Orientation Program \_\_\_\_\_  
Mature Age Entry \_\_\_\_\_  
Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
6. Secondary Education Institution  
State Secondary School \_\_\_\_\_  
Catholic School \_\_\_\_\_

Independent School \_\_\_\_\_

7. Location of Secondary Education Institution

Melbourne - metropolitan area \_\_\_\_\_

Large rural city - pop. 5,000+ \_\_\_\_\_

Rural area \_\_\_\_\_

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

8. Parents' Occupations

Mother \_\_\_\_\_

Father \_\_\_\_\_

9. If You Have Children Please Indicate Whether

All are below primary school age \_\_\_\_\_

Child/children at primary school \_\_\_\_\_

All are above primary school \_\_\_\_\_

10. If You Had a Break Between Secondary School and Entry To This Course

Please Specify What General Activity You Engaged in During the Year  
Prior to Commencing This Course.

\_\_\_\_\_

**THANK YOU.**

## **PART B**

### **Instructions**

- \* Read each statement carefully to ensure that the meaning is clear and then circle the response that best represents your opinion:**

e.g.    strongly agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    strongly disagree

- \* Please respond to all statements in the order they are presented.**
- \* Do not return to a statement and change the response.**

1. It's better for the child if parents don't try to help too much at home because the teaching methods have probably changed since they were at school.

strongly agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    strongly disagree

2. It's better for parents to be informed about the curriculum by the Principal or experienced teachers.

strongly agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    strongly disagree

3. When a parent sees that a child is having some difficulties with school work, the parent would be best advised to report the problem to the teacher and leave her/him to deal with it.

strongly agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    strongly disagree

4. I wouldn't like to have a parent criticize what I was teaching in my classroom

strongly agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    strongly disagree

5. A school where all teachers are expected to have parents actively involved in some classroom programs would not appeal to me for my first year of full time teaching

**strongly agree**    **agree**    **uncertain**    **disagree**    **strongly disagree**

6. A Parents Club's most important responsibilities are the raising of money for the school and organizing the school tuck shop.

**strongly agree**    **agree**    **uncertain**    **disagree**    **strongly disagree**

7. A teacher should have the right to decide if and when she/he would like to have parents working in the classroom.

**strongly agree**    **agree**    **uncertain**    **disagree**    **strongly disagree**

8. Organizing a curriculum workshop for parents would require a great deal of preparation time because there aren't suitable materials available.

**strongly agree**    **agree**    **uncertain**    **disagree**    **strongly disagree**

9. A teacher should welcome any offer of assistance from a parent who wanted to help in the classroom.

**strongly agree**    **agree**    **uncertain**    **disagree**    **strongly disagree**

10. Most parents don't have enough knowledge of teaching and learning to be able to make decisions about curriculum content and teaching activities.

**strongly agree**    **agree**    **uncertain**    **disagree**    **strongly disagree**

11. Educating parents about what is happening in the classroom is almost as important as teaching the children.

**strongly agree**    **agree**    **uncertain**    **disagree**    **strongly disagree**



12. It is better for the child if a parent supervises and encourages at home rather than tries to teach something
- strongly agree      agree      uncertain      disagree      strongly disagree**
13. Most parents aren't really interested in making decisions about what should be taught in schools.
- strongly agree      agree      uncertain      disagree      strongly disagree**
14. At the end of a teacher training course a teacher would be well prepared for conducting curriculum workshops with parents.
- strongly agree      agree      uncertain      disagree      strongly disagree**
15. The best activities for parents to conduct are those that the teacher has planned and prepared.
- strongly agree      agree      uncertain      disagree      strongly disagree**
16. Parent representatives should be included in the panels that select the Principal and teachers for a school.
- strongly agree      agree      uncertain      disagree      strongly disagree**
17. Many children are embarrassed when their parents start attending the school to help in a classroom.
- strongly agree      agree      uncertain      disagree      strongly disagree**

18. The School Council is only responsible for maintaining the grounds and buildings and approving decisions made by the Principal and staff.

**strongly**  
**agree**      **agree**      **uncertain**      **disagree**      **strongly**  
**disagree**

19. Only the class teacher can supply the parents with accurate information about the content and teaching methods used in a particular classroom.

**strongly**  
**agree**      **agree**      **uncertain**      **disagree**      **strongly**  
**disagree**

20. Participation and involvement mean the same thing.

**strongly**  
**agree**      **agree**      **uncertain**      **disagree**      **strongly**  
**disagree**

21. Working with parents requires skills and techniques that aren't taught during a teacher training course.

**strongly**  
**agree**      **agree**      **uncertain**      **disagree**      **strongly**  
**disagree**

22. Parents need to be both told and shown what their children are learning.

**strongly**  
**agree**      **agree**      **uncertain**      **disagree**      **strongly**  
**disagree**

23. A parent is best viewed as an extension of the class teacher.

**strongly**  
**agree**      **agree**      **uncertain**      **disagree**      **strongly**  
**disagree**

24. I would prefer to have a year of full time teaching before conducting a curriculum workshop with parents.

**strongly**  
**agree**      **agree**      **uncertain**      **disagree**      **strongly**  
**disagree**

25. A well organized and conscientious teacher should be able to cater for the range of needs found in most classrooms

strongly  
agree      agree      uncertain      disagree      strongly  
disagree

26. To retain their professional position in the community, teachers need to be seen as the experts in deciding what content should be taught and how it should be taught.

strongly  
agree      agree      uncertain      disagree      strongly  
disagree

**PLEASE DO NOT OPEN THE NEXT SECTION  
BEFORE VIEWING THE PROGRAM.**

**THANK YOU.**

APPENDIX 2  
POST-VIEWING QUESTIONNAIRE

# VIDEO EVALUATION

## PART A

### Instructions

The information listed below was presented in the video production you have just viewed.

Please indicate what your level of awareness of this information would have been BEFORE you saw the video by circling the appropriate response

very well known      known      knew a little about it      was uncertain      completely unknown

1. That participation means making formal decisions, usually in committees

very well known      known      knew a little about it      was uncertain      completely unknown

2. That involvement means helping by doing something at someone's request.

very well known      known      knew a little about it      was uncertain      completely unknown

3. That parent representatives participate in the selection of school principals

very well known      known      knew a little about it      was uncertain      completely unknown

4. That parent representatives participate in the selection of staff in some schools

very well known      known      knew a little about it      was uncertain      completely unknown

5. That parents and teachers have worked together to completely design their new school.

very well known      known      knew a little about it      was uncertain      completely unknown

6. That parents' participation and involvement in schools are required by government policy.
- |                        |              |                               |                      |                           |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>very well known</b> | <b>known</b> | <b>knew a little about it</b> | <b>was uncertain</b> | <b>completely unknown</b> |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
7. That parents and principals don't expect the classroom teacher to provide for all the learning needs of the children, single-handed.
- |                        |              |                               |                      |                           |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>very well known</b> | <b>known</b> | <b>knew a little about it</b> | <b>was uncertain</b> | <b>completely unknown</b> |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
8. That it is a parent's right to be informed and consulted about any decisions a teacher makes concerning her/his child
- |                        |              |                               |                      |                           |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>very well known</b> | <b>known</b> | <b>knew a little about it</b> | <b>was uncertain</b> | <b>completely unknown</b> |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
9. That teachers are expected to run curriculum workshops for the parents of the children she/he teaches
- |                        |              |                               |                      |                           |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>very well known</b> | <b>known</b> | <b>knew a little about it</b> | <b>was uncertain</b> | <b>completely unknown</b> |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
10. That a range of specially prepared materials is available for use in curriculum workshops for parents
- |                        |              |                               |                      |                           |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>very well known</b> | <b>known</b> | <b>knew a little about it</b> | <b>was uncertain</b> | <b>completely unknown</b> |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
11. That conducting curriculum workshops for parents generally requires skills and techniques that are not normally part of a teacher training course.
- |                        |              |                               |                      |                           |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>very well known</b> | <b>known</b> | <b>knew a little about it</b> | <b>was uncertain</b> | <b>completely unknown</b> |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
12. That parents are sharing with teachers the decision-making on curriculum content and teaching methods
- |                        |              |                               |                      |                           |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>very well known</b> | <b>known</b> | <b>knew a little about it</b> | <b>was uncertain</b> | <b>completely unknown</b> |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
13. That parents have both the knowledge and willingness to help teachers to devise and present classroom activities
- |                        |              |                               |                      |                           |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| <b>very well known</b> | <b>known</b> | <b>knew a little about it</b> | <b>was uncertain</b> | <b>completely unknown</b> |
|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|

14. That in many schools parent-assistants make many of their own decisions about what the group or individual they are in charge of should be doing

**very well known**                      **known**                      **knew a little about it**                      **was uncertain**                      **completely unknown**

15. That parents have much higher regard for teachers who are willing to openly share their professional knowledge

**very well known**                      **known**                      **knew a little about it**                      **was uncertain**                      **completely unknown**

16. That research shows that parent interest in a school is a factor in improving a child's learning.

**very well known**                      **known**                      **knew a little about it**                      **was uncertain**                      **completely unknown**

17. That most parents are only too willing to help a school, but they expect teachers to ask them for assistance

**very well known**                      **known**                      **knew a little about it**                      **was uncertain**                      **completely unknown**

18. That it is a mistake to assume that parents who don't attend meetings and other school activities are not interested in their children's education

**very well known**                      **known**                      **knew a little about it**                      **was uncertain**                      **completely unknown**

## PART B

### Instructions

- \* Read each statement carefully to ensure that the meaning is clear and then circle the response that best represents your opinion:

e.g. strongly agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    strongly disagree

- \* Please respond to all statements in the order they are presented.
- \* Do not return to a statement and change the response.

- 
1. The open-ended documentary (current affairs) style used isn't appropriate for the content being presented

strongly agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    strongly disagree

2. The production's opening sequence captured my attention immediately.

strongly agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    strongly disagree

3. The music used during the opening titles and closing credits didn't appeal to me.

strongly agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    strongly disagree

4. The Education Faculty identifier should be left out.

strongly agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    strongly disagree

5. The opening barn doors effect to introduce the series of programs is a good attention-grabbing device

strongly agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    strongly disagree



6. The short segment containing a single comment from each of the interviewees helped me to focus on the program topic
- |                       |              |                  |                 |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| <b>strongly agree</b> | <b>agree</b> | <b>uncertain</b> | <b>disagree</b> | <b>strongly disagree</b> |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
7. A video is the best way to introduce a topic that needs information from different people located in different places
- |                       |              |                  |                 |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| <b>strongly agree</b> | <b>agree</b> | <b>uncertain</b> | <b>disagree</b> | <b>strongly disagree</b> |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
8. It is necessary to see and know who is providing the information in the voice over links between interviewees to decide if they know what they are talking about.
- |                       |              |                  |                 |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| <b>strongly agree</b> | <b>agree</b> | <b>uncertain</b> | <b>disagree</b> | <b>strongly disagree</b> |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
9. The interviews should have been taped in the studio for better sound and pictures.
- |                       |              |                  |                 |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| <b>strongly agree</b> | <b>agree</b> | <b>uncertain</b> | <b>disagree</b> | <b>strongly disagree</b> |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
10. The program was too long, given the amount of new information it contained.
- |                       |              |                  |                 |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| <b>strongly agree</b> | <b>agree</b> | <b>uncertain</b> | <b>disagree</b> | <b>strongly disagree</b> |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
11. I wouldn't normally look for and use a video to find information on a topic set for an assignment.
- |                       |              |                  |                 |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| <b>strongly agree</b> | <b>agree</b> | <b>uncertain</b> | <b>disagree</b> | <b>strongly disagree</b> |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
12. The studio presenter's voice over is essential for linking the comments by the interviewees.
- |                       |              |                  |                 |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| <b>strongly agree</b> | <b>agree</b> | <b>uncertain</b> | <b>disagree</b> | <b>strongly disagree</b> |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
13. The school principals are the best sources for the information they present
- |                       |              |                  |                 |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| <b>strongly agree</b> | <b>agree</b> | <b>uncertain</b> | <b>disagree</b> | <b>strongly disagree</b> |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
14. Some of the interview segments were too long or irrelevant
- |                       |              |                  |                 |                          |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| <b>strongly agree</b> | <b>agree</b> | <b>uncertain</b> | <b>disagree</b> | <b>strongly disagree</b> |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|

15. The visual images didn't change often enough to hold my attention.  
**strongly** agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    **strongly** disagree
16. There was too much information in the program.  
**strongly** agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    **strongly** disagree
17. The graphics (diagrams and writing) are very important because they add variety to the images appearing on the screen.  
**strongly** agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    **strongly** disagree
18. The graphics make the information being heard easier to follow.  
**strongly** agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    **strongly** disagree
19. All the interviewees were enthusiastic supporters of parent participation and involvement.  
**strongly** agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    **strongly** disagree
20. The interviewees were too old for me to really relate my future to what they were saying.  
**strongly** agree    agree    uncertain    disagree    **strongly** disagree

21. **Please rate each of the following elements of the production by circling the appropriate standard.**

e.g.	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
Quality of the pictures.....	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
Interest level of the pictures.	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
Quality of the sound.....	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
Flow of the program .....	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
Focus on the topic .....	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
Speed of the narration .....	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
The use of pauses. ....	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
Quality of the titles.....	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
Quality of the graphics .....	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
Suitability of music.....	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
Variety of effects .....	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor
Selection of interviewees	v good	good	fair	poor	v poor

## PART C - Possible Modifications.

1. Would you use this program as an information source if you were given this topic as an assignment? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Why/Why not?
  
2. If you knew a friend was interested in this topic, would you recommend this program to her/him? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Why/Why not?
  
3. Would this program be suitable for use in a lecture or tutorial as an introduction to the topic of parent participation and involvement?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Why/Why not?
  
4. Would you use video programs that were of a similar style and quality for information on other assignment topics?  
Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
Why/Why not?
  
5. Who do you think is the natural audience for this program?  
Why?

6. If you were to re-edit the program, what else would you include?

Why?

What would you cut out?

Why?

6. Would you like to see any changes in the graphics?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Why/Why not?

7. What other changes do you think should be made to the program?

Why?

8. Do you have any suggestions that could make the program more interesting to a wider audience?

## **PART D - Other Thoughts**

What other comments would you like to make about the program?

Did any questions come to mind while you were watching the program?

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR  
ASSISTANCE**