The Family Life Education program at David Thompson Secondary School is a one semester course dealing with human sexuality. Given to eleventh grade students the course is directed at helping students understand the emotional and social dimensions of their sexuality. Because the emphasis in the course was on feeling, not fact, this evaluation of the Family Life Education program examined attitude changes as an index of the course's success. Three instruments were used on a pre-test and post-test basis: a Premarital Attitude Scale, a Semantic Differential and a questionnaire. The results of the testing did not offer any conclusive evidence of the course's success. There were few significant changes in students' attitudes, as evidenced by scores on the Attitude Scale and the Semantic Differential. Pronounced differences which emerged in the pre-testing between the attitudes of male and female students persisted in the post-test. Several factors should be remembered in considering the implications of this evaluation for other programs of Family Life Education. First, the instruments used were crude: measurement of attitudes is open to question. Second, there was a drastic decrease from pre-test to post-test in the number of students responding. Finally, if its purpose is to assist students in dealing with the problems of their coming of age, then an evaluation such as this can only be a partial measure of its success. (Author/MLF)
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The Family Life Education program at David Thompson Secondary School is a one semester course dealing with human sexuality. Given to students in Guidance 11, the course is directed at helping students understand the emotional and social dimensions of their sexuality.

Because the emphasis in the course was on feeling, not fact, this evaluation of the Family Life Education program examined attitude changes as an index of the course's success. Three instruments were used on a pre-test and post-test basis:

1) a Premarital Attitude Scale, composed of thirty-one items selected to measure marriage readiness,
2) a Semantic Differential of seven topics concerned with sexual attitudes, and
3) a questionnaire about students' expectations of, and reactions to, the program.

The results of the testing did not offer any conclusive evidence of the course's success. There were few significant changes in students' attitudes, as evidenced by scores on the Attitude Scale and the Semantic Differential. Pronounced differences which emerged in the pre-testing between the attitudes of male and female students persisted in the post-testing.

The results of the pre-test questionnaire indicated that students were interested in the open discussion of sexuality, which was to be the main concern of the course. However, the post-test responses suggested some disappointment in the discussion that did occur. In the opinion of the majority of students, the films and speakers proved to be the most valuable part of the program.

The results of the evaluation are not encouraging. However, there are several mitigating factors which should be remembered in considering the implications of this evaluation for other programs of Family Life Education. First, the instruments used were crude; measurement of attitudes in the quantitative terms of attitude scales and the semantic differential - particularly about so sensitive a topic as sexuality - is always open to question. Second, there was a drastic decrease from pre-test to post-test in the number of students responding: only one hundred of the two hundred and forty-five students enrolled wrote both pre-test and post-test. Finally, one must consider the purpose of Family Life Education: if its purpose is to assist students in dealing with the problems of their coming of age, then an evaluation such as this can be only a partial measure of its success.
INTRODUCTION

Traditional sexual mores have eroded in our culture. Young people have been given greater freedom in sexual matters than were previous generations, but are equipped with fewer stable values to guide them in that freedom. What is "right" or "acceptable" is no longer universally understood. The need for family life education in a time of such uncertainty is clear.

The Vancouver School Board has recognized this need, and has affirmed its support for family life education in Vancouver schools.¹ A recent set of family life education guidelines issued by the Board begins with a quote from Dr. George Szasz (Chairman of the Committee on Interprofessional Education, University of British Columbia):

"Sexuality is far more than just physical activity or just procreation. It is being a man or a woman. What is the school for if it is not to help a child become a man or a woman in society?"²

It is with this sense of its responsibility that the Board has encouraged teachers to provide family life education.

The need for family life education, and the schools' responsibility to satisfy at least part of that need, are clear. Vancouver schools have been developing programs to meet their responsibility, but the question of what effective family life education should consist of remains problematic. This evaluation examines the effectiveness of one of these programs, Family Life Education at David Thompson Secondary School.

DESCRIPTION OF FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION AT DAVID THOMPSON

The Family Life Education program was developed as part of the Guidance 11 course by two counsellors, Jan Harvey and Mike Potkonjak. Their program was directed at helping students understand the social and emotional dimensions of their sexuality. Family Life Education usually has broader concerns than sexuality; other aspects of family relations such as child-raising and communication skills are considered within its scope. However the program at David Thompson was concerned specifically with sexuality. Its aim was to enable students to:


² Dr. George Szasz, in a speech given at the Vancouver Teachers' Centre, November 2, 1972.
become more comfortable talking about sex and sexuality
- gain factual information about physiological aspects of sex and to recognize the desirability for more information regarding sexuality
- become more knowledgable about potential problem areas in a marriage
- recognize the importance of effective communication skills in a marriage
- become aware of what characteristics the opposite sex values most in seeking a mate
- become aware of differing customs of courtship and marriage
- become aware of the implications of abortion
- feel more at ease talking with professionals about sex and sexuality and going for professional help when sexual problems occur
- become more aware of Venereal Disease and specifically more aware of the resources for remediation available in Vancouver, such as clinics and information centres
- become aware of the changing role of women in our society.

The course comprised sixteen hours of classes within one semester. It began with an intensive two-week program of daily one-hour classes, followed by one class per week for the duration of the semester. Films on childbirth and sexuality were used. Various speakers, such as public health nurses, social workers and psychiatrists led discussions of the topics on the outline (above). In its emphasis on "feeling, not fact", the program was structured along the guidelines suggested by many authorities on family life education.

After teaching the course for the fall semester, Ms. Harvey and Mr. Potkonjak wanted to find out if they were achieving their objectives. On the basis of the aims outlined above by Ms. Harvey and Mr. Potkonjak, the Planning and Evaluation Department and the two teachers devised an evaluation plan to measure the effect of the course in the spring semester.

LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION

It should be remembered that the success of the course cannot finally be gauged by apparent attitude changes, or even by what the students themselves claim to have gained from the course. If, indeed, a course in Family Life Education should "help a child to become a man or woman in society", then the final measure of its usefulness must lie in how well these students can face the problems of their coming of age.

3 Personal correspondence with Ms: Harvey.

4 See, for example, Kilander, Frederick H., Sex Education in the Schools, 1970, p. vi: "... the creation of wholesome attitudes is far more important than the remembering of facts."; also Dr. George Szasz, in "The Invisible Curriculum", United Community Services, p. 2-3.
All one can determine at this time is whether the students' professed attitudes toward certain subjects changed over the two-and-a-half months of the course. The results of the evaluation indicate only that change.

The instruments used in this evaluation offer quantitative descriptions of attitudes; they can provide, at best, a crude and approximate measure of feelings. This inevitable distortion of the students' attitudes must be remembered, in examining the results of the evaluation.

The short duration of the course should also be considered. In only sixteen hours of class time, it would be extremely difficult to work any profound changes in students' sexual attitudes, or to develop the comfortable, trusting atmosphere which is essential to open discussion. One should be guarded in assessing Family Life Education programs on the basis of the results of this evaluation.

**COLLECTION OF DATA**

1. **Attitude Scale**

The Attitude scale (See Appendix A) was compiled from two sources. The majority of the items on the scale were taken from a Pre-Marital Attitude Scale written by Dr. Arcus of the University of British Columbia Department of Home Economics. The remainder came from a Traditional Family Ideology Scale, printed in Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes, edited by Marvin E. Shaw and Jack M. Wright. The attitude scale was assembled by Ms. Harvey and Mr. Potkonjak to measure how prepared the students were for marriage. The scale was scored to indicate three factors which were considered important for a successful heterosexual relationship:

1) how liberal the students' sexual attitudes were,
2) how aware they were of the changing role of women, and
3) how realistic they were about the early difficulties of a marriage.

Thus a high score on the scale would indicate that a student was liberal in his sexual attitudes, believed in equality for women, and was realistic about the problems that young married couples must face. It must be remembered that the factors which the teachers isolated are their personal selection, and reflect their ideas on marriage.

2. **Semantic Differential**

The semantic differential (See Appendix B) used in the evaluation measured attitudes on a uni-dimensional scale: positive and negative feelings. The topics given for the semantic differential were:

- marriage
- my body
- sharing feelings
- sexual feelings
- double standards in sex
- masturbation
- homosexuality
A high score indicated positive feelings about these subjects. The fifth item, "double standards in sex", is the only one for which a negative change was expected from pre-test to post-test.

3. **Questionnaire on Expectations**

In March, students were asked to complete the following statements:

1. This year's Guidance program will be ...
2. Talking with other students in Guidance about sexual relationships will be ...
3. The most valuable part of the program will be ...
4. My knowledge about sex is ...
5. Talking about sex with counsellors and other adults present will be ...

In June, they were asked to complete the same sentences, written in the past tense. Their expectations of the course, as expressed by their choice of completion in March, were contrasted with their assessments of it, as expressed by their choice in June. The questionnaire was administered as part of the Premarital Attitude Scale. (See Appendix C).

**RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION**

1. **Results of the Attitude Scale**

The expected higher post-test scores on the Attitude Scale did not occur; there was no significant improvement from pre-test to post-test, as is evident from Table I.

**TABLE I: A COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST MEAN SCORES ON THE ATTITUDE SCALE.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Possible Score: 155</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males (N=43)</th>
<th>Females (N=57)</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot; Score</th>
<th>Males and Females (N=100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test Mean</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>2.32*</td>
<td>101.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test Mean</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>2.21*</td>
<td>102.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;t&quot; Score</td>
<td>.43 (n. s. d.)</td>
<td>.81 (n. s. d.)</td>
<td>.84 (n. s. d.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: * - significant to the .05 level  
n. s. d. - no significant difference

It should be noted that when the mean scores for males and for females are compared, on both pre-test and post-test a significant difference emerges. The higher scores obtained by the females on the Attitude Scale indicate that they are more interested in marriage and have more positive feelings about it than do the male students. (This finding is consistent with the results of the Semantic Differential: the females scored higher than the males on the item "marriage" on both the pre-test and the post-test. [See Table II]) Furthermore, the choices for Item 3 on the questionnaire...
[See Table IX], offer further evidence, for more females than males deemed discussion about marriage the most valuable part of the program.

The results of the Attitude Scale should be regarded with some caution. The three-fold nature of the factor "marriage readiness" which the scale attempted to measure complicates the results. It seems likely that some students felt strongly about only one or two aspects of "marriage readiness". For example, a student might well have "liberal sexual attitudes" and remain unenlightened about the "changing role of women" and "the early difficulties of marriage". Another student might have more traditional sexual attitudes, but be a feminist, and a realist about marriage. While both these students could make approximately the same score on the Attitude Scale, their "marriage readiness" would not necessarily be comparable. That the difference between male and female scores remained much the same on the pre-test and post-test offers a counter argument for the scale's validity; but the possible disparity in opinion between students making the same scores should be considered a major limitation in the Attitude Scale.

2. Results of the Semantic Differential

Tables II to VIII present the results for each item on the Semantic Differential. 5

| TABLE II: A COMPARISON OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCORES FOR PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST. ITEM 1: "MARRIAGE" |
|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| **Males** | **Females** | **"t" Score** | **Males and Females** |
| Pre-Test Mean | 52.6 | 59.8 | 4.08** | 56.5 |
| Post-Test Mean | 55.2 | 60.8 | 3.66** | 58.2 |
| "t" Score | ↓ | ↓ | ↓ | 1.46 |
| **Legend:** **"** - significant to the .01 level

Item 1: Marriage: The results from this item show some increase from pre-test to post-test. While males increased their mean score more than did the females, there was no significant difference between pre-test and post-test scores for either sex, or for the entire group. A significant difference evident in the pre-test between scores of the males and the scores of the females appeared in the post-test, too. The females continued to have a more positive view of marriage than the males.

5 For TABLES II - VIII "t" values without any asterisk indicate no significant difference.
TABLE III: A COMPARISON OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCORES FOR PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST. ITEM 2: MY BODY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>'t' Score</th>
<th>Males and Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test Mean</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Mean</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 2: My Body: The male students felt more positively about their bodies, on both pre-test and post-test. But in none of the five directions noted in Table III was there a significant difference.

TABLE IV: A COMPARISON OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCORES FOR PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST. ITEM 3: SHARING FEELINGS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>'t' Score</th>
<th>Males and Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test Mean</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Mean</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>3.59**</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: * - significant to the .05 level  
** - significant to the .01 level

Item 3: Sharing Feelings: The female students were significantly more positive about sharing feelings on the pre-test and the post-test. Their scores on the post-test increased more than did the male scores. However, none of the changes from pre-test to post-test was significant.

TABLE V: A COMPARISON OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCORES FOR PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST. ITEM 4: SEXUAL FEELINGS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>'t' Score</th>
<th>Males and Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test Mean</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Mean</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 4: Sexual Feelings: There were no significant differences in any direction. The mean scores for males and females on "sexual feelings" were very close on pre-test and post-test.
TABLE VI: A COMPARISON OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCORES FOR PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST. ITEM 5: DOUBLE STANDARDS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot; Score</th>
<th>Males and Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test Mean</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Mean</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;t&quot; Score</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 5: Double Standards in Sex: It was anticipated that if the course were effective, the mean score on Item 5 would decline. However, a slight but not significant increase was made by both males and females on the post-test. One of the teachers noted that at the time of the pre-test some students were not familiar with the term "double standards". Their confusion about the meaning of the item may account for the unexpected increase. Certainly, if students had become "more aware of the changing role of women" during the course, they would have had a more negative reaction to this item.

TABLE VII: A COMPARISON OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCORES FOR PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST. ITEM 6: MASTURBATION.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot; Score</th>
<th>Males and Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test Mean</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test Mean</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;t&quot; Score</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.04**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: ** - significant to the .01 level.

Item 6: Masturbation: This was the only item in which there was a significant difference between pre-test and post-test scores. The mean score of male students increased nearly eight points, a difference which is significant to the .01 level. The increase for females was not significant. There was no significant difference between mean scores of the males and of the females on either test. The change in the mean scores of the males indicates some success in helping students become more comfortable with their sexuality. The sense of guilt traditionally associated with masturbation has apparently diminished for these students as a result of the program.
TABLE VIII: A COMPARISON OF SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL SCORES FOR PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST, ITEM 7: HOMOSEXUALITY.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot; Score</th>
<th>Males and Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Test Mean</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>3.13**</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Test Mean</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>4.51**</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;t&quot; Score</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: ** - significant to the .01 level.

Item 7: Homosexuality: The lowest scores were recorded for this item. The females scored significantly higher on both pre-test and post-test. The males increased their scores slightly, but the gap between males and females widened from pre-test to post-test. Perhaps the usual identification of homosexuality as a male deviation created more negative associations for the male students than for the females; those negative feelings were not reduced by the program.

3. Results of the Questionnaire

One hundred students answered some or all of the questionnaire on both the pre-test and post-test. Their responses are summarized below.

Item 1: This year's Guidance program will be (was) ... 

In Figure 1, the completions given on the post-test are compared with those from the pre-test. Several changes are immediately evident:

- a drop of more than fifty percent in the number of students deeming the course "interesting",
- a slight increase in the number of students finding it "valuable",
- a three-fold increase in the number finding it "okay".

Taking both "interesting" and "valuable" as positive responses, one finds a decline in positive views of the course, from sixty-seven in March, to forty-eight in June. While this change indicates disappointment, the students generally moved from positive responses to the neutral position expressed by "okay". The large number who chose "interesting" to reflect their expectations may only have been expressing their ignorance and curiosity about the program. It is understandable that the course did not live up to those expectations since they were founded on very little information about the program.
This year's Guidance program will be (was) ....

- Will Be: 
  - Interesting
  - Boring
  - Valuable
  - Okay
  - No Response

- Was: 
  - (Post-test, June)
FIGURE 2: A COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST COMPLETIONS FOR ITEM 2 OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Talking with other students in Guidance about sexual relationships will be (was) ....

Number of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Pre-test March</th>
<th>Post-test June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Embarrassing&quot;</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Valuable&quot;</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Boring&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Interesting&quot;</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Okay&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Didn't talk&quot;</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 2: Talking with other students in Guidance about sexual relationships will be (was)...

One of the aims of the program was to enable students to "become more comfortable talking about sex and sexuality". (See page 2). There is some evidence here, in the decline from March to June in the number of students responding "embarrassing" (see Figure 2), that the program succeeded in this aim.

The same drop in the number of students responding "interesting" appears here, as in Item 1; it may be attributed to the same cause, for "interesting" is a safe and speculative description of the unknown.

Eleven students responded "didn't" to Item 2. Their claim that there was little or no discussion among students should perhaps be taken as confirmation of the difficulty the teachers reported in promoting discussion among students. Both teachers felt that the discussion was often carried by an articulate minority; the majority of students remained silent or participated infrequently.

Item 3: The most valuable part of the program will be (was)...

Table IX presents the change from pre-test to post-test in Item 3 responses. In the pre-test, the largest number (twenty-two) anticipated that "sharing feelings" would be the most valuable part of the program. On the post-test, fewer (thirteen) chose "sharing feelings"; the decline corroborates the evidence from Item 2 responses (see above) that class discussion was not as involving or intense as had been hoped.

There is also, understandably, a decline from pre-test to post-test in the number not responding. Students would be more likely at the end of a course to have opinions on its most valuable part.

The most dramatic change from pre-test to post-test is the increase (from six to thirty-seven) in the numbers reporting that "films and speakers" were most valuable. It appears that the speakers were, generally, interesting and sympathetic individuals whom the students enjoyed listening to. "The Rose", a film on childbirth, prompted many comments. Two remarks made by male students on the questionnaire indicate the impact of the film:

- "it showed how women give birth and it looks tough"
- "birth is a beautiful thing and no one ever told me very much about it".

In view of the large number responding "discussion about marriage" and "sharing feelings" on the pre-test, and the subsequent decline in the numbers giving those responses on the post-test, it would appear that while students wanted to discuss marriage and sexuality, they were disappointed in the discussions that did occur. The course outline (see page 2) indicated that open discussion would be an important element of the program. Discomfort, or reticence apparently thwarted that objective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Discussion of Marriage</th>
<th>Films &amp; Speakers</th>
<th>Specific Facts</th>
<th>Sharing Feelings</th>
<th>Learning New Things</th>
<th>Intensive 2-Week Section</th>
<th>Talking With Teacher</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males (N=43)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (N=57)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=100)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Discussion of Marriage</th>
<th>Films &amp; Speakers</th>
<th>Specific Facts</th>
<th>Sharing Feelings</th>
<th>Learning New Things</th>
<th>Intensive 2-Week Section</th>
<th>Talking With Teacher</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males (N=43)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (N=57)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=100)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nothing (Facetious Responses)</th>
<th>All of Program</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males (N=43)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (N=57)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (N=100)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 3: CHART OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST COMPLETIONS TO ITEM 4 OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

My knowledge of sex is ....

Post-test

Knowledge increased N=12

No change N=1

Pre-test

Knowledge adequate but could be expanded N=13

Post-test

Knowledge increased N=7

No change N=2

Pre-test

Knowledge not adequate N=9

Knowledge limited N=1

No change N=48

Knowledge increased N=9

Knowledge adequate N=57

Knowledge adequate N=57

Knowledge limited N=1

No change N=48

Knowledge increased N=9

Knowledge adequate N=57
BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Since many students seem to want discussion, any future program should perhaps concentrate on overcoming these obstacles.

**Item 4: My knowledge about sex is (was) ...**

In analyzing the responses to this item, only those students who responded to both pre-test and post-test were considered. Thus, for those seventy-nine students (as opposed to the one hundred students who responded to some or all of the questionnaire) there is information on how their response to this item changed. Figure 3 presents this information.

The majority of students (fifty-seven) stated on the pre-test that their knowledge of sex was adequate, and for most (forty-eight) of the fifty-seven, their opinion remained the same on the post-test. Nine reported some increase in their understanding; one apparently discovered some gaps in his previously adequate knowledge. When the males and the females are considered separately, an almost identical pattern appears.

Students who described their knowledge as not adequate on the pre-test generally reported that it increased during the course.

Thirteen students responded that their knowledge of sex was adequate but could be improved; all but one of these reported some improvement on the post-test. Thus, a total of twenty-eight students reported that their knowledge of sex had increased because of the course. In view of the 245 students who were originally enrolled in Guidance 11, this situation, by itself, is to the writer, dismayingly slight evidence of the course’s success.

**Item 5: Talking about sex with counsellors and other adults present will be (was) ...**

The responses to Item 5 are presented in Figure 4. The pattern of change from pre-test to post-test in Item 5 is markedly similar to that for Item 2. There is the same decline in the number of students responding "embarrassing", "valuable", or "interesting". An increase in the numbers responding "boring" and "okay" appears in both items as well. The "no response" increase is also parallel. The two items, of course, touch on similar matters; it would appear that discussing sex, be it with fellow students, or with adults, evoked much the same reaction from the Thompson students.

The responses for Item 5 offer further evidence of the problems which the teachers experienced in developing discussions with the Guidance 11 students. But the large numbers anticipating that the discussions would be "interesting" and "valuable" support the contention that students do want to talk with each other and with adults about sexual matters.
FIGURE 4: A COMPARISON OF PRE-TEST AND POST-TEST COMPLETIONS FOR ITEM 5 OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

Talking about sex with counsellors and other adults present will be (was) ....

Will be: (Pre-test, March)  
Was: (Post-test, June)  

Number of students

Embarrassing  
Boring  
Okay  
Interesting  
Valuable  
Didnt talk  
No response
CONCLUSIONS

From the results of the evaluation, it appears that the Family Life Education program at David Thompson Secondary School did not have a significant impact on the students. There were very few changes from pre-test to post-test; the slight changes that did occur do not warrant any optimistic conclusions.

However, the limitations of the evaluation were many. It is entirely possible that the Attitude Scale and the Semantic Differential were not suitable instruments for evaluating the course. The subjects covered by both instruments were very sensitive ones and students may not have responded frankly on either the pre-test or post-test. Since attitude change was established as the criterion of the course's effectiveness, any less-than-frank responses would definitely compromise the results.

As well, there was a drastic decrease from pre-test to post-test in the number of students participating in the evaluation. Of the 245 students enrolled in Guidance 11, only one hundred wrote both pre-test and post-test. It is impossible to determine what changes, if any, would have appeared if all the students taking the course had written both pre-test and post-test.

A further reason for caution is the very nature of the course. It may be neither possible nor useful to determine if students' sexual attitudes change in one semester of Family Life Education. If the purpose of Family Life Education is, in the words of Frederick Kilander, "to indicate the immense possibilities for human fulfillment that human sexuality offers", then the accomplishment of that purpose can scarcely be measured by an hour's testing. Only the evidence of a successful maturity can attest to that.

Thus, while the evidence from the evaluation is not promising, it would be imprudent to consider that evidence conclusive. Certainly some students benefitted from the program, and perhaps the experience from this semester will ensure that more can benefit in future.

In "The Invisible Curriculum", a brief on Family Life Education presented to the Vancouver School Board by the United Community Services, the authors suggest that "no specific curriculum should be developed". They quote Dr. Szasz to support this suggestion:

... a specific curriculum in the school is the wrong thing; it limits the area for discussion. And as soon as you give kids less information than they can get in the drugstore across the street, you create a credibility gap.

6 Kilander, Frederick H., op. cit., p. vi.
If Dr. Szasz' analysis is correct, then the equivocal results of this evaluation may reflect the failure of a "specific curriculum" to reach the students at David Thompson. It may be useful to consider the evaluation in this light, and to examine ways of integrating the aims of the program -- and the open sympathetic attitude of the teachers -- into the rest of the curriculum.


"The Invisible Curriculum: A Proposal for a Team Approach to Family Life Education in the Schools", a brief prepared by the Social Policy and Research Department of the United Community Services of Greater Vancouver.