This digest presents the summary and conclusions reached in an impact study of a film series, "One To Grow On." The purpose of the series was to serve as a catalyst, in an inservice teacher workshop setting, for discussions relating to teacher/student interactions with the goal being to stimulate teachers to be more humanistic in their relationships with students. Data was obtained from the administration of three tests to teachers and students in a pre-post/experimental-control paradigm and from two interview schedules administered to teachers and discussion leaders. The film program had an impact on the teacher in terms of his behavior in the discussion and his immediate reaction to the films to some extent for most teachers. As to the extent to which teacher attitudes changed in a more humanistic direction, only 25 percent of the teachers showed any appreciable post-over-pretest gain in attitude test scores. Most teachers showed no change; 10 percent showed a lower score. Very few positive shifts occurred in the students' attitude toward the teacher. Very little evidence was found that students were influenced in any positive way by the exposure their teachers had to the film series. The authors feel that the series represents a potentially useful departure from much of the more traditional teacher training materials and should be supported. It is recommended that the series be made easily available to all school systems. (JC)
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FOREWORD

This digest presents the summary and conclusions of the Final Report, *Evaluation of the Impact of the Film Series One To Grow On On Selected Teachers And Students*, prepared for NIH, and dated June, 1975.

The project staff consisted of Harris H. Shettel, Principal Investigator; Ruth Hughes, Project Director; Mary Kay Garee, Research Staff; and Robert Fitzpatrick, staff advisor for measurement and evaluation.
SECTION I

INTRODUCTION

A series of mental health films called "One To Grow On" was produced for NIMH under contract to be used by teachers in an in-service workshop setting. The films were conceived of as being a catalyst for discussions relating to teacher/student interactions with the goal being to stimulate all teachers, at whatever grade level or school setting, to be more "humanistic" in their relationships with students, and thus create a "mentally healthier climate in their classrooms." The theoretical base of the films is the causal approach to understanding and dealing with student behavior, developed by Dr. Ralph Ojemann, although the films themselves make no explicit reference to him, his theory, his techniques, or any of the supporting research. The films could thus be characterized as being non-didactic, non-exhortative, and only at a "low key" level, as offering a model for teacher behavior.

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the impact of the "One To Grow On" film/discussion experience on teachers and students selected from a variety of grade levels and settings.

At the time the study was done, there were six films in the series, each approximately 15 minutes in length. (An introductory film and a new series film has since been made available.) The post film discussion period lasted about one hour. The study sample consisted of teachers from two sites, (Pittsburgh and Rhode Island) from urban, rural and suburban schools, and from primary, intermediate and secondary grade levels. The sample was also designed to include experienced and inexperienced teachers, and male and female teachers.

The study was conducted under realistic field conditions, simulating as much as possible the environment in which each film will actually be used.
All participating schools volunteered to put on the series and to provide a discussion leader (facilitator) for this purpose. Teachers also were volunteers. A Discussion Guide was provided to each Discussion Leader which pointed out key areas to cover and a number of questions that could be asked. Leaders were encouraged to view the film and study the Guide prior to conducting the workshops. (All of them did.) Workshop groups averaged eight teachers, all drawn from the same school.

The study used a combination of hard data obtained from the administration of three tests to teachers and students in a pre-post/experimental-control paradigm, and "soft" data obtained from two interview schedules that were administered to teachers and to those who led the post-film discussion sessions.

It was expected that the impact of the films would be greatest on the teachers' verbal behavior in the discussion session and that the effects would be less noticeable on teacher attitude change and behavior change in the classroom, and least noticeable on student attitude change toward the teacher. However, it was also recognized that the true value of the "One To Grow On" films must be measured in terms of their ability to produce real and positive changes in the classroom, consistent with the stated goals and objectives of the series. A fair assessment would thus look at "impact" of the films at each of these points.

The following sections of the Digest have been organized so as to permit the reader to select the level of detail he wishes to pursue with respect to the major areas covered by the Final Report. Section II summarizes the results of the various analyses conducted, covering both the hard (test) data and the soft (interview) data.

Section III covers the major conclusions and recommendations made with respect to the further use of the "One To Grow On" film series.

Section IV provides the reader who is interested in knowing more about the context in which the study was done with some of the pertinent background information and "philosophy" that guided the development of the "One To Grow On" series.
Section V provides a brief description of the content of each of the films in the series.

Finally, for those interested in how the project was conducted, Section VI covers, in some detail, the design and schedule of the study, the processes of selecting participating schools and teachers, and the kinds of test instruments used to obtain impact data from teachers, students and discussion leaders.
SECTION II

RESULTS

The results can best be summarized in terms of the four levels of impact that were considered as desirable and expected outcomes of the film/discussion experience.

Impact Level I: The films + discussion would have an immediate impact on the teacher in terms of his behavior in the discussions and his immediate reactions to the films.

Impact Level II: The above experience would have an impact on his attitudes/beliefs with respect to the interpersonal relationship between the teacher and his students and consistent with the aims of the program.

Impact Level III: As a result of the above impact, the teacher would behave differently in the classroom in a manner reflecting and consistent with the change noted at Level II.

Impact Level IV: The above change on the part of the teacher in the classroom would have an impact on the students in that classroom in terms of the improved perception of the interpersonal relationship between them and the teacher.

Level I impact was achieved to some extent for most teachers. Post-film discussions were often relevant and directed toward positive changes in teacher attitude and behavior consistent with the purpose of the film series. The Discussion Leaders supported the series for the most part as offering a needed forum for the exchange of ideas among peers concerning problems in the classroom. They, and the teachers, found some films more "stimulating" and thought-provoking than others. Usually, the more closely the film related to the milieu of the teacher, the greater the impact. The concept most often reported by teachers (52%) as having been impressed on them by the films was the notion of treating each student as an individual, both academically and personally. However, relatively few teachers (20%) said that they were going
to change their classroom activities and/or behavior in a way that would be consistent with the individualized approach. Nevertheless, the number of teachers that did so indicate is large enough to be considered significant if they are successful in carrying out their intended action plans. Unfortunately, there is little support for this assumption in the analysis of the other three levels of impact.

Level II impact is concerned with the extent to which the attitude of the teacher is changed in a direction that reflects a more humanistic approach to the student. Almost no support was found for this on a group basis, even though the data were looked at in a variety of ways in an effort to discover some relationship between the program and pre- and post-test attitude scores. Only 25% of all experimental teachers showed any appreciable post over pre gain in attitude test scores. Most teachers showed no change and 18% actually showed a lower post-treatment score than pre-treatment score. Small differences in favor of female experienced teachers in urban settings were found in the attitude data.

Level III impact could only be inferred from student scores. It was expected that a positive change in teachers' behavior in the classroom would be reflected in a more positive attitude of the student toward the teacher. However, very few positive shifts of this kind occurred. This was true even when students of those teachers who showed the highest gain in attitude scores were singled out for analysis.

Of course, Level IV impact (student attitude change) is measured directly by the same data that were described above to measure teacher behavior change indirectly. As noted, very little evidence was found that students were influenced in any positive way by the exposure their teachers had to the One To Grow On film series.

Two limitations of the study should be noted since they have an influence on the interpretation of the data.

1. The original design was compromised by school and teacher dropouts. Delays in getting approval of forms was a major precipitating factor. For this reason, certain cross comparisons could not be made because of insufficient subjects in certain groups. Also, for the same reason, some follow-up data was lost due to schools closing before the tests could be administered.
2. The objectives of the film program were not well articulated by those responsible for its development. This made it difficult to select measures that would be appropriate for adequately determining the true value of the experience for teachers.
It is fair to say, as a general conclusion, that the use of the One To Grow On films, considered within the limitations and parameters of the study, were a qualified success. That is to say, the series accomplished what one would most reasonably expect that it could accomplish—it served as a stimulus or catalyst for discussions around important issues relating to student/teacher interaction in the classroom. The central thrust of these discussions was directed at the notion that students at all grade levels should be viewed as and treated as individuals, with particular emotional needs, a unique home-life, special aptitudes, etc. The teachers in many cases seemed to be saying in their comments that they wanted to be able to do a better job of interacting with their students on the basis of this individual approach—both academically and personally.

These notions are at the core of the original conception around which the series was based, i.e. the humanistic/causal approach to human interaction. To the extent that teachers can truly implement these notions in their classrooms, they will be:

*less punitive
*less vindictive
*less likely to respond only to the overt aspect of acting out behavior
*more reinforcing
*less adversarial
*less likely to use humiliation
*more likely to listen to what their students say
*less likely to command
*more likely to allow variations in assignments and in the criteria for acceptable performance
This list could be extended almost indefinitely. The point is that all of these possible sequelae to the workshop experience are consistent with the goals and objectives of the series. A more refined expression of the above "qualified success" statement would thus be that the series caused many participating teachers to start re-evaluating their own attitudes, and, at least at the verbal level, to consider moving in a direction that could be characterized as being more humanistic and causal in its approach to individual students.

What did not happen as a result of the series that, had it occurred, would have allowed a less qualified assessment of success to be made?

1. A relatively small proportion of teachers, but a number that nevertheless needs to be reckoned with, did not accept the message of the series even at the verbal, or self-report, level. Many of them thought the materials were either inappropriate for their needs, too simplistic, redundant, or covered areas they already "knew." Three avenues are open to deal with this group. (1) Try to "select them out" in advance; (2) allow them to enter the program and consider them as an acceptable part of the process or (3) modify the materials so that their concerns and/or objections are at least partially taken into account. If the first approach were taken, the data obtained in the study would suggest some of the candidates for exclusion, i.e. male, rural, inexperienced teachers. However, this is not recommended. There are too many exceptions within each of these groups. The second alternative is acceptable but the third is preferable. Some changes could be made in the Discussion Guide, for example, that would probably reduce the "rejection rate." They will be discussed below under Recommendations.

2. The materials appeared to have had no systematic effect on basic attitude toward the teaching role vis-a-vis the student as measured by the attitude test. The message was received, understood, and accepted by many, but it
was as yet not internalized so that it influenced basic attitudes. It may be so internalized after a period of time has elapsed and/or after other inputs are brought into play. The fact that many of the subject teachers began to see the possibility of change is the first and most important step. This should be followed by other supporting inputs such as:

- other workshop programs that are consistent with One To Grow On but use a different approach, different media, etc.
- administrative support, both practical and philosophical
- peer support
- success in the classroom using the new ideas, particularly from changes noted in student behavior

3. Students as a group did not show any measurable effects as a result of their teachers having been exposed to the films, as determined by their attitude tests. This conclusion is the most disappointing because the current zeitgeist almost "demands" that programs demonstrate significant impact on the target audience. But, one should be very cautious in making statements about effectiveness or lack of effectiveness in such difficult areas. The position of the authors is that the program clearly met its objectives at the first level of impact—the verbal behavior of the teachers in the discussion sessions. In time, and with help from other sources, this could well have an effect on the teacher's classroom behavior.

Recommendations

1. For the above reasons, and given the limited impact found, it is the basic recommendation that the One To Grow On series be made easily available to all school systems and that they be encouraged to examine it and use it on a voluntary basis.

2. If funds are limited, the program should be promoted on the basis of the following prioritized target groups:

   a. Suburban and inner city secondary schools.
   b. Suburban and inner city primary schools.
   c. Rural secondary schools.
   d. Rural primary schools.
3. The program should be considered as only one element in a broader effort to introduce the humanistic/causal approach to teacher/student interaction. Only in this way will effective changes in the classroom be realized on a wide-scale basis.

4. The discussion guide should emphasize even more than it does the need to relate the film episodes to the problems most relevant to the environment found in the particular school using the materials. This is particularly important at the two extreme ends of the continuum—the rural school that does not relate to the films because "we don't have those kinds of problems" and the inner city school because "our problems are too overwhelming and transcend those shown in the films." It is also critical that participants be helped to "see" the relevance of those films whose setting is not at the same grade level as that of the participants. The most important need in this regard is at the junior high school level. None of the films deal with these grade levels. The other two needs, of course, are to help elementary teachers relate to the high school films and the high school teachers to the elementary school films.

Concomitant with this recommendation is the need to re-emphasize to Discussion Leaders that they must repeatedly remind participants that the films are only meant to serve as a stimulus and catalyst for discussion.

5. Discussion Leaders do not need formal training in small group techniques. They do need to be and do the following:

a. They need to be philosophically compatible with the humanistic/causal approach.

b. They need to be accepted by the participants as a person who has their respect and with whom they can identify. "Authority figures" or administrative types who are not on the firing line (i.e. do not share the daily concerns and frustrations of the teachers) should be avoided. However, DLs need to be able to detach themselves from such concerns and frustrations so that they can explore and (more importantly) stimulate teachers to explore, creative and alternative ways of dealing with them. Several workshops in the study were conducted very effectively by peer teachers. Contrariwise, some of those who were most skilled in group leadership techniques failed to achieve high levels of participant involvement.
c. Discussion Leaders need to see all of the films at least twice and to study the Discussion Guide carefully before beginning.

d. They should give careful attention to the environment in which the program is conducted. It should be comfortable but designed for group interaction (i.e., a table around which everyone can sit, or a circle of chairs). The film and projection equipment should be checked and everything ready for "error free" viewing (i.e., room can be quickly made sufficiently dark, film is on title frame, sound is adjusted to correct level so everyone can hear, focus is sharp). After the viewing, the projector should be stopped and left alone—no rewinding, etc.—and the discussion period begun.

6. Discussion Leaders should be encouraged to conduct more than one program. The upper limit is not known. "Creative burnout" may occur after 10 or so programs had been conducted, but the effectiveness of the Discussion Leader is bound to improve for at least the first four or five offerings.

7. All teachers in the participating school should be allowed to volunteer to attend after they have been informed of the purpose of the program, the time involved and the schedule for each film/discussion session.

8. The program participants should all be from the same school.

9. The Discussion Leader should be selected, if possible, from the staff of the school using the materials.

10. The films themselves are, as noted, only the "trigger" for the program. However, most discussions lean very heavily for a while on the content of the films. It was often noted that many teachers failed to fully comprehend or follow the "story" of the films (particularly the three "problem" films: Sarah, Lindsay, and A Pretty Good Class For A Monday). This would often lead to misunderstandings and even debates about "what really happened." Furthermore, the richness of the films in terms of the nuances of behavior, facial expression, body language and verbal expressions cannot be fully comprehend in one viewing. (Although the project staff has seen the films repeatedly, something new was seen each time.) It is therefore suggested that an alternate viewing strategy be recommended that would present the film to be used for the following sessions at the end of the current session. This would also have the added advantage of giving the
participants time to "think over" the next film and relate it to their own problems and concerns in the interval between the two sessions.

11. It is recommended that the films be scheduled in a sequence that initially captures the attention of the target audience, but does not lose their attention later on. Thus, a high school group should see a high school based film first (e.g. Lindsay) and last (e.g. Sarah), with the others mixed in between. Of course, primary grade teachers would receive a primary based film first (e.g. Reflection) and last (e.g. Individuals) with the high school films interspersed between them. The Discussion Leader should let teachers know in advance if the next film will be in a different setting.

12. The Discussion Guide needs to point out that the Discussion Leader be prepared for, and even encourage, highly individualized reactions to the film/discussion experience, even including complete rejection by some teachers of the basic notion underlying the program. Their views should be respected, but they should not be allowed to draw the group into extended arguments.

13. Related to the above, the Discussion Guide needs to emphasize that the Discussion Leader be prepared to help focus the discussion on realistic and possible action plans and not allow the participants to use the sessions as opportunities to escape responsibility by berating the school board, the principal, etc. Projecting problems onto others is a common response to personal frustration and anxiety and this mechanism was observed in operation in a number of groups (especially inner city). The teacher must be led to see that he can make changes now despite all the various constraints that he is forced to work within. The Discussion Leader must always bring the discussion back to this point whenever it seems to be getting too philosophical, too broad or too general.

14. Sessions should be scheduled no more frequently than once a week, and no less frequently than twice a month. This will avoid the negative effects of both saturation and lack of sustained interest.
15. If the length of the program had to be reduced for any reason, Reflection would be the film least missed according to teacher rankings of the six films used in this study. The Discussion Leader results are generally consistent with this finding and further suggest the possibility of eliminating individuals. However, the project staff and members of the project review panel give Reflection a high rating and consider Individuals and Learning Strategies lower in overall effectiveness and somewhat redundant in concept.

To quote from the final paragraph of the Technical Report: "These Three To Grow On films represent an important contribution to both the technique of effective teacher training and to the critical content area with which they deal—mental health in the classroom. This is no small accomplishment, and the necessarily critical tone of this report should not be construed as an effort to diminish it, nor to inhibit further efforts to expand on it."
The American educational system must be the most scrutinized, most criticized and (certainly) the most studied of all our basic institutions. A recurring area of concern with respect to this institution has to do with the basically authoritarian structure of most schools within which students have little or no opportunity to participate in decisions which affect them, and where dissent, disagreement and even creativity are often inhibited if not punished outright. One result of this concern has been a trend toward what is loosely called the "humanistic," or human relations approach, to education.

"Humanistic" in the context of the classroom can be defined as any systematic attempt to sensitize the teacher to students' feelings, attitudes, and values, and to increase the teachers' application of the qualities of empathy, warmth, positive regard, and genuineness in his interaction with students. Looked at more broadly, this viewpoint, based in part on the teachings of Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow, and others, holds that the restrictive, authoritarian climate of the school is incompatible with the students' need for self-actualization, and thus does not lead to optimum mental health and, in some cases, contributes to poor mental health. This viewpoint could be more easily ignored if it could be shown that children learn more under an authoritarian system, but such an assertion finds little support in the research literature. In fact, recent studies suggest that students are likely to learn most from teachers who show high levels of understanding and respect toward them. It has been said that "the placing of very healthy teacher-models in all classrooms may be tantamount to a peaceful revolution, and may well prevent a more violent educational revolution."

The humanistic approach to education is beginning to be reflected in the curriculum of many schools of education. However, the need to reach inservice teachers with appropriate training and educational materials dealing with this approach is seen to be equally important. After all, there are many more practicing teachers than there are teachers in training,
and the time required to produce a complete "transfusion" would be many, many years. The NIH produced film series, One To Grow On, the subject of the exploratory study described in this digest, was designed as one answer to meeting this critical need for inservice teacher training in this area. The film series is based in part on a well-known and well-documented approach to the improvement of mental health in the schools developed by Dr. Ralph H. Ojemann, an educational psychologist. This approach is consistent with the humanistic philosophy in that it emphasizes a causal orientation to the social environment which focuses on the causes of, or motivations behind, human behavior, as opposed to a concern only with the surface manifestations of that behavior. Such an approach involves an awareness of the probabilistic nature of human events, and supports an attitude of flexibility, tolerance, and an ability to view a given situation from another's perspective.

This causal approach to behavior parallels the widely documented description of a mentally healthy classroom climate as one in which there is flexible permissiveness within clearly recognizable limits so as to provide a sense of security, a building of self-esteem, appreciation of the rights of others, and challenge to each individual.

More than a dozen controlled research studies have shown that an "appreciation of the dynamics of behavior is accompanied by significant changes in such dimensions as manifest anxiety, tendency to immediate arbitrary punitiveness, anti-democratic tendencies, and tolerance of ambiguity." There is evidence, therefore, that Ojemann's causal approach can work under rather carefully controlled research conditions. Unfortunately, this approach has had, to date, very little impact on school procedures in a general way, or to use the vernacular, "in the real world." To quote one author who laments this fact, "Perhaps the reason is that effective use of this program demands specific training on the teacher's part." (Italics added.)
The need to assess the impact of a potentially important effort, such as is represented by the One To Grow On film series, is critical to an orderly and validated process of improvement in our techniques and approaches to educational problems, particularly as they relate to mental health issues. The results of such an evaluation would be important in helping SIMH in their continuing efforts to reach teachers with mental health messages and suggest guidelines for the development of future programs in this critical area. The results should also be of direct assistance in the dissemination and support of the One To Grow On film series itself.
The complete teacher training package contains an introductory film plus six separate film segments, each with an accompanying discussion guide. The strategy employed by this training package is one of providing a common stimulus (the film series) with post film discussion sessions during which the participants (teachers), under the direction of a Discussion Leader, engage in a dialogue which is intended to achieve the following major objectives:

1. To stimulate discussion of the nature of student behavior and the teacher's relationship to it.
2. To help teachers appreciate and understand human behavior, taking into account underlying factors which can produce different kinds of surface behavior in students.
3. To help teachers explore and understand their own attitudes and feelings toward teaching, and by this exploration improve the ways in which they relate to their students and their students relate to themselves and others.

A brief description of each film is contained below.
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1. "A Pretty Good Class for a Monday"

Film action centers about three male students in a conventional history class. The students' major outside interests are explored as well as their

The introductory film was not ready in time to be used in the study. A seventh film has also been prepared and is now part of the series.
parents' and teachers' attitudes and descriptions of them. Each student represents an area of emphasis of the school:

(a) Academic development (a student whose major interest is math).

(b) Vocational training (a student whose interest centers about motorcycles).

(c) Citizenship preparation (a student interested in Scout activities, holding a job, and eventually going into police work).

The purpose of "A Pretty Good Class for a Monday" is to stimulate a discussion of ways of reconciling the apparent conflicts presented by individual students with individual values, orientations and spheres of success and the circumstances prevailing in a school in which teachers deal with large numbers of students, are responsible for teaching a prescribed curriculum, and must apply standards set by the school or by the community.

(2) "Lindsay"

Film action centers about a girl in conflict with the values of her parents. Family setting is one of affluence. Action includes girl's use of contraceptive pills and abuse of drugs. Her teacher is shown in an unsuccessful attempt to encourage the girl to discuss her problem.

The purpose of "Lindsay" is to provoke a discussion of the way in which the needs and responsibilities of students, parents, and teachers can be at odds with each other, and ways that the resulting unresolved conflicts can be destructive.

Issues raised include the conflict between parents' needs, which they attempt to fulfill through their children, and the children's own needs. There is a problem between the goals of the teacher and the methods he uses, and the extent to which the school exacerbates or might help resolve students' problems which arise from deep differences between the student and his or her parents.
(3) "Sarah"

The action centers about a girl about to be suspended from school for repeated unexcused absences. An understanding teacher learns that the girl has had an abortion, unknown to her parents. She wants this to remain unknown to them. The responsible male student is in the class the girl has been avoiding. The teacher attempts to preclude the girl's suspension by telling the vice principal that there was a valid reason for the girl's behavior, with assurances that she will attend the class in the future. The teacher fails in her attempt. No exception will be made for Sarah.

The purpose of "Sarah" is to provoke a discussion around the issues and the behavior of the characters in the film, by portraying a conflict situation in which everybody is apparently "sincere" and "responsible," but by their actions assure an unsatisfactory conclusion.

Issues raised include the conflict between the teacher's responsibility to the student and responsibility to the institution; conflict in the role of the vice principal or dean as counselor on the one hand and the implementor of rules on the other; conflict between Sarah's responsibility for her own actions (and her need to work out her own problems) and her parents' and the school's responsibility for her; the appropriateness of suspension as a response to truancy; the need for privileged communication between teacher and student; the question of personal responsibility for decisions vs. actions that might be defended in terms of "enforcing the rules," "doing one's job," etc.

(4) "Individuals"

This film presents a concrete example of an innovative, "individualized," program geared to self-direction of students. Film content is devoted to a description of how such a program "works." (This is an unscripted documentary of an actual class.)

The purpose of "Individuals" is to provoke a discussion of the goal of self-direction, methods of achieving it, and the impact of such a change on the roles and responsibilities of teachers.
The major issues raised are questions about changing the view of the ultimate objectives of the process of education from the mastery of a set body of skills towards the development of self-direction. What is the relationship between learning self-direction and learning a particular skill such as adding fractions? How can a teacher best help a child to learn? What is a teacher's true responsibility? What is the nature of knowledge; what is teaching; what is learning? What makes a child learn? Who is responsible for what parts of the process? What makes a child remember? What is the use of learning? How does a school program that stresses self-direction fit into a society that has a relatively highly structured extrinsic reward system?

(5) "A Teacher in Reflection"

Film shows a teacher conducting a "class meeting." Pupils are lower elementary school level. The meeting is of a problem-solving nature, approaching situations such as the difficulties encountered by a girl new to the school, and ways in which students can help one another with learning problems. In voice-over commentary the teacher "reflects" on ways in which she unconsciously influences and shapes the decisions the children ultimately make about changing classroom procedures.

The purpose of "A Teacher in Reflection" is to provide a concrete example of a program which attempts to deal directly with mental health development in the classroom. It is hoped that after seeing one example as shown in the film, teachers can share their reactions to the underlying ideas in that particular approach, consider the implications of the program's objectives for teachers, and speculate seriously about ways of achieving the same objectives in their own classrooms, either with a program like the one portrayed in the film or in some other way more appropriate for them.

Issues include the extent to which a new program is just "old wine in new bottles" if there is no fundamental change in the teacher who is using the program. Also, is there a possibility of conflict when the teacher, the central authority in a class, attempts to give some authority to the students? Is encouraging critical thinking among students a worthwhile objective for a classroom teacher?
The action in this film shows several activities, without commentary, in various classrooms in which strategies are being employed with the purpose of helping children learn to guide their own development.

The purpose of this film is to provoke a discussion of the concept of guiding one's own development and the ways in which particular techniques might be most effectively employed.

Issues raised include the question of how the school can best support children as they learn to guide their own development, and to consider the ways in which children can do this. An important issue is one that approaches ways in which a teacher's habits may interfere with a conscientious effort to help children do their own learning.

The major thrust of the approach taken in the training program described above is to be found in the discussion sessions. The focus of the discussions is intended to be on what teachers do within their own classrooms that relates to the mental health of their students. The strategy employed in this program is to provide stimuli (the films) and a forum that will make it possible for teachers, working together as colleagues, to develop and discuss changes they can make that will result in more constructive classroom experiences for students.

The films are set in different schools with a variety of types of classroom organization, from very conventional to experimental. The grade level ranges from kindergarten to high school. The assumption behind this variety is that the teacher is the key element in developing a constructive approach to mental health in the classroom. The grade level, the shape of the classroom, the configuration of the desks, the type of program that is officially sanctioned, all contribute in their way to the kinds of interaction that occur in the classroom. But the teacher's awareness, sensitivity, and behavior are by far the most important variables. His realization that he can change his behavior in a constructive way is the underlying message of the entire series.
There is no intention to “sell” the particular techniques shown in some of the films to the participants. The adoption of specific classroom devices and programs is not the objective of this program. The success of the discussion cannot be measured by the participants' final receptiveness to the specific techniques shown. A bad discussion would be one in which the whole focus of attention was on labeling the situations or techniques, and passing judgment on them. The best discussion would be one in which the participants explored their own reactions to the situations, and came out with some new ideas about how they might better cultivate good mental health practices in their own classrooms.
The basic study design is shown below. It should be noted that the film series was designed to be used by all in-service teachers—thus the complexity and completeness of the design. Since it was considered desirable to conduct the study in two different geographical locations, this design was replicated at a second site (Site 1 was Pittsburgh and environs, and Site 2 was Rhode Island).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RURAL</th>
<th>SUBURBAN</th>
<th>URBAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Grades (1 - 6)</td>
<td>Experienced, Male &amp; Female</td>
<td>Experienced, Male &amp; Female</td>
<td>Experienced, Male &amp; Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Grades (7 - 9)</td>
<td>Experienced, Male &amp; Female</td>
<td>Experienced, Male &amp; Female</td>
<td>Experienced, Male &amp; Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (10 - 12)</td>
<td>Experienced, Male &amp; Female</td>
<td>Experienced, Male &amp; Female</td>
<td>Experienced, Male &amp; Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In actual practice, the program will not be used by all teachers, all schools, or all school districts. Rather, at each level, it is anticipated that the decision to use the program will be a voluntary one, and that the population of users will be a highly biased subset of the whole teacher population. The exact composition of the subset is not known, and it is thus in a strict sense impossible to draw a random sample from it. Furthermore, even if it were possible to obtain an appropriate random sample, it
would not be feasible within the scope of the present project to use a sample of sufficient size to support generalizations of the precise sort envisioned in sampling theory. This is so because the appropriate sampling unit is not teachers, or schools, but school districts. It would have been prohibitively expensive to obtain an adequate sample of this unit of measurement.

One of the important factors considered in the selection of participants was the requirement that the discussion groups be kept relatively small and manageable so that meaningful discussions could be had (and monitored) and also so that the notion of "realism" be maintained. For this same reason (and also to measure school impact more effectively) the teachers in any one cell were to be drawn (to the extent possible) from a single school.

School systems were selected in which the types of respondents and types of settings would be reasonably representative of those expected to be encountered in practice. Teachers participating in the film and discussion program were selected by the school systems from among those volunteering.

The essential criteria for the selection of a study site were:

1. Large enough system to have teachers representing the various critical design categories (grade level, experience, etc.) in sufficient numbers so as to provide an adequate pool of volunteers.

2. A system with a sympathetic administration, willing to provide the necessary support to the effort.

3. A system that represents conditions typical of the three types of schools: urban, suburban, and rural.

4. A system geographically proximate to the project staff or able to provide the necessary leadership to ensure that the study be conducted as intended.
Control group and experimental group teachers were matched to the extent possible on the basis of the following parameters:

a. **Experience.** This is one of the experimental variables shown in Figure 1. Experienced teachers are defined as those with more than two years total of teaching experience; inexperienced two years or less.

b. **Teacher location.** Experimental and control teachers were drawn from the same school or from schools that are considered by those qualified to make such a judgment as representing the same ethnic, socio-economic and neighborhood characteristics.

c. **Age and sex.** To the extent possible, each cell in the design contains a variety of age ranges and a mixture of male and female teachers. These characteristics were distributed as equally as possible between the experimental and control groups.

The primary defining characteristics of the respondent population were determined, of course, by the grade level and school location parameters. The following working definitions were used for the latter categories:

a. **Rural.** A school located outside the metropolitan area of a city or large town and serving a population whose income is derived primarily from farming and/or local industry, e.g., mining.

b. **Suburban.** A school located outside the central city but within the metropolitan area, served by a separate school system. Income is usually derived from occupations in the city.

c. **Urban.** A school located within the heart of the central city serving a population whose income is derived primarily from occupations based in the city.

Another input to these definitions was the terminology used by the local school system.

Pupil characteristics were not controlled per se, but were determined by the selection of schools and teachers within those schools. One entire class of each teacher participating in the workshop was selected as comprising the pupil sample. Teachers in the upper grades who teach more than one class had a class randomly selected for use in the study.
Three published tests were selected and two interview forms were designed for data collection purposes. The three published tests are:

1. The Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI)
2. The Minneapolis Student Opinion Questionnaire (SQO)
3. The AIR "When Do I Smile" test

Item 1 was the primary instrument for obtaining teacher attitude information towards students and teaching, pre-, post-, and follow-up. Item 2 was selected to yield information on the feelings of secondary and high school level students toward school, particularly the teacher. Item 3 was selected for the same purpose but for the primary level grades. The other two data collection devices were designed to obtain information from the discussion leaders and the teachers in the experimental group with respect to their thoughts, feelings and attitudes about the entire experience. The Discussion Leader Report Form was to be completed immediately after each discussion session. The Teacher Interview Schedule was used as soon after the completion of the entire series as possible. (Many teachers were interviewed by a member of the project staff or someone trained by the project staff. Those who could not be reached in this way were asked to write their responses, with telephone follow-up used for any problem areas.)

The overall sequence of the study, with the various test instruments identified, was as follows:

1. Pretest

   a. Teachers, both experimental and control, were given the Minneapolis Teacher Attitude Inventory. This was done by individual mailings or in groups at the various selected schools.

   b. Primary grade pupils who are in the classes of the selected teachers, experimental and control, were given the "When Do I Smile" test in class by "the school" (not the classroom teacher).

   c. Junior and senior high school students were given the Minneapolis Student Opinion Questionnaire under the same conditions as in b above.
II. Experimental Treatment (six workshop sessions)

a. A "realistic" setting was maintained throughout the "workshop" experience to the extent possible. That is, they were conducted by the schools in essentially the same way they would be had the school purchased or rented the film series "One To Grow On" and proceeded to use them independently of AIR and the evaluation study. Most of the workshops were conducted on a 2-hour after-school session basis. However, one school district found it necessary to show the films before school began in the morning and to split their discussion periods between a 15-minute period following the film and a later session either the same day or on the following day.

Each of the school systems in the two sites agreeing to participate had available a pool of in-service trained "Leaders," trained in group methods by a school administration staff member whose major task is the planning and coordination of in-service teacher training. These "Leaders" were, by profession, school social workers, school psychologists, and guidance counselors. In one school district, however, it was necessary to use peer teachers to act as Discussion Leaders. This seemed to work very well. AIR did make available training in values clarification strategies and techniques to the Discussion Leaders from the suburban and rural schools in the Pittsburgh area (provided by Creative Communication, Inc., who also trains readers for the Social Seminar program). However, some of the more highly qualified and skilled Leaders came from a school district in Rhode Island that had no formal training.

To summarize, some of the "real world" conditions under which the film series was conducted were: volunteer subjects, a variety of conditions under which the workshops were conducted, and Discussion Leaders who had different background and training.

After each film and discussion session (scheduled once a week), the Discussion Leader filled out the Discussion Leader Report Form. Teachers were not to be involved personally in this activity.
b. After the completion of the entire series of films/discussions, the teachers were either interviewed personally using the Interview Schedule for Teachers or filled out the Schedule and sent it to the project staff.

c. Control group teachers and students received no special training of any kind.

III. Posttest

The Posttest procedure for experimental and control teachers was identical in all respects to the Pretest procedure. The same instrument was used (HTAI). No testing of pupils was done at this time.

IV. Three-month Follow-up Testing

The three-month follow-up testing procedures for teachers and pupils were identical in all respects to the Pretest procedures (i.e. both experimental and control, teachers and pupils, received all test instruments).