

Department of Audiovisual Instruction
National Education Association
1201 Sixteenth Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

MEMORANDUM

TO: Editorial Board, AV Communication Review

FROM: Robert C. Snider, Assistant Executive Secretary

SUBJECT: Changes in AVCR for 1964

DATE: September 20, 1963

At the AV Communication Review Editorial Board meeting last April in Denver, it was recommended that this journal once again be published as a quarterly without the two special supplement issues which we have had each year since 1960. In Denver it was also suggested that DAVI consider issuing a series of monographs.

These recommendations have been carefully considered by the DAVI staff, Board of Directors, and Executive Committee and, beginning in 1964 with Vol. 12, AVCR will once again be issued quarterly with regular Winter, Spring, Summer and Fall issues, and no supplements. Mrs. Leban, our Managing Editor, is developing a revised publication schedule which we will pass on to you when it is ready.

Also in 1964, DAVI will begin to publish a continuing series of monographs. Although the DAVI monographs will have the same trim size as AVCR, they will be sold as separate publications not related to AVCR. The first monograph, edited by Donald Bushnell, will be "The Automation of School Information Systems," a collection of papers on the application of EDP to various instructional and administrative problems.

The enclosed sample pages will give you a preview of changes in type and layout that will be made next year in Volume 12 of AVCR. A new cover design will also be introduced at that time. These changes have been authorized by the editor who, according to the AVCR Charter, shall "determine the format and changes therein." We think you will agree with us that these changes will make for an even better journal. Your comments and suggestions, as always, will be appreciated.

RCS:mao
Enclosure

Bab

nea

department of audiovisual instruction

1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W. • WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036.

March 24, 1964

Dr. George Gerbner
Institute for Communications Research
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Dear Dean:

Let me be one of the first to extend to you my very sincere congratulations on your impending appointment. Not only is this a considerable personal achievement, but it is also a major step forward for our field. Perhaps we can drink to this in Rochester!

I have passed your note on to Ann. As to the book by Clark and Sloan, it is weak on philosophy and media. I am quite certain Ofiesh will point this out and do a good review for us.

Yours very truly,



Robert C. Snider
Assistant Executive Secretary

RCS:mgs

OFFICERS

William H. Allen, President
Director of Cinema Research
University of Southern California

Mendel Sherman, President-Elect
Assistant Director, AV Center
Indiana University

John E. Dome, Acting Vice-President
Director, Audiovisual Service
Miami University

Clyde K. Miller, Past-President
Director, Audiovisual Education
State of Ohio Department of Education

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

William G. Gnaedinger
Director, Audiovisual Center
Washington State University

Robert O. Hall
Head, Division of Education
Alameda State College

John P. Vergis
Professor of Education
Arizona State University

Raymond Wyman
Professor of Education
University of Massachusetts

NATIONAL STAFF

Anna L. Hyer
Executive Secretary

Robert C. Snider
Assistant Executive Secretary

Mickey Bloodworth
Convention Coordinator

Florence Ih-chi Fan
Administrative Assistant

EDITOR, AV COMMUNICATION REVIEW

William H. Allen
1355 Inverness Drive
Pasadena 3, California



department of audiovisual instruction

(202) 223-9400, EXT. 325

1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, N. W. • WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036.

May 23, 1968

Dr. George Gerbner, Dean
The Annenberg School of Communications
The University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Dear George:

The enclosed copies of my letters to Lange and Ofiesh will give you a report on what I have been up to.

Although I am honored at your suggestion that I review the Seattler book, I would like to suggest Charles Hoban as my first choice for a reviewer, and secondly, Dr. VanderMeer. If you have no luck with either of these suggestions, of course, I will be pleased to do the review.

I am in complete sympathy with your desire to be relieved of your book review editorship after all these years of distinguished service, and I am actively discussing the matter with individuals (and there aren't very many) who would be qualified to assume this responsibility. Do you have any suggestions?

We have just employed a new Managing Editor for AVCR, a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania, School of Journalism.

Yours very truly,

Robert C. Snider
Associate Executive Secretary

RCS/sb
Enclosures

OFFICERS

John P. Vergis, President
Professor of Education
Arizona State University

Lee E. Campion, President-Elect
Director, Division of Educational Communications
New York State Education Department

Curtis Ramsey, Vice-President
Director, Learning Resources Center
George Peabody College for Teachers

Wesley C. Meierhenry, Past-President
Assistant Dean, Teachers College
University of Nebraska

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

June Dilworth
Director of School Broadcasting
University of Washington

Robert Gerletti
Director, Division of Educational Media
Los Angeles County Schools

Harry A. Johnson
Professor of Education
Virginia State College

Arthur Lalime
Director, Instructional Materials Center
Darien (Conn.) Board of Education

NATIONAL STAFF

Anna L. Hyer
Executive Secretary

Robert C. Snider
Associate Executive Secretary

Richard G. Nibeck
Assistant Executive Secretary

Mickey Bloodworth
Associate in Audiovisual

Bill Huff
Convention Coordinator

May 23, 1968

Dr. Gabriel D. Ofiesh
Professor of Education
The Catholic University of America
710 Lawrence Street, N. E.
Washington, D. C. 20017

Dear Gabe:

Several weeks ago, I received word indirectly that you would be willing to review Fred Skinner's new book on educational technology for AV Communication Review.

Dr. George Gerbner, book review editor for AVCR, tells me that he will be very pleased to have you do this. Your deadline is August 15, and we will plan to run your review in the Winter issue.

Do you have a copy of the book?

Yours very truly,

Robert C. Snider
Associate Executive Secretary

RCS/sb

cc: Dr. George Gerbner ✓

May 23, 1968

Dr. Phil Lange
Professor of Education
Teachers College - Columbia University
New York 27, New York

Dear Phil:

As a reader of AV Communication Review, I am looking forward to reading your review of Phil Jackson's 1967 Horace Mann lecture, "The Teacher and the Machine," University of Pittsburgh Press, 1968.

If you do not receive your copy, see enclosed carbon, and please let me know.

Your deadline is August 15 and we will plan to publish your review in the Winter issue.

Yours very truly,

Robert C/ Snider
Associate Executive Secretary

RCS/sb
Enclosure
cc: Dr. George Gerbner ✓

June 10, 1968

Dr. Robert C. Snider
Associate Executive Secretary
NEA - DAVE
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036

Dear Bob:

Thank you for your letter of May 23. I appreciate your help with Lange and Ofiesh. Fred Haveleroad agreed to review the Seattler book.

I have sent in the book review copy for the next issue, and I would like to make that my last. I have enjoyed the work, and appreciated the opportunity, but feel that I can no longer do justice to it. As I said before, it is time for a change, and for new blood. I think that your contacts with young people who might be most suitable are much better than mine. So I prefer to make no suggestions, but will be glad to comment on anyone I know, if you want me to. Please accept my resignation as book review editor and my best wishes for continued success with AVCR.

I may still get some reviews in this summer, and will be glad to turn them over to you, or to the new editor. I can also send books on hand, and copies of pending correspondence, to whomever you designate.

With best regards.

Sincerely yours,

GG:kaf

George Carbner,
Dean



department of audiovisual instruction

(202) 223-9400, EXT. 325

1201 SIXTEENTH STREET, N.W. • WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

June 25, 1968

Dr. George Gerbner, Dean
The Annenberg School of Communications
3620 Walnut Street
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Dear George:

On the basis of our recent discussions of this matter, your resignation as Book Review Editor of AV Communication Review in your letter of June 10 came as no surprise.

Although your resignation and your important contributions to AVCR will be duly accepted and noted by our highest officials, let me take this opportunity to accept it on the "working level" and to thank you personally for your great contributions to all of us as Book Review Editor for AVCR. Really, George, the annals of this journal and the field itself are much brighter because of your important service.

As finished book reviews and review copies of new books reach you, I will very much appreciate it if you will forward them to us in care of Mrs. Vita Pariente, Managing Editor, AV Communication Review.

With best personal regard and sincere thanks.

Yours very truly,

Robert C. Snider
Associate Executive Secretary

RCS/sb

cc: Dr. William H. Allen, Dr. James D. Finn, Dr. John Vergis,
Dr. Anna L. Hyer, Mrs. Vita Pariente

(Transcribed in Dr. Snider's absence)

OFFICERS

John P. Vergis, President
Professor of Education
Arizona State University

Lee E. Champion, President-Elect
Director, Division of Educational Communications
New York State Education Department

Curtis Ramsey, Vice-President
Director, Learning Resources Center
George Peabody College for Teachers

Wesley C. Meierhenry, Past-President
Assistant Dean, Teachers College
University of Nebraska

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

June Dilworth
Director of School Broadcasting
University of Washington

Robert Gerletti
Director, Division of Educational Media
Los Angeles County Schools

Harry A. Johnson
Professor of Education
Virginia State College

Arthur Lalime
Director, Instructional Materials Center
Darien (Conn.) Board of Education

NATIONAL STAFF

Anna L. Hyer
Executive Secretary

Robert C. Snider
Associate Executive Secretary

Richard G. Nibeck
Assistant Executive Secretary

Mickey Bloodworth
Associate in Audiovisual

Bill Huff
Convention Coordinator

Attitude: Helpful Predictor of Audiovisual Usage?

JAMES KNOWLTON

ERNEST HAWES

The pull of the future has always been slowed by the drag of the past, and whenever something new or unfamiliar appears upon the scene, there is an all too human tendency to "close all the shutters except the little ones through which we can see the things we want to see (3:173)."

But just as there is resistance to change, there is, in time, acceptance of what proves valuable. The degree of acceptability that has been achieved by the more "conventional" audiovisual media, particularly motion pictures, concerns us in this paper. We explored the question in order to learn some things that may be useful in guiding an information campaign urging an increasing and more effective use of audiovisuals.

Attitude measurement was central to this task, and this article is a report of the progress we made to that end. The report, however, is a little more than this, for in working toward the intermediate (or attitude measurement) goal, we encountered difficul-

James Knowlton is assistant professor of education at Indiana University. Ernest Hawes, of the Audiovisual Center staff at the University, is research assistant to Dr. Knowlton on the NDEA Title VII research project out of which this article grew.

ties that, through our attempts at solution, led us to a somewhat different view of our larger problem than we originally held.

EXPLORATORY
STUDY

In an exploratory investigation, questionnaires were sent to the Directors of 48 randomly selected National Science Foundation (NSF) Summer Institutes for high school teachers of science and mathematics. Of these Directors, 42 agreed to distribute the questionnaires among the NSF participants, and to collect and return them upon completion. They returned a total of 1,458 completed questionnaires. The average per institute was 35, yielding a return of more than 80 percent.

The ability level of these NSF teacher-participants was high, as the Institute Directors inferred from the academic records and recommendations they had on file for both successful and non-successful applicants. Of these 93 statements, barely more than half (*viz.*, 49) made any reference to AV in its instructional function.

Summary Comment. Of the three measures of attitude described, it is likely that only the latter direct approach was uncontaminated. And this approach, because of its direct character, is open to the criticism that it could be faked easily; it might, therefore, have invited "plus gesturing."³ The two deterrent questions were unsuitable because they failed in a majority of cases to reveal opinions as to the usefulness of film for instructional purposes. Rather, opinions about the barriers to usage formed the most apparent category of response.

While it is true that doubts about the usefulness of some material operate to reduce usage in the same manner as do beliefs that barriers to usage are strong, it is nevertheless mandatory to keep measures of these two things separate. The logic of attitude measurement requires this, for attitude scales must be uni-dimensional to be interpretable. And the psycho-logic necessary to understand

³ We have borrowed the phrase "plus gesturing" from Alfred Adler to indicate that a person motivated to do so may behave in a way intentionally meant to mislead in order to create a better impression in another's eyes. Though we recognized the opportunity for "plus gesturing" here, we doubt that its effect, if present, was very great. Obviously, a person may lie on a questionnaire, but he may also lie in pretending friendliness to his boss whom he hates, or to conceal cheating in a test. It is not so much a question of verbal behavior (as on a questionnaire) *versus* grosser muscular behavior in a real life situation, as it is a matter of the strength of motivation for falsifying. A number of studies including Finger's (4) and a study by Melikian and Prothro, (8) have shown that in situations like that of our exploratory study where anonymity is guaranteed, motives to falsify are generally weak.

behavior change also requires this separation. (This latter point will be amplified in the discussion section.)

CONTAMINATION
STUDY

The results of our exploratory investigations led us to hypothesize that many, possibly most, AV attitude scales have not measured attitudes toward the instructional usefulness of audiovisual materials in an uncontaminated way.

These ten staff members achieved an initial over-all agreement of 88 percent in this categorizing task. This result indicated a better than 80 percent probability that these judges were all using the same criteria for judgment (10). However, agreement on one item dropped to the 50 percent level. On the basis of further discussion, the judges felt that his item should be placed in the instructionally non-relevant category. As a result, 14 items were placed in the instructionally relevant category, and eight items in the instructionally non-relevant category. Some examples may make the difference between these two categories more obvious.

A thorough testing of this hypothesis would require that a sample of AV attitude scales be subjected to analysis. This process was not only beyond our means, but we have been able to discover only a very few attempts to measure attitude toward AV that used any sort of scaling procedure. In any case, the scale analyzed and reported in this section was selected before we had formulated this hypothesis. Moreover, it was selected for another end, and because it appeared to have been constructed with more than usual care and thought. This scale is a 22-item Thurstone scale designed by Kelley to measure teachers' attitudes toward audiovisual materials (5).

Summer Session
Test

A modification in formal and scoring as described by Willis (12), was employed to sharpen the discriminating power of Kelley's scale. Since no item was reworded, this modification could only enhance—and in no way nullify—the test of our hypothesis. The subjects for this study were summer session students in an AV utilization class at Indiana University. Nearly all were teachers, or had had teaching experience. None had had any prior AV training. Kelley's scale was administered in the first week of the session and again in the eighth or last week, with only the question order changed. Forty-one subjects completed the scale both times.

Scoring was done so that high numerical scores indicated favor-

post-course scores, and the difference was taken as an indicator of the direction and magnitude of attitude change. The Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test (11) was used to assess the significance of the differences between pre-course and post-course scores. The results indicated that a highly significant change in the the direction of a more favorable attitude toward AV had occurred ($p < .0001$, one-tail test).

*Professional
Staff Aid*

To determine whether this scale was contaminated, and whether the highly significant change represented a genuinely increased belief in the instructional usefulness of AV, or whether it was due to something else, ten persons from the AV professional staff at Indiana University were asked to categorize the 22 items on the Kelley scale into one or the other of the two categories earlier described; that is, one category was defined so as to include statements as to the instructional value or lack of value of AV, and the other included statements as to conditions, situations, or experiences connected with the use of AV materials, but not as to the instructional value of such materials.

Instructionally relevant examples are these: (a) "Children retain longer the material that has been presented visually;" (b) "The use of audiovisual materials makes for high levels of student interest." Instructionally non-relevant examples are these: (a) "Obtaining the audiovisual materials that I want is usually quite a simple procedure;" (b) "Films are usually in good repair when they are received." The item on which there was most disagreement—*viz.*, the item on which there was originally an even split among the judges—was this: "My instructors in college did not use audiovisual materials; why should I?"

REFERENCES

1. Berelsonfi Bernard. *Content Analysis in Communication Research*. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1952.
2. Cartwright, Dorwin. "Some Principles of Mass Persuasion." *Public Opinion and Propaganda*, edited by Daniel Katz *et al.* New York: Dryden, 1954.
3. Christensen, Parlay A. *All in a Teacher's Day*. Salt Lake City: Stevens & Wallis, 1948.
4. Finger, F. W. "Sex Beliefs and Practices among Male College Students." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 42: 57-67; 1947.
5. Kelley, Gaylen B. "A Study of Teachers' Attitudes toward Audiovisual Materials." *Educational Screen and Audiovisual Guide* 3: 119-21; 1960.