

**University of Glasgow**

**Faculty of Education**

**Evaluation of the  
Moving Image in Education Project**

**FINAL REPORT**

**Professor J. Eric Wilkinson  
Dr. George Head  
Mr. Fraser McConnell**

**June 2009**

## **CONTENTS**

*Acknowledgements*

*Executive Summary*

**1. Background**

- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Issues in Moving Image Education (MIE)
- 1.3 The Moving Image Project in Angus

**2. The Research Design and Methodology**

- 2.1 Aims of the Evaluation and Research Questions
- 2.2 Design
- 2.3 Methodology
- 2.4 Sampling

**3. Findings : Year 1 - 2004/05**

**4. Findings : Year 2 - 2005/06**

**5. Findings : Year 3 – 2005/06**

**6. Findings : Year 4 - 2007/08**

**7. Response of pupils to MIE**

**8. Discussion**

**9. Conclusions**

*References*

*Appendices*

## Acknowledgements

The evaluators wish to express their appreciation to the staff and pupils of the seven schools involved in the MIE Project. They were subject to scrutiny on several occasions – both through interviews and observation – and willingly cooperated fully with us. Thanks are also due to the Director of Education in Angus Council for granting access to these schools.

Our sincere gratitude is also extended to the Lead Practitioners of the MIE Project in Angus. They painstakingly facilitated our data gathering activities on numerous occasions.

To everyone else involved in the Project who assisted our work, we extend our gratitude.

It should be noted that interpretation of the data and the conclusions drawn are entirely our responsibility.

Professor J. Eric Wilkinson  
Dr. George Head  
Mr. Fraser McConnell

June 2009

## **Executive Summary**

In November 2004, the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) commissioned the Faculty of Education in the University of Glasgow, under the leadership of Professor J. Eric Wilkinson, to undertake an evaluation of the Moving Image Education (MIE) Project in Angus. The evaluation ran from November 2004 to September 2008. The Final Report provides an account of the work undertaken, presents the findings and discusses the key issues.

Moving Image Education (MIE) is a means of promoting literacy – in its widest sense – in schools. The traditional view of literacy as competence in reading, talking/listening and writing print-based material is no longer tenable in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Whilst the ability to access, analyse and produce traditional texts remains important for young people in schools, the concept of literacy itself has been extended to include other media, thereby suggesting that it is necessary for young people to engage with other, non-traditional texts, including those constructed through moving images.

### **The Moving Image Project in Angus**

The Moving Image Education (MIE) project began in 2004-05 with all P6 classes (and composite classes with P6 pupils) in six primary schools in a single secondary school cluster in Angus. In year 2 the programme was extended to P7 in all schools involved and negotiations opened up with staff in the secondary school with a view to introducing MIE into the first year, that is, S1 in year 3 of the project. In 2006-07, MIE was first introduced into the secondary school with the new intake of S1 pupils. It was then extended to S2 in 2007-08, such that the first cohort of pupils had four years experience of MIE.

The key aims of the MIE project were as follows:

- development of literacy teaching through the media of moving image
- an increase in 5-14 attainment levels in reading and writing in P6, P7, S1 and S2
- enhanced core skills in ICT and teamwork
- an increase in the range of teachers' skills in literacy teaching
- the development of skills among support staff in both Angus Council and Angus Digital Media Centre, enabling them to sustain and expand their use of moving image education in learning and teaching
- improvements in creativity, transition, motivation, enhancement of external links, expansion of the creative use of ICT, teamwork and education for work and enterprise.

## **Aims of the Evaluation and Research Questions**

The four aims of the evaluation of MIE were as follows:

- to assess the overall impact of the project on the teachers and pupils in the participating schools;
- to identify what, if any, impact it has had on the development of teaching and learning skills and in particular the development of literacy;
- to explore the impact of the project on the development of ICT skills and teamwork in those pupils participating in the project;
- to identify what, if any, improvement participation in the project has had on pupil attitudes, motivation, self-esteem, achievement and attainment levels; development of a more creative approach to learning and transition to secondary school.

In line with these aims, a number of research questions were articulated.

## **Research Design**

The research used both a longitudinal and cross-sectional design and a comparative statistical approach to teacher assessments of attainment in reading and writing. The data collected were both qualitative and quantitative.

The longitudinal aspect focused on two successive cohorts of P6 pupils and their teachers, MIE staff and other stakeholders engaged with the Moving Image Education Project, each year from 2004 to 2008. The cross-sectional aspect occurred in the final year, 2007-2008. It involved all P6-S2 pupils in that year and their teachers.

The methodologies used for collecting the qualitative data were:

- observation of MIE sessions in each of the seven schools
- 1:1 interviews with teachers involved in MIE
- focus groups of pupils participating in MIE activities
- 1:1 interviews with MIE staff
- 1:1 interview with a Council representative

For the observation of MIE sessions, a pre-designed pro forma was used. It focussed on the pedagogic methods used by the member of MIE staff, the engagement of the pupils in the range of MIE activities and the role of the class teacher in MIE sessions.

In terms of the quantitative data, three sources of information were used:

- questionnaires completed by all pupils involved in MIE 2004-08
- the 5-14 National Assessment grades P6-S2 (2002-2008) in reading and writing
- PIPS scores for P7 in 2006

## **Sampling**

In order to obtain the views of a representative group of pupils in all six primary schools, the evaluation team selected approximately 25% of pupils in each school for inclusion in focus groups. In five of the schools, six pupils were chosen on the basis of gender, age and 5-14 attainment levels. Each group consisted of one male and one female from the highest attaining group, one male and one female from the mid-attaining group and one male and one female from the lowest attaining group. In composite classes, there was also an even distribution of pupils from the different year groups. In the case of the smallest rural school, there were only nine pupils; therefore all pupils were included in the focus groups rather than omitting three pupils. Initially, 55 pupils formed nine focus groups among the primary schools. In the secondary school the number of groups was reduced to three, involving some 25 S1 and S2 pupils that had transferred to the secondary school in 2006 and 2007 respectively.

## **Conclusions**

On the basis of the findings outlined in the Final Report, the following conclusions have emerged:

- At the outset there was, in general, a positive reaction to the introduction of Moving Image Education into the selected cluster of schools. Although many aspects of MIE were regarded as challenging, particularly the technical aspects, there was no sense that the schools saw MIE as burdensome or peripheral.
- On the whole, teachers in the primary schools responded very positively to the various activities associated with MIE, though a small minority were initially cautious given the level of technical skill required.
- The role of the Lead Practitioners was crucial. Their skill, enthusiasm and expertise played a very large part in the success of MIE.
- MIE proceeded more successfully when teachers regarded it as an alternative (and better) pedagogy for the teaching and learning of traditional literacy skills.
- Virtually all pupils were enthused by MIE. They saw it as exciting, challenging, fun and highly motivating.
- There are some tentative indications that engaging in MIE over a period of time impacts positively on children's literacy as well as on their ICT and group work skills. Teachers were convinced that MIE had improved children's talking and listening skills though there were mixed views on the impact of MIE on children's writing. As far as the formal assessments were concerned, there was some evidence, though by no means conclusive, that MIE had improved children's reading and writing skills.
- Headteachers in general were supportive of MIE, particularly when faced with such eager and willing learners, though MIE was more successful when the headteacher adopted a 'champion' role in the promotion of MIE.
- The role of the local authority, including involvement of senior management, was significant in developing MIE in the cluster of schools involved.

- MIE is now sustainable in the initial cluster of primary schools providing that access to technical expertise is available, if required, on request.
- MIE has been more successfully introduced into the primary schools. In the secondary school, for a range of reasons such as the structure, organisation, teacher attitudes and teacher absence, the introduction of MIE has been problematic. However, the outcome of the initial problem of introducing MIE into the secondary school has been the willingness on the part of many teachers to experiment with an inter-disciplinary approach to MIE.
- Despite the many challenges which arose, members of the English Department in the secondary school remained key players in the development of MIE.
- MIE as it has been operating in the cluster of schools is highly compatible with the impending introduction of the Curriculum for Excellence in Scottish schools.

## CHAPTER 1 : BACKGROUND

### 1.1 Introduction

In November 2004, the Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) commissioned the Faculty of Education in the University of Glasgow, under the leadership of Professor J. Eric Wilkinson, to undertake an evaluation of the Moving Image Education (MIE) Project in Angus (ref. 2CV/P002/055). The evaluation was planned to run from November 2004 to September 2008. This Final Report provides an account of the work undertaken, presents the findings and discusses the key issues.

### 1.2 Issues in Moving Image Education

Moving Image Education (MIE) is a means of promoting literacy – in its widest sense – in schools. The traditional view of literacy as competence in reading, talking/listening and writing print-based material is no longer tenable in the 21<sup>st</sup> century (see Lankshear and Knobel, 2003). Whilst the ability to access, analyse and produce traditional texts remains important for young people in schools, the concept of literacy itself has been extended to include other media, thereby suggesting that it is necessary for young people to engage with other, non-traditional texts, including those constructed through moving images (Schwarz and Brown 2005). Indeed, Buckingham (2005:8) argues:

*...contemporary childhoods are now permeated, even in some respects defined, by the modern media – by television, video, computer games, the internet, mobile phones and popular music, and by the enormous range of media related commodities that make up contemporary consumer culture.*

(Buckingham 2005: 8)

Moreover, Buckingham goes on to argue that children and young people today may, in fact, spend more time engaging with media than they do with any other activity other than sleeping. This has led some sections of adult society to argue that the media, and television in particular, have ‘destroyed’ childhood. The nature of television programmes and DVDs aimed at children and young people and the ability of children to access a range of materials on the internet has resulted in adults’ concerns regarding the need to protect young people from possible corruption and exploitation. On the other hand, a counter argument, that the media, and television and the internet in particular, have served to liberate and empower children and young people, exists. Most young people have the ability to access materials relatively free of adult supervision, they are encouraged through gaming and advertising to behave as autonomous decision makers and consumers, and, through their own and others’ interactive websites, express views and opinions on any topic that they and other young people consider worthy (Buckingham 2000, 2005). Regardless of whichever side or mix of the argument to which one chooses to subscribe, the current situation suggest an imperative to equip our children and young people with the skills and abilities to engage with the media, including moving images. The obvious context for such an enterprise is the teaching of media literacy in schools.

Media Literacy as a concept has been developed and contested in recent years. The precariousness of the concept is reflected in the range of terminology used to refer to various aspects of emerging thinking: for example, digital literacy, visual literacy, and, more recently, media intelligence. It is significant, perhaps, that whilst the term ‘media’ naturally embraces written, audio and visual forms of communication, recent discourse appears to focus largely

on moving image artefacts constructed for the visual media of film, television, video (DVD) and games. McBrien (2005) arguing for a critical approach to media education, cites Considine and Haley's (1999) seven principles of media literacy as a foundation. In terms of moving image education, McBrien would recognise that all moving images are constructed, offer one version of reality and have a commercial purpose. Furthermore, the principles argue that moving images convey values and ideologies, that their messages have social consequences, and that meaning is negotiated by the viewer. Put simply, the medium mediates and the viewer constructs meaning and sense in relation to the images portrayed. As Cortes argues:

*The mass media teach whether or not media makers intend to or realize it. And users learn from the media whether or not they try or are even aware of it.*

(Cortes 2005: 55).

With globalisation, the world is becoming increasingly interconnected, with simultaneous pressures towards, paradoxically, both unity and diversity. One of the major factors in the diversification of youth cultures is the rate at which cultural objects and ideas are transmitted throughout the world. But, in communities that are cut off from technologies that can disseminate information and ideas widely, there appears to be much less diversity (Besley, 2003; Buckingham 2000, 2005). Young people produce their identities and cultures from images and ideas they receive from the media. One of the effects of the MIE project is likely to be greater connectedness with the world and current ideas and issues. With the emergence of a series of new ICT technologies, contemporary culture has introduced a range of new 'texts' and ways of communicating into our lives. Such 'texts' are no longer simply written technology of books/magazines, but may also be aural and visual technologies such as film, video, TV, Internet, advertising, mass media, and gaming, all of which produce our culture(s). In our contemporary world, young people need the knowledge and skills to be able to 'read' critically the multiple cultural texts to which they are exposed – i.e. multiple critical literacies. Henry Giroux suggests that "students need to learn to live in a substantive democracy, read critically in various spheres of culture, engage those critical traditions of the past that continue to shape how we think about the present and the future, and engage multiple texts for the wisdom they provide and the maps they offer us to live in a world that is more multicultural, diverse, and democratic" (Giroux, 1997), <http://www.zmag.org/zmag/articles/Girouxsept97.htm>.

Giroux (1990) argues that the new information and communication technologies, through emphasizing individualism, create both a sense of alienation and boredom with school which can no longer compete with such exciting technology. Today, in sharp contrast to the era of the omnipotent, all-knowing teacher, and in a manner that threatens traditional lines of teacher authority, there is an unprecedented dilemma for many teachers when pupils probably know more about the information technologies than they do. From playing video games, and playstation, using the Internet and text-messaging, many pupils use a whole different range of information processing, thinking and problem solving skills to those that are required when negotiating written text (books/literature) (Besley, 2003). ICT technologies such as texting, photo messaging and email challenge the conventions of language literacy. Indeed, it has been claimed that they form part of what has been called *new literacies* (Lankshear and Knobel 2003). Furthermore, there is a growing realisation that literacy *per se* is more than a narrow use of language. The recent Project for International Student Assessment (<http://www.pisa.oecd.org>) recognised literacy in at least three domains: language, mathematics and science. Buckingham (2006) argues that media literacy, including the moving image media, can and should be used to develop critical competence in a range of domains. The existence of communications media in which texts are no longer solely verbal but include visual images, sound and music has challenged the dominance of the written word and '*is fundamentally reshaping how we use language*' (Buckingham 2006: 35). Thus, if our

young people are to grow up capable of engaging critically with the world around them, they need to learn new ways of analysing media texts and the world that they represent.

The first issue for the researchers in this project, therefore, concerns the nature of literacy itself. The project allows for the measurement of performance in traditional and moving image literacies and an important outcome of the research that would benefit Scottish Education generally would be findings on the nature of literacy as it is understood in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

A second issue, following on from the first, concerns the nature of Moving Image Education: what constitutes MIE and how it differs from any other form of education. Buckingham (2000) argues that education in media generally has been centred on analysis of media as a 'defensive' approach related to adults' concerns to protect young people from the '*moral, cultural or political shortcomings of the media.*' (Buckingham 2000:205). Now, he further argues, the pervasiveness of media requires us to develop beyond the stage of critical viewers to become critical **participants** and cultural **producers** (Buckingham 2000; Hart and Hicks 2002; Schwarz and Brown 2005). In pedagogical terms, this represents a shift from a passive position of 'being taught' or instructed to one of learners actively constructing their own learning. Moreover, there is a general recognition within the literature that engaging with media is a social rather than solitary function, even where a child is watching or surfing alone. There are clear resonances here with those theories of learning that argue that learning is constructed socially (Piaget; Vygotsky). Whilst the media, and moving images in particular, may be ubiquitous in our everyday lives, moving images as a learning context is new and this represents a considerable challenge for teachers.

Pugente *et al.* (2005), writing on the Canadian experience, posits four main ways of teaching media. First, is a medium based approach in which a particular medium's characteristics are explored in depth; second is a theme-based approach (which might be familiar to most teachers); third, as a stand alone unit; and fourth, media studies integrated into other classroom activities. Buckingham (2005) arguing the case for digital media, insists that if we are to use (in this case moving images) to teach, then an instrumental or functional use is inadequate and we must develop our students' critical awareness of the production, use, effect, and intended audience of moving image materials. MIE, for him, requires to be both a subject of study and a means of learning in which the critical and creative aspects are integrated (Buckingham 2006).

How this is manifest in classrooms raises questions of what constitutes good practice, the relationship between moving images in the classroom and outside, and how teachers are supported in developing the pedagogies necessary to support their pupils' learning in this context. The teachers' world in schools has been dominated by the written word but within MIE, visual images, music and sound are as important and teachers find themselves being learners as much as their pupils (Goetze *et al.* 2005). Buckingham likens this to a context of 'edutainment' in which pupils interact with a mix of visual texts, music, and sound, and which, therefore, demands '*more informal, less didactic styles of address*' (Buckingham 2005: 18) than may be current in schools. Buckingham (2006) argues that what is required is a pedagogical approach based on conceptual learning that has its roots firmly in the work of Vygotsky. Buckingham is particularly attracted by two aspects of Vygotsky's work: the suggestion that rather than wait until children are 'ready' they should be supported or 'scaffolded' through social and teacher support to achieve what they are currently unable to do on their own; and secondly, the interface between what might be termed spontaneous or 'folk' knowledge and scientific (including social scientific) knowledge (Vygotsky 1962, 1978). Buckingham envisages Vygotsky's theories as offering a dynamic model of learning and teaching based on dialogue. In the dialogic process, the teacher first engages with pupils' spontaneous knowledge and through a collaborative process of action and reflection develop a 'conscious mastery' (Buckingham 2006: 145). Buckingham's proposed model, however, has

similarities to what has been advocated as a multiliteracies approach and he pushes the model beyond mastery to encompass to what Scottish Screen have called 'critical connectedness' that transforms practice. In terms of Moving Image Education, therefore, Buckingham's aspirations for media education can be seen to match those of Scottish Screen:

*The aim of [Moving Image Education] then, is not merely to enable children to 'read' – or make sense of – [moving image] texts, or to enable them to 'write' their own. It must also enable them to reflect systematically on the processes of reading and writing, to understand and to analyse their own experience as readers and writers.*

(Buckingham 2006: 141)

The researchers are interested to know if MIE is a form of situated learning that has a theoretical basis in the work of Vygotsky or if, indeed, it offers new insights into learning and pedagogy as argued by Buckingham.

A third issue is that of transfer. Whilst it is possible and relatively simple for learners to nurture and refine their skills in a particular domain, it is notoriously difficult, especially for young learners, to carry that skill into another aspect of their school education. In the context of MIE, taking pupils' learning into other domains (including the world beyond school) will consist of more than attempting to combine education and a medium still largely associated with entertainment, or being enthusiastic about the educational potential of MIE, but will require teachers to examine theories of learning, for example, metacognition and critical skills (see Head 2005, 2007; Martin 2007), that claim to address this issue. Research on any skills development initiative, particularly in the field of metacognition, highlights the problem of transfer. It is therefore of concern to the evaluation whether MIE has any impact on teachers' practice and children's learning in other aspects of the 5-14 curriculum and their experiences beyond school.

A recent Ofcom report (Ofcom 2008) indicated that children in Scotland are more likely than children in the other three UK countries to have a wider range of media in their bedrooms, and are more likely to watch or download online video content (Ofcom 2008: 60-61). Significantly, 47% of those Scottish children aged 8-15 who watch television stated that they trust the content that they view. More importantly, perhaps, 59% of Scottish children of the same age indicated that they trust the content of sites that they access online. At the same time, only 3% of Scottish parents had major concerns regarding their children's television viewing and whilst almost half were concerned about their children's use of the internet, only 10% considered it to be one of their major concerns. From a social perspective, therefore, there is a strong argument that the development of young people's critical media intelligence is both an entitlement and an imperative. Buckingham (2000, 2005) contextualises media education generally within a rights framework. He sees young people's traditional relationship with media as passive, with provision being mediated through adults and adult institutions. He advocates that children's (and all people's) rights to expression, participation and consumption demand a new relationship in which participants are active, informed and have developed the skills and abilities necessary to engage with and change media. This ability is underpinned by the right to education.

Pugente *et al.* (2005) identify nine factors that they consider to be crucial for the success of a media-based initiative such as MIE. They argue that the initiative must be grounded in 'grass roots' and have the full support of the local authority; there should be in-service training for and collaboration among teacher, suitable materials, and the support of appropriate media 'consultants'. Finally, they argue, there should be '*appropriate evaluation instruments*' (Pugente *et al* 2005: 158).

### 1.3 The Moving Image Project

The Moving Image Education (MIE) project began in 2004-05 with all P6 classes (and composite classes with P6 pupils) in six primary schools in a single secondary school cluster in Angus. In year 2 the programme was extended to P7 in all schools involved and negotiations opened up with staff in the secondary school with a view to introducing MIE into the first year, that is, S1 in year 3 of the project. In 2006-07, MIE was first introduced into the secondary school with the new intake of S1 pupils. It was then extended to S2 in 2007-08, such that the first cohort of pupils had four years experience of MIE.

The key aims of the MIE project are as follows:

- development of literacy teaching through the media of moving image
- an increase in 5-14 attainment levels in reading and writing in P6, P7, S1 and S2
- enhanced core skills in ICT and teamwork
- an increase in the range of teachers' skills in literacy teaching
- the development of skills among support staff in both Angus Council and Angus Digital Media Centre, enabling them to sustain and expand their use of moving image education in learning and teaching
- improvements in creativity, transition, motivation, enhancement of external links, expansion of the creative use of ICT, teamwork and education for work and enterprise.

## **CHAPTER 2 : THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY**

### **2.1 Aims of the Evaluation and Research Questions**

The four aims of the evaluation of MIE were as follows:

- to assess the overall impact of the project on the teachers and pupils in the participating schools;
- to identify what, if any, impact it has had on the development of teaching and learning skills and in particular the development of literacy;
- to explore the impact of the project on the development of ICT skills and teamwork in those pupils participating in the project;
- to identify what, if any, improvement participation in the project has had on pupil attitudes, motivation, self-esteem, achievement and attainment levels; development of a more creative approach to learning and transition to secondary school.

In line with these aims, a number of research questions have been articulated. They are:

#### **Overall impact of MIE on teachers and pupils in the participating schools:**

What assumptions underpin the design of the Moving Image Education Project? Do staff in the schools share such assumptions?

How did teachers respond to the input from Moving Image Education staff?

Have teachers (principally primary school headteachers, P6 and P7 teachers and S1/S2 teachers) detected an improvement in attitudes, motivation, self-esteem, achievement and attainment levels; development of a more creative approach to learning; transition; development of ICT skills and teamwork in those pupils who participated in the project?

How did participating pupils respond to the input from Moving Image Education staff?

#### **Impact and change in development of teaching and learning skills and in particular the development of literacy:**

Have participating teachers changed their strategies in teaching literacy skills in response to participation in the MIE? If so, to what extent?

If teachers have changed their teaching approaches, how have pupils responded to such changes?

Have participating pupils improved their literacy in response to participation in the MIE? If so, to what extent?

Have there been changes in attainment in national reading and writing level test results? If so, to what extent?

**Impact of the project on the development of ICT skills and teamwork in those pupils participating in the project:**

To what extent have pupils developed ICT skills and teamwork?

To what extent are such matters rated by external experts (HMIE, Advisers, ITE/CPD staff)?

**Identify what, if any, improvement participation in the project has had on pupil attitudes, motivation, self-esteem, achievement and attainment levels; development of a more creative approach to learning and transition to secondary school:**

Do teachers report participating pupils displaying greater co-operation, communication and better behaviour (e.g. less aggression) at school?

Has the transition for primary to secondary school been improved by the MIE project?

Has a more creative approach to learning been developed?

## 2.2 Research Design<sup>1</sup>

The research used both a longitudinal and cross-sectional design and a comparative statistical approach to teacher assessments of attainment in reading and writing. The data collected were both qualitative and quantitative.

The longitudinal aspect focused on two successive cohorts of P6 pupils and their teachers, MIE staff and other stakeholders engaged with the Moving Image Education Project, each year from 2004 to 2008. The cross-sectional aspect occurred in the final year, 2007-2008. It involved all P6-S2 pupils in that year and their teachers.

The timescale for data collection is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Timescale for data collection from pupils and teachers involved in MIE

	T1 2004-2005	T2 2005-2006	T3 2006-2007	T4 2007-2008
Cohort 1	P6	P7	S1	S2
Cohort 2	-	P6	P7	S1

## 2.3 Methodology

The methodologies used for collecting the qualitative data were:

- observation of MIE sessions in each of the seven schools
- 1:1 interviews with teachers involved in MIE
- focus groups of pupils participating in MIE activities
- 1:1 interviews with MIE staff
- 1:1 interviews with a Council representative

---

<sup>1</sup> This design is slightly more intense than specified in the original proposal due to the issues that arose when MIE was introduced into the secondary school for the first time in 2005

For the observation of MIE sessions, a pre-designed pro forma was used (see Appendix A). It focussed on the pedagogic methods used by the member of MIE staff, the engagement of the pupils in the range of MIE activities and the role of the class teacher in MIE sessions.

The teachers' interview schedule consisted of five themes as follows:

- impact of MIE on the participating schools
- impact on teaching and learning, especially on literacy
- changes to pupil attitudes and behaviour
- teacher perspectives
- reflection

A copy of the schedule is provided in the Appendix B

The interview schedules for MIE staff, headteachers and a Council representative contained similar themes adjusted according to the role the interviewers played in the MIE work. Copies are provided in Appendices C, D and E.

The focus group discussions also centred round a number of themes as follows:

- initial response to MIE
- initial impact
- getting on at school

All pupils willingly contributed to the discussions, which were conducted in an informal and open manner.

In terms of the quantitative data, three sources of information were used:

- questionnaires from all pupils involved in MIE 2004-08 (see Appendix F)
- the 5-14 National Assessment grades P6-S2 (2002-2008) in reading and writing
- PIPS scores for P7 in 2006

## 2.4 Sampling

In order to obtain the views of a representative group of pupils in all six primary schools, the evaluation team selected approximately 25% of pupils in each school for inclusion in focus groups. In five of the schools, six pupils were chosen on the basis of gender, age and 5-14 attainment levels. Each group consisted of one male and one female from the highest attaining group, one male and one female from the mid-attaining group and one male and one female from the lowest attaining group. In composite classes, there was also an even distribution of pupils from the different year groups. In the case of the smallest rural school, there were only nine pupils; therefore all pupils were included in the focus groups rather than omitting three pupils. Initially, 55 pupils formed nine focus groups among the primary schools. In the secondary school the number of groups was reduced to three, involving some 25 S1 and S2 pupils that had transferred to the secondary school in 2006 and 2007 respectively.

## CHAPTER 3 : FINDINGS : YEAR 1 – 2004/05

### 3.1 Introduction

The following represents the findings of the research team following the first phase of the evaluation. At this stage, the team had observed MIE lessons in all six participating primary schools. In addition, focus groups of pupils in all participating schools had taken place, thereby allowing the pupils involved to confirm or challenge our observations and to add their own voices to the evaluation. A series of 1:1 interviews were also conducted with teachers, headteachers, MIE staff, including the Lead Practitioner(s) and a representative of Angus Council and their views, as reported to the research team, are presented below.

### 3.2 Teachers' response to MIE

Two rounds of interviews with teachers and headteachers were conducted in each of the primary schools. The first of these took place in May 2005 and the second round in the period December 2005 to January 2006. The first set of interviews represents the views of teachers who pioneered MIE in the Angus cluster of schools. The second set of interviews included some of these same teachers following a full session's experience of MIE and some others who were undertaking MIE for the first time.

#### **Teachers' perceptions of the impact of MIE on teachers and pupils in participating schools**

A number of teachers and headteachers initially saw the programme as '*an add on*', something that was not necessary, and an Angus Council's rather than a schools' initiative. However, as the initiative progressed, this concern dissipated. There was a clear understanding that the underpinning assumption of the programme was that attainment in literacy could be improved and that MIE could make a significant contribution to that end. There was also recognition that children '*watch a lot of film and TV*' and that making links between moving image and literacy would be beneficial. One teacher described MIE as a '*twenty-first century approach [and] more relevant to the times*'. In the initial round of interviews, some teachers considered that MIE was particularly useful in supporting '*reluctant writers*', '*kids that are disaffected*' and possibly having a focus on boys.

All teachers were overwhelming in their appreciation of input from MIE staff. Typically, responses included matters concerning the use of MIE materials and tasks, but also the way in which they were taught, for example:

*Seeing how [the Lead Practitioner] is using resources is useful as we have to do it ourselves in the future. [The] way [the Lead Practitioner] has handled the class...and how pupils react to him... and participation has been good.*

There was also an appreciation that MIE staff had been able to allay fears regarding the use of technology and the training days were highly appreciated. There was some concern, however, that future lessons in which the teacher would play a more active role or be taking by themselves, would perhaps require some joint planning between teachers and MIE staff, and possibly further training in the use of equipment.

Encouragingly, all teachers and headteachers reported a positive impact of the MIE project on pupils' attitude, motivation, self esteem and a more creative approach to learning. Interestingly, one teacher reported that improvement spanned the range of abilities within the class:

*[there is a] more positive attitude about MIE than writing. Motivation, especially with lower ability [for example: pupil] puts his hand up all the time, comes out with good answers and takes part. People listen to his opinions, boosts esteem and confidence. [He] can't give a wrong answer. More able pupils are being challenged by it but it is all really supportive of each other.*

The level of motivation, teamwork and ICT skills was remarked upon by all teachers, with some recognising that some pupils had greater ability than teachers in this last area. None of the teachers viewed this as a threat but were prepared to engage in what they saw as a new and exciting learning environment. Several teachers reported that, as a result of group work in MIE, pupils were now much more willing to take part in group work generally and to listen to each other's ideas.

In particular, teachers reported a significant increase in the quality of discussion. There was an appreciation that moving image as a '*creative medium, stimulates their thinking*' resulting in quality ideas being taken into discussion. Whilst some teachers reported an improvement in writing within the MIE context, there was still uncertainty regarding the impact on writing tasks not related to MIE

Perhaps the most encouraging response in the first round of interviews was the number of teachers' perceptions that MIE had a greater impact on the motivation, attitude and attainment of pupils who may have required additional support for their learning. By the second round of interviews, the perceived impact was highly significant for all pupils.

Similarly, all teachers reported a positive response by pupils to the input from the Lead Practitioner. All pupils were reported as being enthusiastic about MIE and looking forward to MIE lessons. Whilst one teacher reported MIE lessons as a good opportunity to '*enjoy his input [and] good to sit back and watch and listen...*' others expressed a measure of apprehension regarding the amount of preparation that would need to go into their own MIE lessons, their own ability to sustain the level of enthusiasm displayed by the Lead Practitioner, and the amount of work they already had to do in preparation and follow-up work for MIE sessions.

Teachers' reactions to questions regarding whether or not pupils had noticed any improvement in themselves was mixed. Most were uncertain as to whether or not pupils were more aware of their own progress. A few teachers reported that pupils were possibly more aware but how far this could be attributed to MIE or some of the other initiatives running in the cluster was uncertain. Finally, a small number of teachers reported that either individuals were noticing their own improvement or that other pupils in the class had expressed awareness that their peers were participating more.

### **Impact and change in teaching and learning skills, especially in the development of literacy**

The majority of teachers reported at the first round of interviews that they had begun to make some changes to their teaching. The nature of change included functional developments such as planning. For example, one teacher reported that '*the whole structure of the writing programme has been adapted to fit in*'. Other teachers reported a change in teaching style with one suggesting that she had '*tried to follow up ..... lessons in his style...*' whilst another summed up her response to MIE input as:

*I listen more and listen longer. I give kids more thinking and discussion time. I am more flexible.*

Only two teachers were unable at that point to indicate specific changes in teaching and learning styles, although both mentioned a positive impact on collaborative learning and group work which were already features of learning in their schools.

At the first round of interviews, all teachers were aware of a significant impact of MIE on pupils' listening and talking skills but were as yet uncertain regarding reading and writing. However, by the second round of interviews, teachers reported significant developments in writing skills. As one teacher put it:

*The pupils can tell me about different genres of writing. The less able can work to a framework and are more confident. They are writing and discussing more than before.*

The above comment applied to a P7 class that had begun MIE in P6. Another teacher indicated that she had completely changed her approach to teaching literacy, shifting from book-based learning to MIE

The majority of teachers reported that they responded to MIE by encouraging a more creative style of learning. In the first round of interviews, some teachers were uncertain if MIE supported more creative learning but by the second round, the perception that it does was unanimous. Examples of more creative learning ranged from greater flexibility and openness:

*Teamwork and discussion... before it was sitting down and writing, but is now more open to different ways of working...*

to more specific changes in practice such as making 'more use of pictures and images with writing' and a 'young inventors' group being set up in another school.

When teachers and headteachers were asked for suggestions for improvement in the design and delivery of MIE, the overwhelming response was that there should be more coherence in the writing tasks. By the time of the second round of interviews, this matter had been discussed by the cluster and writing was done in blocks of, for example, functional and imaginative writing. Otherwise, teachers and headteachers were pleased with the programme as it stood and any suggestions related largely to organisational matters.

All teachers in the first round of interviews felt that they had been or were being adequately prepared for MIE. The usefulness of the training days and availability of MIE staff were cited as being of particular benefit. Only one headteacher felt that the teachers had not been adequately prepared regarding the longer term aspects of the initiative but the same headteacher felt that this situation would improve as teachers had been vociferous about this.

There was also a general enthusiasm among teachers regarding sustainability of the programme. A typical response to the question regarding sustainability was:

*Very much so. Children never get tired of it. There are so many different opportunities; filming, animation etc. Once it settles down it could be quite demanding for teachers but they will manage it.*

All teachers also reported that the success they had experienced with MIE need not be unique to either Angus Council or the particular cluster and that all schools could benefit from the advances in teaching, learning and attainment that it brings. This response was significantly reinforced at the second round of interviews.

## Reflection

Overwhelmingly, the main strengths of the MIE programme as reported by teachers at the first round of interviews were its relevance to pupils' experience outside school, the impact it has had on collaborative learning, and the increase in confidence, mutual respect and its impact on talking and listening. One headteacher summed up teachers' responses as:

*Motivating, stimulating and refreshing approach. A tool that has had a positive effect within the school. Skills learned will stand them in good stead – listening and talking have really taken off. Children who would not normally volunteer are now right in there waiting to discuss and contribute.*

By the second round of interviews, this response was extended to include improvements in writing.

Issues concerning any shortcomings of the programme related to the amount of time that it takes and how it would fit into the curriculum. Again, by the second round of interviews, this was no longer an issue as teachers had extended the use of MIE into other topic and subject areas and for some, it had become a newer way of teaching and learning other aspects of the curriculum.

### 3.3 Observation of MIE lessons

There were two observation periods in each of the six primary schools. The first of these took place in the Spring of 2005. The sessions observed on this occasion represented the first experiences of MIE for both pupils and their teachers.

The second included classes and teachers who were undertaking their first experience of MIE and, in addition, those who were now into the second phase of MIE where the class teacher had a shared responsibility for each MIE session. The following presents the findings from these observations.

#### General Observations

On both periods of observation, the majority of lessons were led by the Lead Practitioner and could most appropriately be described as whole-class interactive in nature, especially in the first set of observations. This method appeared entirely appropriate as these lessons represented teachers' and pupils' first experience of MIE and the Lead Practitioner acted as both teacher and mentor. The prime focus of work during the first set of observations was visual literacy, especially at the level of narrative. However, there had obviously been a considerable degree of prior collaboration between the Lead Practitioner and class teachers to find ways in which to address the literacy requirements of the curriculum. On these occasions, there was a clear sense among teachers that MIE provided a context for listening and talking but there was less certainty about reading and writing. Indeed, whilst the listening and talking observed was highly impressive (see below), the amount and quality of written work did not reach the same high quality.

During the second set of observations, however, there appeared to be a more equal emphasis on both visual and traditional literacies, both in terms of the areas explored verbally and in the tasks set for pupils. For example, in this second round of observations, there was sufficiently greater flexibility to allow for exploration of pupils' ideas and for the introduction of new material in response to the pupils' interests. More explicit links were made between visual literacy and literacy in language. For example, in a number of classes the Lead Practitioner

introduced discussion on ‘the three Cs and three Ss’ and explored the connections between these in film and adjectives in written and verbal texts. In addition, the pedagogical emphasis during these observations was more interactive than teacher led. There also appeared to be a better time balance among talking, listening and written work and more coherence between the MIE context and the writing tasks. This was in great part due to collaboration between the Lead Practitioner and teachers that resulted in different types of writing task (for example, functional writing, imaginative writing) being set as coherent sets rather than mixed throughout the MIE programme.

### **Observation of pupils**

Throughout both sets of observations, the vast majority of pupils appeared enthusiastic, attentive and engaged with MIE. The pupils obviously enjoyed MIE sessions and several commented that they would not, under any circumstances, want to miss them. During the first round of observations, most pupils displayed a high level of understanding of moving image texts, especially the construction and function of narrative. In sessions involving the analysis of moving image texts, some pupils also displayed a measure of emotional literacy and an understanding of MIE concepts beyond the immediate context but these tended to be the exception.

Whilst engaged in practical tasks such as animation or the use of Garage Band for audio-tracking, pupils were again fully involved, enthusiastic and inventive. Whilst the nature of the MIE tasks themselves was set, the majority, if not all, ideas on how they should be developed appeared to emerge from pupils’ thinking in discussion with the Lead Practitioner and class teachers. All pupils took part in these practical tasks and displayed high levels of imagination and invention. Even when their ideas and suggestions were impractical or tended to move out of the context of the task, they were not overly disappointed to be ‘corrected’ and instead of feeling that they had ‘got it wrong’, preferred to look for new suggestions more appropriate to the task.

The second round of observations revealed a significant shift in the depth of pupil engagement with all aspects of MIE, visual literacy, emotional literacy and literacy in language, including pupils in those classes having their first experience of MIE. Only a small number of pupils appeared not to be fully engaged at any one time, especially during analysis and writing tasks.

Those pupils who did engage, did so with enthusiasm, curiosity and imagination. They expressed their thoughts and ideas and explored them to the full. Individual ideas were supported, challenged and probed further by other pupils as well as the Lead Practitioner, teachers and other adults in the room. As well as individual learning and exploration, a sense of group learning also emerged. Throughout, the pupils displayed a high level of visual literacy. Indeed, in one class, one pupil was able to predict accurately the remainder of the film, even recognising where the director was trying to catch the audience’s sympathy, and the device used to do so. Throughout analysis lessons the pupils were encouraged to analyse, speculate, and predict, but always they justified their contributions with something they had seen or heard in the film. Moreover, in particular with classes for whom this was their second experience of MIE the level of discussion went beyond narrative, and aspects of visual literacy such as the creation and changes of mood were explored. Significantly, pupils were prepared to make ‘mistakes’ as these were not considered as ‘failures’ but were viewed as learning opportunities by pupils, teachers and the Lead Practitioner.

This was also the case in practical lessons such as the use of Garage Band. The pupils generated their own ideas for soundtrack and explored them as fully as they could. Where a suggestion was tried and rejected, there was no sense of failure either of the individual or the group. Rather, there was a realization that the suggestion somehow did not quite work and

required alteration. Whilst there was a degree of trial and error about this process, it was kept to a minimum through deep discussion of mood and sound among the groups. Once again, a sense of group learning in which a common sense of the task was generated leading to a collective competence that is greater than the sum of individual ability could be seen to emerge. One observation that may be worthy of further exploration is that in the larger schools discussion tended to be dominated by pupils who were obviously more able in this area and in rural schools discussions tended to be dominated by older pupils.

During writing tasks, however, the level of engagement observed by the evaluation team was varied. Some of the more able pupils worked quietly and steadily on their own whilst others requested help from the adults in the room. However, collaborative writing tasks appeared to provide a context in which all pupils were equally engaged and in which everyone's contributions were valued and there was little or no sense of failure or poor performance. Indeed, the standard of written work observed during the second round of observations in those schools that had already experienced one year of MIE was very impressive.

### **Observation of teaching**

Perhaps one of the most significant differences observed between the two rounds concerned a shift in teacher involvement. There were two aspects to this shift, namely a pedagogical development in the Lead Practitioner's approach and, secondly, greater teacher involvement in comparison with the first round of observations.

Whilst in the first round of observations pedagogy could be described as largely task or product focused, the emphasis in the second observations was on process. For example, all pupil contributions were treated with respect and explored. Whereas in the first round of observations there would have been a tendency for the Lead Practitioner to suggest that an idea may not be quite appropriate, pupils were now encouraged by the same the Lead Practitioner and their teachers to explore the suggestion more deeply and decide for themselves on the appropriateness of the idea. Similarly, when pupils asked questions they were encouraged by the Lead Practitioner and teachers to generate possible answers for themselves. The generation of pupils' ideas was encouraged through questioning thereby creating a context in which the pupils were active participants in their own learning throughout the lesson. Moreover, rather than the Lead Practitioner making explicit links between visual and language literacies, pupils were assisted in making these links for themselves through a series of thoughtful process questions posed by the Lead Practitioner or a teacher. This represented a significant shift in pedagogy away from the teacher expert model in which pupils are largely passive learners towards discovery learning in which the teacher acts as mediator, simultaneously supporting learning for those who may be struggling in the immediate context, whilst stretching the learning of pupils displaying a high level of ability at that time.

During individual writing tasks, however, the focus on the task appeared to offer less opportunity for teachers to teach in a mediational style. Teachers' and the Lead Practitioner's attention appeared to be drawn to more able pupils who had the majority of ideas and suggestions and made greater demands on teacher time. Consequently, some pupils who appeared to be struggling would sit for some time without writing or putting their hands up to attract the teacher's attention.

Throughout the second round of observations, class teachers and classroom assistants were more involved in the whole-class sessions than had been the case in the first round. On the first observations a number of teachers had been fully involved in the practical sessions (even revelling in the fact that the pupils often knew more than themselves) but they were matched by an equal or greater number of teachers who, quite naturally and understandably, were more cautious. This was especially the case in the analysis aspect of MIE lessons. In the second

set of observations, however, all teachers, including those undertaking MIE for the first time, appeared to be more involved and more confident throughout.

### 3.4 Pupil Perspectives

The evaluation team conducted pupil focus groups during May 2005 in the six participating primary schools. Nine focus groups involving a total of 55 pupils ranging from Primary 4 -7 were set up and covered a number of broad themes for discussion detailed below.

#### Initial Responses to MIE

The overall response from pupils was very positive with answers such as *everything* and *the whole thing* given to questions regarding what they considered to be enjoyable about MIE. Most of the pupils told the evaluation team that they had fun during MIE. More specifically, the pupils enjoyed making characters for their own films, animating, watching film clips, storyboarding scenes, working with cameras, using the I-MAC computers and writing diaries. In addition, some of the older pupils were aware that they were learning as well as having fun and could see the connection between film and literacy, believing that their imagination, language and writing skills had improved. One Primary 7 boy stated that, *'I've enjoyed the different way of learning, not basic way of copying out of a textbook, you can see what is happening'*. All pupils involved in the focus groups had enjoyed the MIE lessons to some degree.

In one group, none of the pupils had any negative comments to make, while in another three groups only one pupil felt that there were any aspects of the lessons that they did not like. The less favourable points cited were that one of the films was quite boring, standing in the cold at a film location and a Primary 5 boy who felt that making their own film was difficult. Across the other groups, four pupils felt that there was too much writing involved in the lessons. One pupil complained about not getting to see the tragedy scene in the film 'Misa Mi', while two pupils from another group felt that storyboarding was a bit boring and working in groups was frustrating because ideas were sometimes ignored. This dissatisfaction with group work was reiterated by a Primary 6 boy from a different school who felt that the Lead Practitioner *'only goes with the majority view, everyone should get to choose, put all ideas into a hat then choose. He should pick people who are bad so they can learn'*. Despite these complaints, it is worth noting that only 11 pupils out of a total of 55 who participated in the focus groups voiced any concerns.

The pupils were able to inform the evaluation team about the nature of MIE lessons. The groups were all at different stages in the programme, some had almost finished making their own film and were at the editing stage of the process, while others had only recently started putting together animated sequences and soundtracks to their films. All groups had watched film clips, discussed the characters in the films and their feelings, made diary entries from the point of view of either the girl in 'Misa Mi' or the wolf in one of the scenes, storyboarded a scene and written a script.

Only three pupils felt that there was too much writing involved in the programme and these were pupils who did not like writing in any lessons. Most of the other pupils preferred the written work in MIE lessons to other classes. One girl summed up this view by stating that *it's better, you can use your imagination rather than writing down exact stuff like what I did on holiday* while another pupil thought that watching the film clips helped her to start writing. One Primary 6 pupil felt that they had not done enough written work.

## Initial Impact

Opinion was divided on the subject of the way they watched films on TV; some pupils did not think that they watched films any differently as a result of their involvement in MIE, while others did but only if it was a boring programme. One girl commented '*I sometimes look at extended close ups and long shots, but if it is a good programme I don't, it would just spoil a good programme*'. The pupils who do watch film differently now commented on their awareness of how much hard work goes into a film, their ability to tell the difference between animation and live action, the number and style of shots used in a scene- '*look mum, a long shot, a close up!*' and how they try to figure out the storyline in a film more than before. A Primary 6 boy talked about how he now watches the special features on a DVD to see how scenes were made and how real actors and animation were mixed. Some pupils believed that they increasingly enjoyed watching films because they were now more aware of what was happening due to MIE.

Most of the pupils felt that their I.C.T. skills had improved as a result of their involvement in the programme. New skills such as using paper cut animation and the Garage Band soundtrack programme had been gained, as well as the ability to edit films. The I-MAC computers, which had been provided by the MIE team, were regarded as being superior to both the existing computers in their schools and in their homes.

Some of the pupils had not yet used computers in their MIE lessons. The majority of pupils who had access to computers and the Internet at home used computers solely to play games. Only one group reported that they used computers in conjunction with their school work (for a project on the Victorians). None of the pupils used the Internet to research films although in one group it was mentioned, '*[the Lead Practitioner] sometimes tells us to look at websites*'. One Primary 7 boy searched the Internet to find out if any of the films shown in MIE lessons were available.

All of the pupils mentioned that they had friends in the school. As the same classes for MIE were used as all other classes in their schools, the pupils had not made any new friends as a result of MIE lessons. Some pupils added that paired work was always with the same person and there were instances where pupils fell out due to partners forcing their opinions on them.

MIE appeared to be making a positive impact on pupils' attitudes to school. Pupils reported that they were going to bed earlier and getting up earlier for the days when they had MIE classes. There was a widespread feeling that school was more fun because of MIE and that the pupils looked forward to going to school more on these days. One girl felt that the day passed quicker when they received MIE, while another added that he told his parents more about his day at school '*rather than just answering 'fine'*'. In one group the pupils stated that they all liked school more due to MIE while another group reported that they did not think any differently about school.

Pupils in one of the groups informed the evaluation team that their class teacher became excited about MIE lessons, particularly animating and soundtracking. They felt that she was more fun during MIE lessons but added that she was '*a good teacher anyway*'. This feeling was shared in other groups where pupils sensed that their class teachers enjoyed being involved in the programme and had fun with the pupils. One pupil commented: '*everybody is more relaxed in class including the teacher when we do MIE*'. In another group the pupils had not noticed any difference in their class teacher as a result of involvement in the programme stating: '*she is a good enough teacher as she is*'.

Opinion was divided amongst the pupils regarding their ability to work better in groups as a result of their involvement in MIE. In five of the groups there was unanimous agreement that

working in groups had improved and that it was their preferred way of working. A Primary 7 pupil commented: *your own idea is not always the best, in a group you can step back and see the wider picture*. Others agreed: *I had some good ideas but someone else had amazing ideas so I was happy to use theirs*. Some pupils were aware that working together in groups had helped shy classmates with their discussion skills and confidence. Other groups experienced some degree of difficulty with group work, with occasional arguments which were resolved in some groups but not in others. As a result, a minority of pupils preferred working on their own rather than in a group as they felt that others ignored their ideas.

### Getting on at school

The majority of pupils reported that they were progressing at school while others felt that they were doing *o.k.* A Primary 6 girl who mentioned that she was frequently getting into fights with boys provided the only negative comment. The pupils' parents were reportedly happy with their children's progress and were showing an interest in the MIE programme. One girl's father played the part of a Pict in the pupil's film, while others put their films onto a DVD for their parents.

Subjects most frequently mentioned as being hardest were: Maths, Writing, Spelling, Reading, French, German, Music and Art, whilst subjects identified as easiest were Maths, Writing, Reading, Science, History, Art, PE and RME.

The overwhelming majority of pupils felt that there should be more MIE mainly because they enjoyed it, but also because they perceived that it helped with writing, imagination, spelling and confidence. A minority of pupils were happy with the current amount of lessons but would have liked more providing it did not clash with after-school clubs or subjects like Art and Music.

### 3.5 MIE staff perspectives

All MIE staff reported that the main long-term purpose of MIE was to address literacy by raising standards. It was assumed that none of the schools had previously considered using moving image as part of their language curriculum. There were felt to be particular aspects of literacy in the 21<sup>st</sup> century that pertained to moving images and that it was important for young people, in order to be fully literate, to engage with them. For instance, one participant argued that:

*Moving Image and sound is a complex language and the dominant global form of communication. We are not literate in moving image and sound, although many think they are because it presents as obvious and transparent. There is a cultural element of the richness of moving image media as heritage. This point is often missed as teachers try to get behind the mendacious methods of the media that tries to persuade young people to buy junk music, junk food etc but this is to ignore the richness of more than 100 years of moving image history.*

The role and place of MIE within this aim is as an effective classroom tool. It is not an 'add-on' or a separate subject. Responses from MIE staff indicate that they conceived the programme as a vehicle for improving literacy rather than teaching film and film making. The Lead Practitioner felt that the programme/approach was easy to use and had in-built language tools from which teachers and pupils could benefit. In particular, the Lead Practitioner felt that pupils who were previously disengaged from schooling would respond positively to MIE because of the familiar and popular nature of the medium, the exciting nature of the project,

and the use of technology. Much of this optimism was founded on evidence from the workshops and the Lead Practitioner felt that this has been confirmed in the project.

In the opinion of some MIE staff, standards of literacy were already high enough and that the reasons for introduction of the programme were not based on notions of underachievement. Rather, MIE was seen as being at the *cutting edge of something that is happening in Primary teaching in Scotland*. MIE staff expressed a sense that the programme was at the start of a development that would lead to a change in practice nationally:

*MIE is about engagement, immersion, problem-solving, divergent thinking in a realistic context. At present the balance too biased towards skills. MIE presents a major challenge for conventional schooling.*

MIE staff reported that they considered the teachers who were delivering MIE to be adept at adopting the programme to their own purposes, teaching styles, and classes. Consequently, the 9 teachers involved were perceived to be delivering the programme in different ways and developing their own strategies for teaching MIE. The aspirations of MIE staff were expressed succinctly by one participant as:

*I hope it will change the ways we encourage and allow children to learn. We patronise kids in how to do things – little understanding and engagement. We need more ‘carrots’ – but we must expect to get hurt at times.*

At this stage of the project, MIE staff had provided two training days, and in-class support for teachers involved in the project. As far as MIE staff could gauge, teachers' responses, whilst mixed, were largely positive. They felt that teachers saw value in the programme, especially in pupils' responses, but that some had concerns, for example regarding the labour and time intensiveness of animation.

The Lead Practitioner was clear that pupils have responded positively to the programme. A number of MIE staff were able to give examples of pupils' responses, including one who disliked being removed from MIE classes, another who did not want to be excluded on the day that his class was timetabled for MIE, and a third who had been reluctant to write but who: *now understands why he has to. It makes sense*. At least one member of MIE staff, however, was of the opinion that, at this stage, pupils generally did not like the writing tasks involved in MIE.

Impact and change in teaching and learning skills, especially the development of literacy.

All MIE staff reported a significant impact in teaching and learning skills. This has been a gradual process over the period of the project, and the degree and pace of change varied among teachers. Although MIE staff felt that all teachers involved had embraced the project, some had *genuine concerns* and remain unconvinced. On the other hand, two members of MIE staff reported that in one school, the headteacher had changed the language plan for the year and that [the headteacher] *has taken forward the deconstruction of MIE texts/films, adopted postmodernist perspective in a pedagogical context*.

Those MIE staff who had closest contact with schools, were able to report that pupils had responded well to the teaching style used in MIE, producing better work, using the language of literacy (traditional as well as moving image), and generally becoming more involved in the class. In feedback from teachers on training days and from contact with pupils on various occasions, MIE staff were convinced of improved ICT skills and teamwork among pupils.

## Improvements in pupil attitude and behaviour

In addition to having an impact on teaching and learning skills, those MIE staff who had closest involvement with pupils reported improved interpersonal skills among pupils:

*I've heard pupils praising other pupils... increased collaboration.  
For animation, a class chose characters; they decided on one to be  
used in the film. [Another member of MIE staff] was amazed at how  
well behaved and respectful they are...*

Whilst these same members of MIE staff were able to report enthusiasm among pupils for MIE, they were unable to comment on improved enthusiasm for or attitude towards other areas of the curriculum.

## MIE staff perceptions

MIE staff views on preparation, improvement and sustainability ranged from the conceptual to the highly practical. At one level, there was a view that sustainability lay in the commitment and attitude of the local authority and teachers. If the authority's education officers and a critical mass of teachers were convinced that the project was worthwhile, then resourcing and development would follow. This would hold true for sustainability of MIE in any of Scotland's schools.

For others, sustainability was a matter of organising training days and how the project operated in schools in response to teachers' requests and demands: of making MIE do what they wanted it to do, when they wanted to do it. An example of this was the schedule for delivery of writing in session 2005-2006.

All MIE staff felt that teachers had been adequately prepared to deliver the programme. In addition to the training days, teaching had been modelled in schools by the Lead Practitioner on a regular, timetabled basis. MIE staff reported that some teachers had initial reservations as they did not consider themselves to be experts but they had become more comfortable towards the end of the training and as a result of the Lead Practitioner working in schools.

## Reflection

Among MIE staff, the major strengths of the project so far were its ability to engage pupils' and teachers' imagination, especially those who would otherwise be seen as disengaged, the efficacy of the programme, and the opportunities it presented to develop teaching and learning in innovative and exciting ways:

*It's an alternative pedagogical model that engages kids in exciting  
activities that make school fun, by engaging them in a glamorous  
aspect of the real world. Kids learn without them knowing that they  
are learning – not necessarily through MIE – there are other methods.*

The provision of in-class support and professional development was also seen by MIE staff as a significant strength of the particular model of implementation of MIE.

Perceived drawbacks among MIE staff were the resource-intensive nature of the project (in terms of both personnel and equipment) and the need for ongoing CPD and other professional support.

### 3.6 Local authority perspectives

Local authority staff shared the view of MIE staff that the MIE project had its origins in collaborative working between ADMC and Angus Council and that the idea of applying for SEED/FLaT funding came from MIE staff. Specifically, Quality Improvement and the link between ADMC and the High School cluster were cited as reasons for the location of the project. Angus Council staff served on the Board, monitored the project, and provided financial and other resources for the project. Communications were by the local authorities standard processes, including school development plans, Quality Assurance reports and headteacher reviews.

Local Authority staff reported 3 clear purposes for the project. The first of these was to address literacy, secondly to introduce pupils to ICT and its application to moving images, and thirdly to link with the *Curriculum for Excellence* especially in the development of teaching and learning in all areas:

*The key thing is – tying it with Curriculum for Excellence – challenge and enjoyment. It allows us to engage pupils more meaningfully in the education process. It helps pupils to see the relevance of the curriculum. It puts literacy in the context of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.*

From pilot studies and the work of MIE staff, the local authority saw MIE as worthy of investment as they felt it would motivate pupils, engender enthusiasm for MIE and school generally, and have an impact on the teaching and learning of language. Consequently, in the longer term, local authority staff expected to see improvements in literacy and other areas of the curriculum:

*If just a 4-year initiative it will have failed. More specifically I want to see the MIE cohorts demonstrating that they are more engaged and better prepared for work. I also expect to see an impact on 5-14 attainment indirectly and eventually on SQA data.*

Local authority staff were very positive about teachers' responses to the programme. It was acknowledged that some teachers had misgivings in the beginning but their fears had been relieved. In particular, the presence of support in classes provided by the Lead Practitioner was reported as an aspect of the project to which teachers had responded very positively. Significantly, local authority staff reported that teachers were now convinced of the value and efficacy of MIE as a pedagogical initiative:

*The scepticism disappeared quite quickly as it was recognised that MIE can fit into the school's curriculum plans. It is seen as an alternative to existing practice with the same learning outcomes.*

Impact and change in teaching and learning skills, especially the development of literacy

At the time of questioning, local authority staff were unable to state whether or not there had been a significant impact on teaching and learning skills. They felt that teachers were still heavily dependent on input from the Lead Practitioner and that it was too early to judge the impact on practice in schools. Local authority staff recognised that in order for changes in teaching and learning to develop effectively, it was important that teachers took ownership of the project and did not become too dependent on the Lead Practitioner.

In addition, local authority staff were able to report having observed a positive response from pupils. Teamwork, confidence, and understanding of how to use equipment were cited as evidence.

Local authority staff considered that preparation for the project had been thorough and effective. Schools had been briefed prior to the project commencing and this was thought to have been an effective introduction to the MIE. Thereafter, management of the project was delegated to MIE staff.

In addition, Angus Council supplied some equipment for the project and also cover to allow teachers involved in the project to attend training.

The major strength of the project from a local authority perspective, was the involvement and enjoyment of teachers and pupils alike:

*So far it's engaged 100% of the pupils and 100% of the staff. This is my perception. This is a huge difference from most initiatives of this kind.*

The enthusiasm of pupils and their engagement with work were seen as important outcomes of the project. In addition, local authority staff felt that it had been important for teachers to be involved in an exciting project.

Crucially, local authority staff reported that sustainability had to be addressed. They repeated the importance of teachers taking ownership of and developing the project in their schools. Extending the project to schools outside the project would require a level of expertise such as that currently being developed in the project in order to get it off the ground:

*It is a matter of tactics – take it to other cluster groups – the trick would be how to use the existing trained teachers/mentoring buddies in schools just starting MIE.*

### **3.7 Summary of the findings at the end of Year 1**

The main findings as they emerged from the evaluation at the end of Year 1 can be summarised as follows:

- response to the MIE project has been overwhelmingly positive;
- the project appears to have had an immediate impact on some aspect of traditional literacy, namely listening and talking;
- the project has the potential to extend traditional definitions of literacy to include some emphasis on visual and media literacy;
- the project presents opportunities for addressing teaching and learning in new and innovative ways;
- sustainability of the project is dependent on a number of factors, including support from MIE staff, teacher ownership of the project, the involvement of a critical mass of teachers, and local authority decisions.

## CHAPTER 4 : FINDINGS - YEAR 2 (2005-2006)

### 4.1 Introduction

This chapter reports the findings of the research team following the second phase of the evaluation. In May 2006, the team conducted focus groups of pupils in all six participating schools, thereby allowing the pupils involved to confirm or challenge our findings from Year 1 and to add their own voices to the evaluation. In addition, a series of interviews were conducted with teachers, headteachers and MIE staff, and their views, as reported to the research team, are presented below. At this point, MIE had been part of the curriculum for almost two academic years

### 4.2 Staff Perspectives

Eight class teachers were interviewed. For four of these teachers (including one probationer and one support teacher) this was their first year of teaching MIE. Four headteachers, three of whom had teaching responsibilities, were also interviewed.

All teachers and headteachers understood that the principle aim of the project was to improve standards of literacy across the board, encompassing reading, writing, listening and talking. One teacher said the aim was *to get more children writing* while another stated that it was *to encourage reading of books especially for boys and [to] improve levels of writing*.

There was unanimous agreement that literacy needed to be addressed in terms of pupils' levels of literacy, their levels of engagement with literacy and the ways in which literacy is presented to them.

All teachers responded very positively to the input of the Lead Practitioner. Teachers' commented that they found training days at the ADMC practical and engaging and that the enthusiasm of the Lead Practitioner was infectious. The input of the Lead Practitioner in the classroom was also welcomed, particularly in terms of his enthusiasm and the time spent with both pupils and staff members in lunch times and after school. The following response was typical: *[The] input is amazing*.

According to all teachers interviewed, pupils also responded well to MIE and to lessons led by the Lead Practitioner. Teachers and headteachers remarked on the rapport that the Lead Practitioner had with the children from the outset. However, one commented that whilst the children responded well to the coordinator, she could not be sure if they would react similarly with another teacher or herself. On the other hand, one teacher who had been involved with MIE lessons for two years mentioned that she was more confident than before and that MIE staff were, as far as she was concerned, principally there for technical support:

*This year I've had more ownership over the activities and I don't really need him to do MIE.*

All teachers reported improvements in pupils' attitude, motivation, self-esteem and their standard of work in language. There was agreement that the majority of pupils were now more willing to write and offer their ideas in class discussions. Some of the greatest improvements were among those pupils who previously had been considered 'poorer' at language work.

*I've had the same class for two years; five pupils are dyslexic. It is quite a poor class academically. It has raised their self-esteem, one girl wouldn't put her hand up and answer anything; during MIE you can't shut her up!*

In terms of attitude there were also improvements. One teacher said pupils were very enthusiastic about their film while another added that it helped boys most specifically. She indicated that some pupils did consider that they were undertaking language work. She also felt that MIE was engaging and helpful for girls who might otherwise struggle with language work.

Confidence has also grown: the pupils were described as being much more confident, especially when using computers. The headteachers also confirmed that there had been improvement across the board:

*Yes to all, some children used to be quiet, now they are openly confident. The less able academically are blooming due to the creative side, making backdrops, animating and using cameras and garage band. One p6 has SEN and he's getting a lot out of it. It has also helped previously bossy types as they have to work as part of a team.*

A more difficult question for teachers to answer was whether or not the pupils had noticed improvements in their own and their classmates attitude, self esteem, and behaviour. Some commented on improvements that they had noticed in terms of ability and increased confidence, but were less certain concerning the extent to which pupils may have noticed this in themselves and each other. One teacher, though, thought that MIE in conjunction with critical skills and the emotional intelligence work that had been undertaken had enabled pupils to recognise improvements in themselves and their classmates: She reported that some pupils were able to express feeling of having made a worthwhile contribution or, alternatively, of possibly letting the class down. The majority, however, remained unsure:

*I don't know, some are more aware than others; it would be interesting to ask them that question. I think they probably would. The MIE policy of no wrong answers has been really good for shy pupils. They do talk about it, whether they analyse it the way we do I'm not so sure, to realise the impact and make links is difficult and may take time.*

Responses to questions regarding changes in learning and teaching, especially in the domain of literacy, were again mixed. Some teachers, particularly those who were in their first year of delivering MIE felt that it was too soon to make significant changes: Two teachers had placed less focus on class reading, listening and talking as MIE covers this. A further two teachers commented that they now used film and video clips in other areas of the curriculum to aid their teaching, particularly in Drama.

One teacher was cautious, indicating that she had refined her practice rather than introducing anything new. In particular, she mentioned her increased awareness of the value of visual images and how they can *spark ideas and generate great discussions*. By contrast two teachers wholeheartedly embraced MIE as the way to teach pupils writing skills: one said *I've changed completely for writing; MIE is the only way to get them to improve*, while the other stated that *I've changed strategy on writing; I give more positive feedback rather than highlighting errors*.

Where teachers made changes to their teaching methods, pupils responded positively. Teachers reported that changes had allowed poor readers to talk better about their understanding of texts, which, in turn, had resulted in increased confidence.

Significantly for the aspirations of the project, most teachers believed that pupils' literacy skills had improved as a result of participation in MIE. Listening and talking, in particular, had improved as had writing. One reason given of the perceived improvement was the benefit of having specific and meaningful purposes for each genre of writing such as a letter to the BBC asking for permission to use film clips, and storyboarding for their own film. In addition, the sense of purpose and the pupils' greater significance of structure that developed from their increased understanding of narrative, was particularly beneficial for average to poor writers. Three teachers, however, pointed out that the creative and imaginative side had improved, possibly to the detriment of the functional aspects of writing:

*Yes they have [improved] overall, but there's not enough time to do the technical side of language such as spelling and punctuation. There has been more emphasis on the creative side and there needs to be a balance.*

Three teachers were less sure about improvements in literacy levels as they had not taught the pupils the previous year. They did, however, report that there had been improvements in listening, talking and writing since the start of the year.

The majority of teachers expected to see improvements in levels of attainment for national reading and writing tests: Two teachers mentioned that they had stopped using the current tests for writing, as they now considered them dull, uninteresting and unnecessary. Others, however, were more cautious and whilst they could report that more able pupils were producing longer and higher quality work, they were less certain about whether or not this would be sustained and translated into higher national assessment results. Teachers commented that this was not necessarily a criticism of MIE but of the current curriculum and national testing. Nevertheless, there was a consensus that poorer pupils would move up a grade and that the better ones would achieve level E.

There was unanimous agreement that pupils' ICT skills had improved as a result of MIE in general and film making in particular. Pupils were able to use PowerPoint, web cams and other editing software..

All of the teachers agreed that pupils' ability to work in a team had also improved. Two teachers mentioned that MIE in conjunction with Critical Skills work was responsible for this improvement.

Six teachers and all four headteachers agreed that improvements had been made in attitude, communication and co-operation. They felt that pupils are now more willing to share work with their group, and that problems and issues are discussed and contested rigorously but respectfully. They reported that pupils were more patient with each other, and were now more able to make and accept others' suggestions and ideas. Two teachers were less sure about improvements in behaviour, one admitted that there were no personality clashes while the other noted that pupils were: *now working well together.*

All eight teachers and three headteachers thought that involvement in MIE would help pupils' transition from primary to high school. This was for three main reasons: group work; continuity of project and familiar faces, and coping with new situations. In addition, the teachers were pleased that the pupils will get to know other pupils through the film festival (the second one planned for the summer). One headteacher, however, remained uncertain whether the project would aid transition:

Only one teacher felt it was too early to say that pupils were developing a more creative approach to learning. The rest of the teachers agreed that this had happened, in particular with regard to pupils using more creative thinking and tapping into a fairly wild imagination. In

this connection, a positive aspect of MIE that teachers and headteachers kept returning to was the policy of no wrong answers. One teacher said that creativity is stimulated because there are no wrong answers in MIE.

*One girl this morning came up with a really obscure idea and nobody laughed; they would have done before. Students are allowed more freedom to try out their ideas.*

Opinions were mixed on how the design and delivery of MIE might be improved. Four teachers and two headteachers had no suggestions, saying *that it's fantastic the way it is and it is much better than last year*. Two headteachers felt that MIE would improve if it became more cross curricular but all teachers and headteachers agreed that staff were adequately prepared to deliver the course. The probationer felt that three days training, two on technical aspects and one on literacy were enough for her, while one of the teachers delivering MIE for the first year was cautious. Other suggestions for improvement were focused on the detail of MIE lessons and entailed the frequency of particular pieces of work and the development of pupils' MIE skills.

Teachers were asked about the sustainability and practical efficacy of the project. The most common theme here centred around availability of the MIE practitioner and the primary school teachers' confidence in teaching MIE. All four headteachers agreed that MIE would be sustainable so long as teachers were supported with technical resources and training and there was unanimous agreement among teachers and headteachers that MIE could be introduced and sustained in other schools.

In terms of management of the project within schools, headteachers reported that they provided support by releasing staff to go to the training days, with resources and timetabling headteacher support. In one school, four parents had been trained in MIE. One headteacher felt that her role was to provide support but in the background

The local authority provided support by providing supply cover for training days out of their budget rather than the school's and the support packs containing DVDs and CDs. In addition, Scottish Screen provided a member of staff two days a week to help in the nursery of one school, which again was funded by Angus Council. Staff development in relation to MIE was confined to time given to CPD although one headteacher planned to involve teachers throughout the school. Two other headteachers also planned to involve teachers from lower down the school for the forthcoming years. Finally, three headteachers reported that either HMIE or Angus Council had taken an interest in the project and shown their support to varying degrees.

For teachers, the main strength of the MIE project has been pupils' enthusiasm for writing lessons and the improved quality of written work. This was a point made by a number of teachers. In addition, teachers also believed MIE was a strong programme because it provided fun approaches to learning, encouraged the imagination of the pupils, engendered good discussions, helped the students to develop teamwork skills and fostered independence. One teacher stated this succinctly: *[MIE] Involves, engages, motivates and gives them control over their own learning*. Another remarked that: *There is nobody that doesn't like MIE*. One headteacher added *it is so much fun they don't even realise how much they are actually learning*. Another headteacher pointed to the overall positivity among staff members as the main strength of the project *even on nights out our staff talk about MIE, that's how much of a grip it's got*.

Despite its evident success, MIE was seen to have a number of shortcomings by all but one member of staff. These included not enough time to deliver it properly; the perception that it was too focused on literacy; the lack of computer equipment; the fact that there were not

enough finished pieces of work and, finally, the problem of new staff coming to the school in the future with no experience of MIE. Headteachers were more positive, however, with only one headteacher feeling that MIE had any shortcomings.

The crucial factor in sustaining MIE in the future according to the majority of teachers and headteachers related to personnel, both in school and with the Lead Practitioner. One teacher believed it was sustainable so long as some of the existing teacher skills base remained. One teacher saw the solution as a specialist teacher or teachers such as those available for PE or Drama. A headteacher agreed with the importance of the Lead Practitioner adding, *if we stopped it now the kids would absolutely slaughter us. I think it has been magic and I don't want it to stop.*

Finally, the role of management in some of the schools was mentioned by a number of teachers. Whilst most headteachers were willing for their staff to be involved in MIE, some teachers expressed reservations about their commitment:

*They need to make sure they know what's going on: they don't have a clue and don't play any part in it. All they see is a film at the end of the year. They need to be more involved and go into classrooms and see the lessons and show an interest*

#### 4.3 Pupil perspectives

Focus groups were conducted during May 2006 with pupils from the six primary schools. Sixty pupils took part, ranging from P4 in the smaller schools with composite classes to P7 in the larger schools. The majority of the pupils involved had completed almost two years of MIE. The overwhelming majority of pupils were still very positive about the project, with the exception of a few pupils in two particular groups who displayed clear signs of dissatisfaction. Similar themes were explored to those during the previous year's visit.

##### Response to MIE

Pupils gave a wide range of responses when prompted about the good aspects of MIE. The most common related to the creative aspects of filmmaking and analysis of film clips. They enjoyed learning how to make films, using the camera and making animations. Having fun in class and approaching language in a different way was mentioned by a high number of pupils as being one of the attractions of MIE.

On the downside, there were only a few complaints, and these confined to two groups. They complained that MIE can become boring and repetitive. In one school some pupils did not like the film they were making (based on a project from the previous year). The class had a vote and although most of the boys did not want to do it, the class voted in favour of the project-based film. In addition, a number of pupils wanted to do live filming rather than animation.

A small number of boys did not like writing as they sometimes found it boring, although two conceded that whilst they sometimes felt they had too much writing to do, it was, nevertheless, more fun writing for MIE. For one boy, writing for MIE appeared to be more about imagination than language:

*It's better than language work: it's like work and I don't like doing work unless it's fun work like MIE.*

The remaining pupils were quite happy about the amount of written work. One girl noted that she was more confident about writing and found starting easier. In one group, all pupils agreed that it was 'exciting' and that they really enjoyed writing stories.

A Primary 5 pupil from one of the small rural schools offered this observation:

*We make more progress each year; last year was mainly diary writing, now it's more exciting.*

When prompted about how MIE compared with last year, most pupils preferred MIE this year for a number of reasons. Everyone had at least one job to do and, consequently, pupils felt more involved this year. They also felt they were writing more stories and imaginative pieces than the previous year. Moreover, the pupils felt that the work they were doing this year was more advanced. The overall sense of competence and ownership of MIE is perhaps summed up in the comment of one pupil:

*We were being taught last year, now we just 'do'.*

Pupils' confidence grew as a result of using more advanced equipment and doing more advanced work on the computer. Pupils also welcomed being allowed to pick what kind of film they made. In many cases they preferred live filming to animation. The only dissenting voices came from one group who thought MIE was better last year as

*We'd never done it before; it was quite exciting and new  
[It's] not as much fun this year*

It should be noted that these comments may relate to some pupils not being allowed to make the film they wanted to.

### Impact

Pupils were less sure about the impact of MIE on how they watched films and television; many were non-committal while others agreed that there had been some effect. For a minority of pupils there had been no impact.

There was unanimous agreement among the pupils that their ICT skills had improved. Some pupils were now so confident with the technology that they made short movies at home on their computers. A minority of pupils, however, admitted that they only used their home computers for MSN and playing games. In one group however, pupils complained that they only got to use computers with MIE or Golden Time.

Responses to the theme of making friends were mixed: in one group no one thought that MIE had helped them to make friends and they all preferred working on their own. In other schools pupils enjoyed working in groups and felt that doing so helped them to make friends. They reported that they get on better with their friends and are more friendly to others when working in groups.

Most preferred school on MIE days as pupils look forward to MIE. The project, however, has had little impact on their attitude to school overall or to other subjects. A number of pupils recognised that their class teachers were different when they were doing MIE, reporting that they perceived their teachers to be more relaxed, more helpful, more trusting during MIE lessons. In pupils' opinions, the main contributory factors were that there were no right or wrong answers and that the teacher was a learner too:

*She is more fun... we get more praise, no wrong answers. She will normally stand and wait ages for an answer.*

*[In other areas] she uses MIE techniques, like films. We know she's learning the same things as us.*

#### Getting on at School

In response to questions regarding how they get on at schools, pupils' comments ranged from *fine* to *quite happy* to *enjoy it*. There were no major complaints from anyone. A number of pupils commented that they preferred school on MIE days and found Maths and other bookwork boring and difficult. Only two pupils (both from the same group) felt that MIE had not helped them in any other subjects. The remaining pupils felt that it had helped in Art, problem solving in Maths, ICT and language work.

Pupils also noticed improvements in their classmates:

*[Pupil] has improved a lot in writing and in tables: she used to get shouted at and told to catch up, now she makes a lot of deadlines. Her reading has improved and she has got a part of the script to read  
[Pupil] used to be really quiet, now he answers more in class  
Someone slow has improved and is now quicker than me.*

According to one of his classmates, a pupil with additional support needs :

*has improved, his language is getting a lot better; he's learning new words. It's nice that he's included in it.*

Most pupils were unsure how MIE would help them at secondary school, although some did indicate that it might have benefits for groupwork, communicating with other people and getting to know people from other schools

When prompted as to whether there should be more/less MIE, only three pupils thought there should be less MIE as they felt it was getting boring and that animating took up a lot of time. Two were unsure and one thought the present arrangements were about right. The remaining fifty four pupils wanted there to be more MIE. In addition, a number of pupils thought MIE should be extended and given to P3/4 pupils as well as those in other schools.

#### 4.4 MIE Staff Perspectives

The Lead Practitioner responsible for delivering MIE lessons in the six primary schools was interviewed in May 2006. After the second year of the project, he thought that the concept had changed in his own mind. In his opinion, the assumptions about teaching and learning underpinning the project had widened:

*What I think is it has changed i.e. literacy, it has grown considerably past that into a more holistic view of what children are and should be. [MIE] ticks a wide range of boxes: self-esteem, confidence, ICT creativity, lateral thinking. I shared the assumption that literacy needed improving.*

There were a variety of communication processes in place to let different people know what was going on in the project, including two full days training per session, attended by teachers, parent helpers, support for learning staff and classroom assistants. Planning meetings

including 'twilights' have also been held with teachers where there are opportunities to discuss what works and what doesn't work. In addition, the head of the cluster is on the Project Advisory Board allowing her to disseminate through the ranks.

Teachers monitor progress of the project through formative assessment, and feedback about the input from the Lead Practitioner was given by means of evaluation summaries where everything had been acted upon. The responses from the teachers were both positive and negative, with some teachers enthusiastic about the possibilities MIE offers for learning and teaching and others not seeing the value of it all as a teaching context. Notwithstanding the above, the Lead Practitioner reported that twelve out of fourteen teachers had changed their strategies for teaching literacy skills as a result of their participation in the project and there was an awareness that some teachers had changed their teaching in other curricular areas.

The pupils, however, were universally positive about the input from the Lead Practitioner in the opinion of the practitioner. The Lead Practitioner also reported that he perceived that pupils had responded positively to changes made by teachers and that ICT skills and teamwork had improved. Most significantly, though, he argued that there had been marked improvements in literacy:

*Talking and listening has gone through the roof: they listen more to each other to respond to each other. Writing has had a mixed response, depending on who you talk to. New teachers have no benchmark but are still seeing improvements.*

Improvements in pupil attitude and behaviour.

The Lead Practitioner was more tentative on the question of whether pupils had displayed better communication, co-operation and behaviour at school as a result of their involvement in the initiative. Moreover, a more creative approach to learning had probably not yet been developed by the pupils although some teachers had given the Lead Practitioner anecdotal evidence that a number of pupils had developed the skill to write less and more succinctly.

Lead Practitioner perspectives

The Lead Practitioner considered that the pack of materials produced for teachers required modification. The Lead Practitioner did not think that all of the teachers felt that they were adequately prepared to deliver the course, mainly due to the creative and technological side of the project, but he did consider that the project was sustainable, practical and capable of being similarly received in any school in Scotland.

Reflection

In his opinion, the project had a number of strengths, principally the ownership that teachers have over it, the impact it has on children and giving learning back to them. In his opinion children are valued within the MIE context, are on a level playing field with each other and the project is empowering them. The Lead Practitioner did concede however that the project had some shortcomings, mostly related to the demands on time made by the creative side.

In terms of sustaining and developing MIE activities in the future, the Lead Practitioner was of the view that the chances of MIE being sustained would be greatly improved if teachers spread the word to other teachers that it could be done:

*Sustainability is based on perception: if they think they can do it, it will work. They need examples that they are not intimidated by it. Teachers need to be hands on as well. It could be part of Initial Teacher Training in teacher training institutions - put it in creativity and cross-curricular areas.*

Finally, the member of staff took the opportunity to add at the end of the interview that:

*I'm grateful that we're here. The project focuses people and makes them think.*

#### **4.5 Summary of the findings at the end of Year 2**

At the end of Year 2, the findings can be summarised as follows:

- almost all participants in the project remained very positively disposed towards MIE
- the majority of teachers were confident with the analysis part of MIE while some were still wary of the creative part
- the creative aspects of the project were time consuming and there was agreement that this needed to be restructured in the future
- teachers reported improvements in the standard of work of pupils in all areas of language
- the ICT and group working skills of pupils had greatly improved
- the role of the MIE practitioner was crucial to the future success of the project
- sustainability of the project was contingent on continued support for teachers with training and technological resources and encouragement from senior school staff
- all headteachers, teachers and the MIE practitioner agreed that the project would work well in schools throughout Scotland

## CHAPTER 5 : FINDINGS FROM YEAR 3 (2006/7)

### 5.1 Introduction

This chapter outlines the findings of the research team for the third year of the evaluation. At this stage, the first cohort of pupils who had experienced MIE in 2004, were now in S1. As in previous years of the project, the team observed MIE lessons in all participating schools. A series of interviews with teachers involved in MIE were also conducted and their views are presented below. In addition, focus groups of pupils in all participating schools took place, thereby allowing the pupils involved to confirm or challenge our observations and to add their own voices to the evaluation.

### 5.2 Staff perspectives on Year 3

In 2006/07 two series of interviews were conducted: one in the secondary school involved in the MIE project in January 2007 and the other in May 2007 in the primary schools. In all, 11 interviews were undertaken – 4 in January and 7 in May. Two teachers either new to the school or new to MIE became involved with the MIE project in the primary schools at the start of session 2006/7 and both were interviewed in May 2007.

In addition, MIE was introduced into the English Department in the secondary school at the start of session 2006/7 with the new intake into S1 that year. Although the programme began in the secondary school in August 2006, interviews with teachers in the secondary school were held over until January 2007 in order to allow time for transition of pupils from primary school to secondary school and for secondary school teachers to become familiar with MIE materials. The perspectives reported here therefore relate to the first year of MIE in the secondary school and the continuing development of MIE in the primary schools.

As a result of their initial experiences with MIE, the teachers new to MIE were generally positive regarding the value of the programme. All understood it to be related to issues of literacy, both traditional and an extended view of literacy that encompasses the visual media and moving images. Secondary teachers' views indicated that at this stage they saw MIE both in terms of its relationship to traditional literacies and as a potentially rich area of study in itself:

*To aid and abet literacy, push it on and make it better and more interesting. Increase literacy in S1, S2 and primary school.*

*It is designed to improve literacy, including media literacy and to develop that into the curriculum. New literacies need to be adopted much more, tap into where the pupils' interests lie and improve traditional literacy.*

Moreover, teachers saw MIE as having a value as a learning tool in its own right. They particularly commented on their experiences of young people being enthusiastic and motivated and hypothesised that analysing visual texts would help pupils to analyse written texts. Teachers' comments also indicated greater collaboration in learning among pupils. In all, the impact on teachers of working with MIE was to generate enthusiasm:

*It has given us another tool in order to teach...literacy is too vague...it helps us to assess how we teach the skills of English on a couple of different levels and to teach to an outcome (diaries etc.) or other skills which make up*

*literacy. It's not about making a movie. We want it to be subsumed into the curriculum, but it is too early at the moment*

*It has allowed them to get to know each other better due to teamwork, lots of peer assistance. It has helped to blend the group.*

This level in enthusiasm was in no small measure attributable to the perceived attitude of pupils and the quality and level of support forthcoming from the Lead Practitioner. Teachers commented on the close working relationship that they had with the coordinator. The model of collaboration used could be described as 'apprenticeship' in which the coordinator first teaches, the teacher observes and then takes over. Teachers' comments included both appreciation of this model and the coordinator's own teaching:

*I don't see how he could have physically given us more help. His input is extremely positive; very good with the kids, very strong as a classroom practitioner and very proactive with changes. They're done immediately.*

*It's early days but it gives them more confidence, especially for kids who found reading and writing hard. They can use computers to help.*

At the time of the interviews, the secondary teachers could see the possibility of benefits for their teaching, although the general feeling was that it was too early to tell at this stage. However, they did report that the different materials and context had allowed them to extend their teaching to include these, in one instance beyond the MIE project:

*I did with my S5 class when teaching short stories, I used the film (about a man marrying a rat), two incongruous characters, good for exploring conflict and resolution in a short story, it got their juices going.*

The most significant impact of the project at this stage was perceived to be on the level of teamwork displayed by pupils. For one teacher, the impact of MIE on pupils' ability to work together was greater than any impact on literacy. In addition, the majority of teachers interviewed felt that the experience of MIE in both primary and secondary schools may have supported pupils through the period of transition:

*There needs to be more continuity between primary and secondary school, so this is giving us more of that, it's a transferable skill, not just in English*

In addition, secondary teachers indicated that the presence of a familiar figure in the shape of the coordinator constituted a 'comfort zone' related to primary school and helped with both transition and the continuity of MIE in the secondary school.

In response to questions regarding the operation and design of the project, the most significant difficulties for secondary teachers at this point were the short period length (40 minutes), the need to block time for MIE purposes and the relationship between MIE materials and the tasks that pupils were asked to perform. The forty-five minute period was considered to be too short in order to complete some tasks, especially those related to film making, thereby possibly jeopardising the sustainability of the creative aspect of MIE as it operated at that time in the secondary school. The most frequently suggested solution suggested by teachers was to block time, for example six weeks, specifically for MIE. Perhaps the most significant secondary teacher response, however, related to their criticism of the teaching pack, including DVD materials, and the tasks that pupils were asked to perform. For example, teachers cited examples where the tasks such as writing poetry were preceded by films that did not provide enough or the appropriate 'mood' to act as a stimulus. Moreover, the tasks were described as

being too prescriptive and focused on outcomes rather than processes such as the writer's craft and skills and the process of writing.

*Give them longer blocks at a time and review the way the tasks link with texts. They are too prescriptive and don't match well enough. It has given the department a good structure but people want the fluidity to use when appropriate. The primary school model was more flexible. I would like to move towards that. It should go beyond S2.*

Not surprisingly at this stage, there was a call for increased understanding of MIE, with some teachers requesting further training, particularly on the technical aspects of the programme:

*I had one day training in the Media Centre on analysis and I felt confident. However, I need more training on the creativity/technical side.*

Even at this early stage, there was also a realisation among secondary teachers that MIE did not necessarily 'belong' in any one department within a secondary school. Whilst English teachers were confident in their own ability to teach MIE, there was a clear recognition that colleagues in other departments were able to contribute to the teaching of MIE and that some tasks belonged more naturally in other departments. Examples given included animation being carried out in Art, and sound tracking in Music. Teachers also intimated that they would welcome working with colleagues in other departments. However, there was a consensus among those secondary teachers interviewed that colleagues in other departments were unaware of MIE:

*Some of it is far too nebulous and amorphous, it should be cross-curricular, We should use it in Music and Art and ICT, where more could be done...I had a meeting with [Lead Practitioner] and we've proposed this to SMT.*

As expected at the early stages of a new project, teachers had begun to identify where the programme in the secondary school required strengthening in order to meet its objectives:

*I'm not sure if it will aid the ability to write better. It might if they get it every year. It should go beyond S2 up until S4. Get rid of the artiness of the films because older pupils are more cynical. They need to be more careful with the choice of film clips as imagination slumps at a later age.*

Overall, however, teachers in the secondary school remained optimistic about the efficacy and sustainability of MIE.

By Year 3, MIE had become well established in the primary schools. As the project moved on to include the first cohort of pupils now in S1, the level of support available from the Lead Practitioner was less than in previous years. In order to evaluate the extent MIE was embedded and sustained within the primary curriculum and teachers' work, the primaries were visited in May 2007, towards the end of the first academic session in which the first cohort had moved to secondary schools. The data below represents the views of primary teachers (including one teacher involved in MIE for the first time) at this stage.

All teachers interviewed continued to be supported by the Lead Practitioner and expressed their appreciation of this. They also indicated that they were now confident enough to teach using MIE either with reduced or no support:

*We have a timetable for [Lead Practitioner]. He comes once per month. His time is used at my discretion. He's used mostly for team-teaching on film-making.*

[Lead Practitioner] *has spent some time in class, depending on the class teacher. We have one teacher who is new so has needed more input. Specifically [Lead Practitioner] has given input to the analysis session. He has indicated his availability and teachers have access into this.*

*I'm very confident with the analysis. With film-making I see this as a more difficult part and I'm not so confident how to plan in a class situation – it's difficult to manage.*

All teachers interviewed expressed appreciation of continued support on the technical aspects of MIE. They each indicated that they called on the Lead Practitioner around once per month for advice on technical matters. All interviewees also reported that they felt adequately and appropriately supported by school management.

In response to questions regarding their experiences of MIE as a context for teaching and learning, responses varied from general enthusiasm to a recognition that MIE was one but not the sole way of helping children to learn:

*I'm giving pupils more time to think about their responses. In using films, everyone is included. It also makes me think more clearly about what I want out of it for my pupils.*

*Personally it's a good resource for use with some aspects of writing. It's excellent for listening and talking. We have more control now over MIE but we don't use it as much –I prefer to use non-MIE activities for teaching literacy. However, we look at more open-ended questioning as a consequence of MIE.*

Teachers' perceptions of the impact of MIE on children's literacy were similarly varied with one teacher expressing a view that MIE is effective across the range of literacy skills, whilst others reporting a more limited impact. Pupils' talking and listening skills would appear to have been the areas of greatest benefit, with all teachers interviewed remarking on increased benefits. Teachers' impressions of the impact on writing were mixed, with two teachers reporting improvements, for example in description, whilst another was uncertain of any benefits in writing. None of the teachers reported improvements in reading with one teacher specifically indicating that there had been none:

*My pupils are still very enthusiastic. They now don't make a distinction between MIE and other lessons in the promotion of literacy. My literacy is my MIE!*

*Listening and talking are fantastic. Pupils who were previously reluctant now offer responses. On writing, there are vast improvements. I'm convinced of this. On reading, there is no overall improvement that I can detect.*

In terms of non-literacy aspects of pupils' experiences, there was general agreement among the primary teachers that children were benefiting from MIE in terms of personal and interpersonal development. In particular, primary teachers, like their secondary colleagues, commented on increased levels of pupil engagement, self-esteem and collaboration. Moreover, primary teachers made frequent reference to the fact that during MIE work, pupils who were otherwise reluctant learners became fully engaged:

*Pupils' self-esteem has improved because there's a greater onus on children's responses in class – they have ownership of the film. The ones who found it hard now find it much easier.*

*Lots of children get a large self-confidence boost. Specific children who are not academic have got a lot out of the film analysis. In terms of creativity – for a lot of pupils it's a very valued activity.*

*It helps with collaboration. There are children who are more engaged and this improves behaviour.*

Finally, whilst, after three years of experience teaching MIE teachers remained positive about its efficacy, there remained a few doubts among a small number of primary teachers regarding the extent to which it was useful. Most of the doubts expressed centred around the question of whether or not there are benefits for pupils' writing and the need for continued technical support for teachers:

*It's working for me, but we need more time from a technical perspective.*

*Teachers are uncertain whether it actually does raise the standards in writing. Because of this there is a need to supplement MIE in writing which steals time from other areas of the curriculum.*

From teachers' experiences in Year 3, the progress of MIE in the cluster, its value as a pedagogical process, and its ability to engage learners and teachers can be evaluated. First, like their colleagues in primary school, secondary teachers found MIE stimulating for both themselves and their pupils and engaging, even for otherwise reluctant learners. However, many of the issues, concerns and reactions expressed by secondary teachers, matched those of their colleagues in primary school in Year 1. For example, the pack of materials offered was based on the operation of MIE in the primary school and was not felt to match the requirements of learners and teachers in a secondary context. There was a clear realisation, then, that secondary teachers had two years less experience than primary teachers in their understanding and development of MIE. This is perhaps significant for any future MIE initiative.

Whilst most of the teachers in both primary and secondary schools were convinced of the efficacy of MIE as a pedagogical process, its impact on aspects of traditional literacy was perceived to be variable. For some teachers, mostly primary teachers, there were benefits across talking, listening, reading and writing. For others, though, including the majority of secondary teachers, the benefits were mostly in talking and listening.

Finally, by the end of Year 3, there emerged the beginnings of a different operation of MIE in primary and secondary schools. In the primary schools, one of the attractions for teachers was the opportunity for cross-curricular work offered by MIE. The experience of the secondary school was quite different and some aspects of MIE were felt to be more properly the domain of several departments, and an inter-departmental or inter-disciplinary model was suggested.

### **5.3 Perspectives of MIE staff**

In the third year of the Project in the primary schools MIE staff had changed their role, largely due to the fact that many primary school teachers began to feel both confident and competent in working with MIE and were taking greater responsibility:

*It's changed very significantly – there are still teachers who need supported in their class, e.g. film-making, due to lack of confidence. Everything else is hands-off. We still have monthly meetings and two training days. All teachers can call me out to address specific issues.*

However, the Lead Practitioner recognised that *MIE needs to be written into school planning* for it to become a more embedded part of the curriculum. Nevertheless at this stage of the Project, MIE was operating successfully in all the primary schools in the cluster. The situation in the secondary school was somewhat different:

*The project is not in a good way in the secondary school. I have massive concerns about its effectiveness in the secondary school. Very little analysis has been done this year. It's a major challenge. Nobody has taken MIE on board by way of responsibility. The Directorate has arranged two development days but not much else.*

When asked about what the Lead Practitioner regarded as the stumbling blocks for MIE in the secondary school, in general he regarded the situation of the secondary school as being problematic and in particular the staffing problems in the English Department:

*The structure of the secondary curriculum is not helpful. Functionally there are problems in the English Department at the secondary school.*

#### **5.4 Observations of MIE lessons**

The evaluation team conducted two sets of observations during the third year of the project. The first set involved those pupils now in S1 who had experienced MIE since P6. The lessons observed involved the lead practitioner working alongside teachers and pupils and teachers working directly with pupils. The areas of MIE covered included both analysis and creativity. Other work observed involved an extension of MIE into the English curriculum. In total, seven lessons were observed.

The second set of observations took place in the primary schools in May 2007 and this time, involved teachers working directly with pupils without the support of the lead practitioner. A total of five lessons were observed during this visit.

##### **General observations**

Prior to the evaluation team's visit to the secondary school, there had been problems with software. As a result, rather than make their own moving image, pupils were provided with seventeen clips which they were asked to edit into a moving image. Each of the lessons observed in the secondary school took place within the context of the English curriculum. Consequently, features familiar to pupils as aspects of moving images, for example, narrative, setting, character, mood and ending, were related directly to short-story writing.

This was in contrast to the observation of MIE lessons in the primary schools later that year. Here, the context was still the moving image artefact. Although there was explicit points made related to the grammar of language, these tended to be as they arose from the moving image being studied or created.

## **Observation of pupils**

In both primary and secondary settings, the pupils were largely fully engaged during analysis sessions, including analysis of, for example, the features of a short-story, either in preparation for writing or as a precursor to the editing exercise in the secondary. In general, pupils generated ideas, challenged others' ideas and justified their own and worked well together when required. When it came to writing tasks, however, the evaluation team observed a difference between the secondary and primary pupils. During writing tasks in the secondary classes there were greater signs of disengagement among significant number of pupils, especially boys. In the primary classes written tasks were tackled with similar levels of enthusiasm as had been observed in the past.

Similarly, tasks involving the making of a moving image were greeted with less enthusiasm among secondary pupils. The evaluation team observed signs of confusion regarding the editing task and this may have contributed to the pupils' approach.

## **Observation of teaching**

In the lessons involving the lead practitioner and teachers working together, the teachers in the secondary school took advantage of these sessions to observe and take notes, in much the same way as their primary colleagues had done previously. In the teacher-led sessions in the secondary school, the focus was firmly on the requirements of the English curriculum. Consequently, moving image materials were analysed in terms of themes and the learning aimed at the production of an English artefact, for example a newspaper article. The choice of writing genre and artefact was influenced by the demands of the curriculum and the value of short films, animations and other moving images, was located in how they could be used as a resource.

In the primary schools, teacher-led analysis focused on the moving image as an artefact. There were discussions relating learning from the analysis to writing tasks such as story writing but the emphasis remained firmly with the moving image and what could be learned from it about story telling.

## **5.5 Pupils' perspectives on Year 3**

The evaluation team conducted two sets of focus groups with S1 pupils during session 2006–2007. The first set took place in January 2007 and the second set in May 2007. The focus groups comprised of three groups of six pupils, each composed of three boys and three girls, giving eighteen pupils in total.

### **Response to MIE**

When prompted about what had been happening in MIE sessions, pupils reported that they had been making animated films, but the software had recently crashed so they were currently engaged in an alternative process of rearranging 17 brief film clips to create their own short films. In one class, this task was related to short story writing. In addition, pupils had been watching a short film (*The Sandman*) and were writing newspaper articles related to this film.

Pupils enjoyed the animating exercise. Pupils enjoyed making their film and some even made their own films at home. A number of pupils enjoyed making animated films as, previously having made only live action films, this was a new activity for them.

The pupils all reported that they had previously been enthusiastic regarding MIE but none of them were enjoying the current task. One pupil commented that it would have been better to add in their own clips to help the storyline along rather than using the prescribed clips which were *totally unrelated*. Working together in groups of three was also unpopular as some pupils could dominate such a small group. Frequency of MIE lessons was another point of dissatisfaction with pupils in one class unhappy at only getting MIE once every five weeks.

When prompted about how MIE compared with last year, a mixed response emerged among the groups, with two groups giving a negative response whilst the other gave a positive response.

For example, in one group all pupils preferred MIE in primary school because they were allowed to choose their own material, rather than working with the 17 clips which were chosen for them. The pupils thought that they had more fun at primary school and preferred to work as a whole class. They found that working with two other people was more difficult as there was a greater focus on the individual and an increase in disagreements, although they did concede that they were more occupied in small groups.

A second group similarly reported that that MIE did not compare favourably with primary school, particularly in relation to the quality of the story lines. MIE was perceived to have been better in the primary context because pupils tended to work as a whole class and there were more people with ideas for the stories. The storylines in the primary school, therefore, were those generated by the pupils. The lack of time in S1 also compared unfavourably with primary school. There were no double periods in English and the pupils felt that forty minutes was not long enough, *you are just getting into it and the period is over, so you don't get anything done*. Five out of six pupils in this group stated that they had learned more in MIE lessons at primary school, with one commenting, *at primary we would be half way to making the film by now*.

About their reaction to the amount of written work involved, there was a degree of disagreement here too. Some felt that there was too much writing at the moment and that they should spend more time on animating. Conversely, one pupil pointed out that, *We wrote a story every week at primary school and did loads of writing before our films were made at the end of the year*. This pupil felt that some of the MIE work this year was hard, as there was not enough time to write *something decent*.

The pupils agreed, however, that written work was harder in S1 than at primary school. For example in primary school some had only drawn for storyboarding exercises, now they were writing as well. The written tasks were perceived as more difficult as the result of watching films for the first time which were *weird and unrealistic* and having to write about the thoughts and feelings of, for example, *The Sandman*. One pupil summed up by stating, *writing how a man could love a rat is pretty hard*. The pupils expected the work to be more advanced, more difficulty and greater in quantity in S1, and they intimated that this was the case. Some felt that there was slightly too much writing and would prefer more fun, practical activities similar to those they had experienced at primary school.

## Impact

Pupils reported that they talked about mistakes in films such as the storm trooper in *Star Wars* banging his head and falling over and continuity errors in *Lord of The Rings*. Consequently, pupils generally claimed that they *can't watch TV without noticing some mistakes or how they've done it*. Some indicated that constant analysing and criticising annoys their parents. All pupils, with one exception, thought that they were more critical when they watch film and TV, that they analysed films more than before, watched more films than previously and were

able to work out what was coming in plotlines. It was also mentioned that there was possibly going to be a Movie Club within the school or Angus Digital Media Centre.

Most pupils felt that they typed faster than before and that their “computer literacy” had improved. One pupil indicated that he intended to make his own short films and post them on YouTube.

There was a mixed response to the prompt of making friends with most pupils agreeing that MIE provided a context in which it was necessary for them to work with others, including pupils with whom they would not otherwise normally choose to work. For example, one pupil did not think that MIE classes had helped her to make friends, as she was *different from most others in most classes except for [pupil A]*. It was also pointed out that MIE started late and pupils had already made new friends in the first six weeks of high school. Another pupil remarked that he already knew people from other schools, so MIE had *not really helped with this*.

Pupils mentioned that working together in groups, particularly small groups was problematic.

#### Getting on at secondary school

One pupil reported that secondary school was better because *at primary you have the whole year with the same teacher, now we can have eight different ones per day...* Another felt that it was sometimes better, sometimes not. This pupil’s primary school was a small school where everyone was known to each other, while BHS had many different people. The pupil stressed that BHS was not intimidating. A third pupil commented, *I don’t like high school*. Clearly, this pupil was having some difficulty adjusting to the transition from primary to secondary school.

Responses to the prompt of whether there should be more/less MIE mirrored pupils’ reflections on the operation of MIE in secondary school. One commented that MIE should go on beyond S2 *so more classes got to do it*. Another felt that they were not given enough time to undertake MIE work, and a third felt that they should be allowed to choose what films they were going to do, like at primary school.

The evidence from the pupil focus groups suggests that whilst some pupils had maintained their enthusiasm for MIE in the secondary school, for many S1 pupils their enthusiasm for MIE had waned somewhat. From their perception, however, MIE had not helped with transition and they varied in their opinions regarding the impact on their written work. Moreover, there was a sense in which they felt they were losing ownership of MIE and that tasks were now prescribed rather than emerging from the ideas generated within the class. Nevertheless, they were almost unanimous in their desire to see MIE continue in both primary and secondary schools in order that other pupils might have the same experience.

## 5.6 Summary of the findings at the end of Year 3

- The primary school teachers continued to be enthusiastic about MIE and MIE activities had become embedded in the regular curriculum for P6 and P7 pupils.
- Some secondary school teachers were less convinced of the efficacy of MIE on the basis of its current organisation for a range of reasons. Some reasons were located in the day-to-day structure of the school; others were more located in staffing and technical issues.
- All teachers understood MIE to be about literacy but the secondary school teachers also saw it as a subject of study in its own right.
- Teachers' views of the impact of MIE on traditional literacy were mixed with primary schools teachers indicating that it impacted across all four elements of literacy but secondary school teachers experiences suggested that the impact was limited to talking and listening.
- The creative aspect of MIE was time consuming for all teachers.
- MIE was embedded and sustained in the primary schools but logistical difficulties were experienced in the secondary school (length of period, blocking time for MIE, suitability of available materials, software crash, location of hardware). All teachers felt adequately supported by the Lead Practitioner and school management.
- The majority of secondary school pupils were less enthusiastic about MIE in comparison with primary school pupils and themselves when at primary school. Dissatisfaction centred round working in groups of three, their lack of choice in materials and task, and the relative infrequency of MIE lessons in comparison with the primary school.
- Many of the major difficulties faced by staff in the secondary school can be partly attributed to MIE being introduced to the secondary school two years after it had begun in the primary schools and partly to a number of significant challenges mostly unconnected with MIE.

## **CHAPTER 6 : FINDINGS FROM YEAR 4 (2007/8)**

### **6.1 Introduction**

In 2007/8 two series of interviews with teachers were conducted exclusively in the secondary school involved in the MIE project, one in January 2008 and the other in May 2008. In all, 18 interviews were undertaken – 8 in January and 10 in May. A number of teachers either new to the school or new to MIE became involved with the MIE project at the start of session 2006/7. Five of the interviews were undertaken with these teachers at the first round in January 2008.

MIE had been introduced into the school at the start of the previous session, i.e. 2006/7 with the new intake into S1 that year. The perspectives reported here therefore relate to the second year of MIE in the school.

Also impacting on the MIE project in the school was the decision by Angus Council to extend the MIE work into two new clusters of schools. This decision had been influenced by the positive response MIE had received in all the primary schools in the initial cluster (see the Interim Report, 2006). However, extending the MIE work (though not as part of the FlaT project) necessitated the deployment of MIE staff to the new clusters. Furthermore, due to a professional difficulty involving the MIE co-ordinator in his relationship with the management of the local Media Centre, which continued for approximately six months from the spring of 2006, support for MIE in the school was based on the expertise of a teacher from one of the local primary schools who had been appointed as a Lead Practitioner on the basis of her training and three years' experience of working with MIE. In the interim, there was a significant reduction in the expertise available to staff in the school at the start of the 2007/8 session. Furthermore, the available expertise had to be spread over two year groups – S1 and S2. However, teachers in the local primary schools were steadily becoming more self-sufficient in the delivery of MIE thereby facilitating more support for teachers in the secondary school.

At the start of session 2007/8, not only was the personnel different from the preceding year, it had previously been decided by the former Lead Practitioner in conjunction with the teaching staff in the secondary school to re-organise the lay out of the technical equipment. Instead of deploying the equipment in a central room it was distributed to several rooms in the English Department and MIE sessions were held as thought appropriate by the staff rather than on a block basis as in the previous year. Challenges arose from the agreed relocation of these technical resources.

The response of school staff and pupils involved in MIE work is therefore set in this fragile and unsettling context.

### **6.2 Perspectives of the Lead Practitioner**

At the start of the session, the Lead Practitioners were incorporated into a restructured Educational Development Service (EDS) and given the title Staff Tutor. In addition, new staff tutors were appointed to provide support for the new cluster of schools now participating in MIE:

*Things have changed completely. EDS has been restructured and they've taken MIE and ICT into consideration. EDS is now in teams with a QIO and ESO and staff tutors. Each team supports two clusters of schools.*

These new arrangements were regarded as a positive step forward:

*Last year was hard, a transition year, getting people on board and raising awareness. It is far more effective this year, EDS has ownership and it is not coming from outside, which leads to a different perception in schools. It is positive that there are direct links, not just one person, there is more effective support now.*

When asked about the on-going impact of MIE on teachers, the staff tutor was very decisive in claiming that MIE had changed the way teachers teach: *It is definitely changing the way teachers teach, in terms of questioning and ICT, especially in the primary schools.*

As in previous years, the impact of MIE on pupils was also regarded as positive:

*Their response is always positive, they are so engaged for the analysis and the creative part, it is a different classroom when doing MIE, very positive. It has definitely impacted on ICT, confidence is building and they are racing ahead of some of the staff. With literacy, talking and listening have improved; there are quality discussions so I would hope it would translate into other areas. It is inclusive, safe and allows them to voice their own opinions and there are no wrong answers. With writing, MIE is a way in, a stimulus for getting the creative juices flowing. It won't teach them how to write, you still have to teach the technical side.*

### **6.3 Staff perspectives on Year 4 (2007/8)**

Given the problems that arose in the school the previous session (see Sections 5.2 and 5.5) and the significantly changed context in 2007/8, it is not surprising to find that the teachers responded in very different ways to the MIE input. The experienced teachers pursued their own plans which, in practical terms, meant that the effort invested in MIE activities diminished. One teacher reported only holding one lesson on MIE for S1 since the start of the session. In addition, the films made available for MIE work were mainly used for analysis in a similar way to how teachers would use a written text: *The film is an alternative book.*

In other aspects of the MIE work, for example, the creative and technical parts, the teachers continued to struggle: *I'm trying hard to find how the creative side fits into literacy*

Despite the difficulties, the teachers reported that their pupils continued to display an enthusiasm for MIE work: *They have been great.*

As far as the new teachers were concerned, their response was more upbeat – particularly to the input from the MIE staff member:

*...great – very supportive but she's not here enough. She's most helpful on the technical side.*

*The input is excellent. I couldn't ask here to be any more supportive. However, I've got other priorities and have to juggle so many balls while hers is MIE,*

Nevertheless, some secondary teachers took issue with the fact that the new Lead Practitioner had been trained as a primary school teacher even though the former Lead Practitioner was also a primary school trained teacher!

As in the previous session, the teachers in the English Department experienced significant problems with the technical aspects of MIE, specifically the technicalities of generating the artefact. Quite clearly, many of them harboured resentment about having to take on this additional responsibility with minimal training. Such resentment, coupled with the technical difficulties, impacted on the pupils: *The pupils have been disheartened – both S1 and S2 though when it goes well, especially with S1, they're so creative.*

Not surprisingly, the difficulties surrounding MIE in the school came to the attention of the School's management:

*There were some tensions earlier in the year but they have disappeared. Some people looked at it [MIE] as bolted onto the curriculum – we need to overcome this barrier.*

*There was resistance from some staff, i.e. the more experienced teachers who felt they didn't need support.*

In response to the difficulties, it was decided to explore the possibility of introducing a cross-curricular approach and get other subject areas involved to address the creative and technical aspects of MIE: *People are up for it – there is genuine interest from Music, Art and ICT.*

The instigation of this development – to regard MIE as essentially cross-curricular (or inter-curricular) had significant impact on how MIE progressed in the secondary school. Teachers in both Music and Art, although not intensively involved in MIE, were well disposed to becoming involved: *Music will help in the production of a better artefact. I'm keen to get involved, though availability of resources is an issue.*

One teacher in the Art Department had had contact with MIE work in the first part of session 2007/8 due to family connections. Her reaction was very positive: *I can see the impact visually. The pupils are confident with the Macs and the concept of MIE. The pupils have benefitted, some are more motivated.*

The same teacher reported improved teamwork amongst her pupils:

*The stronger ones are the leaders. It's a great project for the kids with more skills. The poorer kids struggled, but I still found them a role in the group. It's quite a good team-building exercise.*

When pursued about how MIE might be developed in the school, the teacher was quite clear about the way forward. She considered that inter-departmental work was essential:

*We need to have support for team teaching and overcome territorial boundaries. It needs to be properly planned.*

Returning to the interviews with teachers directly involved in MIE, when the respondents were asked whether MIE work had made any difference to their teaching skills, responses varied: *It's pushed me to use media a bit more. Analysing films makes us think more*

*It makes you think about giving children more control of their learning-centred skills, collaboration and interaction.*

However, a number of reservations were expressed:

*I don't know yet if kids transfer their knowledge to the written word.*

*Maybe the bright ones have picked up the idea of how a context carried through a short story. I'm not convinced about the others.*

As with many other teachers involved with MIE in other schools in the project, there was considerable doubt as to whether MIE benefitted children's literacy skills, which is a point on which to ponder.

The same teachers responded warmly to the idea of organising MIE work on an inter-departmental basis but cautioned:

*Teachers would feel more valued and included if they were involved in discussions and planning rather than being told what to do.*

On the issue of sustainability, the school management was quite clear:

*It is crucial how English staff embrace the key features about how they'll teach S3 and S4 as there is more pressure than in S1 and S2 because of the exams at the end of the year and pupils' minds are focused. They need to think about how they extend the good practice of using film to help with writing. MIE has had more impact on those who struggle to write extensively and read, so they need to make sure that these features continue.*

*I'm happy to support it and use school resources to support it; otherwise you are condemning it to the bin. We need to convince teachers that whatever has worked with S1 and S2 they will do the same in S3 and S4. We need a plan for S3 and S4.*

In view of the difficulties in the MIE project in the school, particularly in its second year (i.e. 2007/8) it was decided to conduct a second round of interviews in May 2008 to ascertain how the proposed new inter-disciplinary arrangements for MIE were progressing. In the interviews teachers were first asked to reflect on the input from the new MIE co-ordinator since January 2008. Several teachers found her input very supportive: ... *has given good support.. She's always available. Her technical support was invaluable e.g. re-formatting movies on DVD.*

Others were less enthusiastic about MIE in general: *None ... I haven't done any MIE since Christmas. Not very much – I didn't engage with MIE staff because I'd finished what I'd planned to do.*

Given the difficulties in the period before Christmas, it would appear that the momentum for MIE in the English Department in particular diminished in the period after Christmas. The tensions in relationships also seemed to have dissipated. However, there appeared to be growing interest in developing an inter-disciplinary approach for the delivery of MIE, particularly between the English and ICT departments: *there's good liaison between English and ICT but there could be even more if time allowed.*

Early attempts at such arrangements had been warmly welcomed – particularly by staff in the English Department who saw significant potential for MIE organised in this way:

*It will be very differently organised next session. We are only going to be part of the beginning and end. We will do all the analysis and introduce the idea of the project and plan. We will try to make it a language based exercise e.g. on similitude. We will work in teams. Each 1<sup>st</sup> year class will*

*have its team of English, ICT, Art and Music. Teachers will meet as a group. It will be 'inter-disciplinary'.*

But as yet there appeared to be little sign of meaningful structured teamwork: *Computing and English have co-operated – but there's no teamwork. Our contact has been informal.*

Another area of concern was the impact of MIE on children's literacy, particularly on writing. Staff were asked for their impressions on this matter. Not unexpectedly, perceptions varied:

*I think it helps their literacy skills as a part of their analysis work – but over a long period of time. We did a lot of writing – I was pro-active in encouraging the pupils to write.*

*I can't see it – it could even be detrimental as we're not spending as much time on writing as we used to.*

Another teacher was even more emphatic that MIE had no impact at all on pupils' literacy. Clearly the perception of several teachers in the secondary school gives cause for serious concern, particularly as the main aim of MIE is to promote children's literacy skills.

In the interview, teachers were then asked for their views on whether MIE has impacted on children's teamwork. Almost unanimously the teachers were very critical of MIE in this respect:

*Not great – one kid tends to dominate and do all the work. It's too long and goes on and on with the technical side, i.e. making the artefact.*

*MIE lends itself to social loafing! I sometimes think there is not enough pace and challenge in MIE.*

*With the animation part, it helps – especially with storyboarding and talking about it. But with the technology it didn't work – the lazy ones just opted out.*

Turning to the future, teachers were then asked if they felt adequately prepared to take responsibility for MIE work. Clearly many teachers in the English Department were relieved that responsibility for the technical aspects of MIE was being transferred to the ICT department:

*I don't feel at all trained in the technology. This held me back. This should now pass to the ICT department – if it worked it would be great – it's the way forward.*

There appeared to be a sign of relief that the English teachers would no longer be involved in the technical aspects of MIE. However, for the inter-disciplinary approach to be successful, the teachers were clear that strong co-ordination was required:

*We need a co-ordinator to make sure everything is happening and departments are collaborating.*

*It needs something more robust in place in terms of planning. So far our SMT has not been involved to ensure it's happening. There's not been a "champion".*

It would seem therefore on the basis of the views of those teachers interviewed by the evaluators that the future of MIE in this particular secondary school is finely balanced.

Not unexpectedly, the SMT were aware of the shortcomings of how MIE had been delivered in the first two years based as it was entirely on the English Department:

*What we tried to do was build on the model that had been successful in the primary school. Maybe what we should have done is been a bit more radical and asked is this going to work in the secondary sector.*

*To turn the clock back two years, we were going through challenging difficulties in English – staff absence, new staff, etc.*

Clearly the experience of the secondary school in introducing a crucial innovation in Scottish education such as MIE has proved inordinately challenging.

## 6.4 Observations

In January 2008, the evaluation team undertook observation of second and first year classes in the secondary school. The pupils in S1 and S2 at this point were those from the first cohort of pupils who received MIE in P6 and P7 from the start of the project. Three second year classes and three first year classes were observed.

### General observations

The context for most of the classes observed at this visit was editing. Two S1 and two S2 classes had completed filming and were now at the editing stage. The computers containing the MIE software were spread throughout the department, necessitating pupils editing in classrooms where English lessons were taking place. The remaining S2 class was filming and the S1 class were working on animation in relation to a simile. This last project was the result of collaboration between an English teacher and an Art teacher.

### Observation of pupils

Throughout each of the lessons observed, the majority of pupils were engaged for most of the time. Both S1 and S2 showed considerable technical skills regarding editing and their discussions centred round problem solving for the task in hand. The S2 pupils in particular, displayed considerable autonomy and collaboration, agreeing how their work was to be edited and deciding who would do each part of the process.

Whilst the majority of pupils worked patiently and diligently in observed classes, there was some evidence of a small number of pupils not engaging as fully as they might. For instance, in one group of 2 boys and 2 girls, it was mostly the girls who took charge of the work, whilst in another group of 3, one pupil appeared not to be contributing.

Encouragingly, though, pupils demonstrated consideration for each other. In one class where a small group of pupils were editing whilst another year group was having an English lesson, the editing group were careful to be as unintrusive as possible, speaking in whispers and focusing on task throughout the time they were in the room. In another class, a small group was editing at the same time as their class group were undertaking a poetry lesson and both activities took place without one impinging on the other.

## **Observation of teaching**

In two S1 and Two S2 classes, the Lead Practitioner and teacher worked together. In the remaining two classes, the teacher worked alone. In one example of collaboration and progress, the lead practitioner led the S2 lesson whilst the teacher observed and supported. In the same teacher's S1 class, the roles were reversed.

Teaching, by and large was done through questioning and problem setting. Pupils made decisions and suggestions regarding their MIE work and the teachers and Lead Practitioner probed the ideas through challenging and inviting justification. Teachers and the Lead Practitioner encouraged pupils to discuss, negotiate and collaborate. The amount of teacher-led instruction observed was minimal.

## **6.5 Pupil perspectives on Year 4**

In January 2008 the evaluation team visited the secondary school and conducted focus groups with pupils from both S1 and S2. Two focus groups were held with S1 and S2 pupils; eleven pupils (six boys and five girls) took part in the discussions which covered themes outlined in Section 2.3

### **6.51 Perspective of S1 pupils**

#### Response to MIE

When prompted about what had been happening in MIE sessions, pupils in one group reported that they had spent most of the year making models and backgrounds for a small movie about similes. The idea was to show visually how similes work. In the other group, pupils had made a film out of short video clips. The pupils have also done some storyboarding.

The pupils were mainly very positive about their experience of MIE so far in S1, as exemplified by the following remarks:

*You get more of a say in small groups, you feel more independent and involved, and everyone has to contribute.*

*It's good when it's related to a subject.*

*Making the films has been more challenging, we had to really think and we got less time.*

When asked about the downside, a number of complaints were raised predominantly in relation to group work. Aspects highlighted as problematic included people dominating the group and taking over and conversely, people not contributing. Other problems included disagreements between group members and the fact that some groups are falling behind other groups and therefore getting annoyed. Other issues raised included only having the MIE teacher available two days a week, film being frequently lost and hard drives getting misplaced. Pupils agreed that there were not enough computers available for them to carry out the work efficiently.

Many pupils reported that the main difference between MIE lessons in S1 and MIE lessons in primary school was that the pupils were now working in small groups rather than as a whole class, although some had worked in small groups last year depending on which primary

school they attended. All pupils preferred MIE work at high school and the following remarks illustrate this view:

*It's better here; you get more stuff to do, get more say and can do more in a smaller group.*

*It's more challenging than before; it took ages in primary, I thought we'd never get it finished.*

*It [MIE at Primary School] was just boring after a while.*

There was a consensus among both groups that there was less written work in MIE lessons this year than in the previous two:

*There's not as much as last year, we do the movie first then do the writing.*

*We've only had one lesson of writing.*

*It's much harder than at primary school but there's less of it. We used to fill up jotters with writing in primary school. This year we've only done about three or four pages in our books in English.*

### Impact

In one group all of the pupils agreed that they now watch films differently: they think more about how the film has been made and why they either do or do not like it. In the other group however, none of the pupils felt that they now watched films any differently than they did before their involvement in MIE.

Most pupils responded that their ICT skills had improved at primary school; only one thought that involvement in MIE classes had helped.

There was general agreement among the pupils that making friends was easier than it was before because of MIE. However, some were unsure if there had been any effect.

The majority of pupils agreed that working in groups, particularly small groups, was easier due to MIE, although they would prefer to choose their own groups rather than have it done by their teachers:

*I'm not friends with any people in my group, I can get along with them but working with friends is easier.*

Most thought that MIE has had little or no impact on transition, although all of the pupils who took part in the discussions prefer secondary school to primary for a number of reasons:

*We don't have to sit in one class all day and we only have a certain amount of time on each subject,*

*They go on and on at primary.*

*We've gone from being big fish in a little pond to little fish in a big pond.*

### Getting on at secondary school

All pupils responded that they were generally getting on fine. Enjoyment of school depended on the subject and their own moods:

*It's alright in some subjects, not in others.*

All agreed that they would like to do more MIE, as it makes them think more and they enjoyed the lessons. However, the teachers make a big difference to their enjoyment; a number of pupils mentioned that they had got used to the previous MIE teacher and their style and were finding it more difficult adapting to the current MIE teachers' methods:

*(previous teacher) would give you clues while (new teacher) just tells you to get on with it.*

The pupils had a number of suggestions for improving MIE lessons. They felt that MIE should be integrated into other subjects like Art, English, Maths, Science and ICT. When a member of the evaluation team mentioned some of the plans that the senior management team had about joint projects, the pupils responded enthusiastically that they would like to do a joint project in Art and Music. Perhaps less realistically, pupils stated that there should be an iMac in every classroom so that they can do MIE work if they need to and add bits in every class.

Most of the pupils' parents are not knowledgeable about MIE and get baffled by it, although one pupil reported that her parents want to try it. The Pupils want MIE to continue into S2 and maybe S3 but not into S4 due to examinations.

## 6.52 Perspectives of S2 pupils

### Response to MIE

When prompted about what had been happening in MIE sessions, pupils reported that they had been animating; making an advert; watching films and writing about them; storyboarding, and writing sequels to films. They had also been split up into four groups to make a trailer for their own movie; they then had to edit all four trailers together.

The pupils mentioned that they had been allocated more time than last year and that they had been able to concentrate on MIE work for a few weeks before Christmas. The majority enjoyed working with their best friends in groups; smaller groups were preferred to whole class groups. However, whole class discussions were viewed as being helpful, principally to generate ideas. Watching films was also mentioned as being an enjoyable component of MIE.

General comments on the positive aspects of MIE ranged from:

*I've not enjoyed the subject for the advert, I hate animating and writing stories. I prefer live action to animating*

to:

*Everyone watching films. Some days you can't do things because someone is off. Felt a bit rushed to do the filming.*

There was general agreement amongst the pupils that MIE was better this year. The following comments illustrate this view:

*Better this year - all films lost last year.  
Films this year are better, longer, more to say about them.  
Better organised this year compared to S1, more writing now, less storyboarding. Last year we didn't get to do it that much because the computers and software crashed. Better this year, had more choice about what we wanted to do.*

Pupils appeared to prefer MIE in S2 compared to S1, but preferred how it was delivered in primary school compared with secondary: *Primary was better - when whole class did it, it was better. Got worse since primary school.*

A number of pupils don't like what they regard as excessive amounts of writing: We are writing a couple of pages per film

The rest of the participants were non-committal.

### Impact

All agreed that MIE had impacted on how they watched films: they focus on them more. Pupils are aware that they notice more things, like different shots, camera angles and are more knowledgeable about how films are made. However, some argued that thinking about the technical aspects could detract from the enjoyment of films.

Opinion was divided on the topic of ICT/Internet skills. In one group, all pupils agreed that they have got better at ICT, while in the other, none thought that their skills had improved.

Most pupils believed that group work in MIE has not helped with making more friends. However, a number of pupils acknowledged that they would perhaps talk to other classmates more often than they normally would.

As far as working in groups was concerned, pupils would rather choose their own groups and would generally rather work on their own or as a whole class because in some cases certain pupils have a tendency to dominate, while: *some do nothing and it can get boring. Some people don't talk to you much. It is more awkward working with them and it takes longer.*

There was an acceptance that, however problematic, working in groups could sometimes be beneficial: *I got better at speaking to people you don't like; you know how to handle it better; try to do your best to co-operate*

All pupils responded that they were getting on fine at school. Some subjects were problematic, but generally they were all relatively happy, rather than enthusiastic. *It's all right* seemed to sum up the mood of the participants.

There was widespread agreement that MIE has helped in English specifically with writing skills. The following comments illustrate where MIE has had an influence on the pupils' work:

*It helps with writing better stories, expands imagination.  
It helped with my writing; I used to be rubbish at it.  
You get more ideas in MIE, [you're] allowed to talk about it more and get more ideas from different people.*

There was widespread agreement amongst the pupils that MIE should not continue beyond S2:

*It should be kept on at primary school, it was good then, I don't want it at secondary school  
It's boring and getting rubbish,  
I would rather just learn about English,  
It's just a muck about.*

However, some pupils disagreed and stated that they would like to do it next year, or at least have some aspects of it incorporated into other subjects. Pupils are less keen on the analysis part of MIE, but they all enjoy the creative side. A number of suggestions were made about improving the lessons as they stand, including:

*When we analyse films, it should be ones that interest us a bit more, some are boring to watch over and over again.  
It would be good to watch bits of the kinds of films we'd go to the cinema to see.*

## 6.6 Summary of findings from Year 4

- MIE remained problematic in the secondary school for a number of reasons: the prolonged absence of the MIE Coordinator arising from the difficulty at the Media Centre which helped to undermine morale and commitment amongst the teachers; the hostility of some secondary school staff at the level of personnel; and the absence of strategic leadership for managing MIE.
- For many pupils in the secondary school MIE had become less attractive. However, several pupils still saw merit in MIE activities
- Changing circumstances, some of which were linked to the decision of Angus Council to roll out the MIE Project beyond the original cluster of schools, contributed to the difficulties which the secondary school faced in securing continuity and progress
- In response to the initial experience of MIE in the secondary school, new ideas emerged regarding the organisation of MIE on an inter-disciplinary basis.

## **CHAPTER 7 : RESPONSE OF THE PUPILS TO MIE**

### **7.1 Introduction**

In the summer of 2008, all pupils who had been involved in MIE work since the outset in 2004 were invited to complete a short questionnaire consisting of eight questions. A copy of the questionnaire is provided in Appendix F. The tables in Appendix G1 and G2 provide the responses of the pupils from both the six primary schools and the secondary school respectively. The tables show the number of pupils who completed the questionnaire in each school and the breakdown of their responses by category.

In order to pursue whether MIE had had an impact on pupils' traditional literacy skills in reading and writing, assessments on the National Assessment scheme for Levels C-F were made available to the evaluation team for P6 to S2 pupils for the period 2003 to 2008. These data are shown in tables 7.41 –7.48.

In addition to the above, data were made available to the evaluation team consisting of scores on the Performance Indicators in the Primary School test (PIPS) for P7 pupils in each of the six participating primary schools together with scores on the same PIPS test from a cluster of primary schools in the same local council area which had not participated in MIE. The tests were undertaken in Session 2005/6. The data are presented in Section 7.5 and provide pupils' scores in three subject areas: maths, reading and science, for both achievement and attitude, together with an attitude rating to school in general.

### **7.2 Questionnaire Responses of Primary School Pupils to MIE**

In the questionnaire, pupils were first asked to describe what they had been doing in MIE sessions. All pupils were able to list a number of activities related to MIE that they had been engaged in (see Table G 1.1), the most commonly mentioned were making films, watching DVDs and editing. Clearly these aspects of MIE are the most memorable for the majority of pupils. Large numbers, however, were also aware that writing (100% in Schools C/D and 50% in School B), analysis (62.5% in Schools C/D and 20% in School F) and discussion (75% in Schools C/D and 33.3% in School F) are also connected to MIE.

Pupils were then asked what had been good about MIE sessions. The most enjoyable MIE activities varied between schools (see Table G 1.2). Analysis of films was the most popular response from pupils in Schools C/D (62.5%) compared to only 2.9% from School B and 5.6% from School E, whilst pupils from the other four schools chose making films as their favourite activity. More than one third of pupils in three schools responded that they enjoyed everything about MIE, in Schools C/D the figure was 50%, while in stark contrast to their counterparts in secondary school where 10.4% did not enjoy anything about MIE (see Table 7.32), only one pupil from the five primary schools gave this response.

When asked what had not been so good about MIE (see Table G 1.3), in the two primary schools, over 20% of pupils responded that they did not enjoy MIE as it was either repetitive or boring, while in School A 14.5% reported a shortage of hardware as an issue which spoiled their enjoyment. Over 20% of pupils from School E felt that written work in MIE was not enjoyable. Other reasons given for not enjoying MIE came mainly from Schools C/D where 62.5% mentioned filming outdoors in bad weather and at School F, where almost half of the class were unhappy about not getting the part they wanted in their film. Despite these complaints, it should be noted that over one quarter of pupils in four schools and nearly one-

fifth in the other, responded that there were no aspects of MIE that they did not find enjoyable.

Responses to Question 4 were mixed across the six primary schools (see Table 7.24) In reading skills, 75% of the class from Schools C/D (6 pupils) thought that MIE had helped to a large extent and 32.7% of School A pupils agreed. In the four other primary schools the majority (86.75, 70.6%, 58.2% and 50%) answered that MIE had not helped their reading skills at all. In written work the picture is slightly more positive; 62.5% in Schools C/D, 50% in School E and 47.3% in School A felt that MIE had helped to a large extent. However 73.3% of School F pupils, 41.2% from School B and 36.4% from School A reported that MIE had not helped their writing skills at all. Over half of the pupils from School E and School F and almost half of the pupils from School A thought that their talking skills had greatly improved; only pupils from Schools C/D and School B were less sure (75% of Schools C/D pupils thought that their talking skills had improved to some extent, while almost 70% of those from School B felt that their talking skills had improved only to a small extent or not at all). In only two schools did pupils think that their listening skills had improved to a large extent in high numbers, while 50% in two schools thought that their listening skills had not improved at all. Clearly, as far as the pupils themselves are concerned pupils' perceptions, their literacy skills have not improved across all four disciplines in any coherent or consistent pattern.

In addition to the areas of the curriculum previously mentioned, pupils also felt that MIE had helped with their ICT skills and ability to work in groups, both important components of the programme (see Table 7.25). A significant percentage (16.4%) of pupils from School A however, did not think that involvement in MIE had helped them in any other areas at all.

The most enjoyable aspects of MIE were watching or making films in all six schools (see Table 7.26). In Schools C/D all pupils enjoyed watching and making films to a large extent, in School A over 70% enjoyed making films and 45.4% enjoyed watching them to a large extent and in School E 56.6% enjoyed making films and 44.4% enjoyed watching films to a large extent. All pupils from Schools C/D enjoyed writing to a large extent while 44.4% of pupils from School E agreed. A different picture emerged from the other three schools on the topic of writing, in School B 67.6% of pupils did not enjoy writing at all and over half of the pupils from School A and School F agreed.

When asked whether MIE should continue, the overwhelming response among pupils from all schools is that MIE should continue in their school (see Table 7.27). Of the 130 pupils who responded to the question, 124 (95.4%) want MIE to continue, while only 6 (4.6%) did not. This represents a ringing endorsement of MIE from participating primary pupils. Although pupils from the secondary school were less positive about MIE than those from primary schools, over three quarters would like the programme to continue and, taken together, the evidence from the student body is strongly in favour of the continuation of MIE.

Finally, when asked what needs to happen to improve MIE, a number of suggestions were made for improving the programme. The most common suggestions made were more hardware, a greater choice of films to watch and analyse and more time spent doing MIE and finishing MIE work. A number of pupils also commented that there should be the same MIE teacher all the way through.

### **Summary of main points**

- Watching films/DVDs and editing are the most commonly reported MIE activities
- Enjoyment of the different aspects of MIE varied from school to school with most pupils enjoying making films

- Only a minority of pupils reported finding MIE boring
- Perceived impact on literacy skills varied between schools with writing the least affected
- MIE helped with ICT skills and group work
- The vast majority wanted MIE activities to continue
- Improvements that were suggested included more hardware and a greater choice of films/DVDs

### 7.3 Questionnaire responses of Secondary School pupils to MIE

When S1 and S2 pupils were asked to describe what they had done in MIE sessions, they gave a wide range of responses (see Table G 2.1); some listed a number of activities while others gave only one or two answers. The most common MIE activity by far was making films followed by animating, watching films and editing. Although writing and analysis were also mentioned (by 12% and 13.7% of pupils respectively), it seems clear that the vast majority of pupils connected the more practical and creative disciplines with MIE rather than those based on traditional forms of literacy.

Pupils reported that the most enjoyable aspects of MIE were making films, animating and editing which combined accounted for over 65% of responses, again all aspects of film creation in general, compared with only 1.1% who most enjoyed storyboarding, which includes writing. 12% of pupils responded that they enjoyed the whole MIE package while over 10% did not like anything about MIE at all (see Table G 2.2).

In response to the question concerning the downside of MIE, consistent with responses to the previous two questions, the highest scoring category was writing at 22% (see Table G 2.3). The next most common complaint was a lack of time devoted to MIE and in particular, not enough time to finish making their films. Over 13% of pupils felt that there were no components of MIE that they did not enjoy.

A high percentage of pupils (80.8%) felt that MIE had not helped them with their reading and around half thought that their writing, talking and listening had not benefited either (see Table G 2.4). On a more positive note, 18% of pupils reported that their writing and talking skills had improved to a large extent.

MIE has helped a significant number of pupils in other ways, most notably with their ICT skills and ability to work well in groups, particularly with those who are not their friends (see Table G 2.5). Unfortunately, almost one quarter of pupils did not think that MIE had helped them in any other way.

When asked how much they enjoyed the various aspects of MIE, watching and making films was once more deemed to be the most enjoyable aspect of MIE, with 51.4% and 42.15% of pupils respectively responding that they enjoyed these activities to a large extent. Conversely 71% of pupils did not enjoy writing at all and 56.8% did not enjoy the talking part of MIE at all. It is perhaps surprising to note that almost 30% did not enjoy making films at all, this may be attributable (a number of comments made on the questionnaires would appear to confirm this view) to some pupils feeling that they were not involved enough in the making of their own group's film (see Table G 2.6).

Despite some of the disappointing and negative responses given to previous questions, over three quarters of all pupils would like to see MIE continuing in their school, mainly so that younger pupils could have the opportunity to take part in the activities (see Table G 2.7).

Finally, in response to pupils' views on how to improve MIE sessions, a number of suggestions for improving MIE were made, the most common being a greater choice of film clips to watch and analyse and more time allocated to MIE. Over 20% thought that nothing was needed to improve MIE while over a quarter of pupils offered other suggestions the most popular of which were being allowed to choose their own groups and having the MIE practitioner that they had in primary school back (see Table G 2.8).

### Summary of main points

- Despite the difficulties, most secondary school pupils identified something about MIE which they found stimulating and enjoyable
- Watching films/DVDs was the most commonly reported MIE activity by far and also the most enjoyable
- A significant minority of secondary pupils did not enjoy anything about MIE
- Over one-fifth found writing the least enjoyable aspect of MIE
- The majority of pupils responded that MIE had not helped them at all with their reading and over half responded that MIE had not helped with their writing and listening.
- Over one-third of pupils thought that MIE had helped with group work and ICT skills
- Three quarters of secondary pupils would like MIE to continue in their school
- Pupils felt that MIE would be better if there was more time devoted to it and if there was a greater choice of film

### 7.4 National Assessments in Reading and Writing

Tables 7.41 to 7.48 show the results of the national assessments (that is, the 5-14 Levels of Attainment) for the period 2002-2008 for all pupils P6 – S1 in all the schools in the cluster and for the period 2002-08 for S2 pupils. As far as pupils in the primary schools are concerned, the years 2002 and 2003 are the National Assessment data for P6 and P7 pupils prior to the introduction of MIE in these schools. The data for the years 2004 – 2008 cover the period when the pupils had experienced MIE.

Close inspection of Tables 7.41 and 7.42 seems to indicate that there is some tangible improvement in the **reading** assessments for P6 pupils who had experienced MIE. There is a small, but significant percentage of P6 pupils assessed as achieving Level E (or F) between 2004 and 2007 compared with more in the years 2002 and 2003 and a very slightly lower percentage at Level C for the same period, particularly in 2006.

As far as **writing** is concerned, the cohort of P6 pupils in 2004/2007 also shows significant improvement over P6 cohorts prior to 2004. Only 32.9% were assessed as achieving Level C in 2006 compared with 51.5 and 46.1% in 2002 and 2003 respectively.

**Table 7.41 5-14 Attainment Levels in Reading for P6 pupils in 2002-2007**

Year	Attainment						Total Number of P6 pupils
	Level C		Level D		Level E/F		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
2002	72	53.7	38	28.4	0	0	134
2003	58	56.3	34	33.0	0	0	103
2004	55	44.0	43	34.40	3	2.4	125
2005	75	55.6	37	27.4	3	2.2	135
2006	48	32.9	65	44.5	2	1.4	146
2007	60	50.4	40	33.6	1	0.8	119

**Table 7.42 5-14 Attainment Levels in Writing for P6 pupils in 2002-2007**

Year	Attainment						Total Number of P6 pupils
	Level C		Level D		Level E/F		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
2002	69	51.5	29	21.6	0	0	134
2003	47	46.1	16	15.7	1	0	103
2004	53	42.4	29	23.2	2	1.6	125
2005	85	63.0	24	17.8	0	0	135
2006	48	32.9	65	44.5	2	1.4	146
2007	73	61.3	19	16.0	2	1.7	119

The data for P7 pupils on **reading** is also quite positive (see Table 7.43). P7 pupils rated at Level E/F for the period 2004-2007 range from 28.5% to 37.5% compared with a range of 16.7% to 27.7% in pre-MIE assessments. The data also show a lower percentage of P7 pupils post-MIE rated at Level C. As far as **writing** is concerned there was no consistent discernable trend (see Table 7.44).

It would appear therefore that experience of MIE could have impacted on children's literacy skills though the evidence is very tentative and not conclusive. It could be that children in general from 2004 improved across the board in literacy. Unfortunately, national data is not available for those assessments to undertake further analysis.

**Table 7.43 5-14 Attainment Levels in Reading for P7 pupils in 2002-2007**

Year	Attainment						Total Number of P7 pupils
	Level C		Level D		Level E/F		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
2002	33	25.4	45	34.6	36	27.7	130
2003	38	26.4	60	41.7	24	16.7	144
2004	20	19.2	43	41.4	39	37.5	104
2005	30	24.8	43	35.6	36	29.8	121
2006	23	16.3	66	46.8	43	30.5	141
2007	24	16.7	62	43.1	41	28.5	144

**Table 7.44 5-14 Attainment Levels in Writing for P7 pupils 2—2-2007**

Year	Attainment						Total Number of P7 pupils
	Level C		Level D		Level E/F		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	
2002	44	33.9	33	25.4	24	18.5	130
2003	41	28.5	59	41.0	25	17.4	144
2004	23	22.1	45	43.3	25	24.0	104
2005	33	27.3	47	38.8	22	18.2	121
2006	43	30.5	58	41.1	25	17.7	141
2007	43	29.9	64	44.4	13	9.0	144

In the case of pupils in the secondary school (Tables 7.45 to 7.48) the ‘pre-MIE’ assessments were undertaken in 2004 and 2005 with the ‘post-MIE’ assessments in 2006, 2007 and 2008. Inspection of Tables 7.45 and 7.46 show no discernable difference between 2004/5 and 2006/7 in both **reading** and **writing** for S1 pupils despite the fact that the pupils in 2006-2008 will have experienced MIE for at least two years, mainly in the primary school.

**Table 7.45 5-14 Attainment Levels in Reading for S1 pupils**

	Attainment								
	Level C		Level D		Level E		Level F		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
2004	23	18.0	52	36.1	61	42.4	2	1.4	144
2005	10	9.3	29	27.0	58	53.7	6	5.6	108
2006	12	10.1	52	43.7	43	36.1	4	3.4	119
2007	10	7.4	55	40.7	51	39.8	8	5.9	135
2008	n/a	12.7	n/a	35.9	n/a	42.3	n/a	2.1	n/a

**Table 7.46 5-14 Attainment Levels in Writing for S1 pupils**

	Attainment								
	Level C		Level D		Level E		Level F		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
2004	23	18.0	51	35.4	59	41.0	4	2.8	144
2005	10	9.3	51	47.2	35	32.4	5	4.6	108
2006	22	18.5	53	44.5	30	25.2	3	2.5	119
2007	13	9.6	59	43.7	45	33.3	4	3.0	135
2008	n/a	15.5	n/a	50.0	n/a	26.1	n/a	0.0	n/a

The situation for the S2 pupils is very marginally more positive. In the ‘post-MIE’ years (2006-2008) the proportion of pupils being assessed as achieving Level C in reading was markedly lower (5.6%, 2.6% and 6.7% respectively) than the proportion of pupils in 2004 and 2005 at Level C, i.e. the ‘pre-MIE’ years (10.1% and 12.3% respectively). The same pattern was evident for S2 pupils in writing (6.5%, 6.1% and 8.9% compared to 9.4% and 11.0% respectively)

Whilst the proportion of S2 pupils assessed as achieving Level C diminished, the proportion of pupils being assessed at Level E increased in both reading and writing (see Tables 7.47 and 7.48). Thus there is some very tentative evidence that experiencing MIE may have impacted on young people’s literacy skills in both reading and writing – but only after three years of MIE.

**Table 7.47 5-14 Attainment Levels in Reading for S2 pupils**

	Attainment								
	Level C		Level D		Level E		Level F		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
2004	14	10.1	41	29.7	43	31.2	38	27.5	138
2005	19	12.3	41	26.5	60	38.7	23	14.8	155
2006	6	5.6	22	20.4	56	51.9	20	18.5	108
2007	3	2.6	32	28.1	53	46.5	20	17.5	114
2008	n/a	6.7	n/a	23.7	n/a	51.9	n/a	11.9	n/a

**Table 7.48 5-14 Attainment Levels in Writing for S2 pupils**

	Attainment								
	Level C		Level D		Level E		Level F		Total
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
2004	13	9.4	48	37.8	56	40.1	17	12.3	138
2005	17	11.0	49	31.6	68	43.9	7	4.5	155
2006	7	6.5	37	34.3	46	45.6	13	12.0	108
2007	7	6.1	36	31.6	57	50.0	7	6.1	114
2008	n/a	8.9	n/a	28.1	n/a	51.1	n/a	5.2	n/a

## 7.5 PIPS data for P7 pupils

Tables 7.51 – 7.54 show the PIPS results in both achievement and attitudes in maths, reading and science for P7 pupils in MIE schools and comparable non-MIE schools. The levels range from A to E, with A being the highest grade and E the lowest grade (cf the grades for the Scottish National Assessment where Grade A is the lowest and Grade F is the highest).

Extracting the data for the highest two grade levels in **reading** (that is, A and B) there is some slight indication that the achievement level in the MIE schools was higher than that in non-MIE schools (47.6% and 28.1% respectively).

Similarly, attitudes to reading were also scored higher in the MIE schools – 24.3% and 13.8% respectively at Levels A and B taken together. These data marginally support the findings from the previous Section (that is, 7.4) with regard to higher reading assessments for pupils with experience of MIE on the 5-14 national assessment scheme. However, longitudinal data is not available to undertake further analysis.

**Table 7.51 PIPS scores for pupils in MIE primary schools (%) N = 103****Achievement**

Subject	Level				
	A	B	C	D	E
Maths	13.5	31.9	44.7	4.8	4.4
Reading	32.4	15.2	41.3	7.7	3.7
Science	30.4	9.2	42.5	14.5	3.5

**Table 7.52 Attitude scores on PIPS for pupils in MIE primary schools (%) N = 103****Attitudes**

Subject	Level				
	A	B	C	D	E
Maths	1.3	6.2	32.2	41.4	18.9
Reading	2.0	22.3	15.0	30.9	29.8
Science	0.4	8.0	12.0	33.1	46.1
School	0.5	1.3	12.1	4.9	43.0

**Table 7.53 PIPS scores for pupils in non-MIE primary schools (%) N = 86****Achievement**

Subject	Level				
	A	B	C	D	E
Maths	12.3	18.3	44.4	16.3	9.6
Reading	7.4	20.7	52.8	12.2	8.4
Science	14.4	19.6	44.4	16.5	4.5

**Table 7.54 Attitude Scores on PIPS for pupils in non-MIE schools (%) N = 86****Attitude**

Subject	Level				
	A	B	C	D	E
Maths	4.2	13.6	26.3	25.5	15.7
Reading	9.3	4.5	14.2	19.6	44.1
Science	0	4.3	10.3	51.3	32.5
School	2.7	2.9	12.3	40.9	40.5

## CHAPTER 8: DISCUSSION

### 8.1 Introduction

The discussion in this chapter focuses on the findings of the evaluation in respect of the four main aims of the evaluation, namely:

- to assess the overall impact of the project on the teachers and pupils in the participating schools;
- to identify what, if any, impact it has had on the development of teaching and learning skills and in particular the development of literacy;
- to explore the impact of the project on the development of ICT skills and teamwork in those pupils participating in the project;
- to identify what improvement, if any, participation in the project has had on pupil attitudes, motivation, self-esteem, achievement and attainment levels; development of a more creative approach to learning and transition to secondary school.

Initially, this Chapter addresses the 14 research questions (as set out in Section 2.1 of the Report) which were derived from the above aims for the evaluation. The discussion then reflects on how the findings illuminate the extent to which the main aims of MIE (see Section 1.3) have been achieved.

### 8.2 Overall impact of MIE on teachers and pupils

At the outset of the evaluation, all participating staff were asked about their perceptions of the underlying assumptions about MIE. Responses differed sharply in their emphasis on different aspects of MIE. Some regarded MIE as essentially a motivational and engaging process to school work in general (including literacy skills) whilst others were quite clear that it had a specific purpose in enhancing children's literacy development *per se*. Only a minority explicitly identified the purpose of MIE as equipping young people to being literate for the modern age in which visual images play such a powerful role.

These findings resonate with the arguments made, particularly by Buckingham (2000, 2005, 2006), Lanksheer and Knobel (2003) and Schwarz and Brown (2005) regarding the ubiquity of media in children's lives. In addition, an accompanying expansion of traditional understandings of literacy to include engagement with and articulation of visual images underlines the importance of this point (See Section 1.2).

In terms of the overall impact of the MIE project on teachers, the picture is sharply divided between teachers in the six primary schools and teachers in the secondary school. The overwhelming majority of teachers in the primary schools reacted very positively to MIE, though a small minority were cautious at first. Those who reacted very well to MIE regarded it as an alternative pedagogy for teaching literacy, group work and ICT skills. Others saw MIE as an addition to existing pedagogy. Part of the reason for the initial positive response was the skill and enthusiasm of the Lead Practitioner that promptly transferred to the P6 and P7 pupils in the primary schools involved. Not unexpectedly some teachers regarded MIE as a significant challenge, especially the longer serving teachers who were not totally at ease with learning how to use new (and complex) software. However, with support from the Lead

Practitioner and the explicit high level of motivation in the pupils, most of the reluctance was overcome, particularly in the second year.

Undoubtedly, MIE has also motivated many teachers. They willingly gave up some of their non-school time to attend workshops, meetings and training sessions in order to become more skilled in all the various aspects of MIE – from the specifically pedagogic skills of analysing moving images to the highly technical aspects of constructing images such as DVDs, etc. They also responded warmly to the input from the Lead Practitioner.

It is also noteworthy that, in the primary schools, MIE was not simply a temporary gimmick. It has become embedded in routine practice in many, if not all, of the schools due largely to the enthusiasm of specific teachers and the respective headteachers. The evaluators are now confident that MIE is sustainable in the upper part of the primary school.

Turning to teachers in the secondary school, the situation was more complex. Given the emphasis on the value of MIE in teaching conventional literacy skills (as well as expanding such skills to encompass visual literacy) it was initially introduced into the English department in the school. At first, some English teachers were willing ‘to try’ MIE whilst others were hesitant to learning new and complex technical skills in the use of ICT. Others were cautious (as were some teachers in the primary schools at first but for different reasons) largely as a consequence of the ideas and procedures emerging from the primary school sector in an area of the curriculum in which English teachers have expertise. Some of the difficulties encountered in the first year of MIE in the secondary school also got caught up with personality differences and staffing issues, which compounded the initial problems. Perhaps, in hindsight, it was a mistake to expect MIE to be entirely located with teachers in the one department, albeit, the English department.

However, in time, and with considerable reflection, new possible ways of approaching MIE arose from the school. It gradually became apparent in the second year of MIE in the secondary school that if MIE was there to stay, it would be better approached from an inter-disciplinary (or inter-departmental) perspective involving the departments of English, ICT, Art, and Music. Such an inter-disciplinary approach to the curriculum is innovative in Scottish secondary schools. It is new territory. Unfortunately the FlaT evaluation of MIE in this cluster of schools did not afford the opportunity to explore the introduction of inter-disciplinary work in the field of MIE. It merely identified the proposal (supported by the headteacher) for such new pedagogic arrangements. Whether it has been possible to introduce and sustain MIE in the secondary school by using an inter-disciplinary approach is, as yet, uncertain.

The complexity of this situation mirrors the arguments of Pugente *et al.* (2005) and Buckingham (2006) put forward in Section 1.2 regarding the observation of the teaching of media. Three of Pugente *et al.*'s proposed approaches, namely a medium-based approach, a themed approach and integrating into the curriculum generally, provide an understanding of how MIE operated mostly in the primary schools. Pugente *et al.*'s fourth suggestion of a discrete subject and Buckingham's arguments for media as both a subject of study and a study tool, reflect the issue for MIE learning and teaching in the secondary school

Turning now to the overall impact on pupils, the overwhelming response was impressive. In the primary schools virtually all the P6/P7 pupils involved responded extremely enthusiastically to most of the MIE activities, though some were less enthusiastic when writing was required. The influence of MIE on pupils' motivation was blatantly evident. To many, MIE sessions were the highlight of their school day! Even those pupils who were reluctant, for a range of reasons, to participate fully in regular classroom activities responded well to MIE. MIE was new, exciting, challenging and rewarding. Any visitor to the schools to observe MIE sessions couldn't help but be impressed! Undoubtedly, as with the teachers,

the skill and enthusiasm of the Lead Practitioners played a key role in orchestrating the pupil response.

In the response to the questionnaires, virtually all the pupils in the primary schools found their experience of MIE enjoyable though enjoyment of the different aspects varied from school to school. Clearly, engaging in MIE activities helped with pupils' ICT and group work skills as well as helping some (but by no means all) with their writing. It is of interest to note that whilst most teachers perceived MIE to help children's talking and listening skills, the children's perceptions of themselves varied from school to school with many nominating this aspect of MIE that had benefitted them only to a small extent. Finally, as far as pupils in the primary schools were concerned, the vast majority wanted MIE to continue into the secondary school.

Possible explanations for pupil enthusiasm for MIE can not only be found in their familiarity with the medium (see Section 1.2) but also in the changing pupil-teacher relationships, leading to greater feelings of autonomy that may match their experiences outside school. In particular, Buckingham's argument that outside school young people are encouraged by and via media to be active participants in and consumers of media products is matched more closely by the active, social model of learning entailed in MIE than more traditional forms of teaching.

### **8.3 Impact and change in development of teaching and learning skills and in particular the development of literacy**

Commensurate with the findings in Section 8.2 above, evidence from the evaluation indicated MIE has had a positive impact on learning and teaching within primary schools. There is comparatively little evidence, however, that the impact was sustained into the secondary school in any significant way.

The majority of teachers in primary schools reported that they had altered their approach to teaching literacy, some dramatically so. Most primary teachers also indicated that MIE has had some impact on how they teach other curricular areas. In particular, they pointed towards increased questioning skills (for themselves and their pupils) in which contributions are probed, challenged and justified. There is strong evidence of this development in interviews with teachers, focus groups with pupils and in the evaluation team's observations. In addition to the use of moving and other images in a range of curricular areas, teachers also reported that pupils demonstrated an increased ability to identify and generate the knowledge and understanding they required to progress in whichever topic they were studying. Again, this finding matches Buckingham's (2006) argument for a Vygotsky-based dynamic pedagogical model (see Section 1.2).

In the secondary school, the impact of MIE on teaching and learning within the subject department in which it was located was not as comprehensive as that in primary schools. The extent and nature of the value of MIE was mixed. The range of responses can be seen as a continuum from those who were positively disposed to those who regarded MIE as providing no added-value to literacy learning. Some teachers remained largely, but not exclusively, towards one end of the continuum. All teachers, however, moved along the continuum to a greater or lesser degree in relation to their experiences of MIE. Sometimes some teachers felt MIE offered a refreshing slant on literacy, as having some intrinsic value in modern culture, and connecting with the work already carried out in the department. For others, and at other times, MIE offered nothing new. At best, it was seen as an interesting resource and at worst an intrusion into and diversion from the core work of the department (see Section 8.6).

Nevertheless, there was evidence of innovation in teaching and learning in response to, if not actually stimulated by, MIE. The most obvious example was the production of visual representations of similes in one class.

In terms of literacy development, the impact was mixed. Most obviously, visual literacy increased as would be expected in this project. Within traditional literacies, the greatest perceived impact was on talking and listening. Primary teachers and pupils from P6 through to S2 agreed that talking and listening skills had been enhanced and also that there had been some impact on writing. There was less certainty over whether or not MIE has had any impact on reading. However, the findings from Section 7.4 indicate that, in terms of the 5-14 Levels of Attainment, some improvement in reading and writing had occurred over the period. Whether this is attributable to MIE is uncertain.

#### **8.4 Impact of the development of ICT skills and teamwork in those pupils participating in the project**

There is strong evidence that ICT skills and teamwork improved considerably, especially in the primary schools. Even among those teachers who were initially unable to identify any impact on literacy, there had been an observable benefit for pupils working together and increasing ICT skills. Most obviously, the filming and editing processes had contributed to both.

Again, the impact was less certain in the secondary school. Some teachers reported that the collaborative aspects of MIE had resulted in some pupils hiding and allowing the others involved in their task to do the work. Moreover, there was no evidence of any significant increase in ICT skills.

The findings related to teamwork and ICT skills match Buckingham's (2006) analysis of media education as an essentially social, rather than individual process (see Section 1.2).

#### **8.5 Improvements in attitudes, motivation, etc.**

The teachers who were interviewed in the evaluation consistently reported enhanced cooperation amongst their pupils as a direct consequence of engaging in MIE. As far as pupil behaviour was concerned, none of the schools were experiencing any significant level of misbehaviour prior to MIE so it is not possible for the evaluators to make any claims in this regard. Neither is there any significant evidence that MIE has helped with the transition from primary to secondary school. Other than the consistent desire of pupils in the primary schools to continue with MIE in the secondary school, only one teacher thought that her pupils' enhanced confidence would help with the transition to secondary school.

On the question of a more creative approach to learning, undoubtedly the pupils had displayed quite sophisticated creativity in the design construction of their artefacts. Their creative ideas were astounding. However, there is little evidence to claim that such creativity has transferred to other areas of the curriculum.

The problematic nature of transfer was recognised in Section 1.2 where critical learning skills such as those entailed in a meta-cognitive process were offered as possible approaches.

## CHAPTER 9 : CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the findings outlined in chapters 3-6, the following conclusions have emerged:

- At the outset there was, in general, a positive reaction to the introduction of Moving Image Education into the selected cluster of schools. Although many aspects of MIE were regarded as challenging, particularly the technical aspects, there was no sense that the schools saw MIE as burdensome or peripheral.
- On the whole, teachers in the primary schools responded very positively to the various activities associated with MIE, though a small minority were initially cautious given the level of technical skill required.
- The role of the Lead Practitioners was crucial. Their skill, enthusiasm and expertise played a very large part in the success of MIE.
- MIE proceeded more successfully when teachers regarded it as an alternative (and better) pedagogy for the teaching and learning of traditional literacy skills.
- Virtually all pupils were enthused by MIE. They saw it as exciting, challenging, fun and highly motivating.
- There are some tentative indications that engaging in MIE over a period of time impacts positively on children's literacy as well as on their ICT and group work skills. Teachers were convinced that MIE had improved children's talking and listening skills though there were mixed views on the impact of MIE on children's writing. As far as the formal assessments were concerned, there was some evidence, though by no means conclusive, that MIE had improved children's reading and writing skills.
- Headteachers in general were supportive of MIE, particularly when faced with such eager and willing learners, though MIE was more successful when the headteacher adopted a 'champion' role in the promotion of MIE.
- The role of the local authority, including involvement of senior management, was significant in developing MIE in the cluster of schools involved.
- MIE is now sustainable in the initial cluster of primary schools providing that access to technical expertise is available, if required, on request.
- MIE has been more successfully introduced into the primary schools. In the secondary school, for a range of reasons such as the structure, organisation, teacher attitudes and teacher absence, the introduction of MIE has been problematic. However, the outcome of the initial problem of introducing MIE into the secondary school has been the willingness on the part of many teachers to experiment with an inter-disciplinary approach to MIE.
- Despite the many challenges which arose, members of the English Department in the secondary school remained key players in the development of MIE.
- MIE as it has been operating in the cluster of schools is highly compatible with the impending introduction of the Curriculum for Excellence in Scottish schools.

## References

- Besley, T. (2003) 'Hybridized and globalized: youth cultures in the postmodern era'. *The Review of Education/Pedagogy/ Cultural Studies* 25 (2), 75-99.
- Buckingham, D. (2000) *after the death of childhood*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- Buckingham, D. (2005) *Schooling the digital generation*. London: Institute of Education.
- Buckingham, D. (2006) *media education: literacy, learning and contemporary culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Considine, D.M. and Haley, G.E. (1999) *Visual messages: integrating imagery into instruction*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition) Englewood, CO: Teachers Ideas Press.
- Cortés, C. (2005) 'How the media teach'. In Schwarz and Brown (2005).
- Giroux, H. (1990) *Curriculum discourse as postmodern critical practice*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.
- Giroux, H. (1997) 'Disney, Southern Baptists and children's culture: the magic kingdom as Sodom and Gomorrah'. <http://www.zmag.org/zmag/articles/Girouxsept97.htm>
- Goetze, S.K., Brown, D.S. and Schwarz, G. (2000) 'Teachers need media literacy too!' In Schwarz and Brown (2005).
- Hart, A and Hicks, A. (2002) *Teaching media in the English curriculum*. Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.
- Head, G. (2007) *Better Learning, Better Behaviour*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.
- Lankshear, C. and Knobel, M. (2003) *New literacies: changing knowledge and classroom learning*. Buckingham, UK; Philadelphia, PA: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.
- McBrien, J.L. (2005) 'Uninformed in the information age: why media necessitate critical thinking education'. In Schwarz and Brown (2005).
- Martin, M. (2007) *Building a Learning Community in the Primary Classroom*. Edinburgh: Dunedin Academic Press.
- Ofcom (2008) *Media Literacy Audit: report on UK children's media literacy*. London: Ofcom.
- Pugente, J.V., Duncan, B. and Andersen, N. (2005) 'The Canadian Experience: leading the way'. In Schwarz and Brown (2005).
- Schwarz, G. and Brown, P.U. (eds) (2005) *Media Literacy: Transforming curriculum and teaching*. Chicago, ill: NSSE.
- Vygotsky, L. (1962) *Thought and Language*. (revised 1986) Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press.
- Vygotsky, L. (1978) *Mind and Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

## **APPENDICES**



### C. Observation of teachers and classroom assistants

Collaboration: How closely do MIE teacher and classroom staff work together in:

Planning, delivering, evaluating?  
How explicit is this?  
Do pupils see this?

How closely do class teachers and assistants work together in:

Preparation, delivering, evaluation?

To what extent do the adults involve the children in all of the above?

Teaching: How does the teacher deal with problems related to MIE?

Supplying the answer?  
Directing pupils towards the answer?  
By asking process questions that help pupils generate the answer?

How does the teacher respond to pupils' work?

- praise and criticism?
- Exploring the process with pupils?

How does the teacher deal with non MIE issues (e.g. behaviour)?

- by addressing the issue?
- by minimising the issue and directing the pupil(s) back to the task?

How does the teacher address literacy?

**Appendix B**

**University of Glasgow**

**Faculty of Education**

**Evaluation of the  
Moving Image Project**

**INTERVIEW SCHEDULE  
FOR TEACHERS**

**Name of Interviewee:** .....

**Name of Interviewer:** .....

**Date:** .....

**Start time:** .....

**Finish time:** .....

**PLEASE STRESS THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE INFORMATION  
AND VIEWS SUPPLIED**

**THEME 1 : IMPACT OF M.I.E. ON TEACHERS AND PUPILS IN PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS**

1. What assumptions underpin the design of the project?  
[Probe the teacher about his/her knowledge and understanding of the project.]
2. What input has there been from M.I.E. staff? How do you respond to the input?  
Are you positive or negative?  
Do you have any examples given?
3. Have you detected any difference in pupils' attitude, motivation, self-esteem, attainment levels and the development of a more creative approach to learning, I.C.T, skills and teamwork between those pupils involved in MIE work and those that are not  
If yes, give examples
4. How did pupils respond to input from M.I.E staff?  
Were they positive or negative?  
Are any examples given?
5. Have pupils noticed any improvements in attitude, motivation, self-esteem, etc. within themselves and their classmates?  
If yes, give examples.

**THEME 2 : IMPACT AND CHANGE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING  
SKILLS, ESPECIALLY THE DEVELOPMENT OF LITERACY**

6. Have you changed or are planning to change strategies for teaching literacy skills in response to participation in M.I.E? If yes, give examples.
7. How have the pupils responded to the changes made?  
Give examples.
8. Have you been able to detect any impact on pupils' literacy skills as a result of participation in M.I.E.?  
If yes, give examples.
9. To what extent have pupils displayed improved teamwork? Give examples.

### **THEME 3 : IMPROVEMENTS IN PUPIL ATTITUDE AND BEHAVIOUR**

10. Have you detected any impact on pupils' communication, co-operation and behaviour (e.g. less aggression) at school?
11. Was the transition from primary to secondary school smoother for participating pupils as a result of the project
12. Have you detected a more creative approach to learning been developed? Give examples.

### **THEME 4 : TEACHER PERSPECTIVES**

13. Do you have any suggestions for improvements in the design and delivery of the project?
14. Do you feel that you are adequately prepared to deliver the course?
15. What are your opinions about the sustainability and practical efficacy of the project?
16. Do you think that the programme would work well in other schools across Scotland?

### **THEME 5 : REFLECTION**

17. What do you see as the main strengths so far with the M.I.E. project?
18. Does it have any shortcomings?
19. How might M.I.E. activities be sustained in your school in the future?

University of Glasgow

Faculty of Education

**Evaluation of the  
Moving Image Project**

**INTERVIEW SCHEDULE  
FOR MIE STAFF**

**Name of Interviewee:** .....

**Name of Interviewer:** .....

**Date:** .....

**Start time:** .....

**Finish time:** .....

**PLEASE STRESS THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE INFORMATION AND  
VIEWS SUPPLIED**

**THEME 1 : BACKGROUND, UNDERPINNING CONCEPTS AND IMPACT OF M.I.E. ON TEACHERS AND PUPILS IN PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS**

1. What assumptions underpin the design of the project?
2. How did you hear about MIE?
3. What about MIE made you feel it would be worthwhile investing time and resources?
4. What expectations do you have for MIE?
5. What assumptions about teaching and learning underpin MIE?
6. What role do you play in the project?
7. What communication processes are in place to let different people know what is going on?
8. How is progress monitored and disseminated?
9. Are you able to gauge response of the teachers about the input from M.I.E. staff?  
Are they positive or negative?  
Are any examples given?
10. Can you gauge how pupils respond to input from M.I.E staff?  
Are they positive or negative?  
Are any examples given

**THEME 2 : IMPACT AND CHANGE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING SKILLS, ESPECIALLY THE DEVELOPMENT OF LITERACY**

11. In particular, have teachers changed strategies for teaching literacy skills in response to participation in M.I.E? If yes, give examples.
12. Are you aware of any other impact on or change in teaching as a result of teachers' participation in MIE?
13. How have the pupils responded to the changes made?  
Give examples.
14. Do you know if pupils have improved their literacy skills as a result of participation in M.I.E.?  
If yes, give examples.
15. Do you know if pupils have displayed improved ICT skills and teamwork?  
Give examples.

### **THEME 3 : IMPROVEMENTS IN PUPIL ATTITUDE AND BEHAVIOUR**

16. Do you know if pupils have displayed better communication, co-operation and behaviour (e.g. less aggression) at school?
17. Has a more creative approach to learning been developed? Give examples.

### **THEME 4 : MIE STAFF PERSPECTIVES**

18. Do you have any suggestions for improvements in the design and delivery of the project?
19. Do you know if teachers feel that they are adequately prepared to deliver the course?
20. What are your opinions about the sustainability and practical efficacy of the project?
21. Do you think that the programme would work well in other authorities across Scotland?

### **THEME 5 : REFLECTION**

22. What do you see as the main strengths so far with the M.I.E. project?
23. Does it have any shortcomings?
24. How might M.I.E. activities be sustained and developed?
25. Are there any further comments you would like to make?

THANK YOU FOR TAKING PART

**APPENDIX D**

**University of Glasgow**

**Faculty of Education**

**Evaluation of the  
Moving Image Project**

**INTERVIEW SCHEDULE  
FOR HEADTEACHERS**

**Name of Interviewee:** .....

**Name of Interviewer:** .....

**Date:** .....

**Start time:** .....

**Finish time:** .....

**PLEASE STRESS THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE INFORMATION  
AND VIEWS SUPPLIED**

## **THEME 1 : IMPACT OF M.I.E. ON TEACHERS AND PUPILS IN PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS**

1. what assumptions underpin the design of the project?  
  
[Probe the headteacher about their knowledge of the project. Do they share these assumptions?]
2. What input has there been from MIE staff? How do you respond to this input?  
  
Are they positive or negative?  
Are any examples given?
3. Have you detected any difference in pupils' attitude, motivation, self-esteem, attainment levels and the development of a more creative approach to learning, I.C.T, skills and teamwork between pupils involved in MIE and those who are not?  
  
If yes, give examples
4. How did pupils respond to input from M.I.E staff?  
  
Were they positive or negative?  
Are any examples given?
5. Do you think that pupils have noticed any improvements in attitude, motivation, self-esteem, etc. within themselves and their classmates?  
If yes, give examples.

## **THEME 2 : MANAGEMENT OF THE M.I.E. INPUT**

6. What support does the school provide to the M.I.E. project?
7. What support is forthcoming from outside the school for the project, if any?
8. Does any specific staff development take place in relation to the M.I.E. work?  
If so, please specify.
9. Are there any plans to involve other teachers in the school in M.I.E. work?
10. Has there been any response from HMIE or Angus Council to the project? If so, please specify

## **THEME 3 : IMPROVEMENTS IN PUPIL ATTITUDE AND BEHAVIOUR**

11. Have you been able to detect any impact on pupils' communication, co-operation and behaviour (e.g. less aggression) at school?
12. Do you think the transition from primary to secondary school to be smoother for participating pupils as a result of the project

13. Have you detected a more creative approach to learning? Give examples.

**THEME 4 : HEADTEACHER PERSPECTIVES**

14. Do you have any suggestions for improvements in the design and delivery of the project?
15. Do you feel that your teachers are adequately prepared to deliver the course?
16. What are your opinions about the sustainability and practical efficacy of the project?
17. Do you think that the programme would work well in other schools across Scotland?

**THEME 5 : REFLECTION**

18. What do you see as the main strengths so far with the M.I.E. project?
19. Does it have any shortcomings?
20. How might M.I.E. activities be sustained in your school in the future?

**APPENDIX E**

**University of Glasgow**

**Faculty of Education**

**Evaluation of the  
Moving Image Project**

**INTERVIEW SCHEDULE  
FOR LOCAL AUTHORITY STAFF**

**Name of Interviewee:** .....

**Name of Interviewer:** .....

**Date:** .....

**Start time:** .....

**Finish time:** .....

**PLEASE STRESS THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF THE INFORMATION AND  
VIEWS SUPPLIED**

**THEME 1 : BACKGROUND, UNDERPINNING CONCEPTS AND IMPACT OF M.I.E. ON TEACHERS AND PUPILS IN PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS**

1. How did you first hear about MIE?
2. What do you understand to be the purpose of the project?
3. What made you feel it would be worthwhile the Authority investing time and resources in the project?
4. What expectations do you have for MIE?
5. What role does the Authority you play in the project?
6. Are there any communication processes in place to let different people know what is going on?
7. How is progress monitored and disseminated in the Authority?
8. In general terms, are you able to gauge response of the teachers about the input from from MIE staff?  
  
Are they positive or negative?  
Are any examples given?

**THEME 2 : IMPACT AND CHANGE IN TEACHING AND LEARNING SKILLS, ESPECIALLY THE DEVELOPMENT OF LITERACY**

9. Are you aware as to whether teachers have changed their strategies for teaching literacy skills in response to participation in M.I.E? If yes, give examples.
10. Are you aware as to how the pupils responded to the changes made?
11. Do you know if pupils have displayed improved ICT skills and teamwork? Give examples.

**THEME 3 : MANAGEMENT**

12. Do you have any views about how the project is managed?
13. What resources have been made available from the Authority to support the project?
14. What interest is shown by external stakeholders (AMIE, SEED, etc.)

#### **THEME 4: REFLECTION**

15. What do you see as the main strengths so far with the M.I.E. project?
16. Does it have any shortcomings?
17. What are your opinions about the sustainability and practical efficacy of the project?
18. How might M.I.E. activities be sustained and developed?
19. Do you know if teachers feel that they are adequately prepared to deliver the course?
20. Do you think that the programme would work well in other authorities across Scotland?
21. Are there any further comments you would like to make?

THANK YOU FOR TAKING PART

## **APPENDIX F**

**University of Glasgow**

**Department of Educational Studies**

### **Moving Image Education : Questionnaire for Primary School Pupils**

You are not asked to give your name or the name of your school in this questionnaire. Should you do so in any of your answers, neither your name nor the name of your school will be used in our report. Your answers will be reported only as 'pupils' answers'.

1. Please describe what you have done in MIE since you began receiving it.
2. What has been good about it?
3. What has not been good?
4. In what ways, if any, MIE has helped you with:
  - Reading
  - Writing
  - Talking
  - Listening
5. Please tell us of any other way that MIE has helped you, e.g. working with others, improving ICT skills.
6. How much did you enjoy the following parts of MIE:
  - Watching DVDs and films
  - Talking about DVDs and films
  - Doing writing in response to films and DVDs
  - Making my own film, including storyboarding and editing
7. Do you think MIE should continue in your school? Please say why or why not.
8. What needs to happen to make MIE better?

If there are any other comments you would like to make, please write them here:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire

## APPENDIX G1

**Table G 1.1**

**Question 1 : Please describe what you have done in MIE**

School		Response Categories								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
A	n	18	10	10	9	29	8	27	4	5
N = 55	%	33.3	18.5	18.5	16.7	53.7	14.8	50.0	7.4	9.3
B	n	10	4	5	1	30	17	16	2	1
N = 34	%	29.4	11.8	14.7	2.9	88.2	50.0	47.0	5.9	2.9
C/D	n	7	2	6	5	8	8	8		6
N = 8	%	87.5	25.0	75.0	62.5	100.0	100.0	100.0	0.0	75.0
E	n	3	3	1	3	10	2	9	1	1
N = 18	%	16.7	16.7	5.6	16.7	55.6	12.0	50.0	5.5	5.6
F	n	6	1	5	3	15	5			5
N = 15	%	40.0	6.7	33.3	20.0	100.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3

**Q.1 : Response category key**

- |                        |                   |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Watching films/DVDs | 6. Writing        |
| 2. Animating           | 7. Editing        |
| 3. Class discussion    | 8. Sound tracking |
| 4. Analysis            | 9. Other          |
| 5. Making films/DVDs   |                   |

**Table G 1.2**

**Question 2 : What has been good about it?**

School		Response Categories									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	n	6	20	11	4	2	9	1	8	1	9
N = 55	%	10.9	36.3	20.0	7.3	3.6	16.3	1.8	14.5	1.8	16.3
B	n	1	19	11	4		2		8		6
N = 34	%	2.9	55.9	32.3	11.8	0.0	5.9	0.0	23.5	0.0	17.6
C/D	n	5	4	0	0	0	2	0	8	0	2
N = 8	%	62.5	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	25.0
E	n	1	5	4	3	0	0	2	7	0	0
N = 18	%	5.6	44.4	22.2	16.7	0.0	0.0	5.6	38.9	0.0	0.0
F	n	2	5	0	2	0	0	0	6	0	4
N = 15	%	13.3	40.0	0.0	13.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	0.0	26.7

**Q.2 : Response category key**

- |    |                        |     |                   |
|----|------------------------|-----|-------------------|
| 1. | Analysis of films/DVDs | 7.  | External location |
| 2. | Making films/DVDs      | 8.  | Overall enjoyment |
| 3. | Editing                | 9.  | Nothing           |
| 4. | Animating              | 10. | Other             |
| 5. | Story boarding         |     |                   |
| 6. | Group work             |     |                   |

**Table G 1.3**

**Question 3 : What's not been so good about it?**

School		Response Categories									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A	n										
N = 55	%	20.0	10.9	5.4	7.2	14.5	9.0	5.5	1.8	18.2	12.7
B	n	8	1	1	0	0	5	2	1	10	6
N = 34	%	23.5	2.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	14.7	5.9	2.9	29.4	17.6
C/D	n	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	4 *
N = 8	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	62.5
E	n	1	1	2	0	0	0	4	0	7	3
N = 18	%	5.6	5.6	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.2	0.0	38.9	16.7
F	n	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	7 **
N = 15	%	0.0	13.3	0.0	6.7	0.0	0.0	6.7	0.0	26.7	46.7

**Q.3 : Response category key**

- |                         |                   |
|-------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Repetitive/boring    | 6. Group work     |
| 2. Time consuming       | 7. Writing        |
| 3. Analysis             | 8. Story boarding |
| 4. Choice of films/DVDs | 9. Nothing        |
| 5. Hardware shortage    | 10. Other         |

\* Filming in bad weather

\*\* For Stracathro not getting part in film that you want

**Table G 1.4**

**Question 4 : In what ways, if any, has MIE helped you with?**

School	Literacy area	Response Categories		
		Not at all	A small extent	A large extent
A N = 55	Reading	58.2	7.3	32.7
	Writing	36.4	16.4	47.3
	Talking	36.4	10.9	49.0
	Listening	30.9	20.0	49.0
B N = 34	Reading	70.6	14.7	11.8
	Writing	41.2	32.3	20.6
	Talking	32.3	35.3	26.5
	Listening	50.0	26.5	20.6
C/D N = 8	Reading	0.0	25.0	75.0
	Writing	0.0	37.5	62.5
	Talking	0.0	75.0	25.0
	Listening	0.0	75.0	25.0
E N = 18	Reading	50.0	5.5	39.8
	Writing	7.8	16.6	50.0
	Talking	38.8	11.1	55.6
	Listening	50.0	16.6	33.3
F N = 15	Reading	86.7	0.00	13.3
	Writing	73.3	6.7	20.0
	Talking	20.0	20.0	60.0
	Listening	26.7	26.7	53.3

**Table G 1.5****Question 5 : Please tell us of any other way MIE has helped you**

School		Response categories			
		Groupwork	ICT	Other	None
A	N = 55	20.0	49.0	14.5	16.3
B	N = 34	55.9	38.2	20.6	2.9
C/D	N = 8	87.5	50.0	12.5	0.0
E	N = 18	44.4	38.9	5.6	11.1
F	N = 15	40.0	20.0	0.0	40.0

**Table G 1.6**

**Question 6 : How much did you enjoy the following parts of MIE?**

		Response Categories			
School		MIE Aspects	Not at all	Small extent	Large extent
A	N = 55	Watching films/DVDs	23.6	30.9	45.4
		Talking	52.7	27.3	16.4
		Writing	52.7	23.6	21.8
		Making films/DVDs	14.5	12.7	70.9
B	N = 34	Watching films/DVDs	26.4	44.1	29.4
		Talking	50.0	32.3	17.6
		Writing	67.6	17.6	14.7
		Making films/DVDs	20.6	44.1	35.3
C/D	N = 8	Watching films/DVDs	0.0	0.0	100.0
		Talking	25.0	37.5	37.5
		Writing	0.0	0.0	100.0
		Making films/DVDs	0.0	0.0	100.0
E	N = 18	Watching films/DVDs	11.1	44.1	44.4
		Talking	50.0	5.6	44.4
		Writing	33.3	22.2	44.4
		Making films/DVDs	16.7	22.2	56.6
F	N = 15	Watching films/DVDs	13.3	26.7	60.0
		Talking	33.3	53.3	6.7
		Writing	53.3	26.7	20.0
		Making films/DVDs	6.7	26.7	66.7

**Table G 1.7****Question 7 : Do you think that MIE should continue in your school?**

<b>School</b>		<b>Response Categories</b>	
		<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
A	n		
N = 55	%	98.2	1.82
B	n		
N = 34	%	91.2	8.8
C/D	n		
N= 8	%	100.0	0.0
E	n		
N = 18	%	94.4	5.6
F	n		
N = 15	%	93.3	6.7

**Table G 1.8****Question 8 : What needs to happen to make MIE better?**

School		Response Categories				
		1	2	3	4	5
A	n	16	4	22	11	5
N = 55	%	29.1	7.3	40.0	20.0	9.1
B	n	0	3	20	1	10
N = 34	%	0.00	8.8	58.8	2.9	29.4
C/D	n	1	0	2	1	4 *
N = 8	%	12.5	0.0	25.0	12.5	50.0
E	n	0	1	13	2	2
N = 18	%	0.0	5.6	72.2	11.1	11.1
F	n	0	2	9	2	3
N = 15	%	0.0	13.3	60.0	13.3	20.0

**Q.8 : Response category key**

1. More hardware
2. Greater choice of films/DVDs
3. Nothing
4. More time
5. Other

\* Had one teacher all way through school

## APPENDIX G2

**Table G 2.1**

**Question 1 : Please describe what you have done in MIE**

School		Response categories								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
High School	n	30	44	25	20	175	22	29	16	2
N = 183	%	16.4	24.0	13.7	10.9	86.9	12.0	15.8	8.7	1.1

Q.1 : **Response category key**

- |                   |                  |                  |
|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1. Watching films | 4. Storyboarding | 7. Editing       |
| 2. Animating      | 5. Making films  | 8. Soundtracking |
| 3. Analysis       | 6. Writing       | 9. Other         |

**Table G 2.2**

**Question 2 : What has been good about it?**

School		Response categories									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
High School	n	15	63	27	30	2	17	11	22	19	13
N = 183	%	8.2	34.4	14.7	16.4	1.1	9.3	6.0	12.0	10.4	7.1

Q.2 : **Response category key**

- |                  |                      |
|------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Analysis      | 6. Groupwork         |
| 2. Making films  | 7. External location |
| 3. Editing       | 8. Overall           |
| 4. Animating     | 9. Nothing           |
| 5. Storyboarding | 10. Other            |

**Table G 2.3**

**Question 3 : What has not been good?**

School		Response categories									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
High School	n	15	30	2	8	10	21	41	7	24	23
N = 183	%	8.2	16.4	1.1	4.4	5.5	11.5	22.4	3.8	13.1	12.6

Q.2 : **Response category key**

- |                      |                  |
|----------------------|------------------|
| 1. Repetitive/boring | 6. Groupwork     |
| 2. Time              | 7. Writing       |
| 3. Analysis          | 8. Storyboarding |
| 4. Choice of film    | 9. Nothing       |
| 5. Hardware shortage | 10. Other        |

**Table G 2.4**

**Question 4 : In what ways, if any, has MIE helped you with?**

School		Response categories			
		Literacy area	Not at all	Small extent	Large extent
High School N = 183	Reading	n	148	20	10
		%	80.8	10.9	5.5
	Writing	n	98	53	33
		%	53.5	29.0	18.0
	Talking	n	85	65	34
		%	46.4	35.5	18.6
	Listening	n	103	55	26
		%	56.2	30.0	14.2

**Table G 2.5**

**Question 5 : Tell us of any other ways MIE has helped**

School		Response categories			
		Groupwork	ICT	Other	None
High School	n	70	67	18	45
N = 183	%	38.2	36.6	9.8	24.6

Q.5 : Response category key

- |              |          |
|--------------|----------|
| 1. Groupwork | 3. Other |
| 2. ICT       | 4. None  |

**Table G 2.6**

**Question 6 : How much did you enjoy the following parts of MIE?**

School		Response categories			
		MIE Aspects	Not at all	Small extent	Large extent
High School N = 183	Watching films/DVDs	n	27	63	94
		%	14.7	34.4	51.4
	Talking	n	104	54	29
		%	56.8	29.5	15.8
	Writing	n	130	31	18
		%	71.0	16.9	9.8

	Making films	n	53	54	77
		%	28.9	29.5	42.1

**Table G 2.7**

**Question 7 : Do you think MIE should continue in your school?**

School		Yes	No
High School	n	138	45
N = 183	%	75.4	24.6

**Table G 2.8**

**Question 8 : What needs to happen to make MIE better?**

School		Response categories				
		1	2	3	4	5
High School	n	8	45	44	38	51
N = 183	%	4.4	24.6	24.0	20.8	27.9

Q.8 **Response category key**

1. More hardware
2. Greater chance of film/more films
3. More time
4. Nothing
5. Other - less boring  
less writing  
old MIE teacher back!  
pick own groups