



## Strathprints Institutional Repository

Soden, Rebecca and , Scottish Executive (Funder) and Seagraves, Liz and Livingston, Kay (2008) *Evaluation of articulate project*. [Report]

Strathprints is designed to allow users to access the research output of the University of Strathclyde. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. You may not engage in further distribution of the material for any profitmaking activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute both the url (<http://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/>) and the content of this paper for research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge.

Any correspondence concerning this service should be sent to Strathprints administrator: <mailto:strathprints@strath.ac.uk>

## **Contents**

	<b>Page no.</b>
<b>Members of the evaluation team</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>Executive summary</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1.1 Background and aims of the Articulate Project</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. The evaluation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.1 Aims of the evaluation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.2 Design of the evaluation</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.3 Organisation of the findings</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Evidence from pupil questionnaires and interviews and from parent interviews</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.1 Introduction</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.2 S1 pupils – Questionnaire</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.2.1 Pupils’ experience of sketch-writing and creative writing</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>3.2.2 Perceptions of ability in, and enjoyment of, related activities</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.2.3 Pupils’ engagement in arts out of school</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>3.3 S1 pupils – Creative thinking tasks</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>3.4 S1 pupils – SDQ-II</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>3.5 S1 pupils – Summary</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>3.6 S3 pupils – Questionnaire</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>3.6.1 Pupils’ experience of sketch-writing and creative writing</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>3.6.2 Perceptions of ability in, and enjoyment of, related activities</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.6.3 Pupils’ engagement in arts out of school</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>3.7 S3 pupils – Creative thinking tasks</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3.8 S3 pupils – SDQ-II</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>3.9 S3 pupils – Summary</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>3.10 Parents’ views of Articulate</b>	<b>22</b>

<b>4.</b>	<b>Evidence from head teachers', teachers' and Traverse Theatre interviews</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1	Introduction	23
4.2	Interview sample	23
4.3	Interview findings: general observations	23
4.4	Interview findings: the five aims of the project	26
4.5	Interview findings: summary of Head Teachers' and teachers' views	29
4.6	The Traverse Theatre view	29
4.7	Interview findings: summary of Traverse Theatre views	31
<b>5.</b>	<b>Conclusions and discussion</b>	<b>32</b>
5.1	Introduction	32
5.2	Articulate Project aims 1-4: the enhancement of pupils' creativity, communication, self-worth and enjoyment of learning	33
5.3	Articulate Project aim 5: exploring impact on individuals, schools and the community	35
	<b>References</b>	<b>39</b>
	<b>Appendix 1: Results from pupil questionnaires</b>	<b>41</b>
	<b>Appendix 2: Analysis of Thinking Creatively with Words: The Torrance Test of Creative Thinking</b>	<b>55</b>
	<b>Appendix 3: Integrating drama across the literacy curriculum</b>	<b>61</b>
	<b>Appendix 4: Evaluation instruments:</b>	<b>64</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Articulate pupil questionnaire 1</li> <li>• Articulate pupil questionnaire 2</li> <li>• Articulate pupil questionnaire 3</li> <li>• Pupil Self Description Questionnaire (SDQ) II</li> <li>• Local authority personnel interview schedule</li> <li>• Head Teacher interview schedule</li> <li>• Teacher interview schedule</li> <li>• Traverse Theatre interview schedule</li> <li>• Network Co-ordinator interview schedule</li> <li>• Parent focus group questions</li> <li>• Pupil focus group questions</li> </ul>	

## **Members of the evaluation team**

Dr Rebecca Soden  
Dr Kay Livingston (until September 2005)  
Liz Seagraves  
Liz Mitchell  
Dr Duncan Campbell  
Elaine Kirkland

## **Acknowledgements**

The Evaluation team would like to thank everyone in who invested their time in making valued contributions to the evaluation. We particularly appreciated their openness in responding to our questions.

School contributors included staff of the following schools:

Haldane Primary School  
Highdykes Primary School  
Leenvale Primary School  
Renton Primary School  
Vale of Leven Academy.

The team would also like to thank Mrs Isobel Leman at Leenvale Primary School for organising a meeting for parents of former pupils of the four primary schools who had participated in the project.

Pupils in the primary schools who had moved on to Vale of Leven Academy responded to questionnaires and were enthusiastic contributors to focus groups. Mrs. Alicia Tindal, Depute Head at Vale of Leven Academy, orchestrated this data collection within the school with commendable efficiency, provided attainment level data for all pupils included in the evaluation and organised a meeting for parents of S3 pupils. The evaluation team would like to thank Mrs Tindal for undertaking all this work with such good humour.

Valuable insights were also provided by Eona Craig, West Dunbartonshire Arts & Education Links Officer, and the Traverse Theatre Literary Development Officer. We are grateful to Eona for everything she did to enable the evaluation to proceed effectively.

# Evaluation of the Articulate Project

## Executive Summary

The Articulate Project was commissioned by West Dunbartonshire Council, with funding from the Scottish Executive's Future Learning and Teaching (FLaT) programme, The Scottish Arts Council, West Dunbartonshire Council and West Dunbartonshire Partnership. Activities relating to the project took place between May and December 2004. The overall aim of the Articulate Project was to *"explore how or if the arts, and specifically drama and theatre practice, might impact positively on English language skills in the classroom"* (AELP, 2005, p5). The five specific aims of the Articulate Project were to:

- develop the creative and imaginative writing skills of participating pupils
- improve the ability of pupils to communicate effectively
- 
- raise levels of pupils' self esteem and self worth
- increase pupils' motivation to participate in, and enjoy, learning
- create a positive impact on thinking skills, problem solving and team working on individuals, schools and the community.

The Traverse Theatre devised a programme of pupil activities with the help of a teacher in one of the participating primary schools. In the initial stage, all participating pupils (in each class from each of five schools) were introduced to drama techniques by a Traverse Theatre actress and they attended two theatre performances. In the next stage the focus shifted to creative writing, and a group of ten pupils from each class worked directly in 10 workshops with a Traverse Theatre playwright, in order to develop their own drama sketches, which were performed by professional actors in Denny Civic Theatre. At the same time, the remainder of each class engaged in similar creative writing lessons with their teacher. Although this second Articulate group did not have their work performed, they supported the Denny Civic Theatre production by producing art work with the help of a professional artist.

There were three main phases in the evaluation, which began five months after the project ended. A first phase (June and July 2005) was designed to build up a picture of the Project through extended interviews with its key architects and through document analysis. In a second phase (August – October 2005), impact on pupils was explored through their responses to Articulate-specific questionnaires and to two standardised instruments (the Marsh Self Description Questionnaire and the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking - 'Thinking Creatively with Words'), as well as through their focus group contributions. This second phase included evaluation of the project's impact on staff through one-to-one interviews with school staff and analysis of an extended interview with the Traverse Theatre Literary Development Officer. A third phase (November 2005 – January 2006) was concerned mainly with data analysis, including pre- and post-project attainment level data for reading and writing, but also provided an opportunity for parents and a local community organisation to express views on the project. During this phase final discussions also took place with a primary Head Teacher and the Depute Head in the secondary school.

The evaluation was designed to explore impact on pupils through comparison of three groups of pupils: two groups of Articulate Project pupils (those whose creative writing was mediated through theatre specialists, and those whose teachers followed an instruction pack to deliver Articulate-style lessons) and a control group (pupils from the same schools who had no Articulate Project experience). There were 84 pupils in total in the Articulate Project groups and 65 pupils in the control group. During the project the pupils were in P7 and S2 and had progressed to S1 and S3 by the time the data was gathered.

The main evaluation aims focused on the extent to which the five project aims had been realised and included an exploration of how the expressive arts can be used as a vehicle for carrying current school curriculum knowledge and broader education goals. The evaluation aims are listed on p3 of this report.

The evidence supports the following main conclusions, with some qualifications that are discussed in the final chapter:

- the S1 pupils who had worked with the playwright showed themselves to be more creative thinkers than those in the other S1 groups
- more of the S1 playwright group pupils progressed to the next level in writing than pupils in the other groups
- the S3 pupils with experience of Articulate showed themselves to be more creative thinkers than the no-Articulate pupils, *regardless of whether they had worked with the playwright or teacher*
- pupil enjoyment of the Articulate Project activities was generally high, but particularly amongst those chosen to work with the playwright
- both Articulate and no-Articulate pupils achieved very high self-concept scores, leaving little scope for the emergence of a project impact
- project classes should not be split into playwright- and teacher-led groups
- project activities need to be better integrated into the 5-14 writing curriculum
- opportunities should be maximised for the teachers and theatre specialists to learn from each other
- consideration should be given to designing a future project in a way that enables class teachers and theatre specialists to plan and teach lessons together throughout the project.

There is sufficient evidence from the project itself and from research literature to justify the idea that theatre professionals can contribute to the aims expressed in *Ambitious, Excellent Schools* (SEED, 2004a) and in *A Curriculum for Excellence* (SEED, 2004b). An important contribution of this project is that it highlights a tension that needs to be reconciled between the aims expressed in a 'Curriculum for Excellence' of promoting broader capacities and current assessment requirements. The Articulate Project data suggests that pupils can progress their capacity to be confident, successful and creative learners who can contribute to Scottish culture, but methods of assessing progress and attainment need to be adjusted if staff and pupils are to value activities that promote these capacities.

On-going measures in Vale of Leven Academy to use expressive arts to enhance learning provide opportunities for a future West Dunbartonshire project to build on and extend good practice. Sustainability is likely to be enhanced through the infusion model described in the final chapter that involves much closer collaboration between theatre professionals and all

the teachers involved in it. In the longer run, such projects need to be implemented in ways that put teachers in a position to cascade approaches throughout their school.

# 1. Introduction

This is the final report of the evaluation of the Articulate Project, conducted by the Quality in Education Centre (QIE) at the University of Strathclyde. This introduction details the background to the Project, and outlines the research design, the evaluation activities and the organisation of the findings.

## 1.1 Background and aims of the Articulate Project

The Articulate Project was commissioned by West Dunbartonshire Council, with funding and other forms of support from the Scottish Executive's Future Learning and Teaching (FLaT) programme, The Scottish Arts Council, West Dunbartonshire Council and West Dunbartonshire Partnership: a commitment by sponsors to the principles upon which the project was built created an energy that helped to drive forward and maintain the ensuing workload. A programme of sketch-writing lessons was devised by the Traverse Theatre and a teacher. The stated aim of the Articulate Project was to *"explore how or if the arts, and specifically drama and theatre practice, might impact positively on English language skills in the classroom"* (AELP, 2005, p5). Similarly, the Traverse Theatre press release (6/12/2004) emphasised that the project *"aims to introduce the under 14s to writing, to stimulate general literacy, to improve confidence and to establish bold, new voices"*.

The West Dunbartonshire Arts and Education Links Programme intended to administer the project to local authority schools, particularly those which were perceived to be lacking in drama provision; in the view of Arts & Education Links Officer, Eona Craig, *"there is a 'drama deficit' in West Dunbartonshire which needs addressing"*. Prior to the offer of project participation the West Dunbartonshire Education Services' Quality Manager scrutinised the levels of pupils' English language attainment. This study led to the Vale of Leven Academy cluster of schools, located in an area of multiple deprivation, being offered the opportunity to participate in the project as an incentive to try new approaches to encouraging achievement in English language.

An initial 'Inset Day' on 10 May, 2004 introduced the Articulate Project to head teachers and teachers from Vale of Leven Academy and four associated primary schools, along with the key arts professionals from the Traverse Theatre. This was followed by steering meetings (22 June and 12 July, 2004), during which the details were finalised. The project was launched on 23 August, 2004, with a visit to the King's Theatre in Glasgow for all pupils in the participating classes; the matinee performance of *Annie* was followed by a backstage tour. These pupils also attended a Theatre About Glasgow performance of *King Lear*.

In the initial stage, all participating pupils (in one class from each of five schools) were introduced to drama techniques over three sessions by actress and drama worker Mary Gapinski. In the next stage, the focus shifted to creative writing, and a group of ten pupils from each class worked directly in 10 workshops with a professional playwright, in order to develop their own drama sketches. At the same time, their classmates were to follow a similar programme of activities with their teacher, working from a specially devised work pack. In the final stage, pupils from each group were given the opportunity to participate in the staging of their short plays by drama professionals in the Denny Civic Theatre, Dumbarton, on 15 December, 2004. Two directors and eight actors supported this stage.

The Articulate Project aims to create a learning and teaching environment for the future; an environment that is sensitive to individual needs, that will promote attainment, and that breaks down barriers to inclusive learning and teaching in the community. The Articulate Project offers access to a range of emotional and intellectual experiences, enabling teachers and



pupils to encounter, in their everyday work, forms of thinking that are embedded in arts education.

The philosophy of the Articulate Project is entirely consistent with the aims expressed in *Ambitious, Excellent Schools* (SEED, 2004a) and in *A Curriculum for Excellence* (SEED, 2004b), 'to enable all children to develop their capacities as successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens and effective contributors to society'. Thus, the five key aims of the Articulate Project are to:

- develop the creative and imaginative writing skills of participating pupils
- improve the ability of pupils to communicate effectively
- raise levels of pupils' self esteem and self worth
- increase pupils' motivation to participate in, and enjoy, learning
- create a positive impact on thinking skills, problem solving and team working on individuals, schools and the community.

These aims are consistent with literature on the power of drama to support literacy. According to Baldwin and Fleming, (2003):

*'drama provides a shared, experiential, structured experience through which enactment can precede and help formulate writing of all kinds. Children can be given a reason for writing in role or from another's point of view for an imagined audience.'*  
(p22)

They describe how drama can create exciting, imagined contexts for writing. They identify that, as with reading, the children need to be emotionally engaged with the story to be effective writers. They cite how drama can contribute to all the project's aims by providing opportunities for writing from different viewpoints as different characters, for actively linking and crossing genres and for reflecting on 'lived' enacted experience through writing. Support for the aims of the Articulate Project can be found in Baldwin and Fleming's assertion that drama enhances many significant writing competences:

*'The nature of drama can furnish children with the ideas and imaginative experiences to fulfil the demands of writing alternative sequels, using story structure to write about their own experience, write openings and endings to stories, thinking about tension, suspense, atmosphere and scene-setting. Drama can provide shared imagined contexts in which children as writers are supported by peers and teachers as co-participants.'*  
(pp 22-23)

At the end of the project and as a result of a second 'bid' to FLaT, an anthology of the pupils work was published; a DVD of the process was produced and a work pack created. These quality resources were created at the request of the teachers/head teachers and provide a tangible legacy for the pupils, parents, teachers, schools and the wide range of support organisations.

Plainly, such a complex project demands thorough planning and preparation. These demands were met by the project manager who ensured that the project would start on time and with the necessary resources. Prior to the commencement of the Articulate Project the project manager went on maternity leave. Inevitably, there was a brief lacuna while a new member of staff, who was also responsible for the running of other projects, gained a understanding of the tasks ahead. This change in personnel meant disruption in the

management of the project just when continuity of administration personnel would have been a real advantage.

It is clear that project delivery and communication benefits from as few unbroken administrative links as is possible. This was also true where the enthusiasm and expertise of the Traverse Theatre staff lost some little effect with unavoidable changes in people involved in the administration of the Articulate Project.

## **2. The evaluation**

### **2.1 Aims of the evaluation**

The aims of the evaluation were to:

1. describe the extent to which the five key aims of the Articulate Project (stated above) have been met
2. identify strengths and any gaps in the training and support available to teachers, writers and drama specialists involved in the Articulate Project
3. assess the overall impact of the Articulate Project on teachers and pupils in the participating schools and in the local communities
4. explore how the expressive arts can be used as a vehicle for carrying current school curriculum knowledge, and for achieving broader educational goals.

### **2.2 Design of the evaluation**

There were three main phases in the evaluation: a first phase (June and July 2005) that was designed to build up a picture of the project; a second phase (August – October 2005) concerned with data gathering; and a third phase (November 2005 – January 2006) in which end of evaluation interviews were conducted, findings were interpreted and conclusions drawn. The evaluation design included a pupil control group from the same school, matched on appropriate characteristics such as attainment level in reading and writing.

Besides a comparison between pupils who did and did not experience the Articulate teaching, there was also a comparison between whose experience of Articulate was mediated through arts professionals, and those whose teachers followed an instruction pack to deliver Articulate-style lessons. Thus, data was gathered from three broad groups of pupils, from head teachers and teachers in the participating schools, from parents of participating pupils and from the Traverse Theatre Literary Development Officer who represented the views of the theatre specialists. There was also contact with a local organisation. Appendix 4 contains copies of all data-gathering instruments.

Since the evaluation began five months after the Articulate Project was completed, there was no opportunity to gather pre-project data. However, the secondary school provided pre- (and post-) project attainment level data relating to reading and writing for all pupils included in the evaluation. This pre-project attainment level data suggests that the more competent writers were not over-represented in the playwright groups.

#### **Phase 1 (June – July 2005)**

During Phase 1 of the research, extended in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with the people who had a leading role in the project: West Dunbartonshire Arts & Education Links Officer and the Traverse Theatre's Literary Development Officer. These officers also participated in a meeting that the research team conducted with head teacher/teachers.

Details of the evaluation were negotiated during this phase and documents relating to the project were collected and analysed.

A map was constructed of the activities in which the project pupils, teachers and theatre specialists engaged. This information informed the design of the Phase 2 evaluation instruments.

## Phase 2 (August – October 2005)

Phase 2 used a combination of research methods, including questionnaires administered to three groups of pupils (two participant groups and a control group), in-depth interviews with the staff in participating schools, and focus groups with pupils in each of the participating and control group classes.

Articulate-specific questionnaires were completed by all pupils in the Vale of Leven Academy who participated in the Articulate project in 2004, either as S2 pupils of the school or as P7 pupils in one of four associated primary schools. In addition, S1 and S3 pupils in the Vale of Leven Academy who had not participated in the project also completed an appropriately amended version of the questionnaires.

Data relating to the pupils' self-esteem were also gathered from all groups through a standardised instrument known as the Marsh Self Description Questionnaire (SDQ-II). This instrument includes scales that assess pupils' self-concept in relation to verbal and reading skills, social interaction and citizenship. A standardised measure of creativity, the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking ('Thinking Creatively with Words'), was also administered to all groups. The Torrance Test is a well validated instrument that has been used extensively to evaluate the impact of arts activities on creativity. It provides seven open-ended scenarios, with pictures. A typical scenario asks pupils to suppose that clouds have ropes attached that come down to the ground, and invites them to write about what could happen. One of the seven scales was omitted because it taps abilities that are less likely to be enhanced by the activities of the Articulate Project. The data from these two instruments were analysed in accordance with their respective instruction manuals.

In summary, the sample included:

- all the Articulate pupil participants (those who worked with the playwright and those who followed a similar programme with their teacher)
- the teacher of the pupil participants in one secondary school
- the teachers of the pupil participants in each of the four associated primary schools
- the S1 and S3 pupils in the secondary school who formed a 'no-Articulate' control group
- Head Teachers in the primary schools
- a Depute Head in the secondary school.

When the evaluation began in 2005, thirteen of the participating pupils from the P7 cohort had moved to secondary schools outside West Dunbartonshire. These pupils were not included in the sample.

Tables 1 and 2 show numbers of pupils involved in the evaluation.

**Table 1: Number and gender of S1 respondents**

	<i>Boys</i>	<i>Girls</i>	<i>Total</i>
Playwright	20 (56%)	16 (44%)	36 (100%)
Teacher	15 (60%)	10 (40%)	25 (100%)
No-Articulate	16 (39%)	25 (60%)	41 (100%)
Total	51 (50%)	51 (50%)	102 (100%)

**Table 2: Number and gender of S3 respondents**

	<b>Boys</b>	<b>Girls</b>	<b>Total</b>
Playwright	6	3	9
Teacher	8	6	14
No-Articulate	12	12	24
Total	26 (56%)	21 (45%)	47 (100%)

### **Phase 3 (November – January 2006)**

During Phase 3, an end of evaluation interview was conducted with one primary Head Teacher and the secondary Depute Head Teacher, and all parents whose children participated in the project were invited to take part in a focus group. Views of the project were sought also from staff at the Network, a club run by the Tulloch Trust. This club was chosen because focus group data suggested that pupils valued their participation in the club's activities.

Data for 5-14 levels in reading and writing were investigated in relation to the playwright, teacher and no-Articulate groups.

Data from the Phases 1 and 2 were analysed and integrated during Phase 3.

### **Changes to the evaluation design**

The Invitation to Tender stated that 50 pupils participated in the project by working with a professional playwright to develop their own drama sketches, which were subsequently performed in Denny Civic Theatre. However, information gathered during the first phase of the research suggested that the definition of participant should be broadened to include all the pupils in each of the five target classes, since all these pupils participated in the project, albeit in different ways. With SEED approval, the second group was included, thereby expanding the project pupil sample in the ITT from 50 to 84 and increasing the control group to 65. The research team did not seek additional funding for the extra work involved in dealing with a larger than expected data set. A minor change was made to the timing of the parent meetings, which were held in Phase 3 instead of Phase 2, and contact with the local community organisation was also made in Phase 3.

## **2.3 Organisation of the findings**

The evidence in the next two chapters is organised around the evaluation aims. These relate to the five aims of the Articulate Project:

*Aim 1: To develop the creative and imaginative writing skills of participating pupils*

*Aim 2: To improve the ability of pupils to communicate effectively*

*Aim 3: To raise the levels of pupils' self-esteem and self-worth*

*Aim 4: To increase pupils' motivation to participate in, and enjoy, learning*

*Aim 5: To create a positive impact on the thinking skills, problem solving and team working on individuals, schools and the community.*

### **3. Evidence from pupil questionnaires and interviews and from parent interviews**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

The main focus of this chapter is the evidence relating to the pupil aspect of the third evaluation aim:

- assess the overall impact of the Articulate Project on teachers and pupils in the participating schools and in the local communities.
- 

The chapter ends with a brief discussion of the interviews with the small sample of parents who responded to the research team's invitation to offer their views on the project.

It addresses, from the pupil perspective, the achievement of the aims of the Articulate Project as seen in relation to the following areas of development:

- pupils' creative and imaginative writing skills
- levels of pupils' self esteem and self worth
- levels of pupil engagement in, and enjoyment of, learning (motivation)
- pupils' social interaction skills
- pupils' thinking, problem solving and capacity to work collaboratively and creatively, including their ability to monitor their own learning
- pupils' citizenship understandings
- pupils' inclination to engage in arts activities outside school hours.

As explained in the section on evaluation design (p4), pupils' development in these areas was investigated through an Articulate-specific questionnaire, the use of the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking abilities (to investigate their ability to think creatively and imaginatively), and the use of the Self-Description Questionnaire which investigated pupils' self-concept in relation to verbal skills (ability and enjoyment of English and reading), honesty and trustworthiness (qualities in citizenship), relationships with both boys and girls (related to social interaction and working collaboratively), and their general view of school and self (related to motivation and self-esteem).

The findings are presented to allow comparison between the three groups of pupils identified for the study: those who undertook sketch-writing with the playwright, those who followed a similar programme with the class teacher, and those who did not take part in Articulate and who were asked to respond in relation to creative-writing lessons. The detailed data for each group are presented in Appendix 1.

#### **3.2 S1 pupils – Questionnaire**

The number of questionnaires completed from each of the three groups and the gender of the respondents are given in Table 1 on p4.

##### **3.2.1 Pupils' experience of sketch-writing and creative writing**

The pupils were provided with a list of statements (Question 7) which sought their views on working with the playwright or teacher on sketch-writing, or taking part in creative writing lessons. These statements reflect key areas of the aims of the project, namely:

- pupil engagement with, and enjoyment of, the learning
- pupil views on effectiveness of the learning experience
- the development of creative thinking
- working co-operatively and collaboratively
- the development of self-esteem and confidence.

The responses showing agreement ('agree a lot' and 'agree a little' combined) with the statements are presented in Tables 3-7 below. (The full range of responses is given in Appendix 1.)

**Table 3: S1 Pupils' views on engagement with, and enjoyment of, learning**

	<b>Playwright group (36)</b>	<b>Teacher group (25)</b>	<b>No-Artic group (41)</b>
I think that working with the playwright/doing sketch-writing with teacher/working with the teacher made creative writing interesting	30 (83%)	18 (72%)	34 (83%)
I wanted to work longer on the tasks	25 (69%)	14 (56%)	26 (63%)
I found that the time seemed to pass quickly in these lessons	29 (81%)	18 (72%)	30 (73%)
Pupils were well behaved during these lessons	23 (64%)	16 (64%)	32 (79%)
I looked forward to the lessons with the playwright/sketch-writing lessons/creative writing lessons	30 (83%)	13 (52%)	28 (69%)
Some pupils did not like working with the playwright/sketch-writing lessons/creative writing lessons	18 (50%)	15 (60%)	31 (76%)
We should have more classes like these	27 (75%)	12 (48%)	25 (61%)

The pupils who worked with the playwright were more likely to agree that time passed quickly in the lessons, that they looked forward to the lessons, and that they would like to have more lessons with the playwright. They were also less likely to perceive that others did *not* enjoy the lessons, suggesting an overall group appreciation of working with the playwright. Further statistical analysis (see Appendix 1) indicated that in relation to looking forward to the lessons and having more classes, the difference between the playwright group and the other two groups was statistically significant. The playwright group was also less likely to agree that others did not enjoy the lessons compared to the no-Articulate group.

Interestingly, although overall agreement to the first statement about the extent to which they found the experience interesting was the same for the playwright and no-Articulate group, there was in fact a statistically significant difference between them (with the playwright group being more positive) due to the playwright group 'agreeing a lot' compared to the no-Articulate group 'agreeing a little'.

The statement on behaviour has been included in this section, as poor behaviour could disrupt the enjoyment of lessons; alternatively, engagement with the learning task could minimise poor behaviour. However, the 'specialist' input of the playwright or the teacher

working on sketch-writing did not lead to perceptions of better behaviour compared to the no-Articulate pupils.

Working with the playwright appeared to enhance the interest in, and enjoyment of, the learning experience for the pupils, and thereby bring motivational benefits.

**Table 4: S1 Pupils' views on effectiveness of the learning experience**

	<b>Playwright group (36)</b>	<b>Teacher group (25)</b>	<b>No-Artic group (41)</b>
I found it easy to learn about creative writing	29 (81%)	17 (68%)	34 (83%)
The playwright/teacher explained things well in these lessons	30 (83%)	29 (80%)	39 (95%)
I found I could easily remember what I learned	25 (69%)	16 (64%)	31 (76%)
I think my work was good in these lessons	27 (75%)	21 (84%)	33 (80%)
I learned new things about writing	32 (89%)	19 (76%)	36 (88%)
I learned new things about drama	30 (83%)	15 (60%)	28 (69%)

The most notable difference between the playwright group and the other 2 groups is their agreement that they learned new things about drama (statistically significant between the playwright and no-Articulate groups), though this is, perhaps, unsurprising, as working with a playwright may have offered opportunities for incidental as well as planned learning. The teacher group seemed to find learning about creative writing less easy than the other two groups. Overall, the impact on learning did not appear any different for the playwright group compared to the other two groups.

**Table 5: S1 Pupils' views on issues related to creative thinking/creativity**

	<b>Playwright group (36)</b>	<b>Teacher group (25)</b>	<b>No-Artic group (41)</b>
It made me want to try out new ideas and be more imaginative ( <i>Control: I like to try out new ideas and be imaginative.</i> )	27 (75%)	15 (60%)	34 (83%)
I was able to put forward my own ideas during the lessons	31 (86%)	20 (80%)	34 (83%)
I tried new things I had never done before	29 (81%)	20 (80%)	33 (80%)



**Table 6: S1 Pupils' views on opportunity to work collaboratively**

	<b>Playwright group (36)</b>	<b>Teacher group (25)</b>	<b>No-Artic group (41)</b>
The things we did help me to work with other pupils in the class	27 (75%)	17 (68%)	35 (85%)
I worked with pupils I don't usually work with <sup>1</sup>	15 (42%)	14 (56%)	13 (33%)
I think that other people in the class had good ideas	32 (89%)	19 (76%)	40 (98%)

<sup>1</sup> For the no-Artic group the statement was 'I always work with the same pupils'. Therefore the disagreement responses have been reported here.

Getting the opportunity to try out new things and contributing ideas are factors which assist in the development of creative thinking and creativity; learning to work co-operatively and valuing the views of others are also important aspects of encouraging this development. Across all groups, the learning experience appeared to allow them opportunities to put forward their own views, to try out new things, to work with others and to listen to and appreciate the views of others. It would seem that they were more likely to work with groups they were familiar with, though considerable numbers in each group appear to have moved beyond their normal work groupings.

**Table 7: S1 Pupils' views on developing confidence**

	<b>Playwright group (36)</b>	<b>Teacher group (25)</b>	<b>No-Artic group (41)</b>
The things we did made me feel confident	26 (72%)	17 (68%)	35 (86%)

The no-Articulate group were more likely to agree that what they did made them feel confident, though for the majority in all groups confidence was encouraged.

All of the above statements were investigated for gender differences, but no statistically significant differences emerged.

### **3.2.2 Perceptions of ability in, and enjoyment of, related activities**

The pupils were asked to indicate how good they thought they were at doing drama, writing poems or stories, sketch-writing, and being creative and using their imagination. They were also asked to say how much they enjoyed these activities. The figures for those who said that they were either 'really good' or 'quite good', and that they 'really enjoyed' or 'quite enjoyed' them, are given in Tables 8 and 9 overleaf. (The details are in Appendix 1.)

**Table 8: S1 pupils who are ‘really good’ or ‘quite good’ at certain activities**

	<i><b>Playwright group (36)</b></i>	<i><b>Teacher group (25)</b></i>	<i><b>No-Artic group (41)</b></i>
Doing drama	18 (50%)	11 (44%)	19 (46%)
Writing poems or stories	20 (55%)	16 (64%)	26 (63%)
Sketch-writing	20 (55%)	10 (40%)	14 (34%)
Being creative and using my imagination	27 (75%)	19 (76%)	33 (80%)

**Table 9: S1 pupils who ‘really enjoy’ or ‘quite enjoy’ certain activities**

	<i><b>Playwright group (36)</b></i>	<i><b>Teacher group (25)</b></i>	<i><b>No-Artic group (41)</b></i>
Doing drama	18 (50%)	12 (48%)	22 (53%)
Writing poems or stories	18 (50%)	11 (44%)	28 (68%)
Sketch-writing	19 (53%)	8 (32%)	21 (51%)
Being creative and using my imagination	28 (78%)	18 (72%)	35 (85%)

For all groups, being creative and using their imagination was clearly a strong favourite, with many pupils also perceiving that they were good at it. More of the playwright group agreed that they were good at sketch-writing and, notably, enjoyed it more than the group who did sketch-writing with their teacher. The data were investigated for gender differences: within the playwright group only, girls enjoyed doing drama more than boys; within the teacher group, more boys than girls thought that they were good at sketch-writing.

### 3.2.3 Pupils’ engagement in arts out of school

Pupils were asked two questions to gauge their level of interest in arts activities out of school: firstly, if they participated in any arts related hobbies; and secondly, if they participated in any arts-related, school-run clubs. The figures presented in Table 10 (below) are for those who indicated that they took part once, or more than once, a week.

**Table 10: S1 – Participation in hobbies out of school**

	<i><b>Playwright group (36)</b></i>	<i><b>Teacher group (25)</b></i>	<i><b>No-Artic group (41)</b></i>
Taking part in drama	2 (6%)	3 (12%)	9 (22%)
Reading	22 (61%)	7 (28%)	29 (71%)
Writing, e.g. stories, plays, poems	9 (25%)	5 (20%)	16 (39%)
Going to the theatre	5 (14%)	6 (24%)	5 (15%)

The pupils were asked if they had taken up any of these hobbies during the current year (i.e. following their experience of Articulate). Their responses were:

- playwright group 20 (56%)
- teacher group 15 (60%)
- no-Articulate group 18 (44%).
- 

The only surprising finding, in relation to hobbies out of school, was the small number from the teacher group who said that they read on a regular basis. This, however, is probably not associated with the Articulate Project and would require further exploration to gain clarification.

The following number from each group had taken part in after-school clubs during the current school year:

- playwright group 20 (56%)
- teacher group 24 (96%)
- no-Articulate group 28 (68%).
- 

Of those who took part in clubs, the following participated in activities relevant to Articulate:

**Table 11: S1 – Types of club attended by the three pupil groups**


	<b><i>Playwright group (20)</i></b>	<b><i>Teacher group (24)</i></b>	<b><i>No-Artic group (28)</i></b>
Drama	5 (25%)	7 (28%)	11 (39%)
Music or singing	7 (35%)	7 (28%)	11 (39%)
Writing (e.g. stories, plays, poems)	4 (20%)	6 (24%)	7 (25%)
Books and reading	4 (20%)	6 (24%)	3 (11%)

### **3.3 S1 pupils – Creative thinking tasks**

The purpose and nature of the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking is explained in the section on evaluation design (p3). The main findings are reported here; the details of the analysis and the supporting inferential statistics are presented in Appendix 1.

The analysis is based on 34 pupils who worked with the playwright, 24 pupils who did sketch-writing with the teacher, and 39 pupils who did not participate in Articulate. (Some of the pupils returned blank workbooks, which explains the slightly lower number of respondents than on the pupil questionnaire.) Each group's total score is represented in Figure 1 (overleaf) beside the mean scores for the three aspects of creative thinking tested by the activities.

**Figure 1: Mean scores of the three S1 groups for three aspects of creative thinking, and total scores**



This illustrates that the pupils who had worked with the playwright scored more highly on all aspects than the other two groups. They were, therefore, more likely than the other two groups to generate many relevant responses to the tasks and also to identify a greater number of categories of ideas. The differences in relation to these two aspects and in the overall total were statistically significant (see Appendix 1). However, differences in producing original ideas were less strong, although a statistically significant difference occurred between the playwright and the no-Articulate groups. No statistically significant differences were identified between the teacher and the no-Articulate groups.

The pupils who worked with the playwright demonstrated, on the Torrance Test, higher levels of creative thinking abilities. It is possible that this apparent effect of the playwright arose because more creative pupils were selected to work with the playwright. However, end of project interviews with senior management suggest that the pupils selected for the playwright groups were better behaved rather than more creative.

The data were analysed according to gender but there were no differences between boys and girls.

### 3.4 S1 pupils – SDQ-II

The nature and purpose of the SDQ-II is explained in the section of the report on evaluation design (p4). This analysis is based on responses from 35 of the playwright group, 25 of the teacher group and 40 of the no-Articulate group. The mean scores (based on a minimum of 1 and a maximum of 6) on each of the scales are given in Table 12 overleaf.

**Table 12: S1 pupil responses to the SDQ-II (mean scores)**

	<b>Playwright group (n 27-30)<sup>1</sup></b>		<b>Teacher group (n 19-23)</b>		<b>No Sketchwriting group (n = 33)</b>	
	m	Sd	m	sd	m	sd
Other sex relations	4.48	1.44	4.30	1.36	4.69	1.32
Same sex relations	5.08	0.78	4.93	0.92	5.17	0.83
Honesty-trust'ness	4.82	0.65	4.64	0.87	4.99	0.72
Emotional stability	3.97	1.27	4.06	0.94	3.94	1.24
Verbal (English)	4.42	0.99	3.99	1.15	4.47	1.14
General school	4.70	0.88	4.27	1.05	4.47	0.95
General self	4.98	0.75	4.85	0.98	4.62	1.13

<sup>1</sup> *Because some individuals were omitted from certain scales due to incomplete responses on that particular scale, the number responding on each scale varies slightly.*

Further investigation of the data, using analysis of variance, revealed no statistically significant differences between the groups on any of the scales. On the whole, the responses indicate positive self-concept but somewhat disparate views within the groups indicated by the larger standard deviation figures, particularly in relation to other-sex relations and emotional stability. There were no differences between boys and girls, with the exception of emotional stability, where the boys were more likely to be positive than the girls.

### **3.5 S1 pupils – Summary**

The survey data indicate that the pupils exposed to the Articulate Project appear to have enjoyed their lessons more than their no-Articulate peers, and they scored more highly in the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking. However, in other respects, they cannot be differentiated, statistically speaking, from their peers. Some, but by no means all, school staff believed that brighter, less disruptive pupils were selected to work with the playwright.

West Dunbartonshire Arts and Education Links Officer, Eona Craig, prefers to judge the project by softer indicators, such as *'the pupils' commitment to learning and enthusiasm for refining their understanding of language'*.

Approximately four out of five of the surveyed S1 pupils made a positive comment about the Articulate Project, ranging from *'we had a good laugh and I let myself get more confident'* to *'I liked doing drama and writing stories'*. However, control group data suggest that creative writing is an intrinsically interesting activity: *'you can use your imagination, you can write it your way'*.

Articulate pupils' views ranged from *'it passed too quickly'* to *'sometimes it was quite hard'*. By contrast, the views of the control group generally centred on the practicalities of writing: *'I disliked having to write it; I would have preferred typing'*.

Pupils who worked with the playwright perhaps experienced a psychological boost. During a focus group session, pupils who had worked with the playwright drew attention to the fact that the Articulate lessons were more enjoyable:

*'It was good because it was different. We made new friends.'*

*'We liked seeing different people.'*

Even those whose experience of Articulate came through their teacher appreciated the different teaching atmosphere.

*'It was different from what the teacher usually does.'*

*'Better than usual lessons. The teacher was more fun during these lessons.'*

### 3.6 S3 pupils – Questionnaire

The number of questionnaires completed from each of the three groups and the gender of the respondents are given in Table 2 (p5).

#### 3.6.1 Pupils' experience of sketch-writing and creative writing

As with S1, the pupils were provided with a list of statements (Question 7) which sought their views on working with the playwright or teacher on sketch-writing, or taking part in creative writing lessons. These statements reflect key areas of the aims of the project, namely

- pupil engagement with, and enjoyment of, the learning
- pupil views on effectiveness of the learning experience
- the development of creative thinking
- working co-operatively and collaboratively
- development of self-esteem and confidence.

The responses showing agreement with the statements ('agree a lot' and 'agree a little' combined) are presented in Tables 13-17. (The full range of responses is given in Appendix 1.) The numbers in each group are small, so although percentages have been shown for comparative purposes, these should be treated with caution.

**Table 13: S3 Pupils' views on engagement with, and enjoyment of, learning**

	<b>Playwright group (9)</b>	<b>Teacher group (14)</b>	<b>No-Artic group (24)</b>
I think that working with the playwright/doing sketch-writing with teacher/working with the teacher made creative writing interesting	9 (100%)	3 (21%)	14 (59%)
I wanted to work longer on the tasks	7 (78%)	2 (14%)	13 (52%)
I found that the time seemed to pass quickly in these lessons	7 (78%)	7 (50%)	17 (71%)
Pupils were well behaved during these lessons	8 (89%)	7 (50%)	10 (42%)
I looked forward to the lessons with the playwright/sketch-writing lessons/creative writing lessons	7 (78%)	1 (7%)	12 (50%)
Some pupils did not like working with the playwright/sketch-writing lessons/creative writing lessons	2 (22%)	14 (100%)	19 (80%)
We should have more classes like these	8 (89%)	7 (50%)	8 (34%)

The playwright group agreed to a greater extent than the other two groups that the learning was enjoyable and engaged their interest; only two observed that some of their fellow pupils did not enjoy the lessons, while all of the teacher group and the majority of the no-Articulate group thought others did not enjoy creative writing lessons. The teacher group were notably less positive in their responses. The data were analysed using Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney non-parametric tests (see Appendix 1). The differences between the playwright group and the teacher group were statistically significant for all of the above statements; there were statistically significant differences between the playwright and no-Articulate groups in relation to the lessons being interesting, the behaviour of pupils, pupils not liking the lessons, and pupils wanting more classes like these.

It is possible that being part of a smaller group contributed to creating a more enjoyable learning experience for the playwright group and may have influenced agreement on the points of behaviour and perceptions of how others engaged with the lessons. It is clear, however, that the playwright group found their lessons more enjoyable and interesting than the other two groups.

**Table 14: S3 Pupils' views on effectiveness of the learning experience**

	<i><b>Playwright group (9)</b></i>	<i><b>Teacher group (14)</b></i>	<i><b>No-Artic group (24)</b></i>
I found it easy to learn about creative writing	7 (78%)	5 (36%)	16 (66%)
The playwright/teacher explained things well in these lessons	9 (100%)	9 (65%)	20 (83%)
I found I could easily remember what I learned	7 (78%)	7 (50%)	16 (66%)
I think my work was good in these lessons	7 (78%)	6 (43%)	18 (76%)
I learned new things about writing	8 (89%)	7 (50%)	19 (80%)
I learned new things about drama	9 (100%)	6 (43%)	9 (37%)

The playwright group were, again, more positive than the other two groups about the effectiveness of the learning experience, though the no-Articulate group also responded positively to these statements. The group who had undertaken sketch-writing with their teacher were least likely to be positive. Statistically significant differences occurred between the playwright group and the teacher group in relation to how easy they found it to learn about creative writing, how well the playwright/teacher explained things, and learning new things about writing and drama. The difference between the playwright group and the no-Articulate group in relation to learning new things about drama was also statistically significant. As with the S1 pupils, this is perhaps unsurprising, as learning with a professional playwright opens up the opportunities for informal as well as formal learning about drama and the world of the theatre.

**Table 15: S3 Pupils' views on issues related to creative thinking/creativity**

	<b>Playwright group (9)</b>	<b>Teacher group (14)</b>	<b>No-Artic group (24)</b>
It made me want to try out new ideas and be more imaginative ( <i>Control: I like to try out new ideas and be imaginative.</i> )	7 (78%)	5 (35%)	19 (80%)
I was able to put forward my own ideas during the lessons	7 (78%)	7 (50%)	19 (80%)
I tried new things I had never done before	7 (78%)	6 (42%)	17 (71%)

**Table 16: S3 Pupils' views on opportunity to work collaboratively**

	<b>Playwright group (9)</b>	<b>Teacher group (14)</b>	<b>No-Artic group (24)</b>
The things we did help me to work with other pupils in the class	7 (78%)	7 (50%)	15 (63%)
I worked with pupils I don't usually work with <sup>1</sup>	8 (89%)	4 (29%)	11 (46%)
I think that other people in the class had good ideas	9 (100%)	10 (72%)	22 (92%)

<sup>1</sup> For the no-Artic group the statement was 'I always work with the same pupils'. Therefore the disagreement responses have been reported here.

Getting the opportunity to try out new things and contributing ideas are factors which assist in the development of creative thinking and creativity; learning to work co-operatively and valuing the views of others are also important aspects of encouraging this development.

The pupils' perceptions of the learning experience suggest that the playwright group and the no-Articulate group were more likely than the teacher group to have been encouraged to think creatively and imaginatively and to have worked collaboratively with others in the group. (The differences between the teacher group and both of the other groups were statistically significant in relation to wanting to try out new ideas and putting forward their own ideas, with the teacher group being more negative.)

**Table 17: S3 Pupils' views on developing confidence**

	<b>Playwright group (9)</b>	<b>Teacher group (14)</b>	<b>No-Artic group (24)</b>
The things we did made me feel confident	9 (100%)	2 (14%)	14 (58%)

The playwright group appear to have gained more in confidence through this experience, though the findings may signify that they were a more confident set of individuals prior to the experience.



All of the above statements were analysed according to gender. As the playwright group was composed of 6 boys and 3 girls, it is therefore unrealistic to draw conclusions from any apparent differences. That said, the boys did appear to be more positive on most statements and, in particular, in relation to being able to try out new ideas, putting forward their own ideas, and learning new things about writing. In the teacher group (8 boys and 6 girls), the only difference was that girls appeared to find it easier to remember what they were learning than the boys. In the no-Articulate group, overall the girls were marginally more positive than the boys, but not to any significant level.

### 3.6.2 Perceptions of ability in, and enjoyment of, related activities

The pupils were asked to indicate how good they thought they were at doing drama, writing poems or stories, sketch-writing, and being creative and using their imagination. They were also asked to say how much they enjoyed these activities. The figures for those who said they were either 'really good' or 'quite good' and that they 'really enjoyed' or 'quite enjoyed' them are given in Tables 18 and 19. (The details are in Appendix 1.)

**Table 18: S3 pupils who are 'really good' or 'quite good' at certain activities**

	<b><i>Playwright group (9)</i></b>	<b><i>Teacher group (14)</i></b>	<b><i>No-Artic group (24)</i></b>
Doing drama	4 (44%)	3 (21%)	10 (42%)
Writing poems or stories	6 (66%)	5 (36%)	12 (51%)
Sketch-writing	6 (66%)	2 (14%)	7 (29%)
Being creative and using my imagination	9 (100%)	6 (42%)	18 (75%)

**Table 19: S3 pupils who 'really enjoy' or 'quite enjoy' certain activities**

	<b><i>Playwright group (9)</i></b>	<b><i>Teacher group (14)</i></b>	<b><i>No-Artic group (24)</i></b>
Doing drama	5 (55%)	2 (14%)	12 (50%)
Writing poems or stories	6 (66%)	4 (29%)	11 (46%)
Sketch-writing	5 (55%)	2 (14%)	6 (25%)
Being creative and using my imagination	9 (100%)	7 (50%)	18 (76%)

The playwright group appear to be more positive about their abilities and enjoyment of these Articulate-related activities than the other two groups, though more noteworthy is the broadly negative response of the teacher group. One might expect both the playwright group and the teacher group to be more confident in their sketch-writing abilities and to enjoy them more. However, out of the three groups, the teacher group had the most negative responses. But even the playwright group were fairly reticent in declaring their enjoyment of sketch-writing.

Further statistical analysis revealed significant differences in relation to being good at and enjoying sketch-writing and being good at and enjoying being creative and imaginative. In all of these, the playwright group were more positive than the teacher group. The no-Articulate group were more positive than the teacher group in being creative and imagination.

The only gender difference which emerged was that, in the no-Articulate group, girls were more likely to say that they were good at and enjoyed drama.

### 3.6.3 Pupils' engagement in arts out of school

Pupils were asked two questions to gauge their level of interest in arts activities out of school: firstly, if they participated in any arts related hobbies; and secondly, if they participated in any arts-related, school-run clubs. The figures presented in Table 20 (below) are for those who indicated that they took part once, or more than once, a week.

**Table 20: S3 – Participation in hobbies out of school**

	<b>Playwright group (9)</b>	<b>Teacher group (14)</b>	<b>No-Artic group (24)</b>
Taking part in drama	1 (11%)	0	2 (8%)
Reading	6 (67%)	5 (43%)	9 (38%)
Writing, e.g. stories, plays, poems	4 (44%)	1 (7%)	4 (16%)
Going to the theatre	1 (11%)	0	2 (8%)

The pupils were asked if they had taken up any of these hobbies during the current year (i.e. following their experience of Articulate). Their responses were:

- playwright group                      5 (56%)
- teacher group                            1 (7%)
- no-Articulate group                    9 (38%).

Reading was the most frequent out of school activity, with the teacher group the least likely to participate in any Articulate-related hobby.

The following number from each group had taken part in after-school clubs during the current school year:

- playwright group                      7 (78%)
- teacher group                            6 (43%)
- no-Articulate group                    15 (63%).

Of those who took part in clubs, the following participated in activities relevant to Articulate:

**Table 21: S3 – Types of club attended by the three pupil groups**


	<b>Playwright group (7)</b>	<b>Teacher group (6)</b>	<b>No-Artic group (15)</b>
Drama	1	0	4
Music or singing	1	0	4
Writing (e.g. stories, plays or poems)	1	1	0
Books and reading	1	1	0

### 3.7 S3 pupils – Creative thinking tasks

The main findings in relation to the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking with Words are reported here; the details of the analysis and the supporting inferential statistics are presented in Appendix 2.

The analysis is based on 9 pupils who did sketch-writing with the playwright, 14 pupils who did sketch-writing with the teacher, and 24 pupils who had not participated in the Articulate Project. The results were analysed using non-parametric tests based on the mean rank of each group. Each group's total score is represented in Figure 2 (below) beside the mean scores for the three aspects of creative thinking tested by the activities.

**Figure 2: Mean ranking of the three S3 groups on the three aspects of creative thinking and total scores**



The pupils who had worked with the playwright consistently ranked more highly than the other two groups. However, there were no statistically significant differences between the playwright group and the group who had done sketch-writing with the teacher. Both those groups performed above the no-Articulate group to a statistically significant level.

There were no differences between the results for boys and girls in any of the groups.

### 3.8 S3 pupils – SDQ-II

The analysis of the SDQ-II is based on responses from 9 of the playwright group, 13 of the teacher group, and 24 of the no-Articulate group. The data were analysed using Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney tests. The mean ranks for the groups are given in Table 22 overleaf.

**Table 22: S3 pupils' responses to SDQ-II (mean ranks)**

Scale	Mean ranks
Other sex relations	Teacher group 28.9
	no-Artic group 19.9
	Playwright group 14.4
Same sex relations	Teacher group 22.2
	no-Artic group 21.5
	Playwright group 18.0
Honesty-trust'ness	no-Artic group 23.2
	Playwright group 22.1
	Teacher group 17.1
Emotional stability	Teacher group 25.4
	Playwright group 19.5
	no-Artic group 17.9
Verbal (English)	no-Artic group 23.5
	Playwright group 22.1
	Teacher group 18.0
General school	no-Artic group 23.9
	Playwright group 23.2
	Teacher group 19.7
General self	no-Artic group 24.6
	Teacher group 21.7
	Playwright group 20.4

On 4 of the 7 scales, the no-Articulate group were ranked highest of the 3 groups, and on the remaining 3 scales, the teacher group were ranked the highest. However, Mann-Whitney comparison of paired groups revealed only one statistically significant difference: the teacher group were more positive about their relationship with members of the opposite sex than the playwright group.

There were no differences between boys and girls on the SDQ-II scales.

Although not reported here, it should be noted that, as with S1, the mean scores for the groups revealed overall positive self-concepts with some variation within groups as opposed to across groups.

### **3.9 S3 pupils – Summary**

The survey data for S3 show that the pupils exposed to the Articulate Project clearly enjoyed their lessons far more than their no-Articulate peers, and they scored more highly in the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking. However, there are extreme differences between the playwright group and the group who had Articulate lessons with their teacher; the latter, although following the Articulate programme, expressed more negative feelings about their creative experience:

*'I disliked having to write a big long story.'*

During focus groups with these pupils, many were unenthusiastic and claimed to have forgotten about the experience. By contrast, the pupils who worked with the playwright remembered it as a positive experience: *'difficult in a good way'*. Approximately three out of five of these expressed strong feelings about the project, ranging from *'I disliked nothing: it was all good'* to *'sometimes you didn't get as long as you would like'*. Some of the control group appreciated the potential in creative writing lessons to use their imaginations:

*'I get to use my imagination and you don't have as many boundaries as you would have if it was a non-creative writing lesson. It's a lot of fun and ideas pop into your head.'*

By and large, although some differences between Articulate and no-Articulate groups did not reach statistical significance, taken together the quantitative and qualitative evidence suggests that the pupils who were selected to work with the playwright had a more positive experience overall.

### **3.10 Parents' views of Articulate**

As explained in the section on evaluation design, parents of pupils who participated in the project were invited to an evening meeting with the researchers in local schools. As in previous SEED evaluations, the sample of parents is very small. Appalling weather conditions and the fact that the project ended in December 2004 accounted in part for low attendance. Some parents who could not attend submitted comments.

The parents reported that their children were entirely positive about the project. The parents believed that arts projects were a good use of school time provided that they contributed to their children's academic achievement:

*'Anything that aids culture is a good thing provided the basics are not compromised'.*

However, a cautionary note was struck:

*'Children are always going to be enthused by anything that takes them away from ABC.'*

Parents seemed to value the opportunity for their children to learn something 'different':

*'This was a fantastic chance for R; I was really impressed with her short play; I was very proud of her.'*

*'I enjoyed the evening (at Denny Civic Theatre).'*

*'I really enjoyed the play – it was a great opportunity for the children – different.'*

One perceived benefit was that children were encouraged to write on themes that were outwith the normal programme. When asked if the project had an effect on children's behaviour or enthusiasm for learning, the parents reported that their children had always been well disposed towards school work.

The parent who had participated as a child in an arts project (in the 1960s in a school in a disadvantaged community) observed that:

*'Benefits are not immediate – the value comes later in life when you still go to opera'.*

## **4. Evidence from head teachers', teachers' and Traverse Theatre interviews**

### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter deals with the evidence relating to teachers' and theatre specialists' perceptions of the project. Their perceptions are of the following matters:

- the appropriateness of the approaches used by the theatre specialists
- the levels of support and assistance offered by the local authority
- the impact of the Articulate Project on creative learning
- the value of running Articulate-style projects in future.
- 

The key points that emerge from the interview responses are:

- many teachers were dissatisfied with the approach adopted by the theatre specialists
- some teachers wanted more ongoing support and assistance
- most teachers felt that the Articulate Project achieved no lasting effect on creative learning
- most teachers were broadly supportive of the aims of the Articulate Project, but suggested radical changes to the way that it might be delivered in future:
  - whole class involvement, rather than segregation
  - more pupil and teacher support materials
  - more opportunities to influence the direction of activities, currently controlled by the theatre specialists
  - better integration of the activities of the Articulate Project into the 5-14 teaching curriculum.

Although most teachers agreed that pupils had enjoyed participating in the Articulate Project, most disagreed that it had a lasting impact on pupils' ability to communicate creatively and effectively.

### **4.2 Interview sample**

The Articulate Project took place in the Vale of Leven Academy and four primary schools in its cluster: Haldane, Highdykes, Levensdale and Renton. The Head Teacher of each primary school was interviewed individually, following a standardised interview schedule, in order to elicit opinions on the implementation and impact of the Articulate Project. The Depute Head Teacher in Vale of Leven Academy who had been involved with the project was also interviewed, using the same schedule.

In addition, the views of the five classroom teachers who had been involved in the project were explored through individual interview, following a similar interview schedule (see Appendix 4).

### **4.3 Interview findings: general observations**

The interview schedules for all head teachers and teachers were designed to elicit their views about several key aspects of the Articulate Project and these were subsequently explored through analysis of the interview records:

- A. the level of support offered to participating teachers by the local authority and the theatre specialists
- B. the appropriateness of the approaches used by the theatre specialists in their teaching
- C. the impact of the Articulate Project on the participating pupils
- D. the impact of the Articulate Project on the teachers.

Analysis of the interview records permits a broad overview of each aspect to be made, and these are tabulated as Table 23 (below).

**Table 23: Teacher responses to questions relating to key aspects of the Articulate Project**

	Aspect A		Aspect B		Aspect C		Aspect D	
	<i>Broadly positive</i>	<i>Broadly negative</i>	<i>Broadly positive</i>	<i>Broadly negative</i>	<i>Broadly positive</i>	<i>Broadly negative</i>	<i>Broadly positive</i>	<i>Broadly negative</i>
Teacher 1	ü		ü		See Section 4.4 (Tables 24–26), below		ü	
Teacher 2	ü			ü				ü
Teacher 3		ü	ü				ü	
Teacher 4		ü	ü					ü
Teacher 5	ü		ü					ü

As regards the level of support (aspect A), the briefing and consultation meetings organised by Eona Craig (West Dunbartonshire’s Arts & Education Links Officer) and the Traverse Theatre were felt to be very helpful, particularly the preliminary meeting of teachers, head teachers and Traverse Theatre personnel at the ‘Articulate Inset Day’.

*‘Inset day was very effective in giving those attending a sense of shared ownership of the project.’*

*‘The inset day put the programme in context for the teachers.’*

*‘The inset day was very useful. Meeting the playwright and drama worker and getting an overview was extremely beneficial.’*

One head teacher commented that the initial meetings were “*vital to get the planning and organisation*”. But, although one of the teachers summed them up as “*fantastic*”, another reckoned they were only “*fairly helpful*”. Nevertheless, in general, the teachers appear to have found the meetings crucial to their motivation and fundamental in allaying any reservations about how the project would proceed.

*‘Possibly there could have been a bit more, but it comes down to time.’*

If teachers were unanimous about the need for preliminary meetings, they were also emphatic that the information disseminated at these meetings must be clear and accurate. There was also a feeling that there could have been more ongoing support, once the project was under way.

*‘Communication during the project was poor. There was probably insufficient opportunity to raise questions once the project was ongoing.’*

*'We were told one thing, and another thing happened. Obviously, things occur; you can't foresee everything, and you may need to move things about ...'*

*'The only down-side was that things would come up that they didn't have the answers to, and it became a bit of a muddle.'*

As regards the appropriateness of the approaches (aspect B), one head teacher was satisfied that her "general impression from popping in and out was that the children's reactions seemed to be positive". However, one teacher voiced "the concern that only half of the children were given the opportunity to work with the playwright".

*'I think it is essential that this kind of initiative be given to the whole class to involve all of the children.'*

*'Two or three asked why the others [in the playwright's group] were doing more exciting things.'*

This general concern was repeated by several teachers. Curiously, the response of the Traverse Theatre was to add an art activity: according to the Traverse evaluation report, "The introduction of art workshops did go some way to ease the issue of the split class". However, in one case, pupils who were not working with the playwright appear to have spent their time painting. In fact, none of the head teachers and only one class teacher valued the time spent with the artist. Here, the comment that "everyone involved should be aware of the standards expected" is particularly relevant.

*'Art was a big disappointment. The children were not stretched. The work was of P3 standard.'*

*'The art specialist was difficult, because I don't believe the children produced anything like P7 work. The standard was very, very low.'*

*'The art was the worst part of it. The art work was absolutely diabolical. I wouldn't have accepted this from some infants. It was actually quite embarrassing when it went on show.'*

The problem was summed up by one head teacher, who observed:

*'People coming into the school need more time working with the class teacher on standards of an acceptable level in all areas of the curriculum. The people coming in need a wider knowledge of the 5-14 curriculum and the targets within it.'*

A major concern was the length of the project. Most head teachers and class teachers felt that the work was too time-consuming. On the one hand, tasks often overran into time allocated to a different topic, while, more generally, devoting 12 weeks to a single aspect of creative writing was felt to be over-indulgent. The requirements of the 5-14 guidelines were mentioned by more than one teacher.

*'The weeks that the children were writing and redrafting were a bit long.'*

*'The writing was too time-consuming.'*

*'We then had to scramble for the rest of the session to cover all the other types of writing that we have to have done by the end of P7.'*

*'Children became good at writing plays, which isn't assessed, but this didn't transfer into the other writing which they were assessed on.'*

However, drama, which was not normally timetabled in many schools, was felt to be a valuable component of the project. Pupils' first taste of the Articulate Project was through a series of three whole-class drama workshops, led by actress and professional drama worker



Mary Gapinski. Many teachers commented that the children benefited from Ms Gapinski's specialist skills. However, here again, the 5-14 guidelines were mentioned.

*'The drama lesson was far superior to normal primary teaching, because it was delivered by a specialist.'*

*'The children absolutely loved [the drama activities].'*

*'I wouldn't have done the more fun, exciting elements of drama, because I would have stuck to 5-14.'*

*'The drama involved [in Articulate] is not practical within the time constraints of 5-14.'*

When asked about the impact of the project on the staff (aspect D, p23), the head teachers were united in the belief that the classroom teachers had benefited from their exposure to Articulate.

The teachers' responses were more varied. On the positive side, one teacher cited the opportunity to learn the specialist craft of the playwright, but another felt that this aspect was irrelevant to the 5-14 curriculum.

*'I benefited from learning a skill that I didn't have before.'*

*'If I'd been allowed to get on with my job, I think I'd have got better results, because Articulate actually set me back.'*

*'I don't think the Articulate Project has really had any impact on my teaching.'*

It is important to acknowledge that head teachers and teachers experience a continuous pressure not only to promote pupils progress towards an appropriate attainment level, but to provide prescribed forms of evidence of that attainment. Enabling pupils to produce assessment evidence has to be balanced against allowing time for activities that develop broader educational outcomes. It is within this context that while generally satisfied with the content of the Articulate Project, it was observed that the head teachers and teachers, in their responses to interview, revealed some concerns. Some of these concerns are a consequence of choices they made about project structure during the negotiation of the terms of the scheme: the option to have the project run over two rather than the initially planned three terms may have brought about the sense of trying to do too much in too short a time. With hindsight and despite time pressures, school staff satisfaction could possibly have been enhanced if the Head Teachers' had taken up the final planning meeting proposed by the project manager.

#### **4.4 Interview findings: the five aims of the project**

Apart from the general goals of inspiring, challenging and motivating the pupils, the Articulate Project had five specific aims (aspect C, p23).

Aims 1 and 2 were to:

- develop pupils' creative and imaginative writing skills
- improve pupils' ability to communicate effectively.
- 

Owing to the nature of the creative writing encouraged by the Articulate Project, teachers had reservations about whether improved writing skills would have been possible. One teacher commented that the type of writing *"did not help to raise the abilities with regard to the criteria set out in the 5-14 guidelines"*, so there was no transfer of skills. Indeed, one head teacher observed that *"the school then had to do a very intensive programme ... to enable the children to reach the next level according to the 5-14 standards"*; in other words, to make up for the work that had been missed during the project.

*'Because of the things they were having to write, they didn't make great strides forward. I couldn't honestly say that there was a great improvement in their writing.'*

*'I do have to say that I was disappointed with the quality of scripts.'*

*'When we went back to their ordinary writing, the pupils couldn't use conjunctions or vocabulary ... they didn't have a clue.'*

*'There was a huge difference in the writing skills [between the playwright's group and the others], but... they were enhancing what they were already doing.'*

Table 24 (below) attempts to tabulate the findings from this part of the questionnaire, drawing on teachers' comments regarding both playwright-led classes and the teachers' own work-pack based classes.

**Table 24: Teacher responses to questions relating to pupils' creative and imaginative development (Aims 1 & 2)**

	Development of creative skills?		Improvement in communication?	
	<b>Broadly positive</b>	<b>Broadly negative</b>	<b>Broadly positive</b>	<b>Broadly negative</b>
Teacher 1		ü	ü	
Teacher 2		ü		ü
Teacher 3	ü			ü
Teacher 4	ü		ü	
Teacher 5		ü		ü

Table 24 suggests low levels of teacher satisfaction in both areas of writing skill development and general communication. This view is shared by head teachers, some of whom admitted that children's imaginations had been stimulated over the short term, but were more pessimistic as regards long-term improvement.

*'One or two of the poorer achievers were more enthused for a short time. But it didn't raise the standards in writing.'*

*'Their imagination was certainly fired, but it became very cartoon-like.'*

*'The children were quite creative anyway. Articulate perhaps stimulated the teacher, who then kept that motivation going.'*

Aims 4 and 5 were to:

- increase pupils' motivation to participate in lessons;
- improve pupils' thinking skills, along with team working.

Teachers seemed more optimistic about these aims.

*'Some of the children who were involved in Articulate have now joined a drama group.'*

*'They were able to work together with each other and **did** remain focused on what they were doing. ... [but] with team working, they were actually quite good at it before.'*

*'They were motivated during the project, but it's difficult to tell whether there has been a knock-on effect.'*

Table 25 attempts to tabulate the findings from this part of the questionnaire, again drawing on teachers' comments regarding both playwright-led classes and the teachers' own work-pack based classes.

**Table 25: Teacher responses to questions relating to pupils' motivation and thinking skills (Aims 4 & 5)**

	Increased motivation to participate?		Improvement in thinking skills/ team work?	
	<b>Broadly positive</b>	<b>Broadly negative</b>	<b>Broadly positive</b>	<b>Broadly negative</b>
Teacher 1	ü			ü
Teacher 2		ü		ü
Teacher 3		ü	ü	
Teacher 4	ü		ü	
Teacher 5		ü		ü

Table 25 still suggests fairly low levels of teacher satisfaction, regarding both pupils' motivation to participate in class work, and pupils' thinking skills in general. Again, head teachers were reserved in their enthusiasm.

*'There was a short-term increase [in motivation to learn] for a few children.'*

*'[Articulate] probably widened their horizons. Learning doesn't always occur in school.'*

*'They were motivated to write during the project period ...'*

Finally, aim 3 was to:

- raise pupils' self-esteem and self-worth.
- 

Achievement of this aim was complicated by the in-built de-motivating factor of being left behind in class when ten pupils were singled out for the privilege of working with the playwright. The latter group certainly seem to have enjoyed a boost in their self-worth.

*'[The playwright's group] was separated from the rest of the class, so they felt special.'*

*'The only thing I would say is that children in the playwright's group worked as a team and produced something that they couldn't have produced as individuals; they were very proud of themselves.'*

*'For a couple of them [there was an increase in self-esteem], definitely for a few.'*

*'It was a great boost when they saw their play performed.'*

Table 26 attempts to tabulate the findings from this part of the questionnaire, again drawing on teachers' comments regarding both playwright-led classes and the teachers' own work-pack based classes.

**Table 26: Teacher responses to questions relating to pupils' self-esteem (Aim 3)**

	Rise in self-esteem/ self-worth?	
	<b><i>Broadly positive</i></b>	<b><i>Broadly negative</i></b>
Teacher 1	ü	
Teacher 2		ü
Teacher 3	ü	
Teacher 4	ü	
Teacher 5		ü

The apparently high level of teacher satisfaction in Table 26 derives mainly from the positive feelings of the groups who worked with a playwright. The comments of the head teachers also concentrated either on these special groups, or on those children who saw their work performed. In any case, attributing improvements in self-worth to the Articulate Project was felt to be problematic.

*'There was a general rise [in self-worth], but they were already quite a chatty class.'*

*'To get their work publicly acknowledged had a big effect.'*

*'There was no difference [in self-worth], but this was a very difficult class.'*

#### **4.5 Interview findings: summary of Head Teachers' and teachers' views**

The tables presented above support the view that many teachers and head teachers were dissatisfied with the way that the Articulate Project was delivered. This general conclusion is supported by the quoted comments, highlighting various shortcomings.

However, teachers and head teachers were broadly sympathetic to the approach, provided that certain alterations were made. These may be summarised as (a) making a commitment to involve teaching staff at the planning stage, and (b) making arrangements to involve the entire class in each lesson.

#### **4.6 The Traverse Theatre view**

The theatre specialists' views were represented by the Literacy Development Officer at the Traverse Theatre in an extended interview (over 2 hours) that was conducted by the drama education specialist in the evaluation team. She used a semi-structured interview schedule to elicit views about key aspects of the Articulate Project and these were subsequently explored through analysis of the interview record:

- A. the level of support offered to the theatre specialists by the local authority
- B. the appropriateness of the approaches used by the theatre specialists in their teaching
- C. the impact of the Articulate Project on the participating pupils
- D. the impact of the Articulate Project on the theatre specialists.

Analysis of the interviews permits a broad overview of each aspect to be made.

As regards the level of support (aspect A), the theatre specialists' view was similar to that of the Head Teachers/teachers. The Articulate Inset Day was helpful, when head teachers, class teachers and Traverse staff met to discuss and identify what Articulate was all about, and briefing and consultation meetings with West Dunbartonshire staff enabled project targets to be formalised and the overall shape of support materials to be agreed. The curricular documentation that West Dunbartonshire Council had sent to the Traverse Theatre was also helpful.

The theatre specialists were concerned that they had very little teaching experience in the primary sector. This issue was addressed by recruiting a teacher from one of the participating primary schools to work alongside one of the playwrights in the production of the Articulate work pack. The Traverse acknowledged that this teacher's input would be vital in terms of her curricular knowledge and coherence with 5-14 National Guidelines.

When asked about the appropriateness of the approaches (aspect B), reference was made to successful experience of using the approach in similar projects. For fifteen years the Traverse had successfully run a play-writing project called 'Class Act', which focused on supporting the curricular elements of scriptwriting with Higher and Advanced Higher drama in secondary schools.

*'They were not being told what to write about, we encouraged their ideas, that is how they evolved.'*

*'The performance was the main pull and focus for the pupils, it kept them on track, they were desperate to have their ideas performed.'*

*'The actors would invite the pupils to tell them what they wanted at particular problematic parts and what kind of lines they would like the actor to speak.'*

The impact of the Articulate Project on the participating pupils (aspect C) is discussed in a Traverse Theatre report. The following statement is typical of pupil views: *'Drama with Mary was really good'*.

The Traverse Theatre evaluation also indicates that the pupils who worked with the playwright are *'happy and confident ... writing is no longer such a chore'*.

The Traverse Theatre perception is that *'there was creative quality in their work'*, and that pupils were aware that the performance process relied on group co-operation.

Above all, what was important to the theatre specialists was: *'What the kids achieved .... (they) had a blast doing it'*.

The impact of the Articulate Project on the theatre specialists (aspect D) is closely bound up with how teachers and pupils valued their work. The perceptions of theatre specialists were that some schools prepared better than others for the visiting specialist, were more welcoming to that specialist, and invested more time in supporting the project between visits. The project team had to address such issues as they arose. These issues are being

explored thoroughly in the large scale 'Evaluation of the Arts Across the Curriculum Project'. In a small scale evaluation with aims that focus on educational outcomes, such issues cannot be fully addressed.

There is reference to constraints of the 5-14 curriculum, which are thought to be connected with the *'mixed response from teachers'*.

*'It is sometimes difficult for teachers because they cannot always measure the value of the drama and theatre experiences and that worries them.'*

*'Linking the project to the 5-14 curriculum was very hard for some teachers.'*

Nevertheless, the teachers valued their theatre colleagues as *'friendly, supportive professionals'*.

The experience was most satisfactory when, at the start of the project, teachers and playwrights worked together in the classroom. Where this was not the case, problems arose with communicating progress. Traverse staff believed that teachers were anxious when they were left alone to work within an unfamiliar genre.

The actors had to adapt to working with sketches that were much more incomplete than usual. They had to respond to ideas in the pupils' writing that did not always make sense to them. In improvising and discussing structure with pupils, the actors' experience was extended.

#### **4.7 Interview findings: summary of Traverse Theatre views**

There were concerns that there was not a strong enough link to the 5-14 targets. In a future project the Traverse Theatre specialists would draw less on their experience in Class Act (their contribution to the creative writing component in Higher Drama) and give more attention to the requirements of the 5-14 curriculum and the expectations of teachers regarding the more technical aspects of literacy.

Some problems arose from the complex logistics of the project.

The Traverse hoped that the project would be repeated, ideally with the entire class working with the playwright. Working with primary and early secondary pupils *'was to some degree a new venture for us'*. The intention is to *'look at the formula and redo it'*.

## 5. Conclusions and discussion

### 5.1 Introduction

Drawing on data presented in earlier chapters and in the appendices, this chapter discusses key findings in relation to each of the evaluation aims, which were to:

1. describe the extent to which the five key aims (listed below) of the Articulate Project have been met
2. identify strengths and any gaps in the training and support available to teachers, writers and drama specialists involved in the Articulate Project
3. assess the overall impact of the Articulate Project on teachers and pupils in the participating schools and in the local communities
4. explore how the expressive arts can be used as a vehicle for carrying current school curriculum knowledge, and for achieving broader educational goals.

The first evaluation aim refers to the five aims of the Articulate Project, which were to:

1. develop the creative and imaginative writing skills of participating pupils
2. improve the ability of pupils to communicate effectively
3. raise the levels of pupils' self-esteem and self-worth
4. increase pupils' motivation to participate in, and enjoy, learning
5. create a positive impact on the thinking skills, problem solving and team working on individuals, schools and the community.

Turning to **Evaluation Aim 1**, which is to investigate the **five Articulate Project aims listed above**, the evidence broadly supports a conclusion that these five aims were achieved. The main points arising from the first evaluation aim are:

- the project had an impact on creative thinking in the S1 groups who worked with the playwright (when they were in P7) and in the S3 class (who were in S2 during the project), regardless of whether the pupils worked on the Articulate activities with the playwright or teacher
- there was an impact on S1 pupils' progress to the next level in writing
- pupil enjoyment of the Articulate Project activities was generally high, but particularly amongst those chosen to work with the playwright

Detailed justification of this broad conclusion, and discussion of variations in the broad picture, are in Section 5.2 below ('Articulate Project aims 1-4: the enhancement of pupils' creativity, communication, self-worth and enjoyment of learning').

Learning points arising from **Evaluation Aims 1 (and the part of Evaluation Aim 3 relating to pupils)** that might be of interest to people involved in similar initiatives are:

- project classes should not be split into playwright and teacher-led groups; the evidence suggests that any such division provokes lower pupil satisfaction levels.
- project activities need to be better integrated into the 5-14 writing curriculum, but better integration requires changes in the type of pupil output required to evidence levels of attainment in writing.

- project writing activities did help to develop broader capacities described in ‘A Curriculum for Excellence’; however, the evidence suggests that, in implementing ‘A Curriculum for Excellence’, there is a tension that needs to be reconciled between such activities and output required to evidence levels of attainment.

Comments on the first of the points above can be found in Section 5.2 and the second and third points are discussed in Section 5.3 (‘Articulate Project aim 5: exploring impact on individuals, schools and the community’).

Evaluation **Aims 2 and 3** relate to training and support provided for those involved in the Articulate Project, and to its overall impact. The impact on pupils is outlined above in connection with Evaluation Aim 1. The main points arising from **Evaluation Aims 2 and 3** are:

- ample initial support was provided
- to achieve greater sustainability, opportunities should be maximised for the two professional groups to learn from each other; this could be realised by the class teacher and theatre specialist planning and teaching lessons together throughout the project.

These points are discussed in Section 5.3 below (‘Articulate Project aim 5: exploring impact on individuals, schools and the community’).

**Evaluation Aim 4** is concerned with how the expressive arts can be used as a vehicle for achieving broader educational goals. This matter is discussed at the end of Section 5.3. The main themes of this discussion are:

- the Articulate Project evidence suggests that the ‘Integrated Curricular Lesson’ used in the current Arts Across the Curriculum Project offers advantages;
- the ‘Integrated Curricular Lesson’ requires resourcing well beyond what was available for the Articulate Project.

Whatever approach is used, what is learned should be applied in other school work.

Effective planning of lessons may be enhanced by Identification of thinking processes to be learned from arts activities that could be applied to school curricula.

## **5.2 Articulate Project aims 1-4: the enhancement of pupils’ creativity, communication, self-worth and enjoyment of learning**

The **first aim of the evaluation** is concerned with the extent to which the five key aims of the Articulate Project have been met. This section begins with consideration of the first four project aims and goes on to discuss the fifth aim.

As explained in chapter 2, the evaluation was designed to assess impact on pupils through comparison of three broad groups of pupils: Articulate Project pupils who worked with the playwright, those who followed a similar programme mediated by their class teacher and a control group of pupils who had no Articulate Project experience. In addition to the analysis of data from the evaluation instruments, pre- and post-project attainment level data for reading and writing for the three groups were analysed, as were pupil and staff interview data. Therefore, impact is defined in terms of differences between the three groups. The reported differences between Articulate and no-Articulate pupils emerged from data that were gathered nine months after the project ended. All differences reported were statistically significant and significance levels can be found in Appendix 1.

As noted earlier, the pupils involved in the project were in P7 and S2 during the project activities and in S1 and S3 during the evaluation. The quantitative data for the S1 pupils indicates that working with the playwright impacted positively on Aims 1, 2 and 4, and an



impact on Aims 1 and 4 from working with the playwright also emerged from analyses of the S3 quantitative data. However, teacher/head teacher interview data provide little indication that Aims 1 and 2 were realised in the playwright groups (see chapter 4). The qualitative data from teachers and Head Teachers points to a consensus that, by and large, the pupils had enjoyed their experience of the Articulate Project (i.e. there was a positive impact on aim 4) but there was less agreement about the long-term educational benefits of the project in its current form.

There is no evidence from the S1 or S3 quantitative data of any impact on Aim 3, but this was because both Articulate and no-Articulate pupils recorded high self-concept scores, leaving little scope for the emergence of differences between Articulate and control group pupils. These high self-concept scores are possibly due to effective measures in all five schools to foster pupils' self-esteem. It is interesting that the interview data from both school staff and theatre specialists supports the idea that self-esteem was enhanced.

On the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking the S1 pupils who had worked with the playwright (in P7) showed themselves to be more creative thinkers, and more of the playwright group pupils also progressed to the next level in writing than pupils in the other groups. The S3 pupils with experience of Articulate in S2 also showed themselves to be more creative thinkers than the no-Articulate pupils, *regardless of whether they had worked with the playwright or teacher*. However, no conclusions could be drawn from the attainment level data about the impact of the project on S3 pupils' writing, and their teacher noticed no substantial impact.

The research team considered the possibility that the more creative or able writers in P7 might have been selected to work with the playwright. Since the evaluation had been commissioned after the end of the project, pre-project scores were not available to check this possibility. However, the attainment data for 5-14 levels in writing at the beginning of the project show that the majority of P7 pupils in all three groups were working towards level D when the project began. If some writing tasks entail abilities that overlap with those measured by the Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (fluency, originality and flexibility of thinking), and the majority of P7 pupils were at a similar writing level when the project began, it might be inferred that the playwright pupils were not substantially more creative than pupils in other groups. Nor is there unequivocal support for such differences in the teacher/head teacher interview data. However, there is support in this data for the view that pupils with challenging behaviour were not allocated to the playwright group. It is not safe to infer that these pupils who remained in the teacher group were less creative than their peers in the playwright groups, although they might well have made greater demands on their teachers.

It is important to acknowledge that other unknown factors might have contributed to the findings. According to end of evaluation senior management interviews, the pupils had experienced a range of other arts related provision in their secondary school that might have boosted creativity. The teacher/head teacher interview data (see chapter 4) suggest that school staff worked very productively with their pupils during the project and after it ended. It is possible that the playwright experience influenced pupils' response to teaching through enhanced motivation towards writing. A plausible interpretation is that an interaction between increased pupil motivation and good teaching subsequent to the project contributed to pupil gains.

As noted below, S1 project pupil data provide quite strong evidence of enhanced motivation during the project (see chapter 3), which might have carried over to class work. However, in relation to the S3 group who worked on similar activities with their teacher, motivational explanations are less plausible in accounting for the finding that the S3 project class scored higher on creative thinking than their control group, regardless of whether they had worked with the playwright or teacher. Exclusion from the playwright group might have dampened motivation. Teacher interview data suggest that increased scores in both S3 Articulate

groups were connected with the teacher's effective utilisation of the Articulate pupil support materials.

The evidence would seem to demonstrate that pupil enjoyment of the Articulate Project was generally high, but particularly amongst those chosen to work with the playwright. The S1 quantitative and qualitative data indicate that the project impacted on Aim 4. However, more of those working with the playwright found the classes interesting, looked forward to the classes, and would have welcomed more classes of this sort. Their positive attitude seems to have brought motivational benefits. Equally, they were more likely to express the belief that they were learning new things about drama (though not about writing).

The project experience does not seem to have influenced some aspects of pupils' views and inclinations. When the S1 pupils were asked about their own creativity and their desire to work collaboratively, there were no statistically significant differences amongst the three surveyed groups. The playwright group shared the same views as their peers regarding their creative ability, and were no more likely to work collaboratively. Participation in extracurricular activities was similarly equally distributed across the three groups. It seems that involvement in the Articulate Project made no impact on these areas.

The survey of S3 pupils paints a subtly different picture of Aim 4. In terms of the enjoyment of creative writing, a greater gulf lay between the playwright group and the teacher group. While all of those working with the playwright found their lessons interesting, barely one-fifth of the teacher group expressed the same satisfaction, as against three-fifths of the no-Articulate control group. Nevertheless, regardless of whether they had worked with the playwright or teacher, these project pupils scored higher than their control group in measures of creativity. When questioned about views related to creativity, there was no statistically significant difference between the playwright group and the no-Articulate group, but the teacher group appeared more pessimistic. The playwright group were far more likely to view the general experience in a positive light, while the least positive responses again came from the teacher group.

The project's reception by both cohorts of pupils can fairly be viewed as enthusiastic, although there are clear differences in perception between the playwright groups and the others.

The **second evaluation aim** is concerned with identifying strengths and gaps in the training and support available to staff involved in the project. This aim is discussed in Section 5.3. The focus of the **third evaluation aim** is the overall impact of the Articulate Project on staff and pupils. The overall impact on pupils is discussed in Section 5.2, in terms of enhancement of pupils' creativity, communication and enjoyment of learning. In Section 5.3, the impact on others involved in the Articulate Project is considered.

### **5.3 Articulate Project aim 5: exploring impact on individuals, schools and the community**

The sustainability of the project is closely connected with its impact on teachers, head teachers and theatre professionals. Their evidence suggests that they had ample initial support that enabled them to understand the nature of the project. Any subsequent perceived shortcomings seemed to be a consequence of the implementation model. The interview data suggested that, as the project progressed, impact on these groups would have been enhanced if clearer lines of communication had been established, and if the project design had enabled teachers and theatre specialists to collaborate much more closely in planning and teaching lessons throughout the project. Such co-operation might have reduced frustrations for the theatre people and increased school staff satisfaction by enabling the project activities to be better integrated into the 5-14 writing curriculum. More opportunities to plan and teach together would also have enabled the two professional groups

to learn more from each other, thereby increasing the sustainability of what was achieved. Plainly, such collaboration involves complex logistics and costs.

The interviews with participating school staff suggested that most were broadly supportive of the project and its aims. However, three of the five teachers did not concur with the head teachers' view that the project had a positive impact on staff. Themes in interviews with both head teachers and teachers included some dissatisfaction with the particular approaches of theatre professionals, with the decision that not all the pupils in each class were to work with the playwright, and with insufficiency of teaching resources. In general the project was felt to be too long.

Any dissatisfaction seems to be centred on school staff perceptions that project activities and pupils' work for their next writing attainment level were not well connected. There is ample evidence that the Articulate pupils made significant progress towards the four broader capabilities that are to be developed through a 'Curriculum for Excellence'. They engaged in collaborative work with theatre professionals to achieve an effective contribution to a performance for their community. However, the evidence of competences required for attainment levels in writing offered little scope for acknowledging the achievement of these broader capacities.

An important contribution of this project is that it highlights a tension that needs to be reconciled between the aims expressed in a 'Curriculum for Excellence' of promoting broader capacities and current assessment requirements. The Articulate Project data suggests that pupils can progress their capacity to be confident, successful and creative learners who can contribute to Scottish culture, but methods of assessing progress and attainment need to be adjusted if staff and pupils are to value activities that promote these capacities.

Therefore, while the impact on staff in the primary schools might have been enhanced through opportunities to reach consensus about how project activities would contribute to the requirements for the attainment levels towards which pupils were working, the assessment requirements constrained what could be agreed. These constraints were also evident in connection with the Art workshops offered to pupils who were not selected to work with the playwright. It appeared that the artist and teachers had insufficient opportunity to discuss their different views about the emphasis that should be placed on process and product aims in art lessons. Teachers perceived artists as privileging aims connected with the creative process in art over improving the quality of pupils' art output. Insufficient opportunities to debate this issue left both school staff and art professionals dissatisfied.

The fifth project aim included influence on the local community, which is ambitious for a modestly funded project spanning a few months. This aim was explored through contact with a local youth club that some Articulate project pupils attended. In the focus groups, Articulate pupils were enthusiastic about the arts opportunities the Network offered but there is no conclusive evidence that the project influenced pupils to join it. Nevertheless, some Articulate Project pupils sustained their interest in the project activities through participation in the club.

Parents were invited to two social evenings during which they had an opportunity to offer their views of the project. The turn out was very low but some parents responded to teachers' invitations to write comments. Overall, parents of pupils who worked with the playwright were enthusiastic about the project and no parent expressed any negative view.

Overall, the findings imply that it is important to involve all pupils within target classes and to provide more opportunities for teachers and theatre specialists to learn from each other.

The **fourth evaluation aim** is to explore how the expressive arts can be used as a vehicle for carrying current curriculum knowledge and for achieving broader educational goals.

Interviews with school staff suggest that the Articulate project could be developed along the lines of the Scottish Arts Council managed Arts Across the Curriculum Project that is currently being implemented in seven Scottish local authorities. Central to the Arts Across the

Curriculum Project is the notion of the 'integrated curricular lesson', which arts professionals and teachers plan and deliver together. The purpose of the 'integrated curricular lesson' is to enhance pupils' understanding of curriculum content through arts activity and for pupils to gain greater insight into the arts. Artist and teacher integrate their specialist knowledge in designing lessons to achieve this end. Maths teachers and dancers, for instance, might teach together to enhance pupils' understanding of fractions. Through teaching lessons together, teachers and arts professional can learn from each other with a view to implementing their new understandings when they teach without their partner.

Although this collaborative model seems to have greater potential for integration of the activities of a future Articulate-type project into the writing curriculum, it has serious resource implications in that arts professionals need to be paid for the time they spend with the teacher in joint planning and delivery of lessons. Extra cost might be recouped in the longer run if teachers were able to cascade what they had learned throughout their school. However, evaluation of the Arts Across the Curriculum Project is still in its first phase and much data has yet to be gathered on how the particular collaborative model works in practice.

The 'integrated curricular lesson' in the Arts Across the Curriculum Project rests on the idea that a variety of thinking processes underlie artistic and other academic endeavours and that learning these processes simultaneously enriches overall ability to think effectively. (For a review of descriptive maps of thinking processes, see Moseley *et al*, 2005.) Introducing drama in science lessons, for instance, might engender a more imaginative thinking that is integrated with making predictions and formulating hypotheses – the sorts of thinking required in science lessons. In other subjects, arts professionals and teachers might collaborate to provoke pupils to envisage different perspectives on a topic, and to understand different ways of assessing these perspectives.

In the extensive research literature concerned with improving learners' thinking, this approach is commonly known as infusion. The concept of infusing forms of thinking across the curriculum has strong research support (e.g. for a review of research in this area, see Livingston and Soden, 2004). Infusion can be contrasted with approaches that provide an experience designed to enrich pupils' thinking but is separate from their other curricular work. The point of an infusion model is that it includes measures to ensure that new skills being introduced through an intervention are practised in normal school work.

A synthesis of research on thinking and arts education implies that expressive arts can be used as a vehicle for carrying current curriculum knowledge, provided that the pedagogical model is based on an analysis of processes that are embedded both in the arts and in school curriculum knowledge. This model is likely to be an infusion one. Grainger (2004) talks about the need to integrate drama into the curriculum through activities like writing in role. She describes three phases of drama that can provide opportunities for pupils to write. These phases are outlined in Appendix 3. Many other writers (e.g. Goode and Neelands, 2000; Taylor, 1995) have illuminated how teachers can use drama to enhance pupils' writing (see Appendix 3). Many writers argue that story drama (see Appendix 3) is a powerful art form for teaching multiple literacies (Booth, 1995; Miller and Saxton, 2004).

## Sustaining the achievements of the Articulate Project

According to the theoretical perspective known as Situated Learning (Lave and Wenger, 1991; Lave, 1996), it would be important in any development of the project that the idea be retained of enabling pupils to work with an arts professional. This perspective implies that learning is more effective when it is situated in real work that matters to learners. According to this perspective, the deployment of professional sketch writers in schools enables pupils to learn through 'legitimate peripheral participation' in a socially valued activity (Lave and Wenger, 1991). The Articulate Project allowed selected pupils to function as apprentices to a playwright for a short period during which they experienced and enjoyed the discipline of writing sketches that could be performed for a real theatre audience.

The idea of learning through work that has a real, socially valued purpose might be realised in a variety of ways. For the playwright group, seeing their sketches performed by actors in Denny Civic Theatre added a rather special dimension to the pupils' experience. However, the costs of this outlet for pupils' work might limit the number who can be offered the opportunity to work with a sketch writer. Pupils might be consulted about other outlets in the community that they perceive as valuable. O'Neill (1995) points out that process drama (see Appendix 3) does not conclude with a public performance. Rather it involves creating stories through action. If the situated view of learning is to be adopted, with its insistence on a real life outlet for pupils' work, pupils could learn techniques of process drama and use these techniques (with staff support) to work with nursery children.

There is sufficient evidence from the project itself and from research literature to justify taking forward the idea that theatre professionals can contribute to developing significant pupil attributes. On-going measures in the case study secondary school to harness expressive arts to learning provide an opportunity to build on and extend good practice. Sustainability is likely to be enhanced through an infusion model that involves much more extensive collaboration between theatre professionals and all the teachers involved in the project. In the longer run, such a project needs to be implemented in ways that put teachers in a position to cascade the approach throughout their school.

The Articulate Project helped to enrich young people's creativity and engagement with writing and they enjoyed working with theatre professionals. It also provided a case study that suggested how we might learn to use the tools of the theatre to help learners create their own culture. It is appropriate perhaps to allow an Articulate pupil to have the last words:

*'it was difficult in a good way'.*

## References

- AELP [Arts & Education Links Programme] (2005) *The Link* [Quarterly newsletter], May 2005. Dumbarton: West Dunbartonshire Council
- Baldwin, P and Fleming, K (2003) *Teaching Literacy through Drama: Creative Approaches*. London: Routledge Falmer
- Booth, D (1995) *Story Drama: Reading, Writing and Role Playing across the Curriculum* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Markham, Ontario: Pembroke Publishers
- Booth, D and Gallagher, K (eds) (2003) *How Theatre Educates: Convergences and Counterpoints with Artists, Scholars, and Advocates*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press
- Burton, JM, Horowitz, R and Abeles, H (2000) Learning in and through the Arts: The Question of Transfer. *Studies in Art Education* 41 (2) 228-257
- Dancey, C and Reidy, J (2002) *Statistics Without Maths for Psychology* (2nd edition). Essex: Prentice Hall
- Goode, T, and Neelands, J (2000) *Structuring Drama Work: A handbook of available forms in theatre and drama*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grainger, T (2004) Drama and writing: Enlivening their prose. In P Goodwin (ed) *Literacy through Creativity*. London: David Fulton
- Lave, J (1996) The practice of learning. In S Chaiklin and J Lave (eds) *Understanding practice: perspectives on activity and context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Lave, J and Wenger, E (1991) *Situated Learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Livingston, K, Soden, R and Kirkwood, M (2004) Post-16 pedagogy and thinking skills: an evaluation. London: Learning and Skills Research Centre
- Miller, C and Saxton, J (2004) *Into the Story, Language in Action through Drama*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann
- Moseley D, Baumfield V, Elliott J, Gregson H, Higgins S, Lin M, Miller J and Robson S (2003). *Thinking skills frameworks for post-16 learners: an evaluation*. London: Learning and Skills Research Centre
- Nicholson, H (ed) (2000) *Teaching Drama 11-18*. London: Continuum
- O'Neill, C (1995) *Drama Worlds, A framework for Process Drama*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann

- SEED (2004a) *Ambitious, Excellent Schools*  
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library5/education/aesaa-00.asp> (Accessed January 2006)
- SEED (2004b) *A Curriculum for Excellence*  
<http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library5/education/cerv-00.asp> (Accessed January 2006)
- Taylor, P (ed) (1995) *Pre-text & Storydrama: The Artistry of Cecily O'Neill & David Booth*.  
National Association for Drama in Education, Research Monograph Series, No.1.  
Australia: NADIE
- Torrance, EP (2000) *Research Review for the Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking*.  
Bensenville, Illinois: Scholastic Testing Service

# Appendix 1

## Results from pupil questionnaires

This appendix presents the tabulated results of the pupil questionnaires representing the 3 groups of pupils: those who worked with the playwrights from the Traverse Theatre (Playwright), those who followed a programme of sketch-writing with the teacher (Teacher), and a control group who did not participate in the project (no-Articulate). The tables are presented in the order of the questions in the questionnaire, and the data for the S1 and S3 year groups are presented separately.

Where the numbers do not add up to the total samples and percentages do not add up to 100%, it is because of a small number of missing responses and also rounding of percentages.

### 1. S1 Pupils

The S1 pupils had taken part in Articulate when in P7.

#### 1.1 The sample

The number of questionnaires completed from each of the three groups and the gender of the respondents are given in Table A1.

**Table A1: Number and gender of S1 respondents**

	<b>Boys</b>	<b>Girls</b>	<b>Total</b>
Playwright	20 (56%)	16 (44%)	36 (100%)
Teacher	15 (60%)	10 (40%)	25 (100%)
No-Articulate	16 (39%)	25 (60%)	41 (100%)
Total	51 (50%)	51 (50%)	102 (100%)

#### 1.2 Hobbies out of school (Q3)

Pupils were asked how often they took part in certain activities as hobbies out of school.

**Table A2: Hobbies out of school: playwright group**

	<b>hardly ever</b>	<b>once a week</b>	<b>more than once a week</b>	<b>I don't do this</b>
Taking part in drama	11 (31%)	2 (6%)	0	20 (56%)
Reading	4 (11%)	6 (17%)	16 (44%)	7 (19%)
Writing, e.g. stories, plays, poems	6 (17%)	4 (11%)	5 (14%)	15 (42%)
Going to the theatre	14 (39%)	4 (11%)	1 (3%)	13 (33%)

They were asked what else they did: 8 (22%) reported that they did not do anything else; 1 (3%) hardly ever did anything else; 5 (14%) reported taking part in other types of activities once a week; and 17 (47%) reported being involved more than once a week. Twenty (56%) reported taking up some of these hobbies this year.



**Table A3: Hobbies out of school: teacher group**

	hardly ever	once a week	more than once a week	I don't do this
Taking part in drama	7 (28%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	15 (60%)
Reading	9 (36%)	3 (12%)	4 (16%)	8 (32%)
Writing, e.g. stories, plays, poems	14 (56%)	2 (8%)	3 (12%)	6 (24%)
Going to the theatre	14 (56%)	2 (8%)	4 (16%)	7 (28%)

They were asked what else they did: 11 (44%) reported that they did not do anything else; 1 (4%) hardly ever did anything else; 1 (4%) reported taking part in other types of activities once a week; and 9 (36%) reported being involved more than once a week. Fifteen (60%) reported taking up some of these hobbies this year.

**Table A4: Hobbies out of school: no-Articulate group**

	hardly ever	once a week	more than once a week	I don't do this
Taking part in drama	12 (29%)	7 (17%)	2 (5%)	18 (44%)
Reading	5 (12%)	7 (17%)	22 (54%)	7 (17%)
Writing, e.g. stories, plays, poems	9 (22%)	9 (22%)	7 (17%)	16 (39%)
Going to the theatre	25 (61%)	4 (10%)	1 (2%)	10 (24%)

They were asked what else they did: 12 (29%) reported that they did not do anything else; 7 (17%) reported taking part in other types of activities once a week; and 16 (39%) reported being involved more than once a week. Eighteen (44%) reported taking up some of these hobbies this year.

### 1.3 Clubs (Q4)

**Playwright group:** Twenty (56%) reported going regularly to a club or clubs this year. Of those 20, 13 indicated taking part in one club, 3 took part in 2 clubs, and 4 took part in 3 or more clubs.

The responses to taking part in specific types of clubs were:

- drama 5 (14% of whole group; 25% of those who participated in clubs)
- music or singing 7 (19% of whole group; 35% of those who participated in clubs)
- writing (e.g. stories, plays or poems) 4 (11% of whole group; 20% of those who participated in clubs)
- books and reading 4 (11% of whole group; 20% of those who participated in clubs)

Fifteen (42% of group and 75% of those who participated in clubs) indicated that they took part in other kinds of clubs.

**Teacher group:** Twenty-four out of the 25 pupils (96%) reported going regularly to a club or clubs this year. Out of the 24, 15 indicated taking part in one club, 4 took part in 2 clubs, and 5 took part in 3 or more clubs.

The responses to taking part in specific types of clubs were:

- drama 7 (28%)
- music or singing 7 (28%)
- writing (e.g. stories, plays or poems) 6 (24%)
- books and reading 6 (24%)

Sixteen (64%) indicated they took part in other kinds of clubs.

**No-Articulate Group:** Twenty-eight out of the 41 pupils (68%) reported going regularly to a club or clubs this year. Of those 28, 17 indicated taking part in one club, 2 took part in 2 clubs, and 9 took part in 3 or more clubs.

The responses to taking part in specific types of clubs were:

- drama 11 (27% of whole group; 39% of those who participated in clubs)
- music/singing 11 (27% of whole group; 39% of those who participated in clubs)
- writing (e.g. stories, plays or poems) 7 (17% of whole group; 25% of those who participated in clubs)
- books/reading 3 (7% of whole group; 11% of those who participated in clubs)

Twenty-two (54%) indicated they took part in other kinds of clubs.

## 1.4 Views on how good they are at doing certain activities (Q5)

**Table A5: Playwright group**

	Really good	Quite good	Not very good	No good at all	Don't know
a. Doing drama	5 (14%)	13 (36%)	8 (22%)	2 (6%)	6 (17%)
b. Writing poems or stories	4 (11%)	16 (44%)	7 (19%)	2 (6%)	6 (17%)
c. Sketch-writing	6 (17%)	14 (39%)	6 (17%)	0	9 (25%)
d. Being creative and using my imagination	20 (56%)	7 (19%)	4 (11%)	1 (3%)	2 (6%)

**Table A6: Teacher group**

	Really good	Quite good	Not very good	No good at all	Don't know
a. Doing drama	5 (20%)	6 (24%)	2 (8%)	8 (32%)	3 (12%)
b. Writing poems or stories	3 (12%)	13 (52%)	3 (12%)	2 (8%)	3 (12%)
c. Sketch-writing	2 (8%)	8 (32%)	7 (28%)	3 (12%)	4 (16%)
d. Being creative and using my imagination	12 (48%)	7 (28%)	4 (16%)	0	2 (8%)

**Table A7: No-Articulate group**

	Really good	Quite good	Not very good	No good at all	Don't know
a. Doing drama	7 (17%)	12 (29%)	7 (17%)	3 (7%)	10 (24%)
b. Writing poems or stories	5 (12%)	21 (51%)	5 (12%)	4 (10%)	5 (12%)
c. Sketch-writing	7 (17%)	7 (17%)	8 (19%)	5 (12%)	10 (24%)
d. Being creative and using my imagination	23 (56%)	10 (24%)	4 (10%)	3 (7%)	0

## 1.5 Views on how much they enjoy certain activities

**Table A8: Playwright group**

		Really enjoy	Quite enjoy	Don't really enjoy	Really dislike	Don't know
a.	Doing drama	8 (22%)	10 (28%)	6 (17%)	9 (25%)	2 (6%)
b.	Writing poems or stories	5 (14%)	13 (36%)	12 (33%)	4 (11%)	1 (3%)
c.	Sketch-writing	8 (22%)	11 (31%)	9 (25%)	1 (3%)	6 (17%)
d.	Being creative and using my imagination	<b>19 (53%)</b>	9 (25%)	5 (14%)	0	3 (8%)

**Table A9: Teacher group**

		Really enjoy	Quite enjoy	Don't really enjoy	Really dislike	Don't know
a.	Doing drama	6 (24%)	6 (24%)	8 (32%)	5 (20%)	1 (4%)
b.	Writing poems or stories	3 (12%)	8 (32%)	8 (32%)	5 (20%)	1 (4%)
c.	Sketch-writing	3 (12%)	5 (20%)	7 (28%)	3 (12%)	7 (28%)
d.	Being creative and using my imagination	<b>12 (48%)</b>	6 (24%)	3 (12%)	3 (12%)	1 (4%)

**Table A10: No-Articulate group**

		Really enjoy	Quite enjoy	Don't really enjoy	Really dislike	Don't know
a.	Doing drama	16 (39%)	6 (15%)	10 (24%)	5 (12%)	4 (10%)
b.	Writing poems or stories	12 (29%)	16 (39%)	9 (22%)	2 (5%)	2 (5%)
c.	Sketch-writing	10 (24%)	11 (27%)	6 (15%)	3 (7%)	10 (24%)
d.	Being creative and using my imagination	<b>25 (61%)</b>	10 (24%)	5 (12%)	1 (2%)	0

## 1.6 Views on participating in sketch-writing with the playwright, the teacher or working in creative writing lessons (Q7)

**Table A11: Views on working with playwright**

		Agree a lot	Agree a little	Disagree a little	Disagree a lot
a.	I think that working with the playwright made creative writing interesting	23 (64%)	7 (19%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)
b.	I found it easy to learn about creative writing	15 (42%)	14 (39%)	3 (8%)	0
c.	The playwright explained things well in these lessons	22 (61%)	8 (22%)	3 (8%)	0
d.	I found I could easily remember what I learned	16 (44%)	9 (25%)	4 (11%)	2 (6%)
e.	I wanted to work longer on the tasks	20 (56%)	5 (14%)	3 (8%)	5 (14%)
f.	I found that the time seemed to pass quickly in these lessons	23 (64%)	6 (17%)	1 (3%)	3 (8%)
g.	I think my work was good in these lessons	15 (42%)	12 (33%)	4 (11%)	2 (6%)

Table A11: Views on working with playwright (contd.)

		Agree a lot	Agree a little	Disagree a little	Disagree a lot
h.	It made me want to try out new ideas and be more imaginative	17 (47%)	10 (28%)	4 (11%)	2 (6%)
i.	I was able to put forward my own ideas during the lessons	26 (72%)	5 (14%)	2 (6%)	0
j.	I learned new things about writing	21 (58%)	11 (31%)	0	0
k.	I learned new things about drama	21 (58%)	9 (25%)	3 (8%)	0
l.	I tried new things I had never done before	17 (47%)	12 (33%)	2 (6%)	2 (6%)
m.	The things we did help me to work with other pupils in the class	21 (58%)	6 (17%)	4 (11%)	2 (6%)
n.	I worked with pupils I don't usually work with	10 (28%)	5 (14%)	9 (25%)	8 (22%)
o.	I think that other people in the class had good ideas	25 (69%)	7 (19%)	1 (4%)	0
p.	The things we did made me feel confident	18 (50%)	8 (22%)	5 (14%)	2 (6%)
q.	Pupils were well behaved when the playwright was in the classroom	14 (39%)	9 (25%)	8 (22%)	2 (6%)
r.	I looked forward to the lessons with the playwright	21 (58%)	9 (25%)	2 (6%)	0
s.	Some pupils did not like working with the playwright	7 (19%)	11 (31%)	5 (14%)	10 (28%)
t.	We should have more classes with a playwright	23 (64%)	4 (11%)	4 (11%)	2 (6%)

Table A12: Views on doing sketch-writing with the teacher

		Agree a lot	Agree a little	Disagree a little	Disagree a lot
a.	I think that the sketch-writing lessons made creative writing interesting	11 (44%)	7 (28%)	4 (16%)	1 (4%)
b.	I found it easy to learn about creative writing	7 (28%)	10 (40%)	6 (24%)	2 (8%)
c.	The teacher explained things well in these lessons	13 (52%)	7 (28%)	2 (8%)	3 (12%)
d.	I found I could easily remember what I learned	6 (24%)	10 (40%)	5 (20%)	3 (12%)
e.	I wanted to work longer on the tasks	9 (36%)	5 (20%)	3 (12%)	7 (28%)
f.	I found that the time seemed to pass quickly in these lessons	14 (56%)	4 (16%)	5 (20%)	1 (4%)
g.	I think my work was good in these lessons	9 (36%)	12 (48%)	3 (12%)	0
h.	It made me want to try out new ideas and be more imaginative	11 (44%)	4 (16%)	4 (16%)	4 (16%)
i.	I was able to put forward my own ideas during the lessons	12 (48%)	8 (32%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)
j.	I learned new things about writing	17 (68%)	2 (8%)	3 (12%)	1 (4%)
k.	I learned new things about drama	8 (32%)	7 (28%)	4 (16%)	4 (16%)
l.	I tried new things I had never done before	12 (48%)	8 (32%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)
m.	The things we did help me to work with other pupils in the class	14 (56%)	3 (12%)	5 (20%)	1 (4%)
n.	I worked with pupils I don't usually work with	10 (40%)	4 (16%)	2 (8%)	6 (24%)
o.	I think that other people in the class had good ideas	14 (56%)	5 (20%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)
p.	The things we did made me feel confident	9 (36%)	8 (32%)	3 (12%)	3 (12%)
q.	Pupils were well behaved during these lessons	7 (28%)	9 (36%)	3 (12%)	4 (16%)
r.	I looked forward to the sketch-writing lessons	7 (28%)	6 (24%)	4 (16%)	6 (24%)
s.	Some pupils did not like sketch-writing lessons	8 (32%)	7 (28%)	2 (8%)	5 (20%)
t.	We should have more classes like these	7 (28%)	5 (20%)	2 (8%)	8 (32%)

**Table A13: Views on creative writing lessons (no-Articulate group)**

		Agree a lot	Agree a little	Disagree a little	Disagree a lot
a.	I think that working with the teacher makes creative writing interesting	12 (29%)	22 (54%)	4 (10%)	3 (7%)
b.	I find it easy to learn about creative writing	18 (44%)	16 (39%)	3 (7%)	4 (10%)
c.	The teacher explains things well in these lessons	25 (61%)	14 (34%)	2 (5%)	0
d.	I find I can easily remember what I learn in these lessons	18 (44%)	13 (32%)	4 (10%)	5 (12%)
e.	I usually want to work longer on creative writing	14 (34%)	12 (29%)	9 (22%)	5 (15%)
f.	I find that the time seems to pass quickly in these lessons	21 (51%)	9 (22%)	3 (7%)	8 (19%)
g.	I think my work is good in creative writing lessons	14 (34%)	19 (46%)	5 (12%)	3 (7%)
h.	I like to try out new ideas and be imaginative	27 (66%)	7 (17%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)
i.	I am able to put forward my own ideas during creative writing lessons	21 (51%)	13 (32%)	5 (12%)	2 (5%)
j.	I have learned new things about writing	24 (59%)	12 (29%)	3 (7%)	1 (2%)
k.	I have learned new things about drama	20 (49%)	8 (20%)	4 (10%)	9 (22%)
l.	I am able to try new things I have never done before	21 (51%)	12 (29%)	4 (10%)	4 (10%)
m.	The things we do help me to work with other pupils in the class	19 (46%)	16 (39%)	4 (10%)	2 (5%)
n.	I always work with the same pupils	9 (22%)	16 (39%)	5 (12%)	8 (20%)
o.	I think that other people in the class have good ideas	31 (76%)	9 (22%)	1 (2%)	0
p.	The things we do make me feel confident	20 (49%)	15 (37%)	5 (12%)	1 (2%)
q.	Pupils are well behaved during these lessons	8 (20%)	24 (59%)	8 (20%)	1 (2%)
r.	I look forward to creative writing lessons	15 (37%)	13 (32%)	9 (22%)	3 (7%)
s.	Some pupils do not like creative writing lessons	16 (39%)	15 (37%)	7 (17%)	2 (5%)
t.	We should have more creative writing lessons	11 (27%)	14 (34%)	7 (17%)	9 (22%)

## 1.7 Differences between groups

The results of the 3 groups were compared using ANOVA and Scheffe's post-hoc test for paired analysis. There were no statistically significant differences between the groups in terms of 'being good at' or 'enjoying' the creative activities. Those who had worked with the playwright did, however, record higher mean scores for being good at drama and sketch-writing and enjoying sketch-writing. On all the other variables, either the teacher group or the no-Articulate groups scored marginally higher.

**Table A14: Activities for which the Playwright group recorded higher mean scores**

Good at drama	m	Good at sketch-writing	m	Enjoy sketch-writing	m
Playwright	2.26	Playwright	2.23	Playwright	2.40
Teacher	2.08	Teacher	2.04	No-Articulate	2.20
No-Articulate	2.08	No-Articulate	1.82	Teacher	1.76

Analysis of the responses to the various statements about working with the playwright, doing sketch-writing with the teacher, or working in creative writing lessons yielded statistically significant results on 5 of the statements, all on account of the playwright group scoring more highly than one or both of the other groups, with the exception of the statement that 'some pupils did not like the activity', when the playwright group were most likely to disagree.

**Table A15: Difference between groups on aspects of the learning experience**  
(Minimum 0 = don't know; maximum 4 = strongly agree)

	Group means		Mean difference	Significance
<b>Playwright and teacher groups</b>				
Learn new things about drama	Playwright Teacher	3.55 2.83	0.72	p=.043
Look forward to lessons	Playwright Teacher	3.59 2.61	0.99	p=.001
There should be more classes	Playwright Teacher	3.45 2.50	0.95	p=.009
<b>Playwright and no-Articulate groups</b>				
Activity was interesting	Playwright No-Articulate	3.58 3.05	0.53	p=.027
Look forward to lessons	Playwright No-Articulate	3.59 3.00	0.59	p=.03
Some pupils did not like the lessons	Playwright No-Articulate	2.45 3.13	0.67	p=.029
There should be more classes	Playwright No-Articulate	3.45 2.66	0.80	p=.011

## 2. S3 Pupils

The S3 pupils had taken part in the project when they were in S2.

### 2.1 The sample

The number of questionnaires completed from each of the three groups and the gender of the respondents are given in Table A16 (below). The number from each group is small; percentages are included only for comparison purposes but obviously should be interpreted with caution.

**Table A16: Number and gender of S3 respondents**

	Boys	Girls	Total
Playwright	6	3	9
Teacher	8	6	14
No-Articulate	12	12	24
Total	26 (55%)	21 (45%)	47 (100%)

### 2.2 Hobbies out of school (Q3)

Pupils were asked how often they took part in certain activities as hobbies out of school.

**Table A17: Playwright group**

	Hardly ever	once a week	more than once a week	I don't do this
Taking part in drama	3 (33%)	1 (11%)	0	5 (56%)
Reading	3 (33%)	0	6 (67%)	0
Writing, e.g. stories, plays, poems	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)
Going to the theatre	5 (56%)	0	1 (11%)	2 (22%)

They were asked what else they did: 3 did not respond and 6 reported being involved in something else more than once a week. Five reported taking up some of these hobbies this year.

**Table A18: Teacher group**

	hardly ever	once a week	more than once a week	I don't do this
Taking part in drama	1 (7%)	0	0	13 (93%)
Reading	4 (29%)	3 (29%)	2 (14%)	5 (36%)
Writing, e.g. stories, plays, poems	4 (29%)	1 (7%)	0	9 (64%)
Going to the theatre	5 (36%)	0	0	9 (64%)

They were asked what else they did: 8 reported that they did not do anything else and 6 reported being involved in something else more than once a week. One pupil reported having started a hobby this year.

**Table A19: No-Articulate group**

	hardly ever	once a week	more than once a week	I don't do this
Taking part in drama	5 (21%)	2 (8%)	0	16 (68%)
Reading	8 (33%)	3 (13%)	6 (25%)	5 (21%)
Writing, e.g. stories, plays, poems	9 (38%)	2 (8%)	2 (8%)	9 (38%)
Going to the theatre	10 (42%)	2 (8%)	0	10 (42%)

They were asked what else they did: 10 indicated that they did not do anything else; 3 reported being involved once a week; and 10 reported being involved in something else more than once a week. Nine reported taking up some of these hobbies this year.

## 2.3 Clubs

**Playwright group:** Seven (78%) reported going regularly to a club or clubs this year: 5 indicated taking part in one club, 1 took part in 2 clubs, and 1 took part in 3 clubs. The responses to taking part in specific types of clubs were: drama, 1; music or singing, 1; writing (e.g. stories, plays, poems), 1; books and reading, 1. Six indicated that they took part in other clubs.

**Teacher group:** Six (43%) reported going regularly to a club or clubs this year: 5 indicated taking part in one club, and 1 took part in 2 clubs. None had taken part in drama, music or singing clubs, and one reported taking part in a writing club and a club related to books and reading. Five indicated that they took part in other clubs.

**No-Articulate group:** Fifteen (63%) reported going regularly to a club or clubs this year: 12 indicated taking part in one club, and 3 took part in 2 clubs. The responses to taking part in specific types of clubs were: drama, 4; music or singing, 4. None reported taking part in clubs related to writing or reading. Ten (42%) indicated that they took part in other clubs.

## 2.4 Views on how good they are at doing certain activities (Q5)

**Table A20: Playwright group**

	Really good	Quite good	Not very good	No good at all	Don't know
a. Doing drama	0	4 (44%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)
b. Writing poems or stories	2 (22%)	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	0	0
c. Sketch-writing	1 (11%)	5 (56%)	2 (22%)	0	0
d. Being creative and using my imagination	6 (67%)	3 (33%)	0	0	0

**Table A21: Teacher group**

	Really good	Quite good	Not very good	No good at all	Don't know
a. Doing drama	0	3 (21%)	5 (36%)	4 (29%)	2 (14%)
b. Writing poems or stories	0	5 (36%)	3 (21%)	3 (21%)	3 (21%)
c. Sketch-writing	0	2 (14%)	4 (28%)	2 (14%)	6 (43%)
d. Being creative and using my imagination	3 (21%)	3 (21%)	0	3 (21%)	5 (36%)

**Table A22: No-Articulate**

	Really good	Quite good	Not very good	No good at all	Don't know
a. Doing drama	3 (13%)	7 (29%)	2 (8%)	3 (12%)	9 (38%)
b. Writing poems or stories	3 (13%)	9 (38%)	6 (25%)	2 (8%)	4 (17%)
c. Sketch-writing	0	7 (29%)	5 (21%)	4 (17%)	8 (33%)
d. Being creative and using my imagination	7 (29%)	11 (46%)	5 (21%)	0	1 (4%)

## 2.5 Views on how much they enjoy certain activities

**Table A23: Playwright group**

	Really enjoy	Quite enjoy	Don't really enjoy	Really dislike	Don't know
a. Doing drama	2 (22%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	0
b. Writing poems or stories	3 (33%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	0
c. Sketch-writing	2 (22%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	0
d. Being creative and using my imagination	6 (67%)	3 (33%)	0	0	0

**Table A24: Teacher group**

	Really enjoy	Quite enjoy	Don't really enjoy	Really dislike	Don't know
a. Doing drama	0	2 (14%)	4 (29%)	4 (29%)	4 (29%)
b. Writing poems or stories	0	4 (29%)	5 (36%)	4 (29%)	1 (7%)
c. Sketch-writing	0	2 (14%)	3 (21%)	4 (27%)	5 (36%)
d. Being creative and using my imagination	1 (7%)	6 (43%)	2 (14%)	2 (14%)	3 (21%)

**Table A25: No-Articulate group**

	Really enjoy	Quite enjoy	Don't really enjoy	Really dislike	Don't know
a. Doing drama	4 (17%)	8 (33%)	2 (8%)	7 (29%)	3 (13%)
b. Writing poems or stories	5 (21%)	6 (25%)	5 (21%)	7 (29%)	1 (4%)
c. Sketch-writing	2 (8%)	4 (17%)	5 (21%)	7 (29%)	6 (25%)
d. Being creative and using my imagination	9 (38%)	9 (38%)	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)



## 2.6 Views on participating in sketch-writing with the playwright, the teacher or working in creative writing lessons (Q7)

**Table A26: Playwright group**

		Agree a lot	Agree a little	Disagree a little	Disagree a lot
a.	I think that working with the playwright made creative writing interesting	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	0	0
b.	I found it easy to learn about creative writing	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)
c.	The playwright explained things well in these lessons	8 (89%)	1 (11%)	0	0
d.	I found I could easily remember what I learned	2 (22%)	5 (56%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)
e.	I wanted to work longer on the tasks	6 (67%)	1 (11%)	0	1 (11%)
f.	I found that the time seemed to pass quickly in these lessons	7 (78%)	0	1 (11%)	1 (11%)
g.	I think my work was good in these lessons	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	0	2 (22%)
h.	It made me want to try out new ideas and be more imaginative	5 (56%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)
i.	I was able to put forward my own ideas during the lessons	7 (78%)	0	1 (11%)	1 (11%)
j.	I learned new things about writing	7 (78%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	0
k.	I learned new things about drama	6 (67%)	3 (33%)	0	0
l.	I tried new things I had never done before	5 (56%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	0
m.	The things we did help me to work with other pupils in the class	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	0
n.	I worked with pupils I don't usually work with	5 (56%)	3 (33%)	0	1 (11%)
o.	I think that other people in the class had good ideas	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	0	0
p.	The things we did made me feel confident	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	0	0
q.	Pupils were well behaved when the playwright was in the classroom	6 (67%)	2 (22%)	0	1 (11%)
r.	I looked forward to the lessons with the playwright	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)
s.	Some pupils did not like working with the playwright	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	6 (67%)
t.	We should have more classes with a playwright	6 (67%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)

**Table A27: Teacher group**

		Agree a lot	Agree a little	Disagree a little	Disagree a lot
a.	I think that the sketch-writing lessons made creative writing interesting	0	3 (21%)	6 (43%)	3 (21%)
b.	I found it easy to learn about creative writing	0	5 (36%)	7 (50%)	2 (14%)
c.	The teacher explained things well in these lessons	4 (29%)	5 (36%)	2 (14%)	3 (21%)
d.	I found I could easily remember what I learned	1 (7%)	6 (43%)	4 (29%)	3 (21%)
e.	I wanted to work longer on the tasks	0	2 (14%)	6 (43%)	6 (43%)
f.	I found that the time seemed to pass quickly in these lessons	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	2 (14%)	5 (36%)
g.	I think my work was good in these lessons	2 (14%)	4 (29%)	3 (21%)	5 (36%)
h.	It made me want to try out new ideas and be more imaginative	2 (14%)	3 (21%)	3 (21%)	6 (43%)
i.	I was able to put forward my own ideas during the lessons	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	2 (14%)	5 (36%)
j.	I learned new things about writing	3 (21%)	4 (29%)	4 (29%)	3 (21%)
k.	I learned new things about drama	4 (29%)	2 (14%)	3 (21%)	5 (36%)

Table A27: Teacher group (contd.)

		Agree a lot	Agree a little	Disagree a little	Disagree a lot
l.	I tried new things I had never done before	3 (21%)	3 (21%)	6 (43%)	2 (14%)
m.	The things we did help me to work with other pupils in the class	2 (14%)	5 (36%)	3 (21%)	4 (29%)
n.	I worked with pupils I don't usually work with	0	4 (29%)	4 (29%)	6 (43%)
o.	I think that other people in the class had good ideas	5 (36%)	5 (36%)	2 (14%)	1 (7%)
p.	The things we did made me feel confident	0	2 (14%)	5 (36%)	7 (50%)
q.	Pupils were well behaved during these lessons	0	7 (50%)	2 (14%)	4 (29%)
r.	I looked forward to the sketch-writing lessons	0	1 (7%)	7 (50%)	6 (43%)
s.	Some pupils did not like sketch-writing lessons	9 (64%)	5 (36%)	0	0
t.	We should have more classes like these	0	7 (50%)	1 (7%)	6 (43%)

Table A28: No-Articulate group: views on creative writing lessons

		Agree a lot	Agree a little	Disagree a little	Disagree a lot
a.	I think that working with the teacher makes creative writing interesting	5 (21%)	9 (38%)	5 (21%)	4 (17%)
b.	I find it easy to learn about creative writing	8 (33%)	8 (33%)	6 (25%)	2 (8%)
c.	The teacher explains things well in these lessons	15 (63%)	5 (21%)	3 (13%)	1 (4%)
d.	I find I can easily remember what I learn in these lessons	8 (33%)	8 (33%)	6 (25%)	2 (8%)
e.	I usually want to work longer on creative writing	9 (38%)	4 (17%)	5 (21%)	5 (21%)
f.	I find that the time seems to pass quickly in these lessons	12 (50%)	5 (21%)	5 (21%)	2 (8%)
g.	I think my work is good in creative writing lessons	9 (38%)	9 (38%)	3 (13%)	3 (13%)
h.	I like to try out new ideas and be imaginative	9 (38%)	10 (42%)	3 (13%)	2 (8%)
i.	I am able to put forward my own ideas during creative writing lessons	13 (54%)	6 (25%)	3 (13%)	2 (8%)
j.	I have learned new things about writing	10 (42%)	9 (38%)	3 (13%)	2 (8%)
k.	I have learned new things about drama	2 (8%)	7 (29%)	3 (12%)	11 (46%)
l.	I am able to try new things I have never done before	8 (33%)	9 (38%)	5 (21%)	1 (4%)
m.	The things we do help me to work with other pupils in the class	4 (17%)	11 (46%)	7 (29%)	1 (4%)
n.	I always work with the same pupils	5 (21%)	7 (29%)	8 (33%)	3 (13%)
o.	I think that other people in the class have good ideas	12 (50%)	10 (42%)	0	1 (4%)
p.	The things we do make me feel confident	7 (29%)	7 (29%)	8 (33%)	1 (4%)
q.	Pupils are well behaved during these lessons	5 (21%)	5 (21%)	8 (33%)	5 (21%)
r.	I look forward to creative writing lessons	4 (17%)	8 (33%)	5 (21%)	6 (25%)
s.	Some pupils do not like creative writing lessons	15 (63%)	4 (17%)	0	4 (17%)
t.	We should have more creative writing lessons	4 (17%)	4 (17%)	9 (38%)	6 (25%)

## 2.7 Differences between the groups

The data were analysed using the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis Test due to the small numbers in each group and the disparity in sample size. This test calculates the mean rank for each group and calculates chi-square. Pairs of groups were then analysed using Mann-Whitney U-test.

Significant results were found for a large number of items. These are largely due to the pupils who had the playwright rating items more highly than those who had sketch-writing with the teacher. Those who had not had sketch writing often held the middle ranking. The pupils who had sketch-writing with the teacher appear to be more negative overall. It is not clear whether this is anything to do with sketch-writing or may be more to do with other characteristics of that particular class.

### Differences in being good at and enjoying activities

**Table A29: Kruskal-Wallis Test on three S3 groups**

	Group mean ranks		Chi-Square	Significance
Good at sketch-writing	Playwright	36.3	10.13	p=.006
	No-Articulate	22.1		
	Teacher	18.6		
Good at being creative and using imagination	Playwright	34.0	10.11	p=.006
	No-Articulate	24.7		
	Teacher	16.4		
Enjoy sketch-writing	Playwright	34.7	7.86	p=.02
	No-Articulate	22.6		
	Teacher	18.7		
Enjoy being creative and using imagination	Playwright	33.8	11.04	p=.004
	No-Articulate	25.2		
	Teacher	15.7		

**Table A30: Mann-Whitney Test on differences between paired S3 groups**

	Group mean ranks		Mann-Whitney U	Significance
<b>Playwright (9) and teacher groups (14)</b>				
Good at sketch-writing	Playwright	16.9	13.0	p=.002
	Teacher	8.4		
Good at being creative and using imagination	Playwright	16.5	22.5	p=.009
	Teacher	9.1		
Enjoy sketch-writing	Playwright	16.4	17.0	p=.006
	Teacher	8.7		
Enjoy being creative and using imagination	Playwright	17.3	15.0	p=.002
	Teacher	8.6		
<b>Playwright (9) and no-Articulate groups (24)</b>				
Good at sketch-writing	Playwright	23.9	36.5	p=.008
	No-Articulate	14.0		
Enjoy sketch-writing	Playwright	22.8	45.5	p=.03
	No-Articulate	14.4		
<b>Teacher (14) and No-Articulate groups (24)</b>				
Enjoy being creative and using imagination	No-Articulate	22.4	99.5	p=.04
	Teacher	14.5		

## Differences in views on aspects of the learning experience

**Table A31: Kruskal-Wallis Test on three S3 groups**

	Group mean ranks		Chi-Square	Significance
Lessons were more interesting	Playwright No-Articulate Teacher	35.6 21.9 13.9	15.99	p<.001
Easy to learn about creative writing	Playwright No-Articulate Teacher	29.3 26.4 16.5	6.84	p=.03
Playwright/teacher explains things well	Playwright No-Articulate Teacher	31.9 25.4 16.6	9.15	p=.01
I wanted to work longer on tasks	Playwright No-Articulate Teacher	32.7 24.9 14.4	11.76	p=.003
Time seemed to pass quickly	Playwright No-Articulate Teacher	30.3 25.6 17.2	6.41	p=.04
I wanted to try out new ideas	Playwright No-Articulate Teacher	29.3 26.9 15.7	8.15	p=.02
I was able to put forward my own ideas	Playwright No-Articulate Teacher	29.8 26.2 16.5	7.34	p=.03
I learned new things about writing	Playwright No-Articulate Teacher	32.5 24.8 17.3	7.77	p=.02
I learned new things about drama ( <i>Note: only one where teacher group higher than no-Articulate</i> )	Playwright Teacher No-Articulate	36.5 22.9 18.8	12.26	p=.002
The things we did made me feel confident	Playwright No-Articulate Teacher	31.9 26.7 12.8	14.73	p=.001
Pupils were well behaved	Playwright No-Articulate Teacher	33.4 26.7 12.8	7.83	p=.02
I looked forward to the lessons	Playwright No-Articulate Teacher	32.7 24.9 15.3	10.39	p=.006
Some pupils did not like the lessons	Playwright No-Articulate Teacher	10.5 26.0 27.8	12.99	p=.002
We should have more classes like these	Playwright No-Articulate Teacher	33.9 21.8 19.6	7.48	p=.02

**Table A32: Mann-Whitney Test on differences between paired S3 groups**

	Group mean ranks		Mann-Whitney U	Significance
<b>Playwright (9) and teacher groups (14)</b>				
Lessons were more interesting	Playwright Teacher	16.7 6.8	13.0	p<.001
Easy to learn about creative writing	Playwright Teacher	15.8 9.6	29.0	p=.03
Playwright/teacher explains things well	Playwright Teacher	16.5 9.1	22.5	p=.005
I wanted to work longer on tasks	Playwright Teacher	17.0 8.4	12.0	p=.002
Time seemed to pass quickly	Playwright Teacher	15.7 9.6	30.0	p=.03
I wanted to try out new ideas	Playwright Teacher	15.7 9.6	29.5	p=.03
I was able to put forward my own ideas	Playwright Teacher	15.7 9.6	30.0	p=.03
I learned new things about writing	Playwright Teacher	16.3 9.3	24.5	p=.01
I learned new things about drama	Playwright Teacher	16.0 9.4	27.0	p=.02
The things we did made me feel confident	Playwright Teacher	16.7 9.0	21.0	p=.005
Pupils were well behaved	Playwright Teacher	16.0 8.9	18.0	p=.004
I looked forward to the lessons	Playwright Teacher	17.1 8.7	17.0	p=.003
Some pupils did not like the lessons	Playwright Teacher	6.3 15.6	12.0	p=.001
We should have more classes like these	Playwright Teacher	16.6 9.1	22.0	p=.007
<b>Playwright (9) and no-Articulate groups (24)</b>				
Lessons were more interesting	Playwright No-Articulate	23.9 13.6	36.5	p=.004
I learned new things about drama	Playwright No-Articulate	25.5 12.9	22.5	p<.001
Pupils were well behaved	Playwright No-Articulate	22.4 14.2	50.5	p=.03
Some pupils did not like the lessons	Playwright No-Articulate	9.2 19.4	37.5	p=.004
We should have more classes like these	Playwright No-Articulate	22.4 14.2	50.5	p=.03
<b>Teacher (14) and No-Articulate groups (24)</b>				
Easy to learn about creative writing	No-Articulate Teacher	22.5 14.4	97.0	p=.02
I wanted to work longer on tasks	No-Articulate Teacher	22.4 13.5	84.0	p=.01
I wanted to try out new ideas	No-Articulate Teacher	22.9 13.6	85.5	p=.009
I was able to put forward my own ideas	No-Articulate Teacher	22.5 14.4	96.5	p=.02
The things we did made me feel confident	No-Articulate Teacher	23.7 11.3	53.5	p<.001
I looked forward to the lessons	No-Articulate Teacher	21.9 14.1	92.5	p=.02

## Appendix 2

### Analysis of Thinking Creatively with Words: The Torrance Test of Creative Thinking

The Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (Thinking Creatively with Words) is a longstanding, well-established instrument for measuring creative thinking skills, and has been used previously in investigations related to the impact of arts education (Torrance, 2000; Burton, Horowitz and Abeles, 2000).

It focuses on three aspects of creative thinking: fluency, originality, and flexibility. Fluency represents a person's ability to produce a large number of relevant ideas. However, it is possible to produce a large number of common or uninteresting responses, and therefore the other two concepts are very important. Flexibility represents the ability to produce a variety of kinds of ideas, to shift from one category of thinking to another, akin to lateral or divergent thinking. Low flexibility suggests rigid thinking habits, limited knowledge or experience, and/or low motivation. Originality represents a person's ability to produce ideas that go beyond the obvious or commonplace.

The scoring of the tests follows a manual based on statistical analysis of large samples with clear guidance on what does not count as an original response and a wide range of categories of ideas which can be generated by participants.

The Thinking Creatively with Words workbook contains 6 tasks, each of which is completed within a timed framework. For the purposes of the Articulate Project, due to time constraints, one of the items was omitted. This means that the data cannot be compared with the norms and standardised scores. However, as the purpose of using the exercise within the evaluation of Articulate is to compare 3 local groups and not to compare performance with statistical norms, this was deemed acceptable.

The results are based on total raw scores. Each task is open-ended and therefore there is no total score to be attained. Each of the 3 strands on which the activities are based and the overall total scores are considered.

#### S1 cohort

A total of 100 workbooks were completed by the S1 pupils:

- 35 who had worked with the playwright
- 25 who had undertaken sketch-writing with the teacher
- 40 who had not been part of the Articulate Project.

Across all 3 groups some pupils did not complete all 5 tasks, with some pupils attempting only one, 2 or 3 tasks. The numbers of those who attempted all 5 tasks are:

- 24 of the playwright group
- 11 of the teacher group
- 17 of the no-Articulate group

Therefore over two-thirds of the playwright group attempted all 5 tasks, while around two-fifths of the other two groups attempted all tasks. Without asking the pupils why they did not attempt all questions, when there was a clear instruction to move on to each task, it is not possible to know the reasons.


Across the whole sample, and in each of the 3 groups, there was a wide range of responses as illustrated in Table A33 (below).

**Table A33: Minimum and maximum scores on aspects of creative thinking for S1 groups**

	Fluency		Flexibility		Originality		Total	
	min	max	min	max	min	max	min	max
Playwright	2	93	2	42	2	58	6	193
Teacher	5	57	4	30	2	43	11	130
No-Articulate	4	60	2	25	1	58	10	142

A 'box and whiskers' plot (Dancey and Reidy 2002, pp 54-55) identified 3 extreme outliers at the top end of the scores, one from each group (see Figure A1). While these high scoring individuals should be acknowledged, their scores have been removed from the analysis to allow for comparison between the groups.

**Figure A1: Box and whiskers plots for 3 S1 groups on total score**  
(plot shows median, upper and lower quartiles, adjacent scores and extreme scores)



The data were analysed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) and Scheffe's post-hoc analysis. Descriptive statistics are reported in Table A34 and the results of ANOVA are reported in Table A35.

**Table A34: Descriptive statistics for the 3 S1 groups on the 3 aspects of creative thinking and the total score**

	Fluency	Flexibility	Originality	Total score
<b>Playwright group</b>				
Median	21.5	13.5	14.0	48.0
Mean	28.1	16.3	17.8	62.2
SD	18.7	9.4	12.1	39.4
95% confidence <sup>1</sup>	21.6-34.7	13.1-19.6	13.6-21.9	48.5-75.9
<b>Teacher group</b>				

Median	13.0	9.0	9.0	31.0
Mean	18.5	10.3	12.2	40.9
SD	11.9	5.7	8.3	25.0
95% confidence	13.4-23.5	7.8-12.7	8.7-15.7	30.4-51.5
<b>No-Articulate group</b>				
Median	18.0	10.0	11.0	40.0
Mean	17.2	11.0	11.6	39.8
SD	9.6	5.3	7.9	21.7
95% confidence	14.1-20.3	9.2-12.7	9.1-14.2	32.8-46.8

<sup>1</sup> 95% confidence interval for mean

Even with the extreme outliers removed, each group still has a wide spread of responses. The mean scores and SDs of the teacher group and the no-Articulate group are similar, while the playwright group shows higher scores but also greater SD. ANOVA identified statistically significant differences on all variables; the results of the post-hoc analysis, where significant differences occurred, are given in Table A35 (below).

**Table A35: Differences between the three S1 groups**

Scores	Group means		Mean difference	Significance
<b>Playwright and teacher groups</b>				
Fluency	Playwright	28.1	9.6	P=.039
	Teacher	18.5		
Flexibility	Playwright	16.3	6.0	P=.008
	Teacher	10.3		
Total	Playwright	62.2	21.3	P=.032
	Teacher	40.9		
<b>Playwright and no-Articulate groups</b>				
Fluency	Playwright	28.1	10.9	P=.005
	No-Articulate	17.2		
Flexibility	Playwright	16.3	5.3	P=.007
	No-Articulate	11.0		
Originality	Playwright	17.8	6.2	P=.030
	No-Articulate	11.6		
Total	Playwright	62.2	22.4	P=.008
	No-Articulate	30.8		

The pupils who had worked with the playwright were more likely than the other two groups to generate many relevant responses to the tasks and also to identify a greater number of categories of ideas. Differences in producing original ideas were less strong and existed only in comparison between the playwright and the no-Articulate groups. No statistically significant differences occurred between the teacher and the no-Articulate groups.

### S3 cohort

A total of 47 workbooks were completed by the S3 pupils:

- 9 who had worked with the playwright
- 14 who had undertaken sketch-writing with the teacher
- 24 who had not been part of the Articulate Project.

All pupils attempted all tasks within the workbooks.

The range of scores achieved by the S3 pupils are given in Table A36 (below).




**Table A36: Minimum and maximum scores on aspects of creative thinking for the S3 groups**

	Fluency		Flexibility		Originality		Total	
	min	max	min	max	min	max	min	max
Playwright	54	116	26	52	36	106	116	274
Teacher	18	116	14	55	13	99	45	267
No-Articulate	15	76	10	45	11	61	39	182

As with the S1 groups, there was a wide range of performance within each group, notably within the ‘teacher’ group. However, scrutiny of the data using a ‘box and whiskers’ plot did not identify any extreme outliers (see Figure A2).

**Figure A2: Box and whiskers plots for three S3 groups on total score**  
(plot shows median, upper and lower quartiles, and adjacent scores)



Descriptive statistics are reported in Table A37. Due to the wide within-groups variance, the non-normal distribution of the data, the differing group sizes, and the small size of the groups, the data were analysed using non-parametric statistics (Kruskal-Wallis and Mann-Whitney). The results of these, where statistically significant results occurred, are presented in Tables A38 and A39.

**Table A37: Descriptive statistics for the three S3 groups on the three aspects of creative thinking and the total score**

	Fluency	Flexibility	Originality	Total score
<b>Playwright group</b>				
Median	88	41	80	209
Mean	88.1	39.3	73.4	200.9
SD	22.5	8.7	23.1	53.3
95% confidence <sup>1</sup>	70.8-105.4	32.7-46.0	55.7-91.2	159.9-241.9
<b>Teacher group</b>				

Median	67.5	35	48	145
Mean	68.9	34.4	53.6	156.9
SD	29.9	11.7	27.2	67.1
95% confidence	51.6-86.1	27.6-41.1	37.9-69.3	118.1-195.6
<b>No-Articulate group</b>				
Median	36	20	24.5	87.5
Mean	39.7	21.8	28.8	90.25
SD	16.9	8.2	14.4	37.9
95% confidence	32.5-46.9	18.3-25.2	22.7-34.9	74.2-106.3

<sup>1</sup> 95% confidence interval for mean

**Table A38: Kruskal-Wallis Test on three S3 groups**

Scores	Group mean ranks		Chi-Square	Significance
Fluency	Playwright	37.4	19.43	p<.001
	Teacher	29.5		
	No-Articulate	15.8		
Flexibility	Playwright	35.8	18.58	p<.001
	Teacher	30.6		
	No-Articulate	15.8		
Originality	Playwright	37.8	19.36	p<.001
	Teacher	28.9		
	No-Articulate	15.9		
Total	Playwright	37.8	20.56	p<.001
	Teacher	29.6		
	No-Articulate	15.6		

**Table A39: Mann-Whitney Test on differences between paired S3 groups**

Scores	Group mean ranks		Mann-Whitney U	Significance
<b>Playwright and no-Articulate groups</b>				
Fluency	Playwright	27.9	9.5	p<.001
	No-Articulate	12.9		
Flexibility	Playwright	27.3	15	p<.001
	No-Articulate	13.1		
Originality	Playwright	27.6	12.5	p<.001
	No-Articulate	13.0		
Total	Playwright	27.9	9.5	p<.001
	No-Articulate	12.9		
<b>Teacher and No-Articulate groups</b>				
Fluency	Teacher	26.5	69.5	p=.003
	No-Articulate	15.4		
Flexibility	Teacher	27.0	63	p=.001
	No-Articulate	15.1		
Originality	Teacher	26.5	69.5	p=.003
	No-Articulate	15.4		
Total	Teacher	26.9	64	p=.002
	No-Articulate	15.2		

The pupils who had worked with the playwright consistently ranked more highly than the other two groups. However, there were no statistically significant differences between the 'playwright' group and those who had done sketch-writing with the teachers. Both those groups performed above the no-Articulate group to a statistically significant level.

## Appendix 3

### Integrating drama across the literacy curriculum

Grainger (2004) asserts *'that drama can act as a valuable precursor to shared, guided and independent writing'*. She talks about the need to integrate drama into the curriculum through drama activities like writing in role. She suggests that, in planning writing lessons, it is useful to think about the following three phases of drama that can provide opportunities for pupils to write:

Phase 1 • *writing to create the dramatic context*

Writing in this part of the drama can contribute to the pupils' sense of who the imaginary people within their dramatic story are, where they are and when the action is taking place.

Phase 2 • *conflicts and tensions: writing to open up the dramatic story*

Writing and drawing in this part of the drama draws upon and helps shape the pupils' responses to the central questions and dilemmas of the dramatic story. As they respond to the story, their commitment and engagement to the story being created deepen.

Phase 3 • *resolutions: writing to draw the drama to a conclusion*

This part of the drama helps children to resolve the predicament, consider the issues and connect their learning to the wider world in which they live. Some of the writing may be from a particular character's perspective, reflecting on a key moment or episode from the story.

Grainger encourages teachers to make fuller use of the affective power of drama to shape and construct meaning in their writing. She stresses that drama is much more than a pre-writing activity:

*'... it is a symbolic art form which seeks to investigate, question and reflect upon meaning. If drama, the art form of social encounters, is used merely as a method of enriching writing, its scope and power will be reduced. Drama offers young writers significant compositional support; it should be employed widely and wisely.'*  
(p104)

Many writers (e.g. Goode and Neelands, 2000; Taylor, 1995) illuminate how teachers can better understand why they might use drama to enhance pupils' writing. Taylor (1995) states that:

*'the nature of learning in the classroom improvisation is no different from that which occurs when spectators witness good theatre. The learning has something to do with ... a reckoning of a new perspective, or a slightly unsettling feeling of identification. It is these transformations which occur spontaneously and without predetermined knowledge in both the theatre and the classroom.'*  
(p9)

Constructing imaginary worlds in drama involves the processes of questioning, discussion, negotiation, experimentation, investigation and reflection from all participants. It invites pupils to engage with the dramatic ideas of others and to initiate and communicate ideas of their own. Active, creative and reflective learning is central to meaningful engagement and learning in the drama classroom.

## Story: the heart of drama and theatre

Booth (1995) contrasts *story drama* and *story dramatisation*. According to Booth *story drama* 'involves a more improvisatory exploration of significant themes, issues or relationships that are suggested through and by story' whereas *story dramatisation* implies a literal re-enactment of narrative.

Booth describes how the teacher can use a story to provide the stimulus for drama, and the story can assist the teacher in giving form to that drama.

*'The story and its strength enable the teacher to dip into the richness of the contexts that the author has provided. Drama becomes the tool for the exploration of the ideas, relationships and language of the story. The students are not limited to the facts or words in the story, since the story per se is not the prime focus. It may indeed happen that the students' appreciation and understanding of the story deepens after drama. However, the teacher must be concerned with the developmental aspects of drama that occur as the children elaborate, extend and invent.'* (p35)

According to Booth, good story drama is generated when the focusing story contains what he refers to as a 'puzzlement'. A puzzlement is something within the story which draws the curiosity of the readers/listeners. It may be an event or detail which has not been fully explored or an uncertainty or fascination. Booth suggests four questions for readers: 'What did you like about the story? What did you not like about the story? What puzzled you? How can we take those puzzlements, connect and explore them?' Booth promotes the teacher as an active participant working with the pupils in their playmaking.

Miller and Saxton (2004) have been using story drama structures to 'open teachers to the possibilities of drama as a classroom methodology.' They describe the teachers they have worked with as seeing drama as "a 'fun' activity; they also recognize immediately the power of the art form for teaching multiple literacies". They explain how 'when students engage holistically, affectively and cognitively with the meanings offered in a story, they develop new ways of seeing the content at both the interpersonal and intrapersonal levels'.

Miller and Saxton conclude: 'Story drama structures offer a powerful way of putting language into action.'

They hope that the teachers will use story drama; that teachers and pupils will fall into the stories they are creating together; that this use of story will give them the confidence and encouragement to create their own stories, with their own pupils, in their own drama classrooms.

## The teacher as an artist in their own classroom, working alongside all of their pupils

Cecily O'Neill (1995) describes process drama as being almost synonymous with drama in education. Process drama proceeds without a pre-written script, with an original text being generated in action. Taylor (1995) identifies that fundamental to O'Neill's understanding of process drama is the central role the teacher plays in weaving the artistic story with the children: the teacher negotiates and re-negotiates pupils' ideas and responses within the story being created and explored.

Taylor says that the features of process drama include:

- *Separate scenic units linked in an organic manner*
- *Thematic exploration rather than an isolated or random skit or sketch*
- *An experience which does not depend on a written script*
- *A concern with participants' change in outlook*
- *Improvisational activity*
- *Outcomes not predetermined but discovered in process*
- *A script generated through action*
- *The leader actively working both within and outside the drama.*

He describes how teachers working within O'Neill's process drama should see themselves as:

- *Structure Operators who weave the units of action together into an artful experience*
- *Artists, the teachers, collaborating with their students, the co-artists*
- *Building a work in process*
- *Capable of finding questions to explore rather than answers to provide*
- *Raising possibilities rather than confirming probabilities.* (p13)

## **Appendix 4**

### **Evaluation instruments**

# Articulate Project

## Pupil Questionnaire 1

**For pupils who worked with the playwright**

Last year, you had sketch-writing lessons during which a playwright came into the class. We want to know what you thought about these lessons.

Please read everything very carefully and answer the questions.

This is **not** a test and there are no right or wrong answers.

No one will see what you write, apart from the researchers at the University, so you can feel free to say what you think.



## About yourself

1. I am a                                  boy  girl  (tick **one** box)

2. This year, my class is .....

3. What hobbies do you have out of school? Please tick how often you do the things on the list. If you don't do the thing listed, tick the box in the end column. If you do anything else, write it in the box at the bottom and tell us how often you do it.

*Please tick*

	hardly ever	once a week	more than once a week	I don't do this
Taking part in drama				
Reading				
Writing, e.g. stories, plays, poems				
Going to the theatre				
<i>Anything else you do:</i>				

Which of these hobbies did you **start** this year?

4. **Do you go to any clubs?**                                  yes  no

If yes, please tick those you have gone to regularly **this year**. If you have done anything else, please write it in the box.

*Please tick*

Drama	
Music or singing	
Writing, e.g. stories, plays or poems	
Books and reading	
<i>Anything else you do:</i>	

5. Please tell us how good you think you are at doing the following things.

		<b>Really good</b>	<b>Quite good</b>	<b>Not very good</b>	<b>No good at all</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
a.	Doing drama					
b.	Writing poems or stories					
c.	Sketch-writing					
d.	Being creative and using my imagination					

6. Please tell us how much you like doing the following things.

		<b>Really enjoy</b>	<b>Quite enjoy</b>	<b>Don't really enjoy</b>	<b>Really dislike</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
a.	Doing drama					
b.	Writing poems or stories					
c.	Sketch-writing					
d.	Being creative and using my imagination					

Go to next page **F**

## About working with the playwright from the Traverse Theatre

7. How did you feel about working with the playwright? Please tick to show how much you agree or disagree with the statements.

*Please tick*

		Agree a lot	Agree a little	Disagree a little	Disagree a lot
a.	I think that working with the playwright made creative writing interesting				
b.	I found it easy to learn about creative writing				
c.	The playwright explained things well in these lessons				
d.	I found I could easily remember what I learned				
e.	I wanted to work longer on the tasks				
f.	I found that the time seemed to pass quickly in these lessons				
g.	I think my work was good in these lessons				
h.	It made me want to try out new ideas and be more imaginative				
i.	I was able to put forward my own ideas during the lessons				
j.	I learned new things about writing				
k.	I learned new things about drama				
l.	I tried new things I had never done before				
m.	The things we did help me to work with other pupils in the class				
n.	I worked with pupils I don't usually work with				
o.	I think that other people in the class had good ideas				
p.	The things we did made me feel confident				
q.	Pupils were well behaved when the playwright was in the classroom				
r.	I looked forward to the lessons with the playwright				
s.	Some pupils did not like working with the playwright				
t.	We should have more classes with a playwright				

8. What did you like **most** about working with the playwright? Write your answer in the box.

*What I liked most about working with the playwright was*

9. What did you **not** like about working with the playwright? Write your answer in the box.

*What I didn't like about working with the playwright was*

**Thank you very much for your help.**

# Articulate Project

## Pupil Questionnaire 2

**For pupils who learned sketch-writing with the teacher**

Last year, you had sketch-writing lessons during which you learned how to write a short play. We want to know what you thought about these lessons.

Please read everything very carefully and answer the questions.

This is **not** a test and there are no right or wrong answers.

No one will see what you write, apart from the researchers at the University, so you can feel free to say what you think.

## About yourself

1. I am a                                boy  girl  (tick **one** box)
  
2. This year, my class is .....
  
3. What hobbies do you have out of school? Please tick how often you do the things on the list. If you don't do the thing listed, tick the box in the end column. If you do anything else, write it in the box at the bottom and tell us how often you do it.

*Please tick*

	hardly ever	once a week	more than once a week	I don't do this
Taking part in drama				
Reading				
Writing, e.g. stories, plays, poems				
Going to the theatre				
<i>Anything else you do:</i>				
Which of these hobbies did you <b>start</b> this year?				

4. **Do you go to any clubs?**                                yes  no

If yes, please tick those you have gone to regularly **this year**. If you have done anything else, please write it in the box.

*Please tick*

Drama	
Music or singing	
Writing, e.g. stories, plays or poems	
Books and reading	
<i>Anything else you do:</i>	

5. Please tell us how good you think you are at doing the following things.

		Really good	Quite good	Not very good	No good at all	Don't know
a.	Doing drama					
b.	Writing poems or stories					
c.	Sketch-writing					
d.	Being creative and using my imagination					

6. Please tell us how much you like doing the following things.

		Really enjoy	Quite enjoy	Don't really enjoy	Really dislike	Don't know
a.	Doing drama					
b.	Writing poems or stories					
c.	Sketch-writing					
d.	Being creative and using my imagination					

Go to next page **F**

## About your lessons in writing a sketch

7. How did you feel about your sketch-writing lessons? Please tick to show how much you agree or disagree with the statements.

*Please tick*

		Agree a lot	Agree a little	Disagree a little	Disagree a lot
a.	I think that the sketch-writing lessons made creative writing interesting				
b.	I found it easy to learn about creative writing				
c.	The teacher explained things well in these lessons				
d.	I found I could easily remember what I learned				
e.	I wanted to work longer on the tasks				
f.	I found that the time seemed to pass quickly in these lessons				
g.	I think my work was good in these lessons				
h.	It made me want to try out new ideas and be more imaginative				
i.	I was able to put forward my own ideas during the lessons				
j.	I learned new things about writing				
k.	I learned new things about drama				
l.	I tried new things I had never done before				
m.	The things we did help me to work with other pupils in the class				
n.	I worked with pupils I don't usually work with				
o.	I think that other people in the class had good ideas				
p.	The things we did made me feel confident				
q.	Pupils were well behaved during these lessons				
r.	I looked forward to the sketch-writing lessons				
s.	Some pupils did not like sketch-writing lessons				
t.	We should have more classes like these				



8. What did you like **most** about the sketch-writing lessons? Write your answer in the box.

*What I liked most about the sketch-writing lessons was*

9. What did you **not** like about the sketch-writing lessons? Write your answer in the box.

*What I didn't like about the sketch-writing lessons was*

**Thank you very much for your help.**

# Articulate Project

## Pupil Questionnaire 3

**For pupils who had no sketch-writing lessons**

Please read everything very carefully and answer the questions.

This is **not** a test and there are no right or wrong answers.

No one will see what you write, apart from the researchers at the University, so you can feel free to say what you think.



5. Please tell us how good you think you are at doing the following things.

		<b>Really good</b>	<b>Quite good</b>	<b>Not very good</b>	<b>No good at all</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
a.	Doing drama					
b.	Writing poems or stories					
c.	Sketch-writing					
d.	Being creative and using my imagination					

6. Please tell us how much you like doing the following things.

		<b>Really enjoy</b>	<b>Quite enjoy</b>	<b>Don't really enjoy</b>	<b>Really dislike</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
a.	Doing drama					
b.	Writing poems or stories					
c.	Sketch-writing					
d.	Being creative and using my imagination					

Go to next page **F**

7. How do you feel about the drama and creative writing lessons you had last year?  
Please tick to show how much you agree or disagree with the statements.

		<i>Please tick</i>			
		Agree a lot	Agree a little	Disagree a little	Disagree a lot
a.	I think that working with the teacher makes creative writing interesting				
b.	I find it easy to learn about creative writing				
c.	The teacher explains things well in these lessons				
d.	I find I can easily remember what I learn in these lessons				
e.	I usually want to work longer on creative writing				
f.	I find that the time seems to pass quickly in these lessons				
g.	I think my work is good in creative writing lessons				
h.	I like to try out new ideas and be imaginative				
i.	I am able to put forward my own ideas during creative writing lessons				
j.	I have learned new things about writing				
k.	I have learned new things about drama				
l.	I am able to try new things I have never done before				
m.	The things we do help me to work with other pupils in the class				
n.	I always work with the same pupils				
o.	I think that other people in the class have good ideas				
p.	The things we do make me feel confident				
q.	Pupils are well behaved during these lessons				
r.	I look forward to creative writing lessons				
s.	Some pupils do not like creative writing lessons				
t.	We should have more creative writing lessons				

8. What do you like **most** about creative writing lessons? Write your answer in the box.

*What I like most about creative writing lessons is*

9. What do you **not** like about creative writing lessons? Write your answer in the box.

*What I don't like about creative writing lessons is*

**Thank you very much for your help.**

# SELF DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE – II

## SDQ II

Your Name \_\_\_\_\_ Circle one:      Male      Female

School \_\_\_\_\_ Year \_\_\_\_\_ Age \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

This is a chance to look at yourself. **It is not a test.** There are no right answers and everyone will have different answers. Be sure that your answers show how you feel about yourself. **PLEASE DO NOT TALK ABOUT YOUR ANSWERS WITH ANYONE ELSE.** We will keep your answers private and not show them to anyone.

When you are ready to begin, please read each sentence and choose an answer. There are six possible answers for each question - "True", "False", and four answers in between. There are six boxes next to each sentence, one for each of the answers. The answers are written at the top of the boxes. Choose your answer to a sentence and put a tick in the box under the answer you choose. **DO NOT** say your answer out loud or talk about it with anyone else.

If you want to change an answer you have marked you should cross out the tick and put a new tick in another box on the same line.

For all the sentences be sure that your tick is on the same line as the sentence you are answering. You should have one answer and only one answer for each sentence. **Do not leave out any of the sentences.** Once you have started, **PLEASE DO NOT TALK.** Turn over the page and begin.

© H.W. Marsh, 1999.

Self-concept Enhancement and Learning Facilitation (SELF) Research Centre, University of Western Sydney.

			FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	MORE FALSE THAN TRUE	MORE TRUE THAN FALSE	MOSTLY TRUE	TRUE	
3	Overall, I have a lot to be proud of.....	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
4	I sometimes take things that belong to other people.....	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
6	I am hopeless in <b>ENGLISH</b> classes.....	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
7	I am usually relaxed.....	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
9	People come to me for help in most <b>SCHOOL SUBJECTS</b>	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
10	It is difficult to make friends with members of my own sex...	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

			FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	MORE FALSE THAN TRUE	MORE TRUE THAN FALSE	MOSTLY TRUE	TRUE	
11	People of the opposite sex whom I like, don't like me.....	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
14	Overall, I am no good.....	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
15	I am honest.....	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
17	I look forward to <b>ENGLISH</b> classes.....	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
18	I worry more than I need to.....	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
20	I am too stupid at school to get into a good university.....	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	20



			FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	MORE FALSE THAN TRUE	MORE TRUE THAN FALSE	MOSTLY TRUE	TRUE	
21	I make friends easily with boys.....	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
22	I make friends easily with girls.....	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
25	Most things I do, I do well.....	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
26	I sometimes tell lies to stay out of trouble.....	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
28	I do badly on tests that need a lot of <b>READING</b> ability.....	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
29	I don't get upset very easily.....	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

			FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	MORE FALSE THAN TRUE	MORE TRUE THAN FALSE	MOSTLY TRUE	TRUE	
31	If I work really hard I could be one of the best students in my school year.....	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
32	Not many people of my own sex like me.....	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
33	I am not very popular with members of the opposite sex.....	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
36	Nothing I do ever seems to turn out right.....	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
37	I always tell the truth.....	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
39	Work in <b>ENGLISH</b> classes is easy for me.....	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
40	I am often depressed and down in the dumps.....	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

			FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	MORE FALSE THAN TRUE	MORE TRUE THAN FALSE	MOSTLY TRUE	TRUE	
42	I get bad marks in most <b>SCHOOL SUBJECTS</b> .....	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
43	I am popular with boys.....	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
44	I am popular with girls.....	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
47	Overall, most things I do turn out well.....	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
48	Cheating on a test is OK if I do not get caught.....	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
50	I am not very good at <b>READING</b> .....	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

			FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	MORE FALSE THAN TRUE	MORE TRUE THAN FALSE	MOSTLY TRUE	TRUE	
51	Other people get more upset about things than I do.....	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
53	I learn things quickly in most <b>SCHOOL SUBJECTS</b> .....	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
54	I do not get along very well with boys.....	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
55	I do not get along very well with girls.....	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
58	I don` t have much to be proud of.....	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
59	Honesty is very important to me.....	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	59



			FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	MORE FALSE THAN TRUE	MORE TRUE THAN FALSE	MOSTLY TRUE	TRUE	
81	When I make a promise I keep it.....	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
83	I get good marks in <b>ENGLISH</b> .....	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
84	I get upset easily.....	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	84
86	I have trouble with most <b>SCHOOL SUBJECTS</b> .....	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
87	I make friends easily with members of my own sex.....	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
88	I get a lot of attention from members of the opposite sex.....	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
90	If I really try I can do almost anything I want to do.....	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

			FALSE	MOSTLY FALSE	MORE FALSE THAN TRUE	MORE TRUE THAN FALSE	MOSTLY TRUE	TRUE	
91	I often tell lies.....	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	91
92	I have trouble expressing myself when I try to write something.....	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
93	I am a calm person.....	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
94	I am good at most <b>SCHOOL SUBJECTS</b> .....	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
95	I have few friends of the same sex as myself.....	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	95
97	Overall, I am a failure.....	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
98	People can really count on me to do the right thing.....	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
99	I learn things quickly in <b>ENGLISH</b> classes.....	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
100	I worry about a lot of things.....	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
101	Most <b>SCHOOL SUBJECTS</b> are just too hard for me.....	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	101
102	I enjoy spending time with my friends of the same sex.....	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	102

## Evaluation of West Dunbartonshire's Articulate Project

### Interview schedule for local authority personnel

**Name:**

**Date:**

(The interviewee might find it more convenient to respond to some questions by providing copies of documents)

### **Background**

What would be the most appropriate documents for us to analyse?

What were the main elements of the Articulate Project?

### **Introduction of the project**

- 1 How and why did the EA get involved?
  - 1.1 When did the process begin at LA level?
  - 1.2 Who was involved? Were HTs, pupils and staff involved in any consultation process?
  
- 2 Did this initiative follow a standard set of procedures for policy development and delivery, including support?
  
- 3 Where does this development fit into the LA's list of priorities?
  - 3.1 How does it link to other major initiatives?
  - 3.2 In what ways does the Articulate Project fit SEED's educational aims, e.g. *National Priorities*?
  - 3.3 Did any national/international policies/initiatives influence the introduction of the Articulate Project?
  
- 4 Have any external agencies (e.g. SEED, HMI, LTS) assisted with the developments? Have any hindered the developments?

### **Rationale for scope and design**

- 5 Why were the following aims chosen for the Articulate Project?
  1. Development of creative and imaginative writing skills
  2. Improvements in pupils' ability to communicate effectively
  3. Rise in pupils' self-esteem and self worth
  4. Increase in pupil motivation to learn, and enjoyment of learning
  5. Development of thinking and problem solving skills
  6. Development of team working skills

- 6 Why was the Traverse Theatre Company chosen? Did you consider other theatre companies?
- 7 Ten pupils in one S2 class at Vale of Leven Academy and 10 pupils from each P7 class in four associated primary schools were involved. How were the participating schools/classes and number of pupils decided?

### **Implementation**

- 8 What strategies were used by the LA to implement the Articulate project?
  - 8.1 What provisions were made by the LA to support schools in the implementation process?
  - 8.2 What sort of training/support was offered to teachers/theatre arts specialists?
  - 8.3 Are there any internal evaluations of this training/support?
  - 8.4 Were there particular strengths and gaps in support available to teachers?
  - 8.5 To what extent was implementation of the Articulate approach similar in the different schools?

### **Monitoring and evaluation processes**

- 9 What monitoring and evaluation processes were used to check on the impact of the initiative on participating pupils? How much was done at school level? Did the LA provide support with this evaluative activity at school level?
- 10 Will it be possible to compare whole school data in each of the participating schools with data for pupils participating in Articulate, with reference to the following indicators:
  - language attainment
  - attendance
  - exclusions
  - other indicators?
- 11 How much is done at school level? Has the LA provided support with this evaluative activity?
- 12 Are there any indicators that point to Articulate Project pupils achieving more positive outcomes than for their peers?
- 13 Why did you seek to have an independent evaluation through the FLaT programme?

### **Continuing the Articulate Project**

- 14 Are there any plans to develop and extend the Articulate initiative to other schools/pupils? If so, what are the LA plans to develop the initiative in other schools? And what are the LA plans to continue to support the initiatives?
  
- 15 In the light of your experience with the Articulate Project, what changes would you make if there were to be a future Articulate-type Project?
  
- 16 Practicalities: administering the questionnaires, interviews with teachers, pupils and parents. How are arrangements to be made? Directly with schools?

# Head Teacher Interview Schedule

## Semi-structured interview schedule for telephone interviews with Head Teachers

Name: .....

School: .....

**1 Firstly, we would like to ask some questions about how your school became involved in the Articulate Project.**

1.1 Why did you decide to become involved in the Articulate project?

1.2 Insert relevant school details

Tick name of school	Write in no./pupils	
	with playwright	with teacher
Vale of Leven Academy		
Levenvale		
Haldane		
Highdykes		
Renton		

1.3 What classes or year groups were selected to participate?

1.4 Why were these selected? How many teachers took part in the project, and how were they selected?

1.5 Were there any other significant initiatives taking place in your school over the period that this project took place? (If so, please give brief details.)



- 1.6 How appropriate were the approaches the theatre specialists used in working with your pupils? What opportunity did you have to influence their approaches?
- 1.7 Did you attend all the Articulate briefing/consultation meetings arranged by Eona Craig?  
Cluster meeting: HTs and Eona Craig  
Cluster meeting: Traverse, HTs of schools who had volunteered (no class teachers)  
Meeting at Denny Theatre (22/6/04): Traverse, HTs of participating schools, and class teachers of participating classes — parameters of the project worked out  
All-day seminar (12/7/04) in the Traverse Theatre
- 1.8 How helpful were these meetings?
- 1.9 After these initial Articulate briefing/consultation meetings, what training or support was offered to teachers? Are there any internal evaluations of this training/support?
- 1.10 What were the main strengths of the training/support provided by the local authority? What additional support would you have wanted from the local authority?
- 1.11 Were parent volunteers sought and selected in your school? If so, can you describe how they were involved? Were parents of all participants kept informed? How were they informed; when were they informed; and regarding which aspects of the project?

## **2 How the Project lessons worked**

- 2.1 What was the time span of the project?
- 2.2 How many Articulate-type lessons did the participating pupils engage in?
- 2.3 What was different about Articulate lessons from your usual lessons in this area?

2.4 Did each pupil write a separate play, or did groups of pupils write one play? Our understanding is that the Traverse actors performed the pupils' plays: was this also the case in your school?

2.5 Where did the pupils perform their work?

### **3 Impact of the Articulate Project**

3.1 Has the school evaluated the effectiveness of its involvement in the project?

3.2 What measures were used? Could we please have copies of your evaluation data?

3.3 To what extent did the participating pupils achieve the following Articulate project aims and objectives?

3.3.1 *Development of pupils' creative and imaginative writing skills*

3.3.2 *Improvements in pupils' ability to communicate effectively*

3.3.3 *Rise in pupils' self-esteem and self-worth*

3.3.4 *Increase in pupils' motivation to learn, and enjoyment of learning*

3.3.5 *Development of pupils' thinking skills, problem solving skills, and team working*

3.3.6 *Improvements in pupils' ability to evaluate their own writing*

3.4 Do you think that the teachers benefited from the Articulate project in any way?

3.5 If the project were to continue, what changes would you want to make? (e.g. team teaching)

# Teacher Interview Schedule

## Semi-structured interview schedule for telephone interviews with Teachers

Name: .....

School: .....

Date: .....

### 1 Information about yourself

- 1.1 Gender Female  Male
- 1.2 How many years have you been teaching? < 5  6-10  11-15  15+
- 1.3 How many pupils were in P7 in 2004/2005?
- 1.4 How many pupils worked with the playwright?
- 1.5 How many pupils worked with you, using the Traverse package?

### 2 Project Background

2.1 Can you say something about why you became interested in the Articulate Project?

- Particular interest in drama/play writing before the project?
- Ideas fitted in easily with the way s/he teaches?
- Opportunity to introduce new approaches to creative writing?
- Different means of improving pupils' attainment?
- Fun atmosphere would increase pupils' enjoyment?

2.2 Why do you think that the Articulate Project was introduced?

### **3 Training and support**

- 3.1 Did you attend the meetings at Denny Theatre (22/6/04) and the Traverse Theatre (12/7/04)?
- 3.2 If so, were they useful in helping you to understand the following areas?
- How the Articulate project would work and your part in it
  - How drama could be used to improve writing
  - How you would work with the Articulate package
  - How you and the playwright might coordinate your respective roles
- 3.3 If so, were they useful in making contacts with other teachers from West Dunbartonshire?
- 3.4 To what extent did you believe that you were adequately briefed and well-equipped to start work on the project?
- Did you have any concerns about how your lessons would work?
  - Did you have any concerns about how the playwright's lessons would work?
  - Were you given evidence of the effectiveness of the approach adopted by the project?
  - Had there been sufficient opportunity to raise questions and issues?
  - Do you feel that any questions you asked were adequately answered?

### **4 The Articulate project lessons**

- 4.1 Can you describe an Articulate lesson that the theatre specialists delivered, in which the whole class participated? How similar was this to lessons that you had previously delivered?
- 4.2 Can you describe the Articulate sketch-writing lessons in which ten pupils participated with the playwright?
- 4.3 Can you describe how you worked with the remainder of the class, when the ten pupils were with the playwright?
- 4.4 Would you have included sketch-writing as a P7 activity?
- 4.5 If so, would your approach have been different from that of the theatre specialists?
- 4.6 If not, why would you not have included sketch-writing? What would you have included instead?

## 5 Impact of the Articulate lessons

5.1 For the ten pupils who participated in the sketch-writing lessons, which of the following aims were promoted **as effectively** / **more effectively** / **less effectively**, through the Articulate project than through the normal class work?

	<b>as effective</b>	<b>more effective</b>	<b>less effective</b>
Development of creative and imaginative writing skills			
Improvements in pupils' ability to communicate effectively			
Rise in pupils' self-esteem and self-worth			
Increase in pupil motivation to learn, and enjoyment of learning			
Development of thinking and problem-solving skills			
Development of team-working skills			

5.2 Why do you think that the sketch-writing lessons were **as effective** / **more effective** / **less effective** than the normal class-work on listening, speaking and writing?

5.3 For the rest of the class, were gains made in the same areas?

	<b>substantial gains</b>	<b>some gains</b>	<b>hardly any gains</b>
Development of creative and imaginative writing skills			
Improvements in pupils' ability to communicate effectively			
Rise in pupils' self-esteem and self-worth			
Increase in pupil motivation to learn, and enjoyment of learning			
Development of thinking and problem-solving skills			
Development of team-working skills			

- 5.4 Why do you think there were substantial gains / some gains / hardly any gains?
- 5.5 In their general class-work, was the performance of the ten pupils who participated in the sketch-writing classes better than the others / poorer than the others / much the same?
- 5.6 Are there significant differences in how girls and boys responded to the Articulate project activities?
- 5.7 Has the project enabled you to develop a wider range of effective teaching methods for your classes?
- 5.8 Are there any important differences between the Articulate project approach and the approach to teaching that you used previously?
- 5.9 Will you continue to use the Articulate approach? If so, what sort of support would help? Is practice and familiarity likely to reduce the preparation time?
- Provision of worksheets or teacher support materials
  - Planning meetings with colleagues
- 5.10 Do you feel that you have benefited from your exposure to the Articulate project?
- 5.11 How did you evaluate the impact of the Articulate project in your own teaching?
- 5.12 If the Articulate project were to be continued, what changes would you like to make?

# Evaluation of Articulate Project

## Semi-structured interview schedule for interview with the Literary Development Officer, Traverse Theatre

1. **Firstly, I would like to explore how the Traverse became involved in the Articulate Project.**
  - 1.1 How did the Traverse become linked with the project?
  - 1.2 Why did The Traverse decide to become involved in the Articulate Project?
  - 1.3 What information did you prepare and give to the schools and/or local authority contact regarding the project? Could we please have copies?
  - 1.4 Had you or any other Traverse colleagues involved in the project any previous experience working in schools with teachers and pupils? Please describe this previous involvement.
  - 1.5 What ways of working did your Traverse colleagues choose to implement in your work with pupils?
  - 1.6 Were the pupils familiar with these ways of working?
  - 1.7 Does the Traverse have a specific in-house policy on arts in the curriculum?
  - 1.9 What was your knowledge – and that of your Traverse colleagues - of curricular guidelines relevant to the stages you were working with, e.g. 5-14 guidelines, Standard Grade/SQA, Local Authority packs, prior to the start of your work with pupils?
  - 1.9 Did the Traverse people receive any training/ support to develop your awareness of the curriculum in relation to the pupils you would be working with? Are there any internal evaluations of this training /support?

## **2. Working with the pupils in the school**

- 2.1 What was the time span of the project?
- 2.2 How many sessions did the participating pupils engage in?
- 2.3 Who led the sessions? Did the classroom teachers have any input to these sessions? Who was responsible for managing the behaviour and responses of the pupils?
- 2.4 How were the pupils who participated in the writing sessions selected?
- 2.5 What happened to the pupils who were not selected for this?
- 2.6 Did the pupils who were selected work independently or collaboratively on their writing tasks?
- 2.6 Did you and or the theatre specialists support or intervene in any way with regard to the ideas and responses of the pupils during the periods of writing?
- 2.7 Can you describe the key processes/approaches you used to support pupils' ideas and responses within the tasks you set them?
- 2.8 Why did you choose to work in this way?

## **3. Impact of the Articulate Project**

- 3.1 Do you have any evaluation of the effectiveness of the work you undertook with the pupils?
- 3.2 Have you had any feedback/evaluation from the pupils and /or the school?
- 3.3 Have there been any discrepancies in this feedback/evaluation?
- 3.4 Why do you think this exists?
- 3.5 To what extent did pupils achieve the following Articulate project aims and objectives?
  - 3.51 **The development of creative and imaginative writing skills of participating pupils** – how did the texts written by pupils evolve?



- 3.52 **Improvements in pupils' ability to communicate effectively** – how important were questions to, from and amongst the pupils during the creative writing phases? How important was the performance of the pupils' scripts? Please clarify what you think the pupils learned within the writing/performance elements of the project.
- 3.53 **A rise in pupils' self-esteem and self worth** – what evidence do you have that this occurred? What strategies did your team use to make this happen?
- 3.54 **An increase in pupil motivation to learn, and the enjoyment of learning** – how were pupils motivated by your team to learn? What were they enjoying within the tasks your team were giving them? What was the creative quality of their responses like?
- 3.55 **Development of thinking skills, problem solving and team working** – what did the pupils have to think about within their writing tasks? Were they challenged to think collaboratively and imaginatively? Did they encounter any problems which supported their understanding of the creative writing and performance processes? Please give examples.
- 3.6 When you reflect on the project you undertook with pupils are there any elements within the content you implemented or the ways of working you used which you would now change? Please explain why.
- 3.7 From a theatre/drama perspective what has been the most positive aspect of your involvement within the project?

## Network Co-ordinator Interview Schedule

Semi-structured interview schedule for interview with the Network Co-ordinator

**Year Group:** P7 (now S1)

**Date:** January 2006

1. Prior to this interview, did you know about the Articulate Project?
2. How did you know this?
3. Did the young people mention the Articulate project at the club?
4. Did they say whether they enjoyed the Articulate project?
5. What did they like most about the Articulate project?
6. Is there anything the young people didn't like about the Articulate project?
7. What did they like most? What did they like least?
8. Did you see any changes in the young people?
9. Is there anything you didn't like about the Articulate project?
10. Do you feel that it presented a good use of school time?
11. Would you want it to happen again?

## Parent Focus Group Questions

*Semi-structured interview schedule for focus groups with parents*

**Year Group:** P7 (now S1) S2 (now S3)

**School:** Levensale Primary/Vale of Leven Academy

**Date:** .....

1. **Prior to this evening's invitation, did you know that your child participated in the Articulate Project?**
2. **How did you know this?**
3. **Did your child mention the Articulate project at home?**
4. **Did they say whether they enjoyed the Articulate project?**
5. **What did they like most about the Articulate project?**
6. **Is there anything your child didn't like about the Articulate project?**
7. **What did they like most? What did they like least?**

- 8. Did you see any changes in your child, regarding:**
- (a) progress at school?**
  - (b) behaviour at home or school?**
  - (c) willingness to attend school?**
  - (d) enthusiasm for school lessons?**
  - (e) willingness to do homework?**
- 9. Is there anything you didn't like about the Articulate project?**
- 10. Do you feel that it presented a good use of school time?**
- 11. Would you want it to happen again?**

## Pupil Focus Group Questions

*Semi-structured interview schedule for focus groups with pupils*

**Year Group:** .....

**School:** .....

**Date:** .....

1. **What does the Articulate Project mean to you? If you had to describe to it to someone who doesn't know about it (perhaps your aunt or uncle), what would you say?**
  
2. **How did you feel about having new people working with you in school?**
  
3. **Did you enjoy the Articulate style of teaching? Was it more/less enjoyable than 'normal' lessons?**
  
4. **In your new classes, do you find that you have used the skills learned during Articulate?**
  
5. **Overall, are you glad that you took part in the Articulate Project?**