



University  
of Glasgow | Faculty of  
Education

**RESEARCH REPORT**

**Supporting Teacher and School Engagement  
with Literature in Learning  
within a Curriculum for Excellence Framework**

*Professor James McGonigal  
Department of Curriculum Studies, University of Glasgow*

*Dr John C Hall and Mr Stuart Hall  
The SCRE Centre, University of Glasgow*

**February 2009**



# Contents

Acknowledgements .....	iv
Executive Summary .....	v
1. Context and rationale for the research approach.....	1
2. Research aims and objectives .....	6
3. Research design and methodology.....	7
4. Focus group findings.....	11
5. Analysis of survey responses .....	14
6. Conclusions and possible next steps .....	31
Bibliography.....	44
Appendices.....	45

# Acknowledgements

The research team would like to thank the representatives from various Scottish Literature Forum organisations who provided a briefing on their existing work with schools; the various members of staff in schools and library services throughout Scotland who responded to an electronic survey on their experience and hopes; and, particularly, those teachers and librarians who volunteered to take part in focus groups in Glasgow, Edinburgh and Aberdeen. Finally, we are grateful for the unfailing helpfulness of Philippa Cochrane of Scottish Book Trust at various stages of this project.

# Executive Summary

## 1. Aim of the Research

This Report outlines the results of a focused research project undertaken by University of Glasgow and SCRE Centre staff for the eleven Scottish cultural organisations that comprise Literature in Learning, and the (sometimes overlapping) twenty-one organisations that are members of the Scottish Literature Forum. In this Report, the term Literature in Learning (LiL) is used to designate this larger group in their combined engagement with primary, secondary and special education. They had called for research to support literature and, more generally, language development in schools in ways that are integrated with, and might also influence, current school development planning towards *Curriculum for Excellence*. The project aimed to gain some empirical data about teacher and school preferences for effective communication with the range of organisations that do already offer such support in schools, in terms of contact with creative writers and performers as well as through provision of curriculum development materials in print and electronic formats.

## 2. Model of Research

The model of research involved both quantitative and qualitative approaches, and aimed to engage with schools and staff by means of an electronic survey questionnaire sent to every Scottish school, and then more closely with the classroom contexts of groups of primary and secondary teachers and school librarians participating in 5 regional focus groups. The context of *Curriculum for Excellence* (CfE) was already part of the thinking of the teachers involved in these focus groups through current Local Authority and school planning. Group membership was voluntary, and mainly in response to an invitation to all who completed the survey. This invitation was extended to Local Authority library and resource staff, working within a range of school and community contexts in literacy and reader development. Focus group participants responded to emerging trends in the first 25% or so of the national responses, and to additional documentation from the Scottish Book Trust. Although they were not constituted as a ‘representative’ group of Scottish teachers and resource staff, they came from 12 Local Authorities across Scotland, worked at different levels of responsibility (Class and Principal Teacher and Depute Head, School Librarian and Area Resource Manager) and brought an extensive range of professional experience to the task. They produced a range of suggestions and comments, the main ones being summarised below.

## 3. Key Focus Group Findings

- The lack of knowledge that even clearly committed professionals currently possess regarding many of the organisations that make up the Scottish Literature Forum.
- Ongoing contact with, and exploration of the potential of, these organisations through an actual or electronic newsletter was seen as a very useful development.
- The current ABC pamphlet providing brief details of the LiL organisations was considered a convenient and practical document that should be available to all schools, in both real and virtual formats.
- Rural and local needs in enhancing reader development were not always being met, it was felt. Relatively little contact was thought to be readily available beyond Central

Scotland, and schools often needed to engage with non-SBT endorsed writers and arts groups.

- Locally there was significant interest in varieties of Scots language, and resources or staff development opportunities here would be welcomed.
- A general and specific need for continuing professional development was indicated, linked to curricular and classroom actualities, with Beginning and Early Career teachers having particular development needs.
- Financial cutbacks have increasingly led to problems in funding LiL opportunities. Networked, partnership or shared funding arrangements between schools, using central venues and community support, should be explored.
- Library and Resource staff can offer expertise and guidance that tends to be more used by primary than by secondary schools at present.
- The Scottish Book Trust website is highly valued by staff, and might be extended to make links with other resources, websites, teaching materials, and also schools (for example, by including examples of children's creative work done in response to author visits).
- Generally, the more lesson development activities that could be included with particular texts or featured authors in mind, the more teachers would tend to use the site, or to engage with LiL organisations who offered such support.
- The 'Scottish' dimension of Scottish Book Trust's work was valued, and yet there was also a sense that broader links with other UK writing would also be useful.
- There was a need to consider extending the reader development activity of Scottish Book Trust (and other LiL organisations) to include current growth areas such as cross-curricular non-fiction texts and graphic literacy.
- Personal e-mail contact was welcomed, perhaps through some sort of opt-in network of 'members', revised every few years to cope with staffing and personal changes.
- Overall, moving beyond information to actual engagement, it was felt that local and partnership support would be helpful, with some 'status' being given to LiL organisations by the support and advice of local Quality Assurance officers, and possibly by Learning and Teaching Scotland.

#### **4. Survey Arrangements**

The survey was shaped by briefing interviews between the researchers and a range of LiL personnel who contribute to, organise, support or evaluate literature, literacy and language development in schools, including storytelling, the National Library of Scotland and Scots and Gaelic publishing initiatives. Those organisations that could not attend were given the opportunity to comment electronically on issues documented in briefing papers, and on the questionnaire to be sent to schools. This went through several drafts, in order that the particular areas of engagement or expertise offered by LiL members would be reflected in the survey. The tight timescale for the project precluded wider canvassing of views from Local Authority advisory and support personnel, as had initially been hoped, but their perspective is not absent from the final recommendations in the Report. Key information and findings from

the survey are summarised below. Detailed statistical figures and analysis are included in the Report.

## **5. Key Survey Findings**

- The survey was web-based and was conducted between mid-October and the beginning of December 2008.
- Two hundred and one usable responses were received. The majority of respondents were based in primary or secondary schools, although a small number were from library services or special education schools. Respondents tended to be in promoted posts, and to have many years experience in education.
- Respondents tended to be highly supportive of the role of literature in learning. They were slightly less sure that it was given the high priority which they desired.
- The respondents would value advice and support on the teaching of almost all genres or aspects of literature, and on non-fiction writing.
- Support would be especially valued for the teaching of literature in the middle and upper years of primary education, and the lower and middle years of secondary education, as well as in some specialist areas (e.g. gifted readers, pupils for whom English is a second or additional language).
- Respondents could see a high value in providing a central web site for information and resources, and in direct and personal communication with them. The preferred frequency of communication would be around once per term. A large proportion of the respondents would particularly welcome information during the summer months (June to August).
- The overall level of awareness of the individual member organisations of the Scottish Literature Forum was not high, although some of the more high profile organisations were better known. Nevertheless, significant minorities of the respondents were aware of organisations which supported their own areas of specialist interest.

## **6. Conclusions and Possible Next Steps**

Data gathered from both quantitative and qualitative strands of the research are used to make 39 recommendations on developing a co-ordinated approach to communication with schools. These take teacher preferences and school development priorities into account, within Local Authority and national development contexts. The potential for sharing good practice in school engagement with writing and writers is also emphasised, building on the positive regard which many teachers have for those LiL organisations whose services they have used. While all of these recommendations are worth reflection, ten are selected as key issues for development. These are summarised below.

## **KEY DEVELOPMENT ISSUES**

### **1. Advisory Panel to Co-ordinate LiL and LA Concerns**

An Advisory Panel might be established, comprising Local Authority Quality Assurance and Resources staff, HMIE and LT Scotland representation, teachers, teacher educators and creative writers, to explore issues of co-ordination and extension of the work of the Scottish Literature Forum in regard to schools.

### **2. Investigation of Shared Budget Arrangements for Cross-curricular Aspects of Author Visits**

Schools cite author or speaker travel costs as a major difficulty in engaging with LiL organisations, yet these can also sometimes be shared between community and school budgets. There is a need to explore funding arrangements with Cultural Co-ordinators, or their equivalent, on cross-curricular dimensions of learning (e.g. cross-curricular work in literature and the expressive arts: text and drama/art/museum activities). Literature should not be separated from other cultural organisations.

### **3. Co-ordination of School and Library Service Support in Learning**

Schools may tend to work ‘independently’ of library services, not knowing what is available. They may also tend to make ‘unreasonable’ demands or last-minute changes, or have unrealistic expectations of writers. A Do’s and Don’ts publication is felt to be needed for schools, including an ideas-list of ways of involving pupils, especially in cross-curricular activities related to any writer’s themes.

Author visits are often not clearly tied into curriculum, because of teachers’ lack of preparation time, or of a system of guidance to support visits. Joint work between Library, English and other staff might redress this at various levels.

### **4. Development of Contexts for Literature in Learning**

Teachers need lists of active, realistic and purposeful learning contexts emerging from language and literature opportunities or texts. These might appear as additional pamphlets, or web-resources, or as author-related materials that might appear in an electronic newsletter (see point 8 below).

It may be possible for LiL staff to link with local university Teacher Education Institutions in this regard, perhaps involving teachers in training together with lecturers and/or local children’s writers, to enhance knowledge of LiL’s aims among beginning teachers.

### **5. Embedding Texts within Stages of School Learning**

Working groups of teachers, academics, librarians, experienced and younger teachers could also produce age- and stage-related lists of suitable texts, in conjunction with LiL partners, with a focus on creative developments with texts in schools. These should also be linked with existing festivals, themes or remembrances (e.g. Holocaust Day, National Poetry Day etc) that might already be used in school. Scottish texts



could be particularly highlighted, and the documents disseminated electronically to schools.

#### **6. Responding to Teachers' Current Development Needs**

The electronic survey reveals development needs in Scottish poetry and Scottish literature generally, so LiL organisations should target developments here. School librarians could work with the next generation of newly qualified teachers on literature resources.

National interest in graphic novels has also increased since they were mentioned in broader definitions of literacy in CfE. LiL's expertise in children's literature and contact with picture book authors and illustrators could be used effectively to develop young readers' (including secondary readers') awareness of the relationship between picture and text.

#### **7. Enhancing the Quality and Supply of Scottish Texts**

There are problems with the supply of Scottish texts in secondary schools, with too much 1970s material still being used, often in a poor state. This relates partly to lack of money, partly to lack of knowledge among teachers. Therefore new texts need to be promoted, with back-up provided on teaching activities. Teachers might be sponsored to try out new texts, developing classroom activities to be shared with others electronically, with a free class set of the texts provided for such involvement.

#### **8. Developing an Electronic Newsletter**

An electronic newsletter for LiL might also be developed, featuring e.g. author experience, one school's activity, children's writing in response to a visit/topic, and suggestions for cross-curricular topics arising. Many of the LiL organisations are not sufficiently known by teachers, therefore the e-newsletter might present featured organisations, personalities and exemplars on a regular rolling basis, creating variety and interest. This development might build upon Scottish Book Trust's current *Learning and Inclusion Newsletter*, but with a different emphasis, both on the LiL organisations themselves and on school curriculum issues or terminology.

#### **9. Developing E-mail Contact with Teachers and Schools**

Although most teachers surveyed want direct e-mail contact to individuals, and/or direction to a main website with links, time constraints on teachers can prevent them from using e-mail in school. Therefore it might be better to use the school's Admin e-mail plus FAO PT English, or the teacher's name, if known.

Some people prefer a named or personal approach – and this might develop teachers' trust in the LiL organisations. Staff will tend to follow up on an invitation if it is not anonymous. There are small but potentially significant variations in preference in the 'Communication' responses to the e-survey. This may have implications for

encouraging an individual electronic mailing list, which should be cross-referenced to sector or subject to facilitate future specialist e-mailings and feedback.

#### **10. Sustaining and Enhancing Current Information to Schools**

The current ABC Guide format seems really appropriate in size, visibility and convenience, and will save time spent by busy teachers on browsing and book-marking different websites. There were thought to be some omissions in the area of Library services, and reference might also be made to national or civic museums or gallery sites which offer good non-fiction opportunities in reading and writing. The problem here is to keep both the size and focus of the document helpful and clear.

At present, this resource is not distributed nationally, presumably for reasons of cost. The ABC Guide needs to come to a named person, (normally the Head) with from 6 to 10 copies for dispersal in secondary schools, including the school librarian and ‘unexpected places’ such as Drama or History or Art to encourage cross-curricular links. Primary schools also need multiple copies. Consideration might be given to a bigger poster version for the classroom, and/or to an electronic version to save on costs.

# 1: Contexts and Rationale for Research Approach

There were three main overlapping contexts for this research on the use of Scottish literary, linguistic and cultural resources in schools, and their intersection affected teacher responses to the electronic survey of knowledge and attitudes that formed a major part of the project. The overlapping contexts were:

- *the context of schooling* (including issues of curriculum and assessment)
- *the context of culture* (including cultural organisations and concepts)
- *the context of policy* (including arts strategy and resourcing).

In the immediate past, different priorities and tensions emerging from these contexts have frustrated or fragmented many worthwhile development initiatives with regard to creative uses of Scottish writing in schools. Communication across these contexts has sometimes been difficult. However, by focusing on this issue of communication as the key research question, the project has to some extent been able to suggest ways forward for both cultural organisations and schools.

Teachers sense themselves to be hard-pressed, if not embattled, in handling many current educational changes, each of which may in itself be good or well justified. Generally, they would welcome contact with, and virtual or actual resources from, the Literature in Learning (LiL) organisations. These include the eleven member organisations of the Scottish Literature Forum Education Task Group, and more broadly (and overlapping) the twenty one members of the Scottish Literature Forum. A list of these organisations is included as Appendix A. They were part of the original Literature in Learning development project (see the following section on cultural provision). They reflect the breadth of cultural expertise offered to schools, and also the extensive range of spoken and written texts and genres that developing readers and their teachers may need access to. These would include the sorts of non-fiction resources which several of the Scottish Literature Forum members can also offer (for example, Scottish Language Dictionaries and the National Library of Scotland), and which are relevant to the ‘cross-curricular literacy’ that is emphasised in *Curriculum for Excellence*, the immediate developmental context for all schools in Scotland.

## **The current context of schooling**

The *National Guidelines for English Language 5-14* (Scottish Office Education Department, 1991) contain one of the most succinct and useful statements of the place of Scottish culture and language in schools one could hope for (Section 6: Specific Issues in English Language Teaching: pp. 67–68), and elsewhere the document clarifies children’s progress in reading, writing, talking and listening/watching in a balanced and helpful way. Yet, because the Guidelines as a whole were new and quite highly systematised across all the curricular areas (with strands, levels and outcomes seeming to form a tight grid against which teachers considered that they and their pupils would be strictly judged), primary schools in particular moved towards a climate of compliance. This tended to cut down on new opportunities for creative engagement in cross-curricular thematic work with Scottish culture, language and literature.

Scottish material has also been problematic in secondary schooling, to some extent. In Years 5 and 6 of secondary, the Revised Higher arrangements of the 1980s brought in optional set texts, which included many Scottish texts with which senior pupils could engage. When these Highers came to be revised in a more thorough-going way for the Higher Still programme of the 1990s, however, such texts were dropped because of issues of teacher workload. While there remained an option to follow an examination course in Scottish Language and Literature at different levels, and exemplar materials for this were developed by LT Scotland (2003), the uptake of thorough study of Scottish culture has been poor, because of lack of coherent course experiences throughout the early years of secondary education, on which such final national assessment could build.

Teacher expertise in Scottish language and literature is also variable across schools, hindering commitment to such detailed study. Close comparative scrutiny of school results by parents, local authority Quality Assurance officers and HMIE has also diminished teacher or school confidence with untried approaches or texts. Use of Scottish literature is sometimes seen as additionally problematic where school populations have become more ethnically varied, and so the need to focus on developing Standard English is felt to be of more immediate concern than exploring the Scots language or literature of a particular locality. Of course, the two are not mutually exclusive (see Arizpe and McGonigal, 2007, 2008) and yet the cultural tensions experienced by teachers in their working lives are real.

More recently, however, the Assessment is for Learning project has provided a model of positive teacher and pupil engagement in formative assessment, and has aimed at systemic change within school contexts with positive results (see Hayward, Priestley *et al*, 2004). This has become the developmental model on which *Curriculum for Excellence* (CfE) has been posited, and, together with the broader ‘capacities’ for engaged and successful learning and citizenship that the new curriculum model aims to foster, this offers some signs of hope that the creative approaches fostered and exemplified by Literature in Learning are timely, and might be become more easily embedded within schools.

A new emphasis on creativity has become current in recent years. HMIE has provided two reports on creativity to inform school developments (HMIE 2006a, 2006b). Yet because of the narrower assessment-led focus over previous decades, it is now worth exploring to what extent teachers, who have been professionally shaped by that narrower focus, can take advantage of new opportunities for accessing contemporary creative writing and performance.

Another area being emphasised by HMIE is an increased focus on ‘cross-curricular literacy’, through developing the reading and writing skills of pupils in the range of genres they can encounter across the curriculum. This happens more easily and effectively at present within the primary generalist classroom than in secondary specialist departments, and is an issue of some concern to secondary staff.

***Research issues arising from this context*** included aspects of teacher confidence in accessing and teaching contemporary Scottish literature; their general perceptions of current continuing professional development needs; the present state of school and departmental

development planning processes in relation to CfE; and differences in expectation among teachers working in different contexts and regions, and at different stages of their professional life. These issues mainly arose within the focus group discussions, but were also evident in comments that many respondents contributed to the survey.

One implication of teachers' desire for resources in the broad area of Scottish literary and linguistic culture is that a focus on staff development needs at national, regional or school or individual level might, if carefully judged and targeted, furnish an area of growth for some LiL organisations. In order for this to happen, teachers and schools would need increasing familiarity with the aims, interests and strengths of the different organisations. And the organisations need not only to engage with teachers more widely, but also to assist schools in taking up the development opportunities on offer by adapting these to local needs. There would also be implications for closer co-operation, or at the very least more extended discussion, with the Local Authority staff mostly closely associated with school development planning and priorities.

Detailed suggestions for taking these issues forward are included in Section 6 below.

### **The current context of cultural provision**

This context centrally includes the work and vision of organisations that have shaped the original Literature in Learning initiative to this point: the Scottish Arts Council, Scottish Book Trust, Scottish Poetry Library, and Scottish Storytelling Centre in particular. In their ongoing support for cultural activities, and in their articulation of ideas about the proper role of culture within civic society in Scotland, they have been major forces for cultural awareness and provision at many levels, including school and community outreach. Despite current uncertainties over funding and organisation of cultural provision nationally, there do exist opportunities to re-think or extend the good work already done, and to demonstrate further engagement with Scotland's future citizens through engagement with schools at many levels.

Details of the original Literature in Learning project can be found at:

<http://www.scottishbooktrust.com/learning-and-inclusion/literature-in-learning>

Earlier national reviews of the intersection of culture, school and community, such as the Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum's *The School Curriculum and the Culture of Scotland* (SCCC, 1999) have stressed the diversity of culture and examined the possibility of embedding it more effectively across a range of school subjects, including science, technology and religious education as well as literature, music, history and geography. This document's focus on creativity, economic enterprise and sustainable growth perhaps reveals political concerns of the period just prior to devolution, and to some extent side-tracked discussion of the review's content. Nevertheless, the scope for creative and cultural approaches within schools had been documented, and would ultimately impact on thinking about CfE. Moreover, the need for school engagement with a wide range of cultural and community organisations was clearly established. This provides an initial rationale for seeking to extend LiL's engagement with schools.

The advocacy of the Scottish Literature Forum, particularly of its Education Task Group (Appendix A), has helped to establish a clearer sense of the range and variety of cultural activity across the genres of Scottish literature. It has also raised questions about how citizens of all ages are to engage with this. The original Literature in Learning project itself has revealed how creative approaches can energise teaching and learning in a variety of school settings across Scotland. The impact of its various projects was clear to HMIE, and helped to establish Scottish literary and linguistic culture more explicitly within the English and literacy outcomes of CfE documentation.

***Research issues arising from this context*** include exploring the knowledge that teachers currently possess of cultural opportunities in Scottish literature and language; their awareness of the potential of CfE to extend pupils' experiences (across all attainment levels) of such opportunities; the ability of clusters of schools, both primary and secondary, to engage in shared artistic/cultural experiences; and the intersection of school and community efforts in developing creative talent and expression across the generations. These issues emerge clearly enough in the data from the national electronic survey, analysed in Section 5 below.

The picture that emerges is, however, a variable one, both in regard to teachers' current awareness of the provision that currently exists in Scottish literature and language (at a most basic level, having actually heard of the organisations funding this research, let alone engaged with them), and in regard to the quality of that provision in meeting the needs both of pupils and of curricular or assessment demands on teachers.

To begin with, this might involve a reworking of current communication with schools in order to tie it more closely to changes in terminology and assessment stages that are gradually emerging as CfE develops momentum. At a more active level, it would involve exploring issues of partnership or networking with other cultural providers, with the aim of assuring wider community contact with young people across more of the regions of Scotland. At a school level, the idea of partnership is a significant current policy issue. In simple economic terms, for example, it may be much easier for three small schools to share the expenses of one writer's visit, but the opportunities that may be involved for shared planning and discussion between otherwise rather isolated school communities are equally important, and may have an impact far beyond the single visit that was the starting point. Again, such co-operation maximises the numbers of teachers who have engaged with the organisation concerned.

Again, further suggestions towards such partnership working are included in Section 6 below, based on both focus group and survey data.

### **The current context of policy**

The Scottish Executive's Cultural Review consultation and final Response to that process (Scottish Executive, 2006) linked cultural provision with the national economy in ways already noted in the SCCC Report above. A new arts organisation, Creative Scotland, was considered to be 'the key to success in the business of developing and nurturing Scotland's creative talent', and would combine the Scottish Arts Council and Scottish Screen, with responsibility for national performing companies being transferred to the Executive. At the

time of writing, the extent to which the present Scottish Government will replicate or extend that vision is not wholly clear, with funding and management arrangements still in a process of actualisation.

Nevertheless, in the light of far-reaching changes to both the educational system and the arts, it seems more important than ever to examine in some detail the impact of cultural policy on schools and communities. Key ideas of entitlement and community engagement need to be examined for their potential impact on the next generations of Scotland's young people, including those who will themselves ultimately find work in the creative arts. Schools provide the best context for such research, and CfE offers a new opportunity for engagement between creative practitioners, arts and cultural development agencies, young learners and their teachers.

***Research issues arising from this context*** include the extent to which teachers are aware of the educational implications of recent changes in arts policy; their existing methods of information-seeking about literature provision in schools; the best alignment, as teachers see it, of creative development and schooling; their experience of school-based and community-based arts activity, particularly with regard to visiting writers and writers in residence; and their awareness of the resource implications for schools of the more recent promotion of Scottish literature and language at different levels within the education system.

This research project deals primarily with how teachers want to receive and update their knowledge of cultural provision, particularly in language and literature, both spoken and written. In the process, they reveal a professional commitment to these areas of knowledge and skill, and also much combined experience in fostering them, within normal limitations of time, energy and awareness, and increasingly of financial constraint. The survey data here indicates clearly where they consider the most crucial resource needs to be, and this should provide lines of development for those LiL organisations that specialise in such provision.

In contemporary classrooms, information technology can dramatically enhance provision and engagement, and although organisations which favour the written word have tended to centre their efforts on texts, a focus on developing spoken and virtual resources may be worth considering. It may even be that the merger of the Scottish Arts Council and Scottish Screen might release creative energies towards engaging teachers and pupils with visual literacy across a range of genres. Other suggestions are included in Section 6 below.

## 2: Research Aims and Objectives

The purpose of the research was to investigate two key questions to inform the development of shared working practice:

- 1 Following the development of *Curriculum for Excellence*, how do educators plan to engage with literature and language in Scotland?
- 2 How would teachers and school librarians prefer to receive information from the organisations in the literature and language sector?

Research issues articulated above in describing the contexts of the project were to be used to give shape and depth to the information-gathering process towards these ends.



# 3: Research Design and Methodology

## Integrated Research Design

The research approach combined three strands:

1. Conducting a small number of sensitising interviews with key stakeholders. A list of potential interviewees was drawn up in collaboration with the funders, and it was considered crucial that the research team engage with the differing aims, experiences and support structures of the various organisations, and their current approaches to contacting schools.
2. A survey of all schools, focusing on the key questions of how educators plan to engage with literature in learning, and how teachers and librarians prefer to receive information from LiL organisations.
3. A series of discussion groups involving teaching staff from relevant curricular areas, representatives from local authorities and other interest groups. These focus groups would provide the opportunity to explore in-depth themes addressed in the survey.

### Strand 1 – Sensitising interviews

The researchers conducted an initial round of interviews with 8 of the key stakeholder organisations identified by the funder. An interview schedule was developed for the purpose (Appendix B). These interviews took place in early September 2008, and were aimed at providing the research team with a list of salient issues and background information for constructing the questionnaire and focus group schedule. Interviews lasted between 45 and 60 minutes in length.

It was clear that the organisations differed not only in their specialist areas of interest but in their size, support staffing, networks of membership, contact with schools, national coverage beyond Central Scotland, and resource provision for teachers or pupils. Their role in the continuing professional development of teaching staff also varied. In a few cases, there was involvement with Scottish university staff in organising conferences or seminars, or in weekend schools with some element of recognised development of teaching skills. There was some awareness of Quality Assurance issues and of the need to monitor the impact of engagement with schools. Overall, there was an awareness of the advantages of a networked or at least co-ordinated approach to working with schools, although the workings of curriculum and assessment in classroom contexts remained somewhat puzzling to most.

## **Strand 2 – Survey of all schools**

This strand of the research comprised a web-based census of Scottish primary, secondary, special and Gaelic medium schools. The SCRE Centre’s subscription to the Zoomerang online survey service made it possible to set up a secure and robust form for completion quickly, via any web-based browser. Conducting a census in this way negated the requirement to seek representative samples of schools, a task which can be deceptively difficult and time consuming. Moreover, the costs associated with conducting a web-based survey were substantially lower than a paper/postal one. Further, Zoomerang also aggregates data as it is submitted, so speeding up basic analysis, an important consideration given the project timescale. The SCRE Centre had successfully used Zoomerang on a number of recent research projects and it was the research team’s experience that response rates through e-mail are improving. This was not wholly borne out by the present project, for reasons explored below, but the agreed target of 200 returns was met.

Previous experience suggested that a short, well-focused survey is more likely to produce a good rate of return than a large, diffuse one. Many teachers feel that they are over-researched and have too many demands for information placed upon them. It was envisaged that most if not all of the questions to be ‘closed’. Closed questionnaires encourage higher response rates as well as speeding up the processing and analysis of data. However, we also included a final open question to allow respondents to ‘pursue their own agenda’ and inform the research, and provided space for further comment following several of the earlier questions.

The exact questions to be included in the survey were a matter for discussion with the funder, and included questions about teachers’ and schools’

- attitudes and opinions on the teaching of literature
- views on the value of support for the teaching of different types of literature
- age groups for which support would be valued
- stages of education for which support would be valued
- types of resources which would be valued
- types of communication preferred
- preferred frequency and timing of information
- familiarity with organisations supporting literature.

Survey questions and staff replies can be seen in detail in the analysis of responses in Section 5, and in Appendix E. A Word version of the questions alone is included in Appendix F.

### *Contact with Schools*

In the first instance, the Head Teachers of all schools were contacted and asked to inform relevant members of staff (including those responsible for English, Library services, Additional Support Needs, English as an Additional Language and community outreach) about the survey and furnish them with the web address to access the questionnaire.

A thorough consultation process took place with various LiL organisations regarding the framing of the questionnaire. It was sent out to schools in mid October, which coincided with the Autumn break in schools. The timing of this break varies across the country, so the

questionnaire would have arrived just before, during or after this holiday. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the initial response was poor. The given deadline was also tight, because of the original timeline of the project, and if teachers did not manage to complete the survey within the deadline they may well have given up. More likely, teachers were extremely busy, with a multitude of tasks to be done in any day, and this survey may not have been high on their agenda, or have been pushed to one side.

More positively, the initial response of 67 teachers was about a quarter of the final total of responses, and the spread of types of school, the range of staff responsibilities within them and their locations across urban and rural Scotland did seem to be broadly representative of the cohort we were attempting to reach. It was decided to send a second message to Heads in mid-November, extending the deadline till the beginning of December and re-emphasising the significance of the project in relation to national and school developments (Appendix C). This was more successful, and almost 250 questionnaires were returned (albeit not all fully completed). In the event, just over 200 of these were suitable for analysis. Meanwhile, the initial responses were used as part of the focus group discussions, which were arranged in different parts of Scotland.

### **Strand 3 – Discussion groups**

This third strand of the research involved conducting a number of focus groups with teaching staff from relevant curricular areas, school librarians and representatives from interest groups and local authorities. Several members of the research team had been involved in a consultation exercise on *Curriculum for Excellence*, funded by Learning and Teaching Scotland. Much of this work had involved setting up discussion groups with subject specialists, teachers, local authority officers and other interest groups. Given the time constraints on the proposed research, it was initially hoped to capitalise on this pre-existing pool of professionals by inviting a number of them to take part in the current research project. Discussion groups would be carried out in a number of geographical locations to minimise travel problems for prospective participants. Additionally their travelling expenses would be reimbursed. We anticipated conducting six focus groups with eight or so participants in each.

A schedule for the discussion groups was devised (Appendix D), which it was hoped would be open and flexible enough to maximise potential lines of enquiry. The expectation was that the discussion groups would allow for in-depth discussion of, for example,

- the role and impact of services providing support for literature and language development in schools.
- how such services can best identify local school needs, and what strategic partnerships might yield ‘value added’ results.

As it turned out, only one of the participants had been previously involved in the earlier project on *Curriculum for Excellence*. Respondents had been asked on the survey to indicate willingness to participate in the regional focus groups, and a good number of teachers had done so. However, we found that many teachers had to cancel their attendance at the last moment in order to cope with school absence cover or other emergencies, and the balance of the groups across roles and sectors could have been better. This in itself reveals something of

the constraints within which most schools operate. Nevertheless, the discussion provided a clear insight into the concerns of teachers and library staff, with many positive lines of thought which have informed the conclusions to this Report.

## 4: Focus Group Findings

Five focus groups took place in late November and early December 2008, in Glasgow, Edinburgh and Aberdeen. Staff involved included one Depute Head and one Principal Teacher (Primary, Glasgow); one Head of Faculty and three Principal Teachers of English (Secondary, Clackmannanshire, Edinburgh, Aberdeen and Moray); four secondary school librarians, one independent sector and two primary children's librarians (Glasgow, North and South Lanarkshire and Aberdeenshire), six Educational Resource Managers (Edinburgh, West Lothian, West Dunbartonshire, Dundee, Aberdeenshire); one Probationer Teacher (West Lothian); and one Arts Education Officer (Aberdeenshire). There was in the end no representation from South and South-West Scotland (Borders, Dumfries and Galloway, and the Ayrshire authorities). Two teachers there expressed interest but were unable to attend on the day selected.

Numbers of staff who were able to attend the focus groups varied, from a maximum of 8 to a minimum of 2, with many apologies sent at the last moment because of school emergency cover arrangements. The balance of teachers to librarians thus did not reflect the proportions in the survey returns. Two of the groups were a mixture of school and library staff, two were librarians only (both school librarians and LA Resource staff) and one group was teachers only. Although it had been intended to tape all of the focus groups, some technical problems at the first meeting led to the machine being switched off. One focus group was recorded, although unfortunately it was the smallest group and thus atypical. To ensure a measure of consistency, it was decided not to record the larger groups, but instead to have one researcher carry out four out of the five focus groups, taking careful notes and writing up immediately the suggestions made. All of the groups followed the schedule in Appendix D.

In addition to printout copies of the first 25% of returns to the survey, with the percentage response clearly indicated for each question, individual copies of the Scottish Arts Council and Literature Forum for Scotland's revised (2008) ABC guide to LiL organisations were available for participants to comment on. This handy reference guide provides an outline of aims and also contact and website details for the organisations. Discussion was wide-ranging, and combined personal and professional experience with more speculative consideration of the needs of schools and teachers in a time of change. Open questioning by the researchers and a responsive attitude among the participants ensured a positive discussion of the issues.

Although the opening stages of the discussion invited reference to personal experience of using literature organisations in school, this experience took place in school contexts, and so was seen as a professional matter. Since the staff involved had almost all been in post for a number of years, many of them in management roles, they could also draw upon the experience of working in various schools and local authorities. Some of the points made were more 'aspirational' than others, but were typical of the enthusiasm of interested professionals keen to see improvements for the children they dealt with.

The key points noted below reflect a consensus across all five focus groups.

- The evident commitment of all staff involved to engaging their pupils, and young people generally, with literature and language at local level and at national level where possible.
- The lack of knowledge that even committed professionals currently possess regarding the organisations that make up the Scottish Literature Forum.
- Ongoing contact with, and exploration of the potential of, these organisations through an actual or electronic newsletter was seen as a very useful development.
- The ABC pamphlet providing brief details of the LiL organisations was considered a convenient and practical document that should be available to all schools and departments, in both real and virtual formats.
- Rural and local needs in enhancing reader development were not always being met, it was felt. Relatively little was thought readily available beyond Central Scotland, and schools often needed to engage with non-SBT endorsed writers and arts groups locally.
- There was, however, much existing engagement with local universities, particularly with senior pupils, but also with educational research studies of primary learning. This engagement might be built upon.
- Locally there was significant interest in varieties of Scots language, and resources or staff development opportunities here were welcomed.
- A general and specific need for continuing professional development was indicated, but this needed to be linked to curricular and classroom actualities.
- Beginning and Early Career teachers had particular development needs, which might be effectively linked to school development planning priorities, so that Heads and Local Authority advisory staff could pragmatically support involvement with LiL organisations.
- Financial cutbacks have increasingly led to problems in funding LiL opportunities. Networked, partnership or shared funding arrangements between schools, using central venues and community support, should be explored.
- Library and Resource staff can offer expertise and guidance that tends to be more used by primary than by secondary schools at present. This extends from co-ordinating author visits and venues to creating booklists and thematic resource material towards new teaching approaches.
- The Scottish Book Trust website is highly valued by staff, and might be extended to make links with other resources, websites, teaching materials, and also schools (for example, by including examples of children's creative work done in response to author visits).
- Generally, the more lesson development activities that could be included with particular texts or featured authors in mind, the more teachers would tend to use the site, or to engage with LiL organisations who offered such support.
- The 'Scottish' dimension of Scottish Book Trust's work was valued, and yet there was also a sense that broader links with other UK writing would also be useful.

## Focus Group Findings

- There was a need to consider extending the reader development activity of Scottish Book Trust (and other LiL organisations) to include current growth areas such as cross-curricular non-fiction texts and graphic literacy.
- Personal e-mail contact was welcomed, perhaps through some sort of opt-in network of ‘members’, revised every few years to cope with staffing and personal changes. It was felt that multiple contacts would be necessary to get the message through to time-pressured staff through [a] individual e-mail, [b] an electronic newsletter to schools for distribution to relevant staff (possibly including not only forthcoming events but also articles on featured organisations or school projects to demonstrate the potential of LiL), and [c] actual copies of the ABC pamphlet also being sent to all schools for staff room or classroom use.
- Overall, moving beyond information to actual engagement, it was felt that local and partnership support would be helpful to schools, with some ‘status’ being given to LiL organisations by the support and advice of local Quality Assurance officers, and possibly by Learning and Teaching Scotland.

# 5: Analysis of Survey Responses

## Details of the survey

The survey was conducted using the on-line, web-based, survey services of Zoomerang ([www.zoomerang.com](http://www.zoomerang.com)) and was open from 14 October to 5 December 2008. Invitations to participate in the survey were sent to the Head Teachers of all schools in Scotland who could be contacted by e-mail (this was virtually all schools, with the exception of a small number which appeared to have changed e-mail addresses). The Head Teachers were asked to forward the invitation to participate in the survey to any members of their staff who had a particular interest in the role of literature in learning. The covering message emphasised that this invitation was not restricted to specialist teachers of literature (for example, English teachers in secondary schools), but was open to all with an interest. We have no way of knowing how many head teachers did forward the invitation to participate to members of their staff. It is important to emphasise that this was not a survey based on a random sample of all teachers, but reflects the views of a self-selected group of volunteer respondents who may be assumed to have a specialist interest in the role of literature and also language in learning.

Two hundred and one completed survey responses were received. Detailed actual and percentage figures for each of the questions appear in Appendix E.

## The background of the respondents

Survey responses were received from 27 out of the 32 Scottish local authorities, and came from all sizes of schools, from the smallest with fewer than 70 pupils (13% of responses), through to the largest with more than 700 pupils (37%). The largest percentage came from schools in large urban settings (35%), followed by those which classified their geographical setting as 'accessible town' (29%), though there were also responses from settings described as 'remote town' (4%), 'other urban' (9%), 'accessible rural' (16%), and 'remote rural' (7%). Ninety seven per cent of the responses came from schools in the state sector, although five (3%) were from the independent sector.

Primary and secondary establishments were almost equally represented in the responses, which were classified according to the main function of the school or organisation in which the respondents worked. Six responses (3%) were from people who worked in library services or resource centres and were not attached to a particular school. Respondents who identified themselves as librarians but who were attached to an individual school were classified according to the type of school. Ninety five responses (47%) came from primary schools. Of these, 37 included some pre-school provision, and 3 included some form of special unit. Ninety four responses (47%) came from secondary schools, two of which included special units, and three of which were multi-stage schools which also provided primary and pre-school classes. Six responses came from schools which were solely concerned with special educational provision. There were no responses from schools or centres which were entirely concerned with pre-school provision.



The largest proportion of responses came from those who identified themselves as Head Teachers, Depute Head Teachers, or other members of a senior management team (72 responses, 37%), while 9 (5%) were Faculty Heads, 41 (21%) Principal Teachers, 37 (19%) Class teachers, and 16 (8%) Librarians. Of those who identified themselves as having a subject specialism (apart from the librarians) the only group of any significant size was that of teachers of English, of whom there were forty four.

Given the seniority of so many of the respondents, it is not surprising that the majority of them (61%) had been involved in teaching for sixteen or more years. Only two (1%) were probationers, and eleven (6%) had been teaching for five years or fewer. We are therefore dealing with survey responses from those who tend to be experienced and relatively senior, and are mostly working in mainstream primary and secondary schools.

Using this background data it was possible to test for differences between the responses from primary and secondary schools. Where these are statistically significant they are reported below. Because of the low numbers of respondents from library services and from special schools, it was not possible to test to see if these groups differed from the others. Similarly it was not possible to test for the influence of years of experience on responses, as there were so few relative newcomers to the teaching profession amongst the respondents.

### The teaching of literature

Question 11 of the survey presented the respondents with a number of statements about the role of literature in education and their own attitudes and feelings towards it (see Appendix F). They were asked to respond using a five-point scale running from '1 = Strongly disagree' through to '5 = Strongly agree'. The results are summarised below with the responses to each item categorised according to the overall median response. The median is a measure of the central tendency of the results, it marks the point on the scale where 50% of responses lie on each side of that point.

Question 11: Below are a number of statements about the teaching of literature in Scottish schools. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement	1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Unsure	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree	Row total (N)
a) The role of literature in education has a high priority within Scottish education	3 2%	12 7%	20 11%	74 41%	72 40%	181
b) Writing and language skills are fundamental to course work in all subject areas	5 3%	4 2%	4 2%	32 18%	136 75%	181
c) I am comfortable teaching and supporting pupils in their oral and written language skills	3 2%	2 1%	6 3%	53 30%	114 64%	178
d) I feel fully confident in my ability to support my students in studying literature	4 2%	5 3%	18 10%	64 36%	89 49%	180

## Literature in Learning within Curriculum for Excellence Framework

e) I would welcome links with libraries, writers' organisations, or websites to develop cross-curricular literacy	4 2%	3 2%	14 8%	52 29%	105 59%	178
f) There is a wide range of resources available to me to support me if I wish to include the study of literature in my teaching	6 3%	13 8%	20 12%	87 50%	47 27%	173
g) I am fully aware of sources of support available to me to help me to include the study of literature in my teaching	6 3%	16 9%	44 25%	88 50%	23 13%	177
h) I have made links with external agencies that have developed my students' literacy skills	18 10%	40 23%	37 21%	65 37%	17 10%	177
i) The place of literature in learning will be enhanced with the introduction of <i>Curriculum for Excellence</i>	8 4%	10 6%	70 39%	54 30%	37 21%	179
j) The study of literature has a valuable contribution to make within the context of cross-curricular work	4 2%	2 1%	15 8%	74 42%	82 46%	177
k) There is a need for more CPD literature and language courses to support the teaching of literature	3 2%	9 5%	29 16%	82 47%	53 30%	176
l) There should be a much wider range of different types of literature available and affordable for students and schools	3 2%	4 2%	22 12%	70 39%	80 45%	179
m) Students benefit greatly from school visits by real writers, poets and storytellers	3 2%	3 2%	12 7%	40 22%	121 68%	179
n) Staff in my school already develop the literacy potential of external visits or agencies	4 2%	22 12%	50 28%	71 40%	32 18%	179
o) Pupils currently receive enough support and encouragement in their own writing and research outside of English and Language classrooms	12 7%	41 23%	85 48%	31 18%	8 5%	177

### Items to which the overall median response was 'Strongly agree'

- Q11b: Writing and language skills are fundamental to course work in all areas
- Q11c: I am comfortable teaching and supporting pupils in their oral and written language skills
- Q11e: I would welcome links with libraries, writers' organisations, or websites to develop cross-curricular literacy
- Q11m: Students benefit greatly from school visits by real writers, poets and storytellers

### Items to which the overall median response was 'Agree'

- Q11a: The role of literature in education has a high priority in Scottish education
- Q11d: I feel fully confident in my ability to support my students in studying literature
- Q11f: There is a wide range of resources available to me to support me if I wish to include the study of literature in my teaching

- Q11g: I am fully aware of sources of support available to me to help me to include the study of literature in my teaching
- Q11i: The place of literature in learning will be enhanced with the introduction of *Curriculum for Excellence*
- Q11j: The study of literature has a valuable contribution to make within the context of cross-curricular work
- Q11k: There is a need for more CPD literature and language courses to support the teaching of literature
- Q11l: There should be a much wider range of different types of literature available and affordable for students and schools
- Q11n: Staff in my school already develop the literacy potential of external visits or agencies

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Unsure’

- Q11h: I have made links with external agencies that have developed my students’ literary skills
- Q11o: Pupils currently receive enough support and encouragement in their own writing and research outside of English and Language classrooms

There were no items in this question where the overall median response category was either ‘disagree’ or ‘strongly disagree’.

There was ***a strong tendency for the respondents to the survey to agree with almost all the items*** in this question. In particular *they were supportive of the central place which literature has in education and saw the value of links with literary organisations and visits to schools by writers*. This might be expected as the survey was deliberately targeted at those with an interest in this area. There was *slightly less agreement about whether literature does, in fact, have the high priority in Scottish education* which these respondents would give it, and whether its place will be enhanced by current developments. They were *decidedly unsure about whether the links with organisations which they desired have been established, and about the place of writing and research outside of English classrooms*.

There were some differences between the responses from primary and secondary schools. ***Respondents from primary schools were more likely to be positive*** (i.e. were more likely to tend towards the ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ end of the scale) about items Q11a (priority of literature in education), Q11i (the extent to which *Curriculum for Excellence* will enhance the role of literature in learning), and Q11o (the extent to which pupils receive enough support and encouragement in their own writing and research outside of English and Language classrooms). *These differences are likely to reflect the more integrated nature of the primary classroom*.

## Types of literature

Question 12 presented the respondents with a list of genres or aspects of literature and asked them about the extent to which they would value advice and support about them for their teaching. Once again a five-point scale was used and the results are summarised below.

Question 12: Are there any particular genres of literature for which you would value advice and support in your teaching? Please indicate below the extent to which you would value advice and support in the teaching of these different genres of literature.	1 Not required	2	3 Unsure	4	5 Highly valued	Row total (N)
a) Poetry	23 13%	25 15%	20 12%	63 37%	41 24%	172
b) Drama	20 12%	21 12%	23 13%	57 33%	50 29%	171
c) Novels / fiction	35 21%	37 22%	27 16%	49 29%	22 13%	170
d) Oral storytelling including folktales	19 11%	16 9%	31 18%	68 40%	38 22%	172
e) Graphic novels	15 9%	18 11%	35 21%	66 39%	36 21%	170
f) Picture books for younger readers	69 41%	31 19%	26 16%	26 16%	15 9%	167
g) 'Classic' literature	28 17%	24 14%	35 21%	58 34%	24 14%	169
h) Scottish literature	24 14%	16 9%	26 15%	65 38%	38 22%	169
i) Literature in the Scots language	25 15%	11 7%	35 21%	60 36%	37 22%	168
j) Gaelic literature	83 51%	15 9%	30 18%	13 8%	23 14%	164
k) The writing process	12 7%	28 16%	24 14%	73 43%	34 20%	171
l) The publishing process	12 7%	23 14%	38 22%	73 43%	24 14%	170
m) Non-fiction	17 10%	30 18%	17 10%	71 42%	34 20%	169
n) On-line resources (including Research Methods Wikis and Blogs)	13 8%	11 7%	14 8%	77 46%	53 32%	168

Items to which the overall median response was 'Highly valued'

- No items

Items to which the overall median response was ‘4’ (= Valued, but not at the highest level).

- Q12a: Poetry
- Q12b: Drama
- Q12d: Oral storytelling including folktales
- Q12e: Graphic novels
- Q12h: Scottish literature
- Q12i: Literature in the Scots language
- Q12k: The writing process
- Q12l: The publishing process
- Q12m: Non-fiction
- Q12n: On-line resources (including research methods, wikis and blogs)

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Unsure’

- Q12c: Novels / fiction
- Q12g: ‘Classic’ literature

Items to which the overall median response was ‘2’ (= Not valued to any great extent).

- Q12f: Picture books for younger readers

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Not required’

- Q12j: Gaelic literature

It is very likely that the lack of any overall median responses falling into the ‘highly valued’ category simply reflects that these respondents tended to have an already developed interest or specialism in the teaching of literature and therefore did not feel that they had any extreme deficit in their knowledge or expertise. Nevertheless, there was still *a fair degree of agreement that they would value some degree of advice or support for many aspects of literature and literary production*. The item which received the *highest value rating overall was item Q12n (On-line resources)*, perhaps reflecting the relative newness and rapid development of this area. It was only in the relatively *specialised areas of picture books for younger readers and Gaelic literature that the overall median response fell on the negative side of the scale*.

Once again, however, there were some differences between primary and secondary school respondents. *Primary school respondents* tended to place *a higher value on advice and support in the areas of poetry, drama, ‘classic’ literature, Scottish literature, and literature in the Scots language*, while *secondary respondents* placed *a higher value on advice and support for non-fiction*. It is possible that these differences reflect the fact that most of the primary teacher respondents will have had a generalist training (and may therefore value support in the teaching of specific literary genres), while many of the secondary teacher respondents were specialist teachers of English, with a strong background in these areas, for whom ‘non-fiction’ may appear the most alien of these aspects of literature (25% of secondary respondents rated advice and support on non-fiction as ‘highly valued’).

## Target groups

Question 14 asked if there were any particular age groups for which the respondents would value advice and support in their teaching.

Question 14: Are there any particular age groups of readers for which you would value advice and support in your teaching? Please indicate below the extent to which you would value advice and support in the teaching of these groups.	1 Not required	2	3 Unsure	4	5 Highly valued	Row total (N)
a) Pre-readers	85 53%	16 10%	13 8%	31 19%	15 9%	160
b) Beginning readers	67 42%	25 16%	9 6%	37 23%	21 13%	159
c) Developing readers	37 23%	24 15%	13 8%	59 36%	29 18%	162
d) Fluent pre-teen readers	49 31%	16 10%	18 12%	43 28%	30 19%	156
e) Young teenage readers	62 41%	13 9%	20 13%	36 24%	21 14%	152
f) Older teenage readers	69 45%	10 7%	23 15%	27 18%	23 15%	152
g) Adult readers	91 65%	7 5%	22 16%	10 7%	9 6%	139
h) Reluctant readers	12 7%	12 7%	13 8%	63 39%	62 38%	162
i) Young people with reading difficulties	8 5%	14 8%	13 8%	59 36%	71 43%	165
j) Gifted students	26 16%	14 9%	16 10%	39 24%	67 41%	162
k) Readers who are learning English as a second or additional language	21 13%	9 6%	27 17%	36 22%	69 43%	162

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Highly valued’

- No items

Items to which the overall median response was ‘4’ (= Valued, but not at the highest level)..

- Q14c: Developing readers
- Q14h: Reluctant readers
- Q14i: Young people with reading difficulties
- Q14j: Gifted students

- Q14k: Readers who are learning English as a second or additional language Items to which the overall median response was ‘Unsure’
- Q14d: Fluent pre-teen readers
- Q14e: Young teenage readers

Items to which the overall median response was ‘2’ (= Not valued to any great extent).

- Q14b: Beginning readers
- Q14f: Older teenage readers

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Not required’

- Q14a: Pre-readers
- Q14g: Adult readers

It was notable that those items where the overall median response was ‘agree’ tended to be those which may be seen as presenting teachers with particular problems or challenges, while those where the overall median response was ‘not required’ may be regarded as groups which are outwith the remit of the majority of our respondents.

There were, as might be expected with these items, a number of differences between respondents in primary and secondary schools. **Primary respondents** were more likely to *place value on support for teaching pre-readers, beginning readers, and gifted readers*, while **secondary respondents** were more likely to *place value on support for teaching young teenage readers, older teenage readers, and readers who are learning English as a second or additional language*.

### Target stages

To some extent, question 15 covered similar territory to question 14, only this time it asked about support for teaching literature within particular stages of education.

Question 15: Are there any particular stages of education for which you would value advice and support in your teaching of literature? Please indicate below the extent to which you would value advice and support in the teaching of these stages.	1 Not required	2	3 Unsure	4	5 Highly valued	Row total (N)
a) Early years, pre-readers	87 55%	16 10%	16 10%	25 16%	15 9%	159
b) Early years, primary education	80 50%	22 14%	9 6%	32 20%	16 10%	159
c) Middle years, primary education	71 45%	16 10%	13 8%	39 25%	18 11%	157
d) Upper years, primary education	51 33%	15 10%	9 6%	51 33%	29 19%	155

e) Lower years, secondary education	65 45%	11 8%	22 15%	22 15%	23 16%	143
f) Middle years, secondary education	68 48%	11 8%	17 12%	25 18%	21 15%	142
g) Upper years, secondary education	70 50%	10 7%	22 16%	16 12%	21 15%	139
h) Post-compulsory education	97 72%	5 4%	16 12%	10 7%	6 4%	134

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Highly valued’

- No items

Items to which the overall median response was ‘4’ (= Valued, but not at the highest level)

- Q15d: Upper years, primary education

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Unsure’

- No items

Items to which the overall median response was ‘2’ (= Not valued to any great extent).

- Q15c: Middle years, primary education
- Q15e: Lower years, secondary education
- Q15f: Middle years, secondary education

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Not required’

- Q15a: Early years, pre-readers
- Q15b: Early years, primary education
- Q15g: Upper years, secondary education
- Q15h: Post-compulsory education.

Again, these results masked differences between primary and secondary school respondents. The differences are as might be expected: primary school respondents were more likely to place a higher value on support at all stages of primary education, while secondary respondents placed a higher value on support for the stages of secondary education. For *primary school respondents* only, the median response category for ‘early years, pre-readers’ and ‘early years, primary education’ was ‘unsure’, while that for ‘middle years, primary education’, and ‘upper years, primary education’ was at point 4 on the scale (‘valued’). For *secondary school respondents* the median response category for ‘lower years, secondary education’ and ‘middle years, secondary education’ was at point 4 (‘valued’) while that for ‘upper years, secondary education’ was ‘unsure’. We can see that **the concentration of valued support is on the central years of education (middle and upper primary, lower and middle secondary).**



## Types of resources

Question 16 asked respondents to consider the types of resources which might support their teaching, and the extent to which they would value them.

Question 16: Are there any particular types of resources which you would value to support your teaching? Please indicate below the extent to which you would value the following types of resources.	1 Not required	2	3 Unsure	4	5 Highly valued	Row total (N)
a) CPD / in-service courses	8 5%	16 10%	22 13%	75 46%	42 26%	163
b) Teaching guides on specific works or writers	5 3%	14 9%	15 9%	76 46%	54 33%	164
c) Conferences or events for teachers	15 9%	23 14%	32 20%	57 35%	34 21%	161
d) Information leaflets from literary organisations	16 10%	24 15%	37 23%	57 35%	27 17%	161
e) A central web site with links to sources of further information	1 1%	6 4%	9 6%	64 39%	83 51%	163
f) Resources including ideas, materials, and methodology suggestions	0 0%	5 3%	12 7%	62 38%	84 52%	163
g) Outreach work in schools by literature / arts organisations	8 5%	5 3%	18 11%	65 40%	67 41%	163
h) School visits by practising writers, poets, or storytellers	4 3%	3 2%	10 6%	47 29%	96 60%	160
i) Writers, poets, or storytellers in residence	17 11%	10 6%	25 16%	37 23%	71 44%	160
j) Conferences or events for students	15 9%	9 6%	37 23%	56 35%	43 27%	160

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Highly valued’

- Q16e: A central web site with links to sources of further information
- Q16f: Resources including ideas, materials, and methodology suggestions
- Q16h: School visits by practising writers, poets, or storytellers

Items to which the overall median response was ‘4’ (= Valued, but not at the highest level)

- Q16a: CPD / in-service courses
- Q16b: Teaching guides on specific works or writers
- Q16c: Conferences or events for teachers
- Q16d: Information leaflets from literary organisations
- Q16g: Outreach work in schools by literature / arts organisations

- Q16i: Writers, poets, or storytellers in residence
- Q16j: Conferences or events for students

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Unsure’

- No Items

Items to which the overall median response was ‘2’ (= Not valued to any great extent).

- No items

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Not required’

- No items.

It was clear that the respondents would value all types of resources to support their teaching of literature. No items fell on the negative side of the scale, or even on the central neutral point.

Although there were some statistically significant differences between primary and secondary responses, these were not great. **Primary respondents** tended to place a *slightly higher value on Q16g (outreach work), Q16h (school visits by practising writers), and Q16i (writers in residence)*, while **secondary respondents** tended to place a *slightly higher value on Q16c (conferences or events for teachers)*.

### Types of communication preferred

Question 18 asked the respondents about various means of communication with them, and asked them to rate them according to how effective they would be. Once again a five-point scale was used, from ‘1’ (= Not at all effective) to ‘5’ (= Highly effective).

Question 18: Are there any particular forms of communication which you would value to support your teaching? Please indicate below the extent to which you would value the following forms of communication	1 Not required	2	3 Unsure	4	5 Highly valued	Row total (N)
a) Direct mailing to yourself	20 13%	25 16%	16 10%	57 36%	42 26%	160
b) Direct e-mail to yourself	10 6%	13 8%	11 7%	55 34%	72 45%	161
c) Information via GLOW	42 27%	19 12%	49 31%	27 17%	19 12%	156
d) LTS Newsletter	20 13%	27 17%	34 21%	62 39%	17 11%	160
e) A single web site to which I could refer for information and links to appropriate materials	2 1%	0 0%	11 7%	44 27%	106 65%	163
f) Information sent to school office in hard copy and circulated within the school as appropriate	29 18%	32 20%	23 15%	50 32%	23 15%	157

g) Information sent to school office by e-mail and circulated within the school as appropriate	33 21%	26 16%	30 19%	45 28%	25 16%	159
h) Press and news reports	37 23%	43 27%	43 27%	35 22%	2 1%	160
i) Personal contact with providers of support	18 11%	17 11%	28 18%	49 31%	46 29%	158
j) Information via the school library / library services	33 21%	28 18%	31 20%	38 24%	26 17%	156

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Highly effective’

- Q18e: A single web site to which I could refer for information and links to appropriate materials

Items to which the overall median response was ‘4’ (= Effective, but not at the highest level)

- Q18a: Direct mailing to yourself
- Q18b: Direct e-mail to yourself
- Q18i: Personal contact with providers of support

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Unsure’

- Q18c: Information via GLOW
- Q18d: LTS Newsletter
- Q18f: Information sent to school office in hard copy and circulated within the school as appropriate
- Q18g: Information sent to school office by e-mail and circulated within the school as appropriate
- Q18j: Information via the school library / library services

Items to which the overall median response was ‘2’ (= Not effective to any great extent).

- Q18h: Press and news reports

Items to which the overall median response was ‘Not at all effective’

- No items

The idea of a single web site as an access point for information and resources was regarded as the most effective means of communication by these respondents, followed closely by various direct means of communication to them personally (either through mail or e-mail, or through personal contact).

There was only one instance of a statistically significant difference between primary and secondary respondents. This was that *primary respondents* were slightly more likely than *secondary respondents* to regard communication through GLOW as effective. Though the median response category for them still fell within the ‘unsure’ category, a higher percentage of them (16%) thought that it could be ‘highly effective’. Of *secondary respondents*, only 9% thought that communication via GLOW would be ‘highly effective’.

### Frequency and timing of information

The respondents were also asked how often they would choose to receive information to support their teaching of literature (Question 19). The *most common response was 'once a term' (41%)*, although 29% responded 'as it becomes available', and 27% 'once a month'.

When they asked about the *preferred timing of information* (Question 20), *the most popular response was 'June to August' (38%)*, with 26% preferring 'April to May', 23% 'September to December', and 13% 'January to March'.

There were no statistically significant differences between primary and secondary teachers in these responses.

### Familiarity with organisations supporting literature

Question 21 asked respondents about their degree of familiarity with a list of organisations which are members of the Scottish Literature Forum. This question used a four-point scale where '1' = 'No knowledge', '2' = 'Know by name', '3' = 'Some knowledge', and '4' = 'Know and use'.

Question 21: Below is a list of organisations which are members of the Scottish Literature Forum. For each organisation, please indicate how familiar you are with it using the following scale	1 No knowledge	2 Know by name	3 Some knowledge	4 Know and use	Row total (N)
a) Association for Scottish Literary Studies	81 51%	45 28%	24 15%	9 6%	159
b) CILIPS (Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals in Scotland)	121 76%	17 11%	10 6%	12 8%	160
c) Edinburgh International Book Festival	8 5%	19 12%	75 47%	58 36%	160
d) Edinburgh UNESCO City of Literature	97 61%	27 17%	23 15%	11 7%	158
e) The Gaelic Books Council	132 83%	20 13%	5 3%	2 1%	159
f) Itchy Coo	57 36%	31 19%	33 21%	38 24%	159
g) Literature in Learning	77 48%	51 32%	31 19%	1 1%	160
h) Moniack Mhor	139 87%	7 4%	10 6%	3 2%	159

i) NALD (National Association for Literature Development)	141 90%	11 7%	3 2%	1 1%	156
j) National Library of Scotland	12 8%	33 21%	77 49%	36 23%	158
k) Playwrights' Studio Scotland	117 74%	24 15%	15 9%	3 2%	159
l) The Saltire Society	31 20%	61 39%	56 35%	10 6%	158
m) Scots Language Centre	66 42%	66 42%	22 14%	5 3%	159
n) Scottish Book Trust	25 16%	44 28%	48 30%	41 26%	158
o) Scottish Language Dictionaries	48 31%	49 31%	38 24%	22 14%	157
p) Scottish Society of Playwrights	112 70%	34 21%	12 8%	1 1%	159
q) Scottish PEN	130 84%	15 10%	8 5%	2 1%	155
r) Scottish Poetry Library	78 51%	41 27%	20 13%	14 9%	153
s) Publishing Scotland	106 68%	31 20%	17 11%	3 2%	157
t) Scottish Storytelling Centre	53 33%	55 34%	30 19%	22 14%	160
u) Society of Authors in Scotland	108 68%	31 19%	16 10%	4 3%	159

Items to which the overall median response was 'Know and use'

- No items

Items to which the overall median response was 'Some knowledge'

- Q21c: Edinburgh International Book Festival
- Q21j: National Library of Scotland
- Q21n: Scottish Book Trust

Items to which the overall median response was 'Know by name'

- Q21f: Itchy Coo

- Q21g: Literature in Learning
- Q21i: The Saltire Society
- Q21m: Scots Language Centre
- Q21o: Scottish Language Dictionaries
- Q21t: Scottish Storytelling Centre

Items to which the overall median response was ‘No knowledge’

- Q21a: Association for Scottish Literary Studies
- Q21b: CILIPS (Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals in Scotland)
- Q21d: Edinburgh UNESCO City of Literature
- Q21e: The Gaelic Books Council
- Q21h: Moniack Mhor
- Q21i: NALD: (National Association for Literature Development)
- Q21k: Playwrights’ Studio Scotland
- Q21p: Scottish Society of Playwrights
- Q21q: Scottish PEN
- Q21r: Scottish Poetry Library
- Q21s: Publishing Scotland
- Q21u: Society of Authors in Scotland.

Although there were none of these organisations for which the overall median response was ‘know and use’, this disguises the fact that, *for some of them, there was clear evidence that a significant minority of our respondents did make use of them.* Those **organisations which more than 10% of our respondents said that they ‘knew and used’** were:

- Edinburgh International Book Festival (36%)
- Scottish Book Trust (26%)
- Itchy Coo (24%)
- National Library of Scotland (23%)
- Scottish Language Dictionaries (14%)
- Scottish Storytelling Centre (14%)

There were also some differences between primary and secondary respondents. **Primary respondents** were more likely to have a *higher awareness of Itchy Coo* (the proportion of primary respondents ‘knowing and using’ Itchy Coo publications was 33%). **Secondary respondents** were more likely to have a *higher awareness of the Association for Scottish Literary Studies, CILIPS, Edinburgh International Book Festival, Edinburgh UNESCO City of Literature, Moniack Mhor, Playwrights’ Studio Scotland, Scottish Society of Playwrights,*

*Scottish PEN, and the Scottish Poetry Library.* In most cases these differences were caused by quite small numbers, and may well reflect the specialist interests of some of our respondents.

### **Final comments**

Twenty seven respondents made some additional comments to their survey return. They tended to be highly supportive of the role of literature in learning. This comment from a primary teacher is typical and reflects the dominant tone:

*Literature is one of the greatest tools to power and develop the acquisition and appreciation of language skills. It is one of the foundation stones of education and should be integral to our daily lives within and outwith school. As teachers we should all be encouraging our children's parents to take time to share and enjoy literature in all its forms.*

The point about the importance of enjoying literature was repeated by several respondents. A small number complained that it was threatened by what they saw as a dominant culture of targets and attainment levels within education, as in this comment from a secondary teacher:

*We need time for reading / listening for pleasure without it being assessed and measured!*

There were also some comments on the role which Scottish literature can play, almost all of which were supportive, although one did caution against the dangers of parochialism, and several complaints, too, about the time and financial pressures under which schools operate, which reinforced the need for readily-available, cheap, and age-relevant resources to assist in the teaching of literature.

### **Summary**

- The survey was web-based and was conducted between mid-October and the beginning of December 2008.
- Two hundred and one usable responses were received. The majority of respondents were based in primary or secondary schools, although a small number were from library services or special education schools. Respondents tended to be in promoted posts, and to have many years experience in education.
- Respondents tended to be highly supportive of the role of literature in learning, as might be expected given that the survey was specifically targeted at those with an interest in this area. They were slightly less sure that it was given the high priority which they desired.
- The respondents would value advice and support on the teaching of almost all genres or aspects of literature, and on non-fiction writing.

- The respondents would particularly value advice and support on the teaching of those ages of pupils and stages of education with which they are professionally concerned, whether it be primary or secondary. Support would be especially valued for the teaching of literature in the middle and upper years of primary education, and the lower and middle years of secondary education. Support for pupils with a variety of reading difficulties, and for gifted children, would also be welcome.
- All forms of resource to support teaching would be welcomed and the respondents could see a high value in providing a central web site for information and resources, and in direct and personal communication with them. The preferred frequency of communication would be around once per term. A large proportion of the respondents would particularly welcome information during the summer months (June to August).
- The overall level of awareness of the individual member organisations of the Scottish Literature Forum was not high among the respondents, although some of the more high profile organisations were better known. Nevertheless there was evidence that significant minorities of the respondents were aware of organisations which supported their own areas of specialist interest.



## 6: Conclusions and Possible Next Steps

There was generally a concordance between the views of the focus groups participants and survey respondents. There was agreement on the value of literature in the curriculum, the need for continuing staff development (particularly with regard to informational and other non-fiction texts), the growing importance of well-linked and relevant websites, and the worth of regular electronic information on a regular basis. This latter might well contain information on LiL organisations and activities which teachers currently knew little of.

Although the survey analysis focused on median levels of response and the broad picture of professional views across Scotland, there is much room for reflection around the percentage figures on either side of the median. What is clear is that Scottish teachers' enthusiasm for literature- and language-based curriculum development is accompanied by an often hazy sense of what is actually on offer, and by a worry about the financial implications of engagement with outside organisations in a time of budgetary constraint.

A considered approach to co-ordinated or partnership developments seems called for, so that the separate LiL organisations can co-operate in 'getting their message across' in ways that respond to current needs. *Curriculum for Excellence* offers one useful focus for partnership work between organisations and schools, but there are so many educational issues involved here (many of them at present unresolved) that it may be better to plan for engagement with schools at a broader level.

A possible model for this is outlined below, comprising a range of 39 possible Action Points

- *at different levels* of the educational system (Local Authority, School and Staff);
- *in development work* with different texts or genres relevant to school needs at various stages (as indicated by focus groups and survey);
- *in developing effective communication* with schools (with a more informed sense of teachers' preferences).

Within each of the sub-sections indicated below, an attempt has been made to prioritise the issues and ideas presented, with *key issues appearing earlier in each listing*. Prioritisation is based partly on the researchers' experience, partly on whether a particular idea seemed to gain general assent within a focus group or groups, and partly on areas of clearly overlapping concern in focus groups and national survey. It is recognised that some of the ideas which emerged from school staff are already put in place or planned for by several of the LiL organisations. However, what is reflected here is the current state of perception in schools, which will sometimes be at a distance from the reality of provision.

It is now a matter for the various members of the Scottish Literature Forum to select which are the most feasible of these 39 steps to take forward in the immediate and medium term. Not all the ideas listed below will be manageable within the staffing and funding constraints of each particular organisation. But, as with the schools themselves, there may be real advantage to be had from working in partnership towards identified goals, and thus *10 points are ultimately selected as key considerations* for developing Literature in Learning within the current educational context. These are presented in the Summing Up below.

## Action at different levels within the educational system

### A. Local Authority

1. **An Advisory Panel** might be established, comprising Local Authority Quality Assurance and Resources staff, HMIE and LT Scotland representation, teachers, teacher educators and creative writers, to explore issues of co-ordination and extension of the work of the Scottish Literature Forum in regard to schools. (This may effectively divide into two working groups: a policy group and a practice group.)

Local Authority staff and LT Scotland staff already working on *Curriculum for Excellence* should be involved. But more generally, Quality Assurance staff and Heads of Service have the advantage of an overview of issues in negotiating with Head Teachers in carrying projects forward and in facilitating partnership links between schools. The aim here is that LiL planning can also be linked to current themes, skills and issues, and to the Yearly Planning Cycle at individual school or local level. Quality Assurance staff are aware of what is on School Improvement Plans, and can help make the case for relevant LiL input, with its staff development potential as well as benefit to pupils.

2. It is important to **work with HMIE** to explore what their key concerns are in the medium term, making use of their national experience of monitoring a wide range of schools annually. LiL organisations therefore need to discuss with HMIE specialist inspectors in Arts and English the emergent priorities and staff development needs, and work towards engagement with schools in the light of that discussion.
3. Schools cite author or **speaker travel costs** as a major difficulty in engaging with LiL organisations, yet these can also sometimes be shared between community and school budgets. There is a need to explore funding arrangements with Cultural Co-ordinators, or their equivalent, on cross-curricular dimensions of learning (e.g. cross-curricular work in literature and the expressive arts: text and drama/art/museum activities). Literature should not be separated from other cultural organisations.

The main goal is to encourage schools towards that crucial ‘next step’ of actually engaging with the resources and organisations on offer. Cluster working would be the best way forward on this, sharing and linking expenses (possibly on one shared voucher to spread the cost?).

4. The personality and **interests of individual teachers** seem to be factors that make a major difference to engagement or otherwise with LiL organisations. How can Head Teachers and the LiL organisations actually identify and make more effective use of such individual strengths?

Some sort of audit or more likely a national project may be needed, in order to create a supportive network between these particular teachers, and through them the schools they individually ‘represent’. ‘Partnership’ between schools and with different social,

cultural or commercial organisations is a current educational issue, and is a particular area where schools may be looking for ideas. As such, it may be a more effective focus of development than the general ‘literacy’ issue, which is perennial, and everywhere.

5. Given the **variability of arrangements** across Scotland, there is a need for LiL organisations to follow up on how any arrangement operates in actuality, through sampling teachers’ and pupils’ experience of the relevance of what was offered during an author or speaker visit.
6. Consideration could be given to organising **subject-specific CPD days**, possibly in the local university, with a Certificate of Attendance given so that this ‘counts’ for McCrone staff development time. There is probably a need for such LiL-sponsored CPD to have clear classroom relevance, possibly through links with subject staff in local Faculties of Education or Arts, or in co-operation with local teachers who show/know good practice.
7. Nationally there has been a **loss of subject-based Advisory staff**, and of a leadership role in literature and language as a consequence. The Local Authority Quality Assurance officer for ‘English’ or ‘Literacy’ may be a former Science teacher, for example, with little practical awareness of teaching strategies and needs. Subject Principal Teacher meetings at LA level have also diminished.

Could Scottish Book Trust or the other LiL organisations provide a leading or at least a facilitating role here, with consequent increase in engagement with schools? This might seem a tall order, yet it was seriously proposed at one focus group by a Principal Teacher of great experience, concerned at the loss of national and local occasions for subject specialists to debate matters of relevance to the teaching of literature and language.

### ***B. School***

8. **Schools may tend to work ‘independently’ of library services**, not knowing what is available. They may also tend to make ‘unreasonable’ demands or last-minute changes, or have unrealistic expectations of writers. Shorter period lengths in secondary schools also create problems.

A Do’s and Don’ts publication is felt to be needed for schools, including an ideas-list of ways of involving pupils, especially in cross-curricular activities related to any writer’s themes. Writers themselves might be involved in creating this, but should themselves be open to learning about the realities of teachers’ working experience.

Author visits are often not clearly tied into curriculum, because of teachers’ lack of preparation time, or of a system of guidance to support visits. Joint work between Library, English and other staff might focus e.g. on Advanced Higher texts in advance, to enable library research and formulation of key questions by students.

9. **The process of book-making and book-marketing** can be considered as a literacy awareness activity, linked with the ‘publishing’ stage of the writing process, and also generally with information and persuasive texts that accompany imaginative ones. This might be a way of extending the current emphasis on literary as compared with other genres of writing, where non-fictional writing is perceived as an area of need.
10. **The particular needs of rural schools** might be explored through a survey and case study of two Local Authorities, North and South, organised with Advisory and Support services. Problems of distance from bookshops might be countered by considering the Aberdeen Book Bus idea for an urban secondary and its associate primaries, now being extended into rural Aberdeenshire.
11. A main **disincentive to uptake of LiL opportunities is cost**, but this may be countered by word of mouth publicity. If one school visit by a writer or group is provided free, provided that other teachers from neighbouring schools are invited, then future invitations are likely to increase across an Authority.
12. A voluntary **communications/literacy group** might be encouraged in schools, comprising library and interested staff as a sounding board for resource or other issues. Cross-curricular representation can move towards shared development work on topics or texts. Meetings should be limited to 3 or 4 per session. (Can LiL link into this sort of development with partner schools?)
13. There needs to be a **clear awareness within any school of the procedures** involved in booking visiting writers/speakers. Payroll issues etc vary in LAs. This could be highlighted in communication with schools, particularly with the needs of new staff in mind.

Details of visits should also go on any school news circular, in print or electronic format, to demonstrate and explain such learning links to parents and others.

### ***C. Staff***

14. Teachers need **lists of active, realistic and purposeful learning contexts** emerging from language and literature opportunities or texts. These may appear as additional pamphlets, or web-resources, or as author-related materials that might appear in an electronic newsletter.

It may be possible for LiL staff to link with local university Teacher Education Institutions in this regard, perhaps involving teachers in training in upper BED courses and PGCE primary and secondary courses, together with lecturers and/or local children’s writers, to enhance knowledge of LiL’s aims among beginning teachers.

In the first instance, however, Literacy Co-ordinators in schools might be contacted, to explore whether links with local library services and SBT or other organisations

are active (remembering that these posts vary in the number and roles of personnel involved across local authorities) and to explore more closely the authors, texts and themes on which development work could most usefully focus.

15. **Working groups of teachers and others**, including experienced and younger school staff, academics and librarians, could also produce age- and stage-related lists of suitable texts, in conjunction with LiL partners and with a clear focus on creative relationship with texts in schools. These should also be linked with existing festivals, themes or remembrances (e.g. Holocaust Day, National Poetry Day etc) that might already be used in school. Scottish texts could be particularly highlighted, and the documents disseminated electronically to schools.
16. Consideration should be given to **defining a LiL progression of engagement** with teachers. This would start with students in pre-service training, and continue through their Probation year into CPD opportunities for more experienced teachers. This engagement might be validated by Local Authorities or a local university, and communicated to all teachers in formation through current Probation arrangements.

## **Texts and strategies for reading development**

### **A. Genres**

17. The electronic survey reveals **development needs in Scottish poetry and Scottish literature** generally, so LiL organisations should target developments here. School librarians could work with the next generation of newly qualified teachers on literature resources.

National interest in graphic novels has also increased since they were mentioned in broader definitions of literacy in CfE. This is another area for growth. LiL's expertise in children's literature and contact with picture book authors and illustrators could be used effectively to develop young readers' (and secondary readers') awareness of the relationship between picture and text. (See also point 36 below.)

18. There are **problems with the supply of Scottish texts in secondary schools**, with too much 1970s material still being used, often in a poor state. This relates partly to lack of money, partly to lack of knowledge among teachers. Therefore new texts need to be promoted, with back-up provided on teaching activities. Teachers might be sponsored to try out new texts, developing classroom activities to be shared with others, with free copies provided for such involvement.
19. **Local History projects with information writing** as well as imaginative writing can work very well in developing literacy. Community Education funding might be linked with such projects, and accessed to support developments.
20. There are several **examples of combined programmes** being organised with teacher, librarian and author working together over a 4 to 5 week period, the author

coming every second week, with the children's writing and reading in response to a range of genres or themes being developed or redrafted in between author visits, and then read and commented on by the author. Some 'publication' outcome can also follow, whether in print or electronic format. This alternative to the 'one-off single-author' visit has shown positive impact across the attainment spectrum, and could be documented for other schools to consider.

### ***B. Location and Levels***

21. **Literacy development using a cross-curricular focus** is much more difficult to organise in secondary schools than in primaries, because of the subject specialist focus of learning, and also the effect of national assessment results on teaching approaches. More help is likely to be needed there, with some worked examples being available electronically to enable secondary teachers to envisage the possibilities for learning across departments.
22. Experience suggests that **library settings for the writers' visits** generally work better, in terms of timing and organisation, and librarian awareness of writers' needs. This relates particularly to primary visits, but could be extended into secondary. These locations are good for community partnerships, but also have the benefit of introducing pupils to library resources in a meaningful and enjoyable context.
23. **Advanced Higher links in Creative Writing** and in Literature are a regular area of engagement with schools. Changes to the set texts should be monitored, and writers or speakers alerted to likely future requests. Generally across the whole age range, the needs of gifted students at different stages could be considered, with a focus on variation in language, theme and response.

### ***C. IT Developments***

24. Is it possible to make **hyperlinks to English authors' websites** or Facebook pages, to extend the current Scottish focus of SBT's website? Many texts used in schools are by non-Scottish authors, and it could be argued that reader development would be well served by such an extension. If it is not possible, then this might be a purposeful context for shared work with LT Scotland's GLOW facility. The survey does suggest that a significant number of teachers, particularly in secondary schools, may have reservations about GLOW, and there are anecdotal reports of some LAs finding its passwords difficult to integrate with their own systems. Nevertheless, the potential of GLOW, and through it a clear way into CfE, should be kept under active review.
25. **Video-conferencing with authors on the SBT or other LiL websites** could be explored, with additional funding being sought for this. Authors may do this free in return for the publicity involved: the content may be a sampling from a current book or work in progress; classroom activities; reflection on how a book or character originates.

## Communication

### A. *How*

26. **An electronic newsletter** for LiL might also be developed, as suggested in points 14 and 15 above (and in Section 4, penultimate bullet point) showing e.g. author experience, one school's activity, children's writing in response to a visit/topic, and suggestions for cross-curricular topics arising. Many of the LiL organisations are not sufficiently known by teachers, therefore the e-newsletter might present featured organisations, personalities and exemplars on a regular rolling basis, creating variety and interest. This development might build upon Scottish Book Trust's current *Learning and Inclusion Newsletter*, but with a different emphasis, both on the LiL organisations themselves and on school curriculum issues or terminology.

The newsletter might be tied in to a 'partnership' or membership status, paid for at school level. While this might defray some staffing costs in producing a newsletter, however, it would increase the complexity and demands of production, 'special offers', the need for regular quality content and so forth. It may be better, in the first instance, to see such an electronic communication as one dimension of outreach, aimed at all schools.

27. Although most teachers, according to the survey, seem to want **direct e-mail contact** to individuals, and/or direction to a main website with links, it would be as well to be aware of time constraints on teachers, which can prevent them using e-mail in school. Therefore it might be better to use the school's Admin e-mail plus FAO PT English, or the teacher's name, if known.

Some people prefer and respond to a named or personal approach – and this might develop teachers' trust in the LiL organisations. Staff will tend to follow up on an invitation if it is not anonymous. There are small but significant numbers in the varied range of 'Communication' responses to the e-survey. This may have implications for encouraging an electronic mailing list, which should be cross-referenced to sector or subject to facilitate future specialist e-mailings and future feedback.

28. The **ABC Guide** format seems really appropriate in size, visibility and convenience, and will save time spent by busy teachers on browsing and book-marking different websites. There were thought to be some omissions in the area of Library services, and reference might also be made to e.g. the Robert Burns Centre or national or civic museums or gallery sites such as the Hunterian, or Kelvingrove in Glasgow, which offer good non-fiction opportunities in reading and writing. The problem here is to keep both the size and focus of the document helpful and clear.

The ABC Guide needs to come to a named person, (normally the Head) with from 6 to 10 copies for dispersal in secondary schools, including the school librarian and 'unexpected places' such as Drama or History or Art to encourage cross-curricular



links. Primary schools also need multiple copies. Consideration might be given to a bigger poster version for the classroom.

29. **Probationers may need particular focus**, organised through school and LA mentors during the guaranteed year in post that follows initial qualification. There is a note of anxiety about the ‘aging profession’ in the returns to Q9, so there is some urgency about engaging early with the next generation of middle managers in schools.
30. LiL organisations might make **links with local festivals** or events within reach of schools, from an educational perspective (e.g. Poetry Slams and S5/6 Creative Writing at Glasgow’s ‘Aye Write’ Festival).
31. Links might also be established with **local Writers Groups** (as suggested in one focus group) that might more cheaply engage with schools. However, there are recognised Quality Assurance implications here.

### ***B. When***

32. The idea of a **Literature Calendar** was suggested, with World Book Day, Roald Dahl Day, National Poetry Day, Burns Day, birth/death dates of key literary figures, and competition deadlines clearly signalled. Writers or organisations might plan visits round that, but must allow for variability, e.g. from student teachers taking classes, staff absence and so forth.

Organisations need to be aware, too, of blocks of time when teachers must concentrate on national assessment pressures. Generally S1–2 classes offer best opportunities for engagement, with S5–6 providing some windows of opportunity.

33. **Visits might be linked to any national or local policy initiative**, e.g. ‘Health Promoting Schools’, ‘Eco Schools’ etc. Generally organisations might try to see what the literature or linguistic or creative link is here, because funding and activity tend to follow these themes, where schools need to show involvement.
34. Generally it was felt that the **system for organising visits** has become more complicated. Individualised billing has replaced the half-yearly billing that made for easier planning (especially for library staff who may be organising multiple visits, possibly from different budgets). There was a plea for ‘transparency’ on why some visit requests are accepted and others refused. Information and feedback on the numbers of events that have taken place over the year would provide a useful overview for libraries and schools – and again might feature in an e-newsletter.

Although the survey suggested June to August were the best times for information coming into schools, this may be ‘wishful thinking’ given teachers’ patterns of energy or busyness at those stages of the session. Library Services preferred April to May (and there is also an easier link to school budget planning at this time).



**C. What next?**

35. **Updating of any electronic mailing list** also needs to be planned for – possibly every two/three years. There needs to be some kind of opt-in system, and the legal issues involved in sharing existing contact lists should be considered.

36. It may be worth **building up the book production and media/visual literacy dimension** of LiL’s work, and signalling this to schools. Sponsored school projects might involve S2 or senior pupils in picture book creation for children at the early primary stage: a cross-sectoral and cross-curricular project. They might work with children’s authors or illustrators on the interrelationship between text and image.

Schools may also welcome advice on contacting local journalists and graphic artists. This wider literacy issue of reader development across and beyond the school community is a growth area, particularly across the transition stages.

37. The idea of a ‘**Literature in Learning Village**’ at LT Scotland’s annual Learning Festival may be worth exploring, with several Scottish Literature Forum members showing the classroom potential of their work. Links can be made to CfE and to cross-curricular approaches, involving museums and the arts.

Generally, there should also be continued efforts to extend LiL’s and SBT’s role in conferences and networks of support services, and heightened representation at such local and national events.

38. The question of whether schools need **other ABC Guides in the area of non-fiction writing**, or inter-arts links, museums and galleries was raised. Multi-lingual or bilingual resources, and large-print or talking books are other specialist areas of need. Consideration needs to be given to the necessary updating programme for such developments over time, every two years.

39. Development of **audio/video resources for children with reading difficulties** might also be worthwhile, although there may be copyright considerations. There may be a research and development project here that teachers or even pre-service students could be involved in. Given the problems of coverage across all areas/levels, this may be a project that would demand GLOW or Local Authority involvement. Remembering that children also need a text to follow, there are resource implications too in such an approach.

At the very least, it may be worth exploring with LT Scotland the production of some videos of good practice in using books with children with a variety of language difficulties.

***Recognising a need to prioritise among these ideas, 10 key issues are selected below.***

## Summing Up

'*Live Literature Scotland is fantastic.*' This was one Principal Teacher's view, and she also praised in particular the SBT website's Author of the Month feature. The main issue underlying the present research project is how to make this portal even more widely known and used, and how to extend this positive recognition to all the member organisations of the Scottish Literature Forum that wish to engage more actively and relevantly with teachers and schools.

A frequent suggestion from the focus groups was for the inclusion of lesson plans, activities, and exemplars of children's work. This suggests a 'top-down' model, and creates problems of authenticity in the materials provided.

A more workable 'bottom-up' development would be to encourage as many English and primary teachers as possible (and their pupils) to make links not only with this site but with the other excellent sites created, for example, by Edinburgh International Book Festival (Schools Events), ASLS, Scottish Language Dictionaries, the Scottish Storytelling Centre and the Scottish Poetry Library. This process would be helped by providing opportunities on the sites for display of, and engagement with, the work of both teachers and pupils.

In order for this to take place over time, there needs to be much more active and regular contact with schools, and an electronic newsletter and e-mail lists may be the most cost-effective means of achieving this. However, the attractiveness of paper resources such as the ABC Guide, and the real impact made on young people's learning by encounters with recognised writers and experts, should never be neglected.

## Key Developmental Issues for Action

All of the 39 steps are worth consideration, with some being of particular relevance to specific LiL organisations. However, it was felt that some selection from the range of ideas would be helpful in providing a clear focus for development planning. Based on the researchers' professional experience of schools, as well as on key areas of overlap between the focus group and survey data, a judgement is made here about 10 key issues for development.

These are not presented in an order of priority, but follow the order of the categorised 39 steps (which are of course already prioritised within each sub-section).

### 1. Advisory Panel to Co-ordinate LiL and LA Concerns [Step 1 above]

An Advisory Panel might be established, comprising Local Authority Quality Assurance staff, HMIE and LT Scotland representation, teachers, teacher educators and creative writers, to explore issues of co-ordination and extension of the work of the Scottish Literature Forum in regard to schools. (This may effectively divide into two working groups: a policy group and a practice group.)

Local Authority staff and LT Scotland staff already working on *Curriculum for Excellence* should be involved. But more generally, Quality Assurance staff and Heads of Service have the advantage of an overview of issues in negotiating with Head Teachers in carrying

projects forward and in facilitating partnership links between schools. The aim here is that LiL planning can also be linked to current themes, skills and issues, and to the Yearly Planning Cycle at individual school or local level. Quality Assurance staff are aware of what is on School Improvement Plans, and can help make the case for relevant LiL input, with its staff development potential as well as benefit to pupils.

## **2. Investigation of Shared Budget Arrangements for Cross-curricular Aspects of Author Visits [Step 3 above]**

Schools cite author or speaker travel costs as a major difficulty in engaging with LiL organisations, yet these can also sometimes be shared between community and school budgets. There is a need to explore funding arrangements with Cultural Co-ordinators, or their equivalent, on cross-curricular dimensions of learning (e.g. cross-curricular work in literature and the expressive arts: text and drama/art/museum activities). Literature should not be separated from other cultural organisations.

The main goal is to encourage schools towards that crucial ‘next step’ of actually engaging with the resources and organisations on offer. Cluster working would be the best way forward on this, sharing and linking expenses (possibly on one shared voucher to spread the cost?).

## **3. Co-ordination of School and Library Service Support in Learning [Step 8 above]**

Schools may tend to work ‘independently’ of library services, not knowing what is available. They may also tend to make ‘unreasonable’ demands or last-minute changes, or have unrealistic expectations of writers. Shorter period lengths in secondary schools also create problems.

A Do’s and Don’ts publication is felt to be needed for schools, including an ideas-list of ways of involving pupils, especially in cross-curricular activities related to any writer’s themes. Writers themselves might be involved in creating this, but should also be open to learning about the realities of teachers’ working experience.

Author visits are often not clearly tied into curriculum, because of teachers’ lack of preparation time, or of a system of guidance to support visits. Joint work between Library, English and other staff might focus e.g. on Advanced Higher texts in advance, to enable library research and formulation of key questions by students.

## **4. Development of Contexts for Literature in Learning [Step 14 above]**

Teachers need lists of active, realistic and purposeful learning contexts emerging from language and literature opportunities or texts. These may appear as additional pamphlets, or web-resources, or as author-related materials that might appear in an electronic newsletter (see point 8 below).

It may be possible for LiL staff to link with local university Teacher Education Institutions in this regard, perhaps involving teachers in training in upper BEd courses and PGCE primary and secondary courses, together with lecturers and/or local children’s writers, to enhance knowledge of LiL’s aims among beginning teachers.

In the first instance, however, Literacy Co-ordinators in schools might be contacted, to explore whether links with local library services and SBT or other organisations are active (remembering that these posts vary in the number and roles of personnel involved across local authorities) and to explore more closely the authors, texts and themes on which development work could most usefully focus.

#### **5. Embedding Texts within Stages of School Learning [Step 15 above]**

Working groups of teachers and others, including experienced and younger school staff, academics and librarians, could also produce age- and stage-related lists of suitable texts, in conjunction with LiL partners, with a focus on creative relationship with texts in schools. These should also be linked with existing festivals, themes or remembrances (e.g. Holocaust Day, National Poetry Day etc) that might already be used in school. Scottish texts could be particularly highlighted, and the documents disseminated electronically to schools.

#### **6. Responding to Teachers' Current Development Needs [Step 17 above]**

The electronic survey reveals development needs in Scottish poetry and Scottish literature generally, so LiL organisations should target developments here. School librarians could work with the next generation of newly qualified teachers on literature resources.

National interest in graphic novels has also increased since they were mentioned in broader definitions of literacy in CfE. This is another area for growth. LiL's expertise in children's literature and contact with picture book authors and illustrators could be used effectively to develop young readers' (and secondary readers') awareness of the relationship between picture and text.

#### **7. Enhancing the Quality and Supply of Scottish Texts [Step 18 above]**

There are problems with the supply of Scottish texts in secondary schools, with too much 1970s material still being used, often in a poor state. This relates partly to lack of money, partly to lack of knowledge among teachers. Therefore new texts need to be promoted, with back-up provided on teaching activities. Teachers might be sponsored to try out new texts, developing classroom activities to be shared with others electronically, with a free class set of the texts provided for such involvement.

#### **8. Developing an Electronic Newsletter [Step 26 above]**

An electronic newsletter for LiL might also be developed, as suggested in points 14 and 15 above (and in Section 4, penultimate bullet point) showing e.g. author experience, one school's activity, children's writing in response to a visit/topic, and suggestions for cross-curricular topics arising. Many of the LiL organisations are not sufficiently known by teachers, therefore the e-newsletter might present featured organisations, personalities and exemplars on a regular rolling basis, creating variety and interest. This development might build upon Scottish Book Trust's current *Learning and Inclusion Newsletter*, but with a different emphasis, both on the LiL organisations themselves and on school curriculum issues or terminology.

The newsletter might be tied in to a 'partnership' or membership status, paid for at school level. While this might defray some staffing costs in producing a newsletter, however, it

would increase the complexity and demands of production, ‘special offers’, the need for regular quality content and so forth. It may be better, in the first instance, to see such an electronic communication as one dimension of outreach, aimed at all schools.

### **9. Developing E-mail Contact with Teachers and Schools [Step 27 above]**

Although most teachers, according to the survey, seem to want direct e-mail contact to individuals, and/or direction to a main website with links, it would be as well to be aware of time constraints on teachers, which can prevent them using e-mail in school. Therefore it might be better to use the school’s Admin e-mail plus FAO PT English, or the teacher’s name, if known.

Some people prefer and respond to a named or personal approach – and this might develop teachers’ trust in the LiL organisations. Staff will tend to follow up on an invitation if it is not anonymous. There are small but significant numbers in the varied range of ‘Communication’ responses to the e-survey. This may have implications for encouraging an electronic mailing list, which should be cross-referenced to sector or subject to facilitate future specialist e-mailings and future feedback.

### **10. Sustaining and Enhancing Current Information to Schools [Step 28 above]**

The ABC Guide format seems really appropriate in size, visibility and convenience, and will save time spent by busy teachers on browsing and book-marking different websites. There were thought to be some omissions in the area of Library services, and reference might also be made to e.g. the Robert Burns Centre or national or civic museums or gallery sites such as the Hunterian, or Kelvingrove in Glasgow, which offer good non-fiction opportunities in reading and writing. The problem here is to keep both the size and focus of the document helpful and clear.

At present, this resource is not distributed nationally, presumably for reasons of cost. The ABC Guide needs to come to a named person, (normally the Head) with from 6 to 10 copies for dispersal in secondary schools, including the school librarian and ‘unexpected places’ such as Drama or History or Art to encourage cross-curricular links. Primary schools also need multiple copies. Consideration might be given to a bigger poster version for the classroom, and/or to an electronic version to save on costs.

# References

- Arizpe, E. and McGonigal, J. 2007. *Learning to read a new culture: how immigrant and asylum-seeking children experience Scottish culture through classroom books*. Final report to funders: Scottish Executive.
- Arizpe, E. and McGonigal, J. 2008. Global citizens, local linguists. *Global Citizenship Education: Philosophy, theory and pedagogy*. M. Peters, A. Britton and H. Blee, eds. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Hayward, L., M. Priestley, et al. 2004. Ruffling the calm of the ocean floor: Merging, practice, policy and research in Assessment in Scotland. *Oxford Review of Education* 30(3): 397–416.
- HMIE. 2006a. Emerging Good Practice in Promoting Creativity. March 2006  
<http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/creativity/aboutcreativity/goodpracticeincie.asp>
- HMIE. 2006b. Promoting Creativity in Education: Overview of Key National Policy Documents Across the UK. September 2006.  
<http://www.ltscotland.org.uk/creativity/aboutcreativity/promotingcie.asp>
- Literature in Learning. 2008.  
<http://www.scottishbooktrust.com/learning-and-inclusion/literature-in-learning>
- Learning and Teaching Scotland. 2003. *Scots Language and Literature: Examples and Activities*. William Hershaw. National Qualifications Curriculum Support. Glasgow: LTSotland.
- Scottish Arts Council and Literature Forum for Scotland. 2008. ABC Guide (2<sup>nd</sup> edition).  
<http://www.scottishbooktrust.com/learning-and-inclusion/literature-in-learning>
- SCCC. 1999. *The School Curriculum and the Culture of Scotland*. Dundee: Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum.
- Scottish Executive. 2006. *Scotland's Culture: Scottish Executive Response on the Cultural Review*. <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/01/18091052/6>. Last accessed 18/01/2007.
- Scottish Office Education Department. 1991. *National Guidelines for English Language 5-14*. Edinburgh: SOED.

## **Appendix A**

### **Membership of the Scottish Literature Forum Education Task Group**

Association for Scottish Literary Studies  
Edinburgh International Book Festival  
Gaelic Books Council  
Itchy Coo  
National Library of Scotland  
Scottish Book Trust  
Scottish Language Dictionaries  
Scottish PEN  
Scottish Poetry Library  
Scottish Storytelling Centre  
Society of Authors in Scotland

### **Member Organisations of the Scottish Literature Forum**

Association for Scottish Literary Studies  
CILIPS (Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals in Scotland)  
COSLA (The Convention of Scottish Local Authorities)  
Edinburgh International Book Festival  
Edinburgh UNESCO City of Literature  
Gaelic Books Council  
Itchy Coo  
Moniack Mhor  
NALD (National Association for Literature Development)  
National Library of Scotland  
Playwrights' Studio Scotland  
Publishing Scotland  
Scottish Book Trust  
Scottish Language Dictionaries  
Scottish Society of Playwrights  
Scottish PEN  
Scottish Poetry Library  
Scottish Storytelling Centre  
SLAM (Scottish Literary and Arts Magazines)  
Society of Authors in Scotland

## **Appendix B**

### ***Researching Teacher and School Engagement with Literature in Learning within the Curriculum for Excellence***

#### ***Initial briefing questions for Scottish Literature Forum Member Organisations***

**A] *Your organisation: Title***

- 1. Could you briefly outline the key role and area of focus of your organisation?**
- 2. Approximate current membership and funding arrangements?**
- 3. What is the organisation's key relevance to the primary or secondary curriculum?**

**At present, is its work mainly relevant to younger or older children?**

**B] *Current involvement with teachers and schools***

- 1. What current involvement with beginning teachers/ initial teacher Education?**

**C] *Current production of school resources or teaching materials***

**D] *Contact with schools as presently organised***

**E] *Feedback from teachers and schools***

**F] *Curriculum for Excellence developments: Implications***



## Appendix C

Dear Colleague

### *Literature in Learning: Electronic Survey of Schools*

My apologies for re-sending this survey, which went out to all schools in Scotland at a really inconvenient time, just before or during the October break.

The reason for this was a really strict timeline from the funders, by which everything was supposed to be completed, so we rushed at it and gave too tight a deadline for returns. As a result, only a small percentage of schools replied. Thank you if you were one of those. In the way of these things, time has now been found to extend the deadline!

If you or your staff had no time to reply earlier, we would be really grateful if someone in your school could take the 12-15 minutes needed to complete and return the survey online. If this could be done by Monday 1<sup>st</sup> December, that would be really helpful.

The survey is available at: <http://www.zoomerang.com/Survey/?p=WEB228CVF7LAGH>

The survey deals with communication between schools and various Scottish creative and cultural organisations. These organisations already work with teachers in the areas of literature, literacy, storytelling, drama and publishing. But they all tend to contact schools separately and by different methods. Is there a better way?

Their work with schools relates to the Curriculum for Excellence focus on creativity, wider cultural links and new approaches to learning, especially in writing. Cross-curricular literacy and project work is also a possibility through the real and virtual resources of the National Library of Scotland, for example. Some of the organisations are involved in CPD with schools.

So far we have had replies from Headteachers, Deputies, Principal Teachers, Classroom Teachers of all ages and stages, Probationers and School Librarians. There is opportunity to have the findings communicated back to participants, with an electronic copy of the final Report if they wish.

But the percentage return is lower than normal. Can you help us give a fuller picture of Scottish teachers' views and needs in this area?

Many thanks—

Prof. James McGonigal (Curriculum Studies) and Dr John Hall (SCRE Centre)

University of Glasgow

## Appendix D

### Focus Group Discussion Points

### Literature in Learning Project, November 2008

1. Briefly outline *the aims of today*, in the context of this research
  - a. Within ACfExcellence, a renewed focus on varied approaches to learning, on broader links to the community and to local/national culture, and on literacy awareness and development.
  - b. Within a re-shaping of arts and literature services, there is the need for funded cultural organisations and interest groups to reach out to wider audiences – notably to schools and young people.
  - c. **Key questions** then arise about how best to reach out, which this project is trying to answer:
    - What sort of communication do schools and teachers need/want or find most helpful?
    - What knowledge do schools and teachers already have of the organisations and resources available?
    - What factors either encourage or prevent schools from making best use of these organisations [Lack of money? Time? Policy or priorities?]
    - What has been teachers' prior experience of using speakers, performers, writers or resources from these organisations?
    - Is there potential for cross-curricular literacy work here, especially in secondaries?
    - What is the potential for co-operation between schools within a community in making use of the resources and skills on offer?
    - What role do LA advisory or resource development staff have to play [e.g. library services within school and community; CPD opportunities]?
  
2. Today's focus group drawn from different sectors, and other groups will take place in different parts of Scotland. **Introductions: name and role.**
  
3. **Which organisations** are we talking about here? Issue **ABC guide** and browse.
  - Which of these do we already know about, or would be interested to use, or have already used and can comment on?
  - What about the format of this guide, and paper communication generally? To whom should it be sent? Multiple copies? How often should it be updated?
  
4. **The e-survey**                      Stress that these are early findings. Browse through. Check whether it arrived in their school, and who filled it in, if they know. Focus on:  
**Question 11**, especially where there is a cluster round 'unsure'/'disagree'  
  
**Question 12**, especially where support for needs would be 'highly valued'  
  
**Question 15**, the most difficult/under-resourced stages of education.
  
5. **Key question of communication**, and preferred means of contact.

Teachers mostly seem to want direct/email contact to individuals, and/or a main website with links.

- Any downsides to this? [Updating of their addresses? Spam mail filters in LAs/schools? Home-work boundary eroded if using own email address?]
  - What do we think is meant by ‘personal contact?’
  - Why do library services seem to polarise opinion? [Is it to do with primary schools not having regular access? Secondary departmental structures?]
6. ***Any other issues?*** Return to ***key questions at 1.c*** above and pick up on anything not touched on already:
- Prior experience of self or colleagues in using literature organisations?
  - Is there potential for inter-school co-operation? [Secondary and associate primaries? Primary clusters? Links with schools in other parts of Scotland?]
  - Role of LA staff? [e.g. co-ordination; CPD; publicity]
  - How do primary and secondary needs differ in using literary/creative/language organisations?
7. Any other issues or ideas not so far dealt with?
8. ***Thanks for taking part.***  
***Issue travel expense forms and say where to send them.***

## Appendix E

### Literature in Learning: Survey results

Once the data was cleaned and totally empty responses were removed from the data set, there were 201 usable replies to the electronic survey.

#### Q1: What is the name of your school?

[Responses omitted]

#### Q2: In which local authority area is your school situated?

Q2: Local Authority	Count	% (Overall)
Aberdeen	24	11.9
Aberdeenshire	4	2
Angus	3	1.5
Argyll&Bute	3	1.5
Borders	3	1.5
Dumfries&Galloway	8	4
Dundee	1	0.5
E. Ayrshire	6	3
E. Dunbartonshire	1	0.5
E. Lothian	5	2.5
E. Renfrewshire	8	4
Edinburgh	20	10
Falkirk	8	4
Fife	12	6
Glasgow	32	15.9
Inverclyde	1	0.5
Midlothian	1	0.5
Moray	1	0.5
N. Ayrshire	3	1.5
N. Lanarkshire	5	2.5
Orkney	3	1.5
Perth & Kinross	7	3.5
S. Lanarkshire	17	8.5
Shetland	9	4.5
Stirling	4	2
W. Dunbartonshire	1	0.5
W. Lothian	11	5.5
All	201	100

There were no responses from Clackmannanshire, Comhairle nan Eilean Siar, Highland, Renfrewshire, or South Ayrshire.

**Q3: How many pupils are there in your school?**

Q3: No. of Pupils	Count	% (Overall)
70 or fewer	25	12.9
71-200	35	18.0
201-400	33	17.0
401-700	29	14.9
701 or more	72	37.1
All	194	100.0

**Q4: How would you characterise the catchment area of your school?**

Q4	Count	% (Overall)
Large urban	68	35
Accessible town	56	29
Remote town	7	4
Other urban	18	9
Accessible rural	30	16
Remote rural	14	7
All	193	100

**Q5: Is your school (please tick all that apply)**

Q5	Count	% (Overall)
State school	189	97.4
Independent	5	2.6
All	194	100.0

**Q6: Stage of education**

Q6_Stage	Count	% (Overall)
Lib	6	3.0
PS	95	47.3
Sec	94	46.8
Spec	6	3.0
All	201	100.0

Note on the above classification:

‘Lib’ = respondents who identified themselves as working for a library service or education resource centre. Librarians working in a school were classified according to type of school.

‘PS’= Primary school, which may include pre-school classes – as 37 did, or a special unit – 3 did.

‘Sec’ = Secondary school which may include a special unit (2), primary classes (3), and even pre-school classes (3)

‘Spec’ = identified as being solely concerned with special education provision.

**Q7: What is your role within the school? Are you:**

Q7	Count	% (Overall)
Other	18	9
A Head Teacher	51	26
DHT/SMT	21	11
Faculty Head	9	5
PT	41	21
Class teacher	37	19
Librarian	16	8
All	193	100

**Question 7: Other, please specify**

Responses:

PE teacher

McCrone timetable of ICT & Support for learning

Class teacher on the C.T> accreditation route

Itinerant teacher

SFL teacher

Literacy Across the Curriculum co-ordinator

Head Teacher and Class Teacher

Network Librarian

Classroom Assistant and Secretary

Acting HT

0.3 CT 0.7 Literacy Developer (secondment)

Both a Class Teacher and Depute Head

CT

Support for Learning Teacher

Senior Officer: Young People's Library Services

Educational librarian (primary) for an area

LRC assistant

Visiting Specialist Behaviour Consultant

**Q8: If you are a specialist subject teacher or librarian (for example, in a secondary school), are you:**

Q8	Count	% (Overall)
Other	17	17
School librarian	15	15
English teacher	44	44
Film or media	1	1

Language s	4	4
Maths or science	6	6
Social subjects	1	1
Expressiv e arts	5	5
Learning support / SEN	6	6
All	99	100

Other responses:

Business Education and Economics

I am trained to teach French to Primary children

Network Librarian

Science Teacher/SEN TEacher

I also have a Media qualification

Non Class Committed Head Teacher

An English as an Additional Language Teacher

Infants

Drama teacher

English/Media Studies/Classical Studies

History (not all social subjects)

Schools Service Librarian

Education Resource service librarian

Primary teacher

Behaviour Consultant

Professional librarian within schools library service



**Q9: For how many years have you been a teacher?**

(If you are not a teacher, for how many years have you worked in education?)

Q9	Count	% (Overall)
Probationer	2	1
<b>Up to 5 years</b>	11	6
6-15 years	60	32
16+ years	116	61
All	189	100

**A note on the following tables.**

In the following tables the responses to each item within each question have been tabulated according to the sector or stage of education of the organisation from which the respondents came (see Q6, above).

There were no respondents from any institution which was solely concerned with pre-school education.

Numbers from library services, and from institutions which were solely concerned with special education were too small to allow for statistical testing. This also applies to the small number of responses from the independent sector. Differences between PS and Sec. respondents were tested using the Mann-Whitney U test. Any statistically significant differences are noted under each item. Statistical significance is at the 5% level.

Please note that significance levels are reported as percentages, and not as decimal fractions as in some other programs (eg SPSS). Therefore a significance level of, eg, '0.05%' reported here is the same as 'p=0.0005' in SPSS.

In each table the category of response which contained the overall median response is highlighted in bold and underlined. (Median equals the '50% mark')

The program used was 'Instat+' from the Statistical Services Centre at the University of Reading.

### The teaching of literature

Below are a number of statements about the teaching of literature in Scottish schools. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement.

['1' = strongly disagree, '5' = strongly agree]

#### Q11a: The role of literature in education has a high priority in Scottish education.

Q6_Stag	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	25	0	0	3	75	0	0	4	10
PS	3	3	3	3	6	7	29	32	50	55	91	10
Sec	0	0	7	9	13	16	39	48	22	27	81	10
Spec	0	0	1	20	1	20	3	60	0	0	5	10
All	3	2	12	7	20	11	<b>74</b>	<b>41</b>	72	40	181	10

Overall median response category = 'Agree'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to 'strongly agree' (p=0.05%)

#### Q11b: Writing and language skills are fundamental to course work in all areas.

Q6_Stag	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Cou	%	Cou	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	25	0	0	3	7	0	0	4	10
PS	4	4	0	0	0	0	14	1	73	80	91	10
Sec	1	1	3	4	4	5	14	1	59	73	81	10
Spec	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	80	5	10
All	5	3	4	2	4	2	32	1	<b>136</b>	<b>75</b>	181	10

Overall median response category = 'Strongly Agree'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q11c: I am comfortable teaching and supporting pupils in their oral and written language skills**

Q6_Stag	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0	3	10
PS	3	3	1	1	1	1	26	29	60	66	91	10
Sec	0	0	1	1	3	4	22	28	53	67	79	10
Spec	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	80	1	20	5	10
All	3	2	2	1	6	3	53	30	<b>114</b>	<b>64</b>	178	10

Overall median response category = ‘Strongly Agree’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q11d: I feel fully confident in my ability to support my students in studying literature.**

Q6_Stage	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	3	100
PS	3	3	2	2	4	4	43	47	39	43	91	100
Sec	1	1	2	2	13	16	17	21	48	59	81	100
Spec	0	0	1	20	1	20	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	4	2	5	3	18	10	<b>64</b>	<b>36</b>	89	49	180	100

Overall median response category = ‘Agree’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q11e: I would welcome links with libraries, writers’ organisations, or websites to develop cross-curricular literacy.**

Q6_Stage	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	3	100
PS	3	3	1	1	5	6	24	27	57	63	90	100
Sec	1	1	1	1	9	11	26	33	43	54	80	100
Spec	0	0	1	20	0	0	2	40	2	40	5	100
All	4	2	3	2	14	8	52	29	<b>105</b>	<b>59</b>	178	100

Overall median response category = ‘Strongly Agree’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q11f: There is a wide range of resources available to me to support me if I wish to include the study of literature in my teaching**

Q6_Stage	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	3	100
PS	2	2	3	3	10	11	52	60	20	23	87	100
Sec	2	3	9	12	9	12	31	40	27	35	78	100
Spec	2	40	1	20	1	20	1	20	0	0	5	100
All	6	3	13	8	20	12	<u>87</u>	<u>50</u>	47	27	173	100

Overall median response category = 'Agree'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q11g: I am fully aware of sources of support available to me to help me to include the study of literature in my teaching**

Q6_Stage	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	1	33	1	33	0	0	3	100
PS	1	1	8	9	26	29	50	55	6	7	91	100
Sec	5	6	6	8	13	17	37	47	17	22	78	100
Spec	0	0	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	0	5	100
All	6	3	16	9	44	25	<u>88</u>	<u>50</u>	23	13	177	100

Overall median response category = 'Agree'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q11h: I have made links with external agencies that have developed my students' literary skills.**

Q6_Stage	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	5	5	22	24	24	26	32	35	8	9	91	100
Sec	12	15	17	22	12	15	28	36	9	12	78	100
Spec	1	20	1	20	0	0	3	60	0	0	5	100
All	18	10	40	23	<u>37</u>	<u>21</u>	65	37	17	10	177	100

Overall median response category = 'Unsure'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q11i: The place of literature in learning will be enhanced with the introduction of A Curriculum for Excellence**

Q6_Stage	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	3	100
PS	2	2	3	3	28	31	30	33	28	31	91	100
Sec	5	6	7	9	40	50	20	25	8	10	80	100
Spec	1	20	0	0	2	40	2	40	0	0	5	100
All	8	4	10	6	70	39	<u>54</u>	<u>30</u>	37	21	179	100

Overall median response category = 'Agree'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec less likely to 'agree' (p=0.00%)

**Q11j: The study of literature has a valuable contribution to make within the context of cross-curricular work**

Q6_Stage	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	3	100
PS	4	4	1	1	3	3	34	38	47	53	89	100
Sec	0	0	1	1	10	13	36	45	33	41	80	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	2	40	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	4	2	2	1	15	8	<u>74</u>	<u>42</u>	82	46	177	100

Overall median response category = ‘Agree’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q11k: There is a need for more CPD literature and language courses to support the teaching of literature**

Q6_Stage	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	1	33	1	33	3	100
PS	2	2	7	8	13	14	43	48	25	28	90	100
Sec	1	1	2	3	13	17	36	46	26	33	78	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	2	40	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	3	2	9	5	29	16	<u>82</u>	<u>47</u>	53	30	176	100

Overall median response category = ‘Agree’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q11l: There should be a much wider range of different types of literature available and affordable for students and schools**

Q6_Stage	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	3	100
PS	3	3	2	2	10	11	39	43	37	41	91	100
Sec	0	0	2	3	12	15	27	34	39	49	80	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	40	3	60	5	100
All	3	2	4	2	22	12	<u>70</u>	<u>39</u>	80	45	179	100

Overall median response category = ‘Agree’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q11m: Students benefit greatly from school visits by real writers, poets and storytellers**

Q6_Stage	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	3	100
PS	3	3	2	2	3	3	14	15	69	76	91	100
Sec	0	0	1	1	8	10	23	29	48	60	80	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	1	20	3	60	1	20	5	100
All	3	2	3	2	12	7	40	22	<b>121</b>	<b>68</b>	179	100

Overall median response category = ‘Strongly agree’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to ‘strongly agree’ (p=4.76%)

**Q11n: Staff in my school already develop the literacy potential of external visits or agencies.**

Q6_Stage	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0	3	100
PS	3	3	11	12	26	29	36	40	15	16	91	100
Sec	1	1	10	13	20	25	32	40	17	21	80	100
Spec	0	0	1	20	2	40	2	40	0	0	5	100
All	4	2	22	12	50	28	<b>71</b>	<b>40</b>	32	18	179	100

Overall median response category = ‘Agree’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q11o: Pupils currently receive enough support and encouragement in their own writing and research outside of English and Language classrooms.**

Q6_Stage	1. Strongly Disagree		2. Disagree		3. Unsure		4. Agree		5. Strongly Agree		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	3	3	18	20	41	47	21	24	5	6	88	100
Sec	8	10	21	26	39	48	10	12	3	4	81	100
Spec	1	20	0	0	4	80	0	0	0	0	5	100
All	12	7	41	23	<b>85</b>	<b>48</b>	31	18	8	5	177	100

Overall median response category = 'Unsure'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to be positive (p=1.89%)



## Types of literature

**Are there any particular genres of literature for which you would value advice and support in your teaching?** Please indicate below the extent to which you would value advice and support in the teaching of these different genres of literature.

[‘1’ = support is not required, ‘5’ = support would be highly valued.]

### Q12a: Poetry

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	1	33	1	33	3	100
PS	5	6	12	13	6	7	43	48	24	27	90	100
Sec	18	24	12	16	12	16	17	23	15	20	74	100
Spec	0	0	1	20	1	20	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	23	13	25	15	20	12	<b>63</b>	<b>37</b>	41	24	172	100

Overall median response category = ‘4’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.07%).

### Q12b: Drama

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	1	33	1	33	3	100
PS	7	8	8	9	9	10	34	38	31	35	89	100
Sec	13	18	12	16	12	16	20	27	17	23	74	100
Spec	0	0	1	20	1	20	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	20	12	21	12	23	13	<b>57</b>	<b>33</b>	50	29	171	100

Overall median response category = ‘4’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.52%).

**Q12c: Novels / fiction**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	1	33	1	33	0	0	3	100
PS	15	17	23	26	13	15	28	31	10	11	89	100
Sec	19	26	12	16	12	16	19	26	11	15	73	100
Spec	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	5	100
All	35	21	37	22	<u>27</u>	<u>16</u>	49	29	22	13	170	100

Overall median response category = ‘Unsure’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q12d: Oral storytelling including folktales**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	7	8	9	10	15	17	34	38	25	28	90	100
Sec	11	15	6	8	14	19	32	43	11	15	74	100
Spec	1	20	1	20	1	20	0	0	2	40	5	100
All	19	11	16	9	31	18	<u>68</u>	<u>40</u>	38	22	172	100

Overall median response category = ‘4’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q12e: Graphic novels**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	0	0	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	4	4	11	12	22	25	38	43	14	16	89	100
Sec	11	15	6	8	11	15	25	34	20	27	73	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	2	40	1	20	2	40	5	100
All	15	9	18	11	35	21	<u>66</u>	<u>39</u>	36	21	170	100

Overall median response category = ‘4’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q12f: Picture books for younger readers**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	0	0	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	29	33	25	28	10	11	14	16	11	12	89	100
Sec	37	53	5	7	16	23	9	13	3	4	70	100
Spec	3	60	0	0	0	0	1	20	1	20	5	100
All	69	41	<b>31</b>	<b>19</b>	26	16	26	16	15	9	167	100

Overall median response category = ‘2’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q12g: ‘Classic’ literature**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	9	10	14	16	16	18	33	37	17	19	89	100
Sec	18	25	9	13	16	22	23	32	6	8	72	100
Spec	1	20	1	20	2	40	0	0	1	20	5	100
All	28	17	24	14	<b>35</b>	<b>21</b>	58	34	24	14	169	100

Overall median response category = ‘Unsure’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=1.13%).

**Q12h: Scottish literature**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	1	33	1	33	0	0	3	100
PS	7	8	9	10	12	13	35	39	26	29	89	100
Sec	17	24	6	8	12	17	26	36	11	15	72	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	1	20	3	60	1	20	5	100
All	24	14	16	9	26	15	<b>65</b>	<b>38</b>	38	22	169	100

Overall median response category = ‘4’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.52%).

**Q12i: Literature in the Scots language**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	3	100
PS	6	7	7	8	18	20	31	35	27	30	89	100
Sec	19	27	4	6	15	21	24	34	9	13	71	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	2	40	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	25	15	11	7	35	21	<b>60</b>	<b>36</b>	37	22	168	100

Overall median response category = '4'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.09%).

**Q12j: Gaelic literature**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	3	100
PS	42	49	6	7	17	20	5	6	15	18	85	100
Sec	38	54	9	13	12	17	6	8	6	8	71	100
Spec	3	60	0	0	1	20	0	0	1	20	5	100
All	<b>83</b>	<b>51</b>	15	9	30	18	13	8	23	14	164	100

Overall median response category = 'Not required'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q12k: The writing process**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0	3	100
PS	5	6	19	21	11	12	40	44	15	17	90	100
Sec	7	10	9	12	10	14	30	41	17	23	73	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	1	20	2	40	2	40	5	100
All	12	7	28	16	24	14	<b>73</b>	<b>43</b>	34	20	171	100

Overall median response category = '4'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q12l: The publishing process**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0	3	100
PS	5	6	10	11	14	16	47	53	13	15	89	100
Sec	7	10	13	18	18	25	24	33	11	15	73	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	4	80	1	20	0	0	5	100
All	12	7	23	14	38	22	<u>73</u>	<u>43</u>	24	14	170	100

Overall median response category = '4'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q12m: Non-fiction**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	0	0	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	11	13	19	22	9	10	34	39	15	17	88	100
Sec	5	7	9	12	7	10	34	47	18	25	73	100
Spec	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	5	100
All	17	10	30	18	17	10	<u>71</u>	<u>42</u>	34	20	169	100

Overall median response category = '4'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to value this (p=3.47%)

**Q12n: On-line resources (including Research Methods, Wikis and Blogs)**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Count	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50	2	100
PS	5	6	9	10	3	3	40	46	30	34	87	100
Sec	7	9	2	3	9	12	35	47	21	28	74	100
Spec	1	20	0	0	2	40	1	20	1	20	5	100
All	13	8	11	7	14	8	<u>77</u>	<u>46</u>	53	32	168	100

Overall median response category = '4'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q13: Are there any other genres of literature, or aspects of literature, for which you would value advice and support in your teaching? If so, please specify.**

Open responses grouped by sector/stage:

**Lib:**

No responses from Lib.

**PS:**

Teaching of writing skills

Additional information on grammar and how to teach it.

Think everything is covered above

Those which are produced by other cultures

Linking the language strands and curriculum to be meaningful, motivating and progressive

High interest low ability books for children who have difficulty with reading and writing.

Developing these areas at Level A but with older children. Sometimes getting this level at the correct context/interest of the child is difficult.

Use of technology e.g .interactive whiteboard in literacy work

Songs as a source of oral tradition

The use of active learning techniques to enhance writing

Support is wonderful but sometimes I can't afford to buy it in. I make do and I do try but I really don't have much time to do any more research and reading just keeping up with my job!

**Sec:**

Persuasion and evaluating validity of sources etc

Types of suitable reading for non readers of teenage years.

SQA Standard Grade Exam, Higher Still Writing. More exemplars of, say, Descriptive Writing tasks. Arrange extra-curricular opportunities to help students produce descriptive pieces of writing – gallery trips When studying a media texts that are films – access to interviews with directors, etc. Teacher accessible database of media texts studied with students would be helpful.

Staff can always utilise support and CPD to get the best from students

If CFE provisions are implemented as they currently stand, then we would probably need support in teaching Scots language and literature

American, Irish, Post-colonial Lit.

Accessible literature for learners of foreign languages at an appropriate maturity level while still being at a straight forward language level

More contemporary teenage fiction

Those linked with the history of mathematics

Media

Script writing for TV/Radio/Film

Play writing, theatrical reviews

Literary Essay and discursive writing in AH Modern Languages

I would like to see more creative writing on the curriculum and would welcome input in methods for teaching this.

Technical accuracy in writing. Published resources tend to be aimed at Primary. We need secondary resources etc for pupils who fail to punctuate well. We also need information on best practice for remediating weak spellers at secondary level.

As a librarian would be good to understand what the staff need out the pupils so that we can integrate it into information skills

Books for secondary special needs pupils where the language is basic but with a more teenage/adult theme.

**Spec:**

Need much better resources for special needs pupils of secondary age. Age appropriate and for non-readers

Literature to support pupils with additional support needs, limited confidence with reading and writing

Books suitable for older pupils with little English language – pupils use BSL as mode of communication

### Target groups

**Are there any particular age groups of readers for which you would value advice and support in your teaching?** Please indicate below the extent to which you would value advice and support in the teaching of these groups.

[‘1’ = support is not required, ‘5’ = support would be highly valued.]

#### Q14a: Pre-readers

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	1	33	0	0	0	0	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	32	37	13	15	8	9	25	29	9	10	87	100
Sec	50	77	2	3	5	8	3	5	5	8	65	100
Spec	2	40	1	20	0	0	1	20	1	20	5	100
All	<b>85</b>	<b>53</b>	16	10	13	8	31	19	15	9	160	100

Overall median response category = ‘Not required’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.00%)

#### Q14b: Beginning readers

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	0	0	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	26	30	20	23	5	6	24	28	11	13	86	100
Sec	40	62	2	3	4	6	10	15	9	14	65	100
Spec	1	20	2	40	0	0	1	20	1	20	5	100
All	67	42	<b>25</b>	<b>16</b>	9	6	37	23	21	13	159	100

Overall median response category = ‘2’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.97%)



**Q14c: Developing readers**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	3	100
PS	18	21	20	24	3	4	31	36	13	15	85	100
Sec	19	28	3	4	9	13	23	33	15	22	69	100
Spec	0	0	1	20	1	20	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	37	23	24	15	13	8	<u>59</u>	<u>36</u>	29	18	162	100

Overall median response category = ‘4’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q14d: Fluent pre-teen readers**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	1	33	1	33	1	33	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	19	24	11	14	6	8	27	34	17	21	80	100
Sec	27	40	4	6	9	13	15	22	13	19	68	100
Spec	2	40	0	0	2	40	1	20	0	0	5	100
All	49	31	16	10	<u>18</u>	<u>12</u>	43	28	30	19	156	100

Overall median response category = ‘Unsure’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q14e: Young teenage readers**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	42	59	7	10	7	10	12	17	3	4	71	100
Sec	18	25	4	5	10	14	23	32	18	25	73	100
Spec	2	40	0	0	2	40	1	20	0	0	5	100
All	62	41	13	9	<u>20</u>	<u>13</u>	36	24	21	14	152	100

Overall median response category = ‘Unsure’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to value this (p=0.00%)

**Q14f: Older teenage readers**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	49	70	5	7	9	13	6	9	1	1	70	100
Sec	18	24	3	4	12	16	21	28	20	27	74	100
Spec	2	40	0	0	1	20	0	0	2	40	5	100
All	69	45	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>	23	15	27	18	23	15	152	100

Overall median response category = '2'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to value this (p=0.00%).

**Q14g: Adult readers**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	45	69	4	6	11	17	3	5	2	3	65	100
Sec	43	64	3	4	10	15	5	7	6	9	67	100
Spec	3	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4	100
All	<u>91</u>	<u>65</u>	7	5	22	16	10	7	9	6	139	100

Overall median response category = 'Not required'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q14h: Reluctant readers**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	6	7	10	12	5	6	31	37	31	37	83	100
Sec	5	7	2	3	7	10	27	38	30	42	71	100
Spec	1	20	0	0	0	0	3	60	1	20	5	100
All	12	7	12	7	13	8	<u>63</u>	<u>39</u>	62	38	162	100

Overall median response category = '4'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q14i: Young people with reading difficulties**

	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
Q6_Stage	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	3	100
PS	6	7	9	11	5	6	29	34	36	42	85	100
Sec	2	3	5	7	8	11	23	32	34	47	72	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	80	1	20	5	100
All	8	5	14	8	13	8	<u>59</u>	<u>36</u>	71	43	165	100

Overall median response category = '4'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q14j: Gifted students**

	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
Q6_Stage	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	4	5	9	11	9	11	23	27	39	46	84	100
Sec	19	27	3	4	6	8	16	23	27	38	71	100
Spec	3	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4	100
All	26	16	14	9	16	10	<u>39</u>	<u>24</u>	67	41	162	100

Overall median response category = '4'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=4.33%)

**Q14k: Readers who are learning English as a second or additional language**

	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
--	-----------------	--	----	--	-----------	--	----	--	------------------	--	-----	--

Q6_Stage	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	3	100
PS	15	18	7	8	16	19	13	16	32	39	83	100
Sec	5	7	2	3	10	14	18	25	36	51	71	100
Spec	1	20	0	0	1	20	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	21	13	9	6	27	17	<u>36</u>	<u>22</u>	69	43	162	100

Overall median response category = '4'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to value this (p=1.45%)

### Target stages

**Are there any particular stages of education for which you would value advice and support in your teaching of literature?** Please indicate below the extent to which you would value advice and support in the teaching of these stages.

[‘1’ = support is not required, ‘5’ = support would be highly valued.]

#### Q15a: Early years, pre-readers

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	0	0	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	29	34	12	14	11	13	21	24	13	15	86	100
Sec	56	86	3	5	5	8	0	0	1	2	65	100
Spec	2	40	0	0	0	0	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	<b>87</b>	<b>55</b>	16	10	16	10	25	16	15	9	159	100

Overall median response category = ‘Not required’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.00%)

#### Q15b: Early years, primary education

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	0	0	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	23	27	16	19	5	6	27	31	15	17	86	100
Sec	55	85	5	8	4	6	1	2	0	0	65	100
Spec	2	40	0	0	0	0	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	<b>80</b>	<b>50</b>	22	14	9	6	32	20	16	10	159	100

Overall median response category = ‘Not required’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.00%)

**Q15c: Middle years, primary education**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	0	0	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	17	20	11	13	6	7	33	39	18	21	85	100
Sec	52	80	4	6	6	9	3	5	0	0	65	100
Spec	2	50	0	0	1	25	1	25	0	0	4	100
All	71	45	<b>16</b>	<b>10</b>	13	8	39	25	18	11	157	100

Overall median response category = '2'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.00%)

**Q15d: Upper years, primary education**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	0	0	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	9	11	12	14	5	6	34	40	24	29	84	100
Sec	40	63	2	3	4	6	13	20	5	8	64	100
Spec	2	50	0	0	0	0	2	50	0	0	4	100
All	51	33	15	10	9	6	<b>51</b>	<b>33</b>	29	19	155	100

Overall median response category = '4'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.00%)

**Q15e: Lower years, secondary education**

Q6_Stage	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	47	71	2	3	12	18	3	5	2	3	66	100
Sec	18	26	7	10	8	11	16	23	21	30	70	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	1	25	3	75	0	0	4	100
All	65	45	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	22	15	22	15	23	16	143	100

Overall median response category = '2'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to value this (p=0.00%)

**Q15f: Middle years, secondary education**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	50	77	2	3	11	17	1	2	1	2	65	100
Sec	17	25	7	10	5	7	21	30	19	28	69	100
Spec	1	20	0	0	0	0	3	60	1	20	5	100
All	68	48	<u>11</u>	<u>8</u>	17	12	25	18	21	15	142	100

Overall median response category = '2'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to value this (p=0.00%)

**Q15g: Upper years, secondary education**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	49	77	2	3	11	17	1	2	1	2	64	100
Sec	18	27	6	9	10	15	14	21	19	28	67	100
Spec	3	60	0	0	0	0	1	20	1	20	5	100
All	<u>70</u>	<u>50</u>	10	7	22	16	16	12	21	15	139	100

Overall median response category = 'Not required'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to value this (p=0.00%)

**Q15h: Post-compulsory education**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	49	78	1	2	11	17	1	2	1	2	63	100
Sec	45	70	4	6	4	6	6	9	5	8	64	100
Spec	3	75	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0	4	100
All	<u>97</u>	<u>72</u>	5	4	16	12	10	7	6	4	134	100

Overall median response category = 'Not required'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

## Types of resources

**Are there any particular types of resources which you would value to support your teaching?**

Please indicate below the extent to which you would value the following types of resources.

[‘1’ = support is not required, ‘5 = support would be highly valued.]

### Q16a: CPD / In-service courses

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	3	100
PS	2	2	11	13	12	14	38	45	21	25	84	100
Sec	6	8	5	7	9	13	32	45	19	27	71	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	1	20	2	40	2	40	5	100
All	8	5	16	10	22	13	<u>75</u>	<u>46</u>	42	26	163	100

Overall median response category = ‘4’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

### Q16b: Teaching guides on specific works or writers

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	0	0	1	33	1	33	3	100
PS	1	1	9	11	7	8	43	51	25	29	85	100
Sec	4	6	3	4	7	10	31	44	26	37	71	100
Spec	0	0	1	20	1	20	1	20	2	40	5	100
All	5	3	14	9	15	9	<u>76</u>	<u>46</u>	54	33	164	100

Overall median response category = ‘4’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

### Q16c: Conferences or events for teachers

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	1	33	1	33	3	100
PS	11	13	18	21	15	18	25	30	15	18	84	100
Sec	4	6	5	7	14	20	30	43	16	23	69	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	2	40	1	20	2	40	5	100
All	15	9	23	14	32	20	<u>57</u>	<u>35</u>	34	21	161	100



Overall median response category = ‘4’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to value this (p=1.33%)

**Q16d: Information leaflets from literary organisations**

	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
Q6_Stage	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	3	100
PS	8	9	15	18	21	25	29	34	12	14	85	100
Sec	8	12	8	12	14	20	24	35	15	22	69	100
Spec	0	0	1	25	2	50	1	25	0	0	4	100
All	16	10	24	15	37	23	<u>57</u>	<u>35</u>	27	17	161	100

Overall median response category = ‘4’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q16e: A central web site with links to sources of further information**

	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
Q6_Stage	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	3	100
PS	1	1	3	4	5	6	35	42	40	48	84	100
Sec	0	0	3	4	4	6	25	35	39	55	71	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	60	2	40	5	100
All	1	1	6	4	9	6	64	39	<u>83</u>	<u>51</u>	163	100

Overall median response category = ‘Highly valued’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q16f: Resources including ideas, materials, and methodology suggestions**

	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
Q6_Stage	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	3	100
PS	0	0	3	4	6	7	34	40	42	49	85	100
Sec	0	0	2	3	6	9	23	33	39	56	70	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	60	2	40	5	100
All	0	0	5	3	12	7	62	38	<u>84</u>	<u>52</u>	163	100

Overall median response category = ‘Highly valued’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q16g: Outreach work in schools by literature / arts organisations**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	3	100
PS	1	1	2	2	7	8	33	39	41	49	84	100
Sec	6	8	3	4	11	15	28	39	23	32	71	100
Spec	1	20	0	0	0	0	3	60	1	20	5	100
All	8	5	5	3	18	11	<b>65</b>	<b>40</b>	67	41	163	100

Overall median response category = ‘4’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.72%)

**Q16h: School visits by practising writers, poets, or storytellers**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	3	100
PS	0	0	1	1	2	2	19	23	61	73	83	100
Sec	3	4	2	3	8	12	25	36	31	45	69	100
Spec	1	20	0	0	0	0	3	60	1	20	5	100
All	4	3	3	2	10	6	47	29	<b>96</b>	<b>60</b>	160	100

Overall median response category = ‘Highly valued’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.01%)

**Q16i: Writers, poets, or storytellers in residence**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	3	100
PS	2	2	5	6	9	11	20	24	48	57	84	100
Sec	14	21	5	7	14	21	16	24	19	28	68	100
Spec	1	20	0	0	2	40	1	20	1	20	5	100
All	17	11	10	6	25	16	<b>37</b>	<b>23</b>	71	44	160	100

Overall median response category = '4'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.00%)

**Q16j: Conferences or events for students**

Q6_Stage	1. Not required		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly valued		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	1	33	1	33	3	100
PS	11	13	5	6	21	25	26	31	22	26	85	100
Sec	2	3	4	6	15	22	27	40	19	28	67	100
Spec	2	40	0	0	0	0	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	15	9	9	6	37	23	<u>56</u>	<u>35</u>	43	27	160	100

Overall median response category = '4'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q17: Are there any other types of resources which you would value to support your teaching?**

Open responses grouped by sector/stage:

**Lib:**

Links to examples of good practice already existing with contact details – sometimes talking to people on the ground is better. Affordable courses or conferences would be good – sometimes there are events but the cost is prohibitive. Joined up working in each authority – knowing who there is already doing something so you could then link up.

**PS:**

More access to seeing all 'reading schemes' available WITHOUT the need to call in reps.

Extra budget funding!

Invitations from local libraries setting up specific events for schools to opt in to

Interactive whiteboard resources

Smartboard resources

Better-equipped library. Multiple copies of quality literature

Resources for Interactive White Boards at affordable costs and which would suit varied reading abilities

Budget tight, so the price has to be right

Cross curricular opportunities made explicit through a resource bank of contexts linked to potential opportunities to explore genres of reading writing etc

Authors nearby or inspirational e.g. Michael Morpurgo who I couldn't otherwise afford.

**Sec:**

Releasing staff to go on courses is impossible in the current climate so all free support is useful

Time to allow staff to develop resources.

On-line broadcasts

Dialect resources for Secondary pupils

Residential opportunities; curriculum specific workshops

TV video games

School/Authority based virtual groups e.g. Moodle [interactive learning environment]

Directors' talks and workshops

I'm sure most schools would be happy to receive ANY resources that are good quality that help to support teaching.

**Spec:**

Cheap online resources for older pupils who cannot read

### Types of communication preferred

**Are there any particular forms of communication which you would value to support your teaching?** Please indicate below the extent to which you would value the following forms of communication.

[‘1’ = this is not required, ‘5’ = this would be highly valued.]

#### Q18a: Direct mailing to yourself

Q6_Stage	1. Not at all effective		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly effective		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	9	11	17	20	10	12	26	31	23	27	85	100
Sec	11	16	6	9	5	7	27	40	18	27	67	100
Spec	0	0	2	40	0	0	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	20	13	25	16	16	10	<u>57</u>	<u>36</u>	42	26	160	100

Overall median response category = ‘4’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

#### Q18b: Direct email to yourself

Q6_Stage	1. Not at all effective		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly effective		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	3	100
PS	6	7	6	7	8	9	25	29	41	48	86	100
Sec	3	4	6	9	3	4	27	40	28	42	67	100
Spec	1	20	1	20	0	0	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	10	6	13	8	11	7	<u>55</u>	<u>34</u>	72	45	161	100

Overall median response category = ‘4’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q18c: Information via GLOW**

Q6_Stage	1. Not at all effective		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly effective		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	0	0	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	12	14	15	18	27	33	16	19	13	16	83	100
Sec	28	43	3	5	20	31	8	12	6	9	65	100
Spec	2	40	0	0	2	40	1	20	0	0	5	100
All	42	27	19	12	<b>49</b>	<b>31</b>	27	17	19	12	156	100

Overall median response category = ‘Unsure’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to value this (p=0.50%)

**Q18d: LTS Newsletter**

Q6_Stage	1. Not at all effective		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly effective		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	8	9	14	16	17	20	36	42	11	13	86	100
Sec	11	17	13	20	13	20	23	35	6	9	66	100
Spec	1	20	0	0	3	60	1	20	0	0	5	100
All	20	13	27	17	<b>34</b>	<b>21</b>	62	39	17	11	160	100

Overall median response category = ‘Unsure’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q18e: A single web site to which I could refer for information and links to appropriate materials**

	1. Not at all effective		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly effective		All	
Q6_Stage	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	3	100
PS	2	2	0	0	7	8	18	21	58	68	85	100
Sec	0	0	0	0	4	6	22	31	44	63	70	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	60	2	40	5	100
All	2	1	0	0	11	7	44	27	<b>106</b>	<b>65</b>	163	100

Overall median response category = 'Highly effective'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q18f: Information sent to school office in hard copy and circulated within the school as appropriate**

	1. Not at all effective		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly effective		All	
Q6_Stage	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	14	17	17	21	12	15	25	31	13	16	81	100
Sec	14	21	11	16	10	15	24	35	9	13	68	100
Spec	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	5	100
All	29	18	32	20	<b>23</b>	<b>15</b>	50	32	23	15	157	100

Overall median response category = 'unsure'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q18g: Information sent to school office by email and circulated within the school as appropriate**

	1. Not at all effective		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly effective		All	
Q6_Stage	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	18	21	12	14	20	24	21	25	13	15	84	100
Sec	15	22	10	15	10	15	21	31	12	18	68	100
Spec	0	0	1	25	0	0	3	75	0	0	4	100
All	33	21	26	16	<b>30</b>	<b>19</b>	45	28	25	16	159	100

Overall median response category = 'Unsure'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q18h: Press and news reports**

	1. Not at all effective		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly effective		All	
Q6_Stage	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	21	25	23	27	22	26	17	20	1	1	84	100
Sec	15	22	18	26	16	24	18	26	1	1	68	100
Spec	1	20	2	40	2	40	0	0	0	0	5	100
All	37	23	<b>43</b>	<b>27</b>	43	27	35	22	2	1	160	100

Overall median response category = '2'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q18i: Personal contact with providers of support**

	1. Not at all effective		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly effective		All	
Q6_Stage	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	1	33	0	0	1	33	3	100
PS	9	11	7	9	13	16	27	33	26	32	82	100
Sec	8	12	9	13	12	18	22	32	17	25	68	100
Spec	1	20	0	0	2	40	0	0	2	40	5	100
All	18	11	17	11	28	18	<b>49</b>	<b>31</b>	46	29	158	100

Overall median response category = '4'



There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q18j: Information via the school library / library services**

Q6_Stage	1. Not at all effective		2.		3. Unsure		4.		5. Highly effective		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	3	100
PS	20	25	16	20	16	20	18	22	11	14	81	100
Sec	12	18	11	16	13	19	20	30	11	16	67	100
Spec	1	20	1	20	2	40	0	0	1	20	5	100
All	33	21	28	18	<b>31</b>	<b>20</b>	38	24	26	17	156	100

Overall median response category = 'Unsure'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q19: If you were given the choice, how often would you choose to receive information to support you in your teaching of literature and language?**

Q6_Stage	Once a month		Once a term		Once a year		As it becomes available		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	2	67	0	0	0	0	1	33	3	100
PS	23	27	42	49	3	3	18	21	86	100
Sec	18	25	23	32	2	3	28	39	71	100
Spec	1	20	3	60	0	0	1	20	5	100
All	44	27	<b>68</b>	<b>41</b>	5	3	48	29	165	100

Overall median response category = 'Once a term'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q20: Is there any one particular time of year in which you would find it especially valuable to receive this sort of information?**

Q6_Stage	January to March		April to May		June to August		September to December		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	100	0	0	1	100
PS	14	19	15	20	24	32	21	28	74	100
Sec	3	5	20	34	27	47	8	14	58	100
Spec	1	25	1	25	0	0	2	50	4	100
All	18	13	36	26	<u>52</u>	<u>38</u>	31	23	137	100

Overall median response category = 'June to August'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

### Familiarity with organisations supporting literature

Below is a list of organisations which are members of the Scottish Literature Forum. For each organisation, please indicate how familiar you are with it using the following scale:

- No knowledge – I have never heard of this organisation
- Know by name – I have heard of this organisation but know very little about it
- Some knowledge – I have heard of this organisation and I know something about what it does
- Know and use – I have heard of this organisation and I have made use of some of the information, materials or resources it provides in my teaching, or I have participated in some of their programmes.

#### Q21a: Association for Scottish Literary Studies

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	1	33	1	33	1	33	0	0	3	100
PS	54	65	24	29	5	6	0	0	83	100
Sec	23	33	20	29	17	25	9	13	69	100
Spec	3	75	0	0	1	25	0	0	4	100
All	<b>81</b>	<b>51</b>	45	28	24	15	9	6	159	100

Overall median response category = ‘No knowledge’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to know of this (p=0.00%)

#### Q21b: CILIPS (Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals in Scotland)

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	3	100
PS	70	84	9	11	4	5	0	0	83	100
Sec	47	68	8	12	6	9	8	12	69	100
Spec	4	80	0	0	0	0	1	20	5	100
All	<b>121</b>	<b>76</b>	17	11	10	6	12	8	160	100

Overall median response category = ‘No knowledge’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to know of this (p=0.00%)

**Q21c: Edinburgh International Book Festival**

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	3	100
PS	6	7	14	17	40	48	24	29	84	100
Sec	2	3	5	7	30	44	31	46	68	100
Spec	0	0	0	0	3	60	2	40	5	100
All	8	5	19	12	<u>75</u>	<u>47</u>	58	36	160	100

Overall median response category = ‘Some knowledge’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to know of this (p=0.97%)

**Q21d: Edinburgh UNESCO City of Literature**

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	2	67	1	33	0	0	3	100
PS	60	74	12	15	8	10	1	1	81	100
Sec	35	51	12	17	14	20	8	12	69	100
Spec	2	40	1	20	0	0	2	40	5	100
All	<u>97</u>	<u>61</u>	27	17	23	15	11	7	158	100

Overall median response category = ‘No knowledge’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to know of this (p=0.10%)

**Q21e: The Gaelic Books Council**

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	1	33	1	33	1	33	0	0	3	100
PS	69	82	11	13	2	2	2	2	84	100
Sec	59	88	6	9	2	3	0	0	67	100
Spec	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0	5	100
All	<u>132</u>	<u>83</u>	20	13	5	3	2	1	159	100

Overall median response category = 'no knowledge'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q21f: Itchy Coo**

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	3	100
PS	27	32	17	20	12	14	28	33	84	100
Sec	28	42	13	19	20	30	6	9	67	100
Spec	2	40	1	20	0	0	2	40	5	100
All	57	36	<b>31</b>	<b>19</b>	33	21	38	24	159	100

Overall median response category = ‘Know by name’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with PS more likely to know of this (p=3.11%)

**Q21g: Literature in Learning**

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	1	33	1	33	1	33	0	0	3	100
PS	37	45	33	40	13	16	0	0	83	100
Sec	37	54	14	20	17	25	1	1	69	100
Spec	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	5	100
All	77	48	<b>51</b>	<b>32</b>	31	19	1	1	160	100

Overall median response category = ‘Know by name’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q21h: Moniack Mhor**

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	2	67	0	0	1	33	0	0	3	100
PS	80	96	2	2	1	1	0	0	83	100
Sec	54	79	3	4	8	12	3	4	68	100
Spec	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0	5	100
All	<b>139</b>	<b>87</b>	7	4	10	6	3	2	159	100

Overall median response category = ‘No knowledge’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to know of this (p=0.11%)

**Q21i: NALD (National Association for Literature Development)**

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	2	67	0	0	0	0	1	33	3	100
PS	76	94	5	6	0	0	0	0	81	100
Sec	58	87	6	9	3	4	0	0	67	100
Spec	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	100
All	<b>141</b>	<b>90</b>	11	7	3	2	1	1	156	100

Overall median response category = ‘No knowledge’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q21j: National Library of Scotland**

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	3	100
PS	8	10	13	16	42	51	19	23	82	100
Sec	3	4	19	28	32	47	14	21	68	100
Spec	1	20	1	20	2	40	1	20	5	100
All	12	8	33	21	<b>77</b>	<b>49</b>	36	23	158	100

Overall median response category = ‘Some knowledge’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q21k: Playwrights’ Studio Scotland**

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	66	80	12	15	4	5	0	0	82	100
Sec	44	64	11	16	11	16	3	4	69	100
Spec	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0	5	100
All	<b>117</b>	<b>74</b>	24	15	15	9	3	2	159	100

Overall median response category = ‘No knowledge’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to know of this (p=1.03%)

### Q21l: The Saltire Society

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	17	21	28	34	31	38	6	7	82	100
Sec	14	21	26	38	24	35	4	6	68	100
Spec	0	0	4	80	1	20	0	0	5	100
All	31	20	<b>61</b>	<b>39</b>	56	35	10	6	158	100

Overall median response category = 'Know by name'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

### Q21m: Scots Language Centre

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	2	67	0	0	1	33	3	100
PS	34	41	32	39	14	17	2	2	82	100
Sec	30	43	30	43	7	10	2	3	69	100
Spec	2	40	2	40	1	20	0	0	5	100
All	66	42	<b>66</b>	<b>42</b>	22	14	5	3	159	100

Overall median response category = 'Know by name'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

### Q21n: Scottish Book Trust

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	3	100
PS	14	17	25	30	22	27	21	26	82	100
Sec	10	15	17	25	25	37	16	24	68	100
Spec	1	20	2	40	1	20	1	20	5	100
All	25	16	44	28	<b>48</b>	<b>30</b>	41	26	158	100

Overall median response category = 'Some knowledge'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q21o: Scottish Language Dictionaries**

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	2	67	0	0	3	100
PS	26	32	25	30	18	22	13	16	82	100
Sec	19	28	21	31	18	27	9	13	67	100
Spec	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0	5	100
All	48	31	<b>49</b>	<b>31</b>	38	24	22	14	157	100

Overall median response category = ‘Know by name’

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q21p: Scottish Society of Playwrights**

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100
PS	66	80	13	16	4	5	0	0	83	100
Sec	39	57	20	29	8	12	1	1	68	100
Spec	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0	5	100
All	<b>112</b>	<b>70</b>	34	21	12	8	1	1	159	100

Overall median response category = ‘No knowledge’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to know of this (p=0.30%)

**Q21q: Scottish PEN**

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	2	67	0	0	1	33	0	0	3	100
PS	76	94	2	2	2	2	1	1	81	100
Sec	48	73	12	18	5	8	1	2	66	100
Spec	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0	5	100
All	<b>130</b>	<b>84</b>	15	10	8	5	2	1	155	100

Overall median response category = ‘No knowledge’

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to know of this (p=0.09%)



### Q21r: Scottish Poetry Library

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	1	33	2	67	3	100
PS	50	63	20	25	9	11	1	1	80	100
Sec	25	38	20	31	10	15	10	15	65	100
Spec	3	60	1	20	0	0	1	20	5	100
All	<b>78</b>	<b>51</b>	41	27	20	13	14	9	153	100

Overall median response category = 'No knowledge'

There is a statistically significant difference between PS and Sec with Sec more likely to know of this (p=0.09%)

### Q21s: Publishing Scotland

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	2	67	1	33	3	100
PS	53	66	20	25	7	9	0	0	80	100
Sec	49	71	10	14	8	12	2	3	69	100
Spec	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0	5	100
All	<b>106</b>	<b>68</b>	31	20	17	11	3	2	157	100

Overall median response category = 'No knowledge'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

### Q21t: Scottish Storytelling Centre

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	3	100
PS	30	36	25	30	18	22	10	12	83	100
Sec	22	32	28	41	11	16	8	12	69	100
Spec	1	20	2	40	1	20	1	20	5	100
All	53	33	<b>55</b>	<b>34</b>	30	19	22	14	160	100

Overall median response category = 'Know by name'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

**Q21u: Society of Authors in Scotland**

Q6_Stage	No knowledge		Know by name		Some knowledge		Know and use		All	
	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%	Coun	%
Lib	0	0	1	33	1	33	1	33	3	100
PS	58	70	16	19	7	8	2	2	83	100
Sec	47	69	13	19	7	10	1	1	68	100
Spec	3	60	1	20	1	20	0	0	5	100
All	<b><u>108</u></b>	<b><u>68</u></b>	31	19	16	10	4	3	159	100

Overall median response category = 'No knowledge'

There was no statistically significant difference between PS and Sec.

## **Final comments**

### **Q22: Do you have any other comments which you wish to make about the role of literature in education?**

Open responses grouped by sector/stage:

#### **Lib:**

I think there are so many ways for literature to be valuable – especially in topics studied in primary school. With the new curriculum, [there's] every chance that use of literature could be formalised so can be more readily available and not seen as something outwith learning, or something to be done in the pupil's own time.

There is a real need to see this developed out of the English classroom and for acknowledgement of the central role that school librarians and school library services can play in delivering this. The impact of bringing authors, poets and storytellers to the pupils is immense. It is imperative that we find ways of developing this further and on a bigger scale. Libraries and librarians need to be seen as at the centre of helping to provide this. It is a tremendous opportunity for their cross-curricular role to come to the fore.

#### **PS:**

Literature is one of the greatest tools to power and in developing the acquisition and appreciation of language skills. It is one of the foundation stones of education and should be integral to our daily lives within and outwith school. As teachers we should all be encouraging our children's parents to take time to share and enjoy literature in all its forms.

Although I am very fond of Scottish literature in all its forms I believe that we are preparing our pupils for life in a global society and it is essential that we do not allow a narrow and parochial focus to pervade Scottish education.

As teachers, we do our best within the current financial climate. The biggest help would be to have parents across the board realise the worth of reading and talking to the children. A love of books and reading starts in the home. My grandson received a wonderful book bag full of lovely books and a CD with multi-lingual songs and poems on it; even a Gaelic one!! Well done to the Scottish Book Trust and others for this fantastic initiative.

Literature is pivotal to every area of the curriculum. Some children's experience is limited by the main core readers on offer within schools. Writing in Scots needs more encouragement and recognition.

It may seem strange that I don't value external input more but time is so pressured in primary schools that we can't afford to spend time on visitors of variable quality with variable understanding of the children's current learning and of the learning priorities. So we are very cautious about this. This is exacerbated by the pressure on us to focus on 'attainment' in reading and writing as determined narrowly by 5–14 national assessments.

In a world dominated by computers, we must not lose sight of the importance of literature for our future citizens.

The Reading Bus has done great work to promote a love of literature and storytelling and book-based activities in Aberdeen.

Greater emphasis needs to be placed on literature and the exciting potential there is to explore social history etc through it, as well as the more obvious linguistic concepts etc therein.

Literature in education has to be targeted and relevant to the audience.

**Sec:**

We need to make time for reading / listening for pleasure without it being assessed and measured!

As an English teacher, I feel literature has a vital part to play in education. Have recently studied literature with the OU and have really enjoyed that and it has kept my own critical essay writing skills fresh. More time needed to work with other departments e.g. History in developing ways of me choosing texts to help students enhance their understanding of a historical period.

We must strive to promote literature in an age when new media is in danger of overshadowing more traditional forms.

Lots of potential to be used in modern languages teaching but suitable resources for the ranges of abilities and interests are hard to come by, likewise guides to making the most use out of texts.

How long have you got.....? It is a sad fact that it is possible to pass Higher English having studied only ONE poem and ONE short story!

As Network Librarian my remit covers both academy and branch libraries and we very much try to encompass literature in education across the community.

I believe it is essential, above all other areas of the curriculum, to foster an appreciation and joy in literature in all forms. I used to teach in New Zealand where the teaching of literacy was fundamental and am convinced that, in order to access all areas of secondary education, it is a priority to have a good grounding in literacy.

[Survey] very geared towards English language teachers in Secondary schools ... this does NOT address subject teachers of other subjects really... and therefore what is the point?

I would like to see it taken more seriously and the enjoyment of literature to be valued more.

The drive towards targets/grades has meant a loss of focus on literatures. The wonderful ideas behind Curriculum for Excellence are being hindered by the outcomes being attached to the ethos. The balance between qualitative and quantitative evidence in education is weighted in favour of the latter.

Drama should be used more as a tool to facilitate learning in literature

It is vital. Scots literature is particularly valuable. Issues do exist with costs when buying in contemporary works. Good centrally produced Resources [are needed to] give an incentive for time-strapped staff to try new works or branch out!

I feel the words literacy and literature are a bit confused in this survey. I would be interested in improving literacy skills, not so much literature skills.

Literacy extends throughout the curriculum not just English – more resources specific to subjects are needed to enable teachers to become comfortable teaching literacy.

I feel that most pupils do not have a good standard of literacy skills and that anything that can help improve this is a plus.

Difficult to answer some of the questions when unaware of the type of support available.

It's essential for all pupils to experience literature at the appropriate level as it is a very personal skill to acquire.

**Spec.**

There were no additional comments from Spec.

## Appendix F

### Literature in Learning Survey

#### Demographics questions

The first set of questions (1-10) asks for some background information about you and your school. This will be important to enable the research team to place your responses in the correct context

1. What is the name of your school?

2. In which local authority area is your school situated?

3. How many pupils are there in your school?

- 70 or fewer
- 71-200
- 201-400
- 401-700
- 701 or more

4. How would you characterise the catchment area of your school?

- Large urban
- Accessible town
- Remote town
- Other urban
- Accessible rural
- Remote rural

5. Is your school:

- A state school
- An independent school

6. Is your school (please tick all that apply):

- Pre-school
- Primary
- Secondary
- Special

7. What is your role within the school? Are you:

- A head teacher
- A depute head teacher or other member of the senior management team
- A faculty head
- A principal teacher
- A class teacher
- A librarian
- Other (please specify)

8. If you are a specialist subject teacher or librarian (for example, in a secondary school), are you:

- A school librarian
- An English teacher
- A teacher of film or media studies
- A teacher of Languages (including Modern Languages, Community Languages, Classics, or EAL)
- A teacher of Mathematics or sciences
- A teacher of Social Subjects
- A teacher of Expressive Arts
- A Learning Support or SEN teacher
- Other (please specify)

9. For how many years have you been a teacher?

(If you are not a teacher, for how many years have you worked in education?)

- I am a probationer
- I am fully qualified and have been teaching for up to 5 years
- I have been teaching for between 6 to 15 years
- I have been teaching for 16 years or more

10. Are you::

- Female
- Male

**The teaching of literature, literacy, and language skills**

11. Below are a number of statements about the teaching of literature in Scottish schools. Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each statement.

["1" = strongly disagree, "5" = strongly agree]



	1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Unsure	4 Agree	5 Strongly agree
The role of literature in education has a high priority within Scottish education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Writing and language skills are fundamental to course work in all subject areas	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am comfortable teaching and supporting pupils in their oral and written language skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel fully confident in my ability to support my students in studying literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I would welcome links with libraries, writers' organisations, or websites to develop cross-curricular literacy	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is a wide range of resources available to me to support me if I wish to include the study of literature in my teaching	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am fully aware of sources of support available to me to help me to include the study of literature in my teaching	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have made links with external agencies that have developed my students' literacy skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The place of literature in learning will be enhanced with the introduction of <i>A Curriculum for Excellence</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The study of literature has a valuable contribution to make within the context of cross-curricular work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
There is a need for more CPD literature and language courses to support the teaching of literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

There should be a much wider range of different types of literature available and affordable for students and schools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Students benefit greatly from school visits by real writers, poets and storytellers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Staff in my school already develop the literacy potential of external visits or agencies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Pupils currently receive enough support and encouragement in their own writing and research outside of English and Language classrooms	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Types of literature

12. Are there any particular genres of literature for which you would value advice and support in your teaching? Please indicate below the extent to which you would value advice and support in the teaching of these different genres of literature.

[“1” = support is not required, “5” = support would be highly valued.]

	1 Not require d	2	3 Unsure	4	5 Highly valued
Poetry	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drama	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Novels / fiction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Oral storytelling including folktales	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Graphic novels	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Picture books for younger readers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
‘Classic’ literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scottish literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Literature in the Scots language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gaelic literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The writing process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The publishing process	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Non-fiction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
On-line resources (including Research Methods Wikis and Blogs)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

13. Are there any other genres of literature, or aspects of literature, for which you would value advice and support in your teaching? If so, please specify.



**Target groups**

14. Are there any particular age groups of readers for which you would value advice and support in your teaching? Please indicate below the extent to which you would value advice and support in the teaching of these groups.

[“1” = support is not required, “5” = support would be highly valued.]

	1 Not require d	2	3 Unsure	4	5 Highly valued
Pre-readers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Beginning readers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Developing readers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fluent pre-teen readers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Young teenage readers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Older teenage readers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Adult readers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reluctant readers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Young people with reading difficulties	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Gifted students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Readers who are learning English as a second or additional language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Target stages

15. Are there any particular stages of education for which you would value advice and support in your teaching of literature? Please indicate below the extent to which you would value advice and support in the teaching of these stages.

[“1” = support is not required, “5” = support would be highly valued.]

	1 Not require d	2	3 Unsure	4	5 Highly valued
Early years, pre-readers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Early years, primary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Middle years, primary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Upper years, primary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Lower years, secondary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Middle years, secondary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Upper years, secondary education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Post-compulsory education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Types of resources

16. Are there any particular types of resources which you would value to support your teaching?  
Please indicate below the extent to which you would value the following types of resources.

[“1” = support is not required, “5” = support would be highly valued.]

	1 Not require d	2	3 Unsure	4	5 Highly valued
CPD / in-service courses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Teaching guides on specific works or writers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conferences or events for teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information leaflets from literary organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A central web site with links to sources of further information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Resources including ideas, materials, and methodology suggestions	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outreach work in schools by literature / arts organisations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
School visits by practising writers, poets, or storytellers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Writers, poets, or storytellers in residence	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conferences or events for students	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

17. Are there any other types of resources which you would value to support your teaching?

**Types of communication preferred**

18. Are there any particular forms of communication which you would value to support your teaching? Please indicate below the extent to which you would value the following forms of communication.

[“1” = this is not required, “5” = this would be highly valued.]

	1 Not require d	2	3 Unsure	4	5 Highly valued
Direct mailing to yourself	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Direct email to yourself	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information via GLOW	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LTS Newsletter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
A single web site to which I could refer for information and links to appropriate materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information sent to school office in hard copy and circulated within the school as appropriate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information sent to school office by email and circulated within the school as appropriate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Press and news reports	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Personal contact with providers of support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Information via the school library / library services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



19. If you were given the choice, how often would you choose to receive information to support you in your teaching of literature and language?

- Once a month
- Once a term
- Once a year
- As it becomes available

20. Is there any one particular time of year in which you would find it especially valuable to receive this sort of information?

- January to March
- April to May
- June to August
- September to December

### Familiarity with organisations supporting literature

21. Below is a list of organisations which are members of the Scottish Literature Forum. For each organisation, please indicate how familiar you are with it using the following scale:

- No knowledge - I have never heard of this organisation
- Know by name - I have heard of this organisation but know very little about it
- Some knowledge - I have heard of this organisation and I know something about what it does
- Know and use - I have heard of this organisation and I have made use of some of the information, materials or resources it provides in my teaching, or I have participated in some of their programmes.

	1 No knowled ge	2 Know by name	3 Some knowled ge	4 Know and use
Association for Scottish Literary Studies	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CILIPS (Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals in Scotland)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Edinburgh International Book Festival	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Edinburgh UNESCO City of Literature	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Gaelic Books Council	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Itchy Coo	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Literature in Learning	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Moniack Mhor	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
NALD (National Association for Literature Development)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National Library of Scotland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Playwrights' Studio Scotland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The Saltire Society	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scots Language Centre	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scottish Book Trust	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scottish Language Dictionaries	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scottish Society of Playwrights	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Scottish PEN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scottish Poetry Library	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publishing Scotland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scottish Storytelling Centre	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Society of Authors in Scotland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Final comments**

22. Do you have any other comments which you wish to make about the role of literature in education?

## Focus Groups

The research team behind this survey are planning to conduct a number of focus group events to explore further the issues raised by it. These will take place in Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen or Ayr in late October or or early November 2008. Places at these events will be limited, and an attempt will be made to balance representation from different sectors, genders and years of experience.

23. Would you be willing to take part in such a focus group discussion?

- Yes       No

24. If you have answered 'yes', you would be prepared to take part in a focus group discussion, which venue would you prefer to attend?

- Aberdeen  
 Ayr  
 Edinburgh  
 Glasgow

25. If you are willing to take part in a focus group discussion, or if you would like to receive email information from Literature in Learning regarding school CPD opportunities in the future, please supply us with an email address which we can use to contact you.

26. If you have supplied your email address, please you also tell us your name?

## Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire

This research is led by Professor James McGonigal of the Faculty of Education, University of Glasgow, St Andrew's Building, 11 Eldon Street, Glasgow G3 6NH.

If you have any questions about the research, he may be contacted by email at:

[j.mcgonigal@educ.gla.ac.uk](mailto:j.mcgonigal@educ.gla.ac.uk)

The results of the survey will be published on the Literature in Learning web pages:  
[www.scottishbooktrust.com/learning-and-inclusion/literature-in-learning](http://www.scottishbooktrust.com/learning-and-inclusion/literature-in-learning).