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This grounded theory study, set in the context of two English Language Arts classrooms, sought to explore the processes and influences involved in the reading and writing (Designing) activities of two groups of students using video as the storytelling medium. The research questions guiding this study were:

1. What processes do students use to Design with video text?
2. What influences students’ decision-making while Designing video texts?

These questions were developed to help explore implications of students reading and composing video in an English Language Arts classroom, and what bearing those implications may have on the future of the English Language Arts curriculum.

Through several data sources, including concurrent think-aloud protocols, interviews, and the students’ video projects, this study demonstrated that the two case study groups were influenced heavily by their knowledge of genre and narrative structure in piecing together video narratives from pre-existing video footage. This study also demonstrated that the groups’ processes of Designing were different in many ways, but shared the characteristics of being iterative and demonstrating attention to creating clarity of meaning for the audience.
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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY AND OVERVIEW OF THE PROBLEM

*When children are continuously offered opportunities to express their stories about the world through many avenues, they show that the power and range of their intellectual and creative pursuits are unbounded; they create new kinds of learning communities that offer membership to every child; they teach us that the process of education transcends methodology and curriculum and is situated in the realm of possibility. They change our conceptions of who teaches whom in the classroom.* (Gallas, 1994, pp. xvi-xvii)

Introduction

I began teaching high school English in the fall of 2001, excited to bring great literature, especially great short stories, to my 10th-grade students. I quickly discovered that it was not going to be as easy as I had thought. I found that many of my students were reluctant to read the stories in the textbook, and even when I brought in other short stories to supplement the limited offerings of our English text, they still largely failed to engage the students’ interests. However, things got even worse when it came time for them to create their own short stories:

“Why do we have to do this?”

“Can we just tell our story?”

“This is BORING. Can we watch a movie?”

Discouraging to a new teacher, to say the least. The challenges I encountered in the process of working with students in reading and writing continued to evolve and grow.
over the course of the next four years of teaching, and I began to wonder exactly what the problem was. Why weren’t these students getting into reading short stories and writing ones of their own? What was the matter with today’s students?

This questioning began back in 2001 from the perspective of a teacher wanting to be able to reach her students. It evolved, just as the challenges and problems did, while I began my doctoral studies in 2003. I continued to experience what Parker Palmer (1998) called “critical moments,” or those moments “in which a learning opportunity for students will open up, or shut down—depending, in part, on how the teacher handles it” (p. 145). I began to wonder if the problem was less about today’s students, and more about how I was teaching today’s students. I decided, therefore, to begin changing how we went about working with short stories, just to see what would happen. Instead of sticking to the tried (but not so true) method of reading and writing print stories, what if we began to consider other media and other ways to read and tell those stories? What if the students were to write and perform short stories as plays? What if they teamed up to create graphic short stories, incorporating visual pictures along with print text? Finally, remembering the “Can we watch a movie?” plea, I wondered what would happen if I let my English students do what only the few TV Studio students traditionally were asked to do—create a video short story. What would that look like? How might that change the terrain of learning in my English classes? What might the students do?
What began with a few small action research projects within my classroom eventually led to this study. Over the course of the last five years, my students taught me what a student-centered curriculum is really about: It is about meeting students where they are, taking their out-of-school lives, experiences, and interests into consideration when designing how to help them learn. In essence, they taught me that I needed to expand my classroom curriculum’s notion of what constitutes “text.”

Introduction to Study and Statement of the Problem

Peter Smagorinsky (1995) asserted that writing is only one possible tool for composition and that “the composition of other kinds of texts (music, art, dance, drama) can potentially enable students to construct meaning in ways similar to those that have been widely claimed and sometimes documented for writing” (p. 164). Smagorinsky (2002) defined composition broadly as “a way of producing texts, rather than a way of producing a particular kind of text” (p. 10). This, however, is not a new idea; James Britton (1970) supported rethinking traditional concepts of text early on:

> Once we recognize the value of books as a source of experience, we must admit as similar sources the visual-verbal media of film, television and stage-play. I think it is a matter of time (and money for equipment) before this realization affects the school curriculum: out of school, at home, the equivalence is already apparent. (p. 264)

Britton’s words were prophetic; students’ out-of-school interests are rapidly drifting farther and farther away from the traditional model of literacy valued in many English
classrooms. The implications of this go beyond a struggle to “hook” students into learning skills; it speaks to what schools are explicitly saying about which “skills” are valuable and which are not. Freire and Macedo (1994) reminded us that literacy is not achieved through alienating and antagonizing students by devaluing what makes them who they are—linguistically or culturally: “The successful usage of the students’ cultural universe requires respect and legitimation of students’ discourses, that is, their own linguistic codes, which are different but never inferior” (pp. 434-435). Students’ out-of-school literacies and experiences must be, and in fact already are, an integral part of what happens in a classroom. Video is a crucial part of students’ lives outside of school, and is of great interest to most of them, interest which Dewey (1948, 1956) reminded us is a crucial part of students’ motivation to learn.

It is valuable that a study of video reading and composition happen in an English classroom because traditionally, work with video media has been relegated to a school’s TV/Video production classes, to which not all students have access. Goodman (2003) also reminded us that separating media such as video from everyday work at school does not have the benefit that incorporating such media in core classes such as English would: “We don’t expect children to learn to write well from just one essay or poetry project. Literacy skills develop over years of repeated practice in countless different situations” (p. 62). The more experience students have in various modes of composition, the better “writers” they will be—no matter the mode. As Costanzo (1984) put it, it is possible that students may discover that what they do when composing with video “can work for them when they are writing too” (p. 3). Additionally, as Danesi (1998) pointed out, “Clearly, a
text bears no meaning unless the receiver of the text knows the code(s) from which it was constructed and unless the text refers to, occurs in, or entails some specific context” (p. 24). Messaris (1994) suggested that the medium of film/video may be a starting point for students’ manipulation of the (often) more difficult code of print text because of its accessibility and familiarity: “Learning to understand images does not require the lengthy period of initiation characteristic of language learning, and permeability of cultural boundaries is much greater for images than it is for language” (pp. 39-40). This study examines the reading and writing of non-print texts in an effort to explore these issues further.

The multimodal characteristic of video allows for students to manipulate a variety of elements for effect, options not available to them in print alone. This view is supported by The National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), which has posted several resources on its website supporting the use of multimodal texts (2006). In fact, NCTE’s 2008 Convention has at its core the theme of multiliteracies for the 21st century, directly addressing the need for educators to acknowledge the power of multimodal texts.

A study such as this taking place in an English classroom is also valuable because, since print has so long been the dominant form of composition in school, relatively few studies have been conducted in an English classroom about students’ composing process with video as the medium. Dewey (1948) stated that we teachers “should know how to utilize the surroundings, physical and social, that exist so as to extract from them all that they have to contribute to building up experiences that are worth while” (p. 35). It is therefore important that teachers begin, and continue, to gain
knowledge about how students navigate the world around them, and what literacies they utilize to do so. Niesyto and Buckingham (2001), understanding the importance of video in students’ lives outside of school, agreed that there is a need for further studies on how students produce, rather than just consume, video. They gave a very pragmatic reason: “If we wish to learn about young people’s views and perspectives, we should be giving them a chance to express themselves through their own media productions” (p. 169). This study sought to gain such information.

Even beyond the importance at-home literacies play in student interest and learning, the larger context is at play: the world in which our children are growing up, and will be living and working once they get out of school. Dewey (1904/1962) made the observation that student teachers need to be prepared to adapt to the students they have, not the other way around:

> The same subject-matter in geography, nature-study, or art develops not merely day to day in a given grade, but from year to year throughout the entire movement of the school; and [the student teacher] should realize this before he gets much encouragement in trying to adapt subject-matter in lesson plans for this or that isolated grade. (pp. 19-20)

This was true back in 1904 but may be even truer today. Friedman (2006) has declared that our world has become “flat,” or increasingly interconnected, due to leaps in technology in the last few years. Friedman claimed that the flat-world phenomenon is the result of a convergence of several things, including the personal computer, fiber optic
cable, and adequate software allowing people to collaborate more freely (p. 10). Tapping into students’ abilities to read and manipulate multiple forms of text and to collaborate in work production is a crucial step in helping students read and write the world in which they will be living. In addition, Friedman pointed to a notable difference between today’s students and those of generations past:

There is going to be something about the flattening of the world that is going to be qualitatively different from the great changes of previous eras: the speed and breadth with which it is taking hold. The introduction of printing happened over a period of decades and for a long time affected only a relatively small part of the planet. Same with the Industrial Revolution. This flattening process is happening at warp speed and directly or indirectly touching a lot more people on the planet at once. (p. 49)

Several scholars (Hobbs, 2007; Niesyto & Buckingham, 2001; Thoman & Jolls, 2005; Tyner, 1998) echo that students’ world context should play an integral part in decision-making about English curriculum for 21st century students. Research such as this study in the area of multiliteracies is one avenue to exploring how best to serve the needs of today’s, and tomorrow’s, students.

Purpose of This Study and Research Questions

This study has been designed to explore the notion that reading and composition are recursive processes that are not limited to print text. The goal is to gain insight and
contribute to our knowledge regarding literacy using media other than print text. The research questions formulated for this study were as follows:

1. What processes do students use to Design with video text?
2. What influences students’ decision-making while Designing video texts?

These questions were developed to help uncover implications of students reading and composing video in an English classroom, and what bearing these may have on the future of the English language arts curriculum.

Definition of Term: Designing

This study is an inquiry into the influences on students’ decision-making and the processes students exhibit during what The New London Group (2000) called “Designing,” which they defined as reshaping an original text (in this case, existing video text) into a new text. Therefore, I designate the reading and composition activities of students working with video text as Designing, and expanded on the literal and metaphorical aspects of this process.

Position of the Researcher

As both the teacher and researcher in this study, I was afforded the opportunity to use each role to enhance the other. Lawrence Stenhouse (1975) explicitly took the stance that teachers have a direct conduit to information about what happens in classrooms: “It is not enough that teachers’ work should be studied: they need to study it themselves” (p. 143). However, he acknowledged that in taking the position of researcher, teachers need to clarify for the participants—the students—what they will be doing, and why. He explained what is required: “In my experience, this is quite possible provided [the
teacher] makes it clear that the reason he is playing the role of researcher is to improve his teaching and make things better for them” (p. 155). This was exactly the setup of this particular study in order to set up an inquiry-rich atmosphere in which students would understand that work done in the classroom was always under scrutiny to some degree.

Gallas (1994) also pointed out that the data-gathering process of teacher-researchers can, and often does, become a natural part of the classroom, and is much less invasive than the methods employed by outside researchers. She noted that “teacher-researchers working with ethnographic methods are distinguished from most other effective teachers in this one important area: We purposefully gather data with which to reflect upon our teaching, our questions, and our children’s learning” (p. 5). Questions were generated in this study from that “insider view,” and it was possible to teach lessons that were a natural part of the everyday workings of the classroom.

Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1993) also promoted the unique perspective of the teacher in asking questions about teaching and students’ ways of knowing within the classroom. They emphasized the distinct difference between research on teaching and teacher research, the former being an outside-in, often university-based perspective, and the latter being the teacher-as-insider’s perspective (p. 10). Ernst (1994), in her study of several art classes she taught, also pointed out the value of the teacher-researcher’s position to create a learning environment that allows students freedom of expression through various media, and then observe the outcome. She called for more teachers to create this atmosphere in their own classrooms: “We need to work toward making our classrooms workshops of learning—a literate community filled with opportunities for
many ways of making meaning . . . so that students can participate in apprenticeships of learning” (p. 166). In this study, I was in a position to use what I knew about students’ previous experiences with traditional texts to create a new approach to teaching and learning, and observe the result.

Assumptions

Based on literature examined in order to contextualize this study, it is assumed that students learn more about composition if they are interested and invested in the process (Dewey, 1948, 1956); that “text” can include more than just the printed word (Costanzo, 2004; Masterman, 1985; Smagorinsky, 1995; The New London Group, 2000; Thomas, 1978; Tyner, 1998); that meaning-making is a process aided by interacting with text on many levels (Bruner, 1986; Iser, 1978; Rosenblatt, 1994; Scholes, 1989); that students use multiple literacies every day to negotiate the world around them (Barton & Hamilton, 2000; Gee, 1990; Heath, 1983; Street, 1984, 2000); and that cooperative learning is a process-oriented activity focused on meaning-making (Barnes, 1992; Britton, 1970; Dyson, 1997; Elbow, 2000a; Holubec, Johnson, & Johnson, 1995; Masterman, 1985; Slavin, 1999).

Limitations

This research is influenced by the pre-existing lens of multiliteracies and new literacy studies, whereby students’ meaning-making happens in multiple ways, and through the manipulation of multiple forms of text (Street, 1984, 2000; The New London Group, 2000). Because I was the teacher of the study participants, and because some of the data to be analyzed (teacher journal, observations) were from my point of view, there
was a possibility of bias when analyzing the data. Also, this study used pre-existing data, collected by myself as the teacher-researcher but nonetheless a bit removed from the participants. One common means to address bias issues with this kind of data, member-checking with participants, was not available to me. However, I was able to check with the participants as the research proceeded, and the fact that I collected the data as the teacher and as a comfortable part of the research environment allowed me to gather that data without restrictions to time or classroom availability. The students were used to classroom procedures and atmosphere at this point in the school year and not inclined to be uncomfortable or bothered by the research elements involved.

Another limitation was set by technology; occasionally, some of the students experienced trouble with their tape-recorders on which they were taping their think-aloud protocols. Also, students would occasionally forget to turn the tape recorders on and have to be reminded, either by me or by fellow group members. This means that perhaps I did not get on tape all of the information I might have in order to shed light on the students’ work. Fortunately, I had several good chunks of time during the day during which to record observations in my teacher journal, thus hopefully filling in any gaps of information.

In addition, because this study took place in an English classroom during the regular class day, the nature of the various research protocols was a disruption. Two other potential limitations to the study were that this was a novel assignment, and that students may very well have been influenced by the desire to please the researcher, who
was also their teacher. However, while the video composition assignment was new to the students, they had experienced a number of technology rich assignments throughout the school year. Finally, whereas some would argue that the position of the teacher as researcher limits possibility of validity, others would argue that for classroom based research, the insight and additional knowledge possessed by the teacher as researcher enhance validity. I concur. This is an in-depth look at the work of two groups in two classes during one school year, in order to gather rich and varied data in a specific situation. Therefore, within the stated limitations of this study, the value of this research lies in its ability to generate new ideas and new thinking on the topic of reading and composing with video text.

Summary of Chapter 1

This qualitative study of two groups of my 10th grade English students sought to answer two questions:

1. What processes do students use to Design with video text?

2. What influences students’ decision-making while Designing video texts?

In answering these questions I had two groups of students use pre-existing video clips with which to create a narrative in order to examine the results of students’ work bringing their in-school and out-of-school tacit and explicit literacies to bear within the context of a high school English classroom.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

_In the end, we might say that, contrary to the literacy myth, nothing follows from literacy or schooling. Much follows, however, from what comes with literacy and schooling, what literacy and schooling come wrapped up in, namely the attitudes, values, norms and beliefs . . . that always accompany literacy and schooling._ (Gee, 1990, p. 42)

Introduction

There are many different pieces to the puzzle of what students experienced in the course of reading and composing texts for this study. Moffett (1983) reminded us that “the question is not just what students can do but what they want to do and how they do it” (p. 55, italics in original). How were students making meaning of texts? How were they creating meanings of their own in composition? Why is the medium—print or non-print—important? What constitutes “literacy” for these students, and exactly what are the implications of that definition? As a teacher-researcher asking these questions, it was important to examine how these students experienced text, both in reading and composition, and to also decide in what way to bridge that gap in order to see how the students’ attitudes, behaviors, and products might be different from those I remember of students from previous years reading and composing in traditional print text.

The theoretical framework for this study is based first on literature on meaning-making in reading and composition. The students in this study were constantly engaged in both as they worked on their video stories in an effort to shape and create meaning, and
I included viewpoints about how and where reading and composition come together on common ground. Next, literature was reviewed that defines and examines the implications of multiliteracies in education. Also included is a summary of studies on multiliteracies and multimedia composition that have served to point the way for this study and highlight the ways in which this study breaks new and different ground. Finally, because students worked in cooperative groups for the creation of their video compositions, it was important to include literature providing insights into cooperative learning and how group issues relate to the findings of this study.

Meaning-Making in Reading and Composition

Rosenblatt (1994, pp. 1-2) began with the metaphor of an author, a reader, and a text on a stage, the spotlight firmly fixed first upon the text, then the author, but never the reader. This view of the reader as “invisible” (p. 1), as Rosenblatt aptly put it, has by no means been a short-lived viewpoint in the teaching of literature; in the 1930s and 1940s the wave of “New Criticism,” a pendulum-swing away from previously expressionistic views on the production of art and literature, brought about a focus not upon the artist’s or viewer’s interpretation as being key, but upon the text itself, and in fact, “close reading” is still seen by some English educators as much more important than individual interpretations of a text with regards to generating meaning (Applebee, 1974; Kinneavy, 1971). However, Rosenblatt (1994) called the New Critics’ stance a “hegemony” (p. 41) that may eventually lose its privileged status in favor of viewpoints like hers that have gained increasing respect.
Rosenblatt’s (1994) argument is that when a text and reader come together, an entirely new entity—the “poem”—is created. “The finding of meanings involves both the author’s text and what the reader brings to it” (p. 14). The reader is therefore made not only visible, but an integral part of what Iser termed “virtual text” (1978), much like Rosenblatt’s “poem.” Iser stated that when “the reader passes through the various perspectives offered by the text and relates the different views and patterns to one another he sets the work in motion, and so sets himself in motion too” (p. 21). Meaning, according to both Iser and Rosenblatt, is a construction, an interpretation, rather than a concrete reality that must be received by the reader.

Rosenblatt’s (1994) concept of an entirely new text being created in the act of reading also finds strong support in Scholes’ (1989) Protocols of Reading, in which he stated that “reading is a creative process in which we generate, use, and discard our own texts as a way of making sense of the text we are ostensibly ‘reading’” (p. 8). Protocols of reading are, he claimed, needed to create a “framework in which to negotiate our differences” (p. 51). This “negotiation,” Scholes said, does not dictate a view of textual objectivity, or “fundamentalism,” as the New Critics would have us believe, and neither does it ignore this subjective meaning-making element. He instead painted a picture of a negotiation between “centripetal” reading, which is a reading focused on a text’s original intention, and “centrifugal” reading, wherein the reader is free to bring his or her own constantly changing and evolving interpretations together in a holistic meaning-making process. Rosenblatt (1994) echoed this viewpoint: “Sharp demarcation between objective
and subjective becomes irrelevant, since they are, rather, aspects of the same
transaction—the reader looks to the text, and the text is activated by the reader” (p. 18).

In addition to recognizing the transaction (a term reflecting a non-linear, give-
and-take relationship) between the reader and the text, Rosenblatt (1994) examined the
reader’s reason for the very act of reading in the first place. She designated two stances a
reader may take, the efferent and aesthetic. In the efferent stance, a reader is focused on
taking away certain knowledge, whereas in the aesthetic stance, the reader is concerned
with the act of reading—feelings, thoughts, emotions, occurring during the process (p.
24). Rosenblatt observed that the “concept of transaction emphasizes the relationship
with, and continuing awareness of, the text” (p. 29, emphasis in original). This clearly
meshes with Scholes’ (1989) sense of “negotiation” (p. 51).

Britton (1970), in his desire to construct a theory of discourse, named roles taken
on by speakers and readers that act in much the same way as Rosenblatt’s reader roles:
participant (efferent) and spectator (aesthetic). Britton saw the manipulation of language
as a way of making sense of the world, and he called this making sense “symbolizing” (p.
14). To Britton, students’ “secondary” experiences with reading are a way for them to
negotiate meaning with the author and the text, and in doing so, grow as individuals.

Bruner (1986, p. 4) described such a negotiation as one in which the reader seeks
to make sense of the “symbolic worlds” created by the author. He posited that, although
the argument can be made that multiple interpretations (which he termed “polysemy”) of
a text may happen simultaneously, it is still of interest to ask exactly how, and why, and
in what way these interpretations come about (p. 5). Like Britton, Bruner sought to
categorize the cognitive functions of the reader. He illustrated two modes of thought, 
paradigmatic (making connections based on observable phenomena, that which could 
logically be testable in an empirical way) and narrative (being able to see the possibility 
of connections not supported by observable, empirical evidence; pp. 12-13). Bruner’s 
narrative mode is one in which the reader is capable of going beyond the limitations set 
by the need of the paradigmatic mode to scientifically “prove.” He equated the narrative 
mode with “art” in the form of story that “triggers” interpretations in the mind of the 
reader. However, Bruner went beyond Britton’s (1970) notion of the reader’s 
development of a sense of “individuation” in the act of making meaning through texts to 
a notion that includes the social:

Insofar as we account for our own actions and for the human events that occur 
among us principally in terms of narrative, story, drama, it is conceivable that our 
sensitivity to narrative provides the major link between our own sense of self and 
our sense of others in the social world around us. The common coin may be 
provided by the forms of narrative that the culture offers us. (Bruner, 1986, p. 69)

Bruner made an important connection, then, between the world of the individual 
**interpreter**, the “reader” in Rosenblatt’s triad, to the larger contextual and cultural 
contribution to the creation of Rosenblatt’s **poem**, and Iser’s **virtual text**.

**Meaning-Making in Composition**

Much of composition process research and theory, taken as a whole, illustrates the 
difficulty faced by teachers and current researchers in deciding what will best aid 
students in making meaning with a variety of texts. As the above examples illustrate,
many theorists sought to explain meaning-making by questioning the transaction happening between the reader, the text, and the larger social context in which that transaction takes place. At the same time, research about writing was starting to come into its own, and there was a growing call from researchers like Britton (1970), Emig (1971, 1994), Hayes and Flower (1980), and Shaughnessy (1977) for more research on how writing contributes to learning, and the very process of writing itself. Emig (1994), in her 1977 *Writing as a Mode of Learning*, stressed that more research on writing is vital, warning that otherwise, “writing itself as a central academic process may not long endure” (p. 98). This call was partly as a result of the feeling among teachers and researchers that the teaching of writing was not serving the needs of students. Shaughnessy (1977) went so far as to say that many students were viewing academic writing as a “trap” (p. 7), whereby the purpose was not to communicate meaning but to expose their weaknesses as writers.

Emphasis on the process, rather than the product, of writing can be found in what the report titled *Research in Written Composition* (Braddock, Lloyd-Jones, & Schoer, 1963) called “Unexplored Territory” (p. 52). The authors compiled a list of possible areas of exploration in composition, many of which are questions that focus on what a writer does while writing—in other words, the process. This process has been described in multiple ways by multiple researchers, beginning with the linear model of pre-writing, writing, and re-writing (Rohman & Wlecke, 1964, p. 12), which has been shaped and reshaped into various incarnations ever since. However the process is laid out, Faigley (1986) usefully addressed these “competing theories of process” by categorizing them
into three viewpoints: the cognitive view, the expressive view, and the social view (pp. 527-528).

The cognitive view, embodied by such landmark researchers as Emig (1971), Hayes and Flower (1980), Britton (1970), Moffett (1981, 1983), and Kinneavy (1971), is less individual-oriented and more focused on the audience, and reason, for composing a text (Faigley, 1986, p. 534). Emig’s (1971) study of the composition process of a group of eight 12th-graders prompted her to categorize two modes of composing: reflexive and extensive. The first mode, reflexive, is reminiscent of Rosenblatt’s (1994) aesthetic mode of reading, in that it “focuses upon the writer’s thoughts and feelings concerning his experiences” (Emig, 1971, p. 4). The second, the extensive, is one that “focuses upon the writer’s conveying a message or communication to another” (p. 4), which corresponds to Rosenblatt’s (1994) efferent mode of reading. One of the greatest contributions of her study is her noteworthy twist in data-gathering; she used think-aloud protocol analysis similar to that developed by Newell and Simon (as cited in Hayes & Flower, 1980, p. 153). In this way, she was able to go one step beyond in the effort to discover what students were thinking in the process of writing and trying to create meaning in a text. This was indeed a switch from the earlier models of product-focused research, like much of what is to be found in the report by Braddock et al. (1964). Emig (1971) noted that all parts of the protocol data provide information: “Even the writer’s silence can be categorized” (p. 92). This illustrates the usefulness of the think-aloud protocol in bringing out certain behaviors that indicate that much more is going on during composition than the mere end product would indicate.
Cognitive theorists Hayes and Flower (1980), in their landmark *Identifying the Organization of Writing Processes*, divided the writing process into planning, translating, and reviewing, with subcategories for each, with an emphasis on the non-linear nature of the model (which was subsequently clarified by Hayes [2000] as consisting of planning, text generation, and revision). They upheld the idea that writing is a recursive act, whereby the writer revisits various parts of the process, echoing Emig (1971).

As another cognitive theorist, Britton (1994) stated that in the same way meaning is constructed during the process of reading, depending on what the reader brings to the text and what other modes of discourse come into play, so too is the act of writing constructive in the moment of the very act itself—what he termed “shaping at the point of utterance” (p. 142). In viewing writing this way, Britton saw the writer’s entire contextual framework interacting with the writer’s work in order to continually shape the work through “manipulative play” (1982, p. 65) as it is composed. In *Language and Learning* (1970), Britton made the point that children who are learning the process of writing should be allowed to experience the spontaneity that, as he put it, will stimulate the writer to keep writing (p. 148).

Influenced by Britton’s categories, Moffett (1981, 1983) developed a writing system to take into account a relationship between a first, second, and third person, all engaged in what he called the “four stages of discourse”—inner verbalization, outer vocalization, correspondence, and formal writing (p. 141). Moffett’s (1981) trio of “I, you, and it” (p. 140) corresponds to the author-text-reader relationship Rosenblatt (1994) outlined in her opening metaphor, and Moffett justified the need for such a system by
clearly pointing out the shortcomings of the “traditional” approach: “One failure of English teaching has been to consider only messages, or consider them before or without placing them in the whole context of the communication frame wherein the student can see the operation of all relations” (1983, p. 12). There must be, according to Moffett, a “discourse unity” (p. 146) that allows for meaning-making to be three-dimensional, taking all parts into consideration.

Another cognitive researcher, Kinneavy (1971), developed the categories of “encoder” and “decoder” (much like the previously mentioned author-reader in Rosenblatt’s triad), which are engaged in four main types, or “aims” of discourse (expressive, referential, literary, persuasive). These correspond closely with Britton’s (1970) function categories (transactional, expressive, poetic), renamed by Applebee (1981) as informational, personal, and imaginative, respectively. These researchers, and others working from the cognitive view, are not only interested in the reader/decoder’s reason, or stance, but also in the types of text being generated through writing.

The expressive view is exemplified in the work of Elbow (2000c), who called meaning making in text a “deforming” of both the text to meet the reader, and the reader to meet the text (p. 58), and has promoted the freewriting approach as being that which has most helped his students make meaning (Elbow, 2000a, p. 113). He has advocated that writing for oneself is just as useful as writing for an audience. The difference lies in purpose; we write for ourselves to make meaning for ourselves, and we revise in order to make meaning for our audience (Elbow, 2000b, p. 340). This view was echoed by Murray (2000), another advocate for the expressive view:
I find that even my remedial students write like writers, putting down writing that doesn’t quite make sense, reading it to see what sense there might be in it, trying to make sense of it, and—draft after draft—making sense of it. They follow language to see where it will lead them, and I follow them following language. (p. 69)

Murray (1980) put the meaning-making process in terms that resonate strongly in the context of this study—that, in the process of creating a piece, the writer “listens for evolving meaning” (p. 7), and looks to the text itself to discover what needs to happen next in the process. Romano (2004) called this “self-sponsored writing” (p. 7) that he claimed is a by-product of writing when students “learn to find places within assignments that activate their passions” (p. 7), independent of audience or other concerns.

Finally, Faigley’s (1986) social view insisted that the cultural and social context in which the text is composed must be taken into consideration (p. 535). This view is one adopted by scholars such as Reither (2000), Applebee (2000), and Dyson (1997, 2000), who believed it would be negligent to focus on an individual’s cognitive processes with regards to meaning making without taking into consideration that individual’s social and cultural influences.

Reither (2000) called this a move toward a “macro-theory” from the “‘micro-theory’ of process now current in composition studies” (p. 288). He also made the important distinction, which clearly connects him to several of the scholars already discussed above, that there is more than just place and time in question regarding context: “Writing is, in fact, one of those processes which, in its use, creates and constitutes its
own contexts” (p. 287, emphasis in original). Applebee (2000) added a call for further examination of contexts where “writers negotiate their place within the many communities of which they are a part, with a variety of resources and competing demands” (p. 104). In other words, context is a fluid, dynamic construct, always changing and growing.

Dyson (2000) also maintained that constructing meaning is a social act, and that “learning to produce different kinds of texts or genres requires many opportunities to participate orally in the social spheres” (Dyson, 2000, p. 52). Schools need to be open to creating these opportunities for students by both working with a variety of texts and acknowledging the larger social and cultural contexts in which the students work with them. In her book *Writing Superheroes: Contemporary Childhood, Popular Culture, and Classroom Literacy* (1997), Dyson examined students’ compositions and explores how they “were shaped at one and the same time by their social goals, their need for social belonging, and by their ideological positioning, their need to define a place for themselves in a society crisscrossed with difference” (p. 12). She called for a “pedagogy of responsibility” (p. 180), or one in which participation in the community is part of the reason for, and process of, composition; it is the dialogue which ensues that creates a larger “meaning.”

*Common Ground: Genre and Narrative Structure*

Smith (1994) offered a view which necessarily reminds us of the inseparable relationship between reader, writer, and text: “I want to consider text as the intersection of intentions and expectations, where the writer’s art and the reader’s skill converge” (p.
This intersection includes two very important areas of common ground that are valuable to explore in understanding some of the processes that govern students’ decisions when reading and composing with video text: genre and narrative structure.

Murray (2004) believed that an enormous part of creating meaning with text—whether reading or writing—involves knowledge of genre: “Genre gives meaning to your material in the same way a house, a barn, an apartment block, a supermarket gives meaning to lumber and nails, steel beams and cement” (p. 77). Specifically, Hobbs (2007) defined genres as “those classifications given to texts that position the text in relation to other similar works” (p. 43) and reminded us that they both help the writer by giving shape to a text, but also shape what the reader expects when he or she comes to the text (p. 43). This includes not only genre of type (such as a horror story) but also narrative structure, such as how the plot is constructed (short story, novel), and the literary elements (such as characterization, irony, and mood) that combine to create that structure. For example, Smith (1994) pointed out the key to students’ understanding of genre:

There is no way of figuring out what the conventions of any particular genre might be, and very little chance of having it explained; the only way to gain a working acquaintance with the conventions of a language genre is to participate in that genre, which for the genres of writing means reading.” (p. 63, italics in original)

In other words, in students’ understanding of video text genres, their knowledge of such genres is influenced by their out-of-school experiences and knowledge of such texts.
Wilhelm (1995), in his case study involving high school students’ reading habits, also noted the importance of past experience with narrative structure in students’ negotiations of literary conventions: “To interpret and construct the meaning such conventions implied, they drew on their previous experiences as readers and people, and upon the literary and cultural repertoires these experiences had developed” (p. 77).

Hubbard (1989), in her research on how children use visual and verbal symbol systems together in composition, also found that her participants were heavily influenced by their knowledge of genre and narrative structure in the form of various television programs and other forms of visual media: “Topics were influenced by what the children had been viewing: Ghostbusters adventures, Batman stories, ‘My Little Pony’ episodes, and stories from the news, like earthquakes or oil tank explosions, were common in the children’s writing folders” (p. 149). This is especially relevant when considering text to include more than just print and meaning-making to be more than communicating with the written word.

In semiotics, the term *meaning* entails, more specifically, the system of images and feelings that a sign elicits. These are shaped, on the one side, by previous experience with the sign’s referent and, on the other side, by the social view of the referent. (Danesi, 1998, p. 19)

The meaning ascribed to signs or codes being used at any given time are influenced by knowledge and experience of that sign or code.

Messaris (1994) made the point that there is always an interaction between codes, which he termed as “rules of correspondence between form and meaning” (p. 18), and the
narrative context of the particular piece. In terms of film and video, Messaris described narrative context as “the larger story in the movie itself, together with corresponding situations from real life and other movies” (p. 76). In other words, Messaris said, it is the narrative context such as genre of story, such as a horror film, comedy, and so forth, and the structural elements contributing to that genre which are keys to an audience’s interpretation within a particular narrative structure, whatever the code may be (p. 76).

Meaning-Making in Multiliteracies: Making Way for “The Redesigned”

As Noddings (2003/2004) aptly put it, “To be literate today . . . is different from being literate in the days of Charlemagne (who could read but not write) or in Colonial America, where people did not need the forms of visual literacy required by present-day media” (p. 332). There are many scholars who have acknowledged this change and have sought to broaden the term literacy to be more relevant to our world today, and in fact, have adopted the term multiliteracies to reflect this broadening.

How are multiliteracies defined? The terms multiliteracies, multi-modal literacies, new literacy studies, and new literacies can be found in much of the current literature on the subject (Gee, 1990; Hobbs, 2007; Kist, 2005; Street, 2000; The New London Group, 2000) to denote the concept of expanding literacy beyond the realm of print text.

However, for the purposes of this study, the term “multiliteracies” refers to what Eisner (1994), in defining literacy, described as “the ability to encode or decode meaning in any of the forms of representation used in the culture to convey or express meaning” (p. x), which Hobbs (2007) acknowledged as an enormously potent tool: “Storytellers compose using print and nonprint media to shape our sense of ourselves, our world, the
nature of human experience, and our own possibilities as human beings. It’s among the most powerful of roles in society” (p. 50).

Eisner’s (1998) essay *Rethinking Literacy* provided what I have found to be one of the clearest explanations of, and justifications for, what The New London Group (2000) termed “a pedagogy of multiliteracies:”

There is little doubt that many of the meanings we secure in our lives are derived from what we read, but there is even less doubt that meaning is not restricted to what we find in text and that text, in fact, constitutes a small portion of the stuff out of which meaning is made. The virtue of literacy is, of course, that it makes meaning possible. (Eisner, 1998, p. 9)

If literacy, then, is the ability to make meaning from one text or another, as Eisner argued, then it follows that we are helping, not hindering, our students by engaging them in the use and development of the capacity to read and write many texts, in whatever mode, because they are literally surrounded by them in today’s world. “Seeing is a reading. Hearing is a reading . . . reading text is not only a process of decoding, it is also a process of encoding. *We make* sense of what we read” (Eisner, 2001/2004, p. 302, italics in original). Gallas (2003), in her own classroom study, agreed

That the practice of carefully “reading” pictures is essential for mastery of many subjects at higher levels. For example . . . we learn to “read” maps, graphs, music, and equations. Each of those readings gives us a different kind of knowledge. (p. 20)
However, it is also important to remember that multimodality is *inclusive*, not *exclusive*; the key is remembering that multiple forms of media are tools, and should be used for appropriate purposes:

The different technologies of communication, record, and art that we have available are options but not true alternatives. They do not work in the same way, nor can they always achieve the same ends. It is not possible to say that one is better than another, or even more convenient; it depends on the purposes of the producer and the recipient and on their situations. (Smith, 1994, p. 10)

When a student has a composition task at hand, it should be the task itself that chooses the medium—and that choice should be made available to the student for the best meaning to come forth.

Drawing is not just for children who can’t yet write fluently, and creating pictures is not just part of rehearsal for writing. Images *at any age* are part of the serious business of making meaning—partners with words for communicating our inner designs. (Hubbard, 1989, p. 157, italics in original)

In addition, Eisner (1994) advocated for a pedagogical approach that will allow students to manipulate “forms of representation” for themselves—in other words, learning to “read” a text is only part of what children need to learn:

Education, I believe, ought to enable the young to learn how to access the meanings that have been created through what I have referred to as forms of representation. But access to the meanings others have created is not enough. Education ought to help the young learn how to create their own meanings
through these forms. Schools cannot accomplish these aims unless the curriculum they provide offers students opportunities to become, for want of a better term, multiliterate. (p. 19)

Eisner’s term multiliterate stems from opening doors of possibility—what Piazza (1999) described as “the complex amalgam of communicative channels, symbols, forms, and meanings inherent in oral and written language (verbal and nonverbal) as well as the arts—visual arts, music, dance, theater, and film (including television, video and technology)” (p. 2). This notion of a “complex amalgam” is geared toward students who are all complex and individual learners, and who possess very individual ways of learning in a world Thoman and Jolls (2005) viewed as one which “demands a new kind of literacy, rooted in the real world of instant information, global interactivity, and messages created on multiple media platforms” (p. 202).

Gardner (1993), in developing his theory of multiple intelligences, did not seek to name all possible human intelligences, because he agreed this would be an impossible task. However, Gardner did seek to create “a list of intellectual strengths which will prove useful for a wide range of researchers and practitioners” (p. 60). Of particular interest in light of the concept of multiliteracies is his discussion of how each of these intelligences—linguistic, musical, logical-mathematical, spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, intrapersonal and interpersonal—uses its own set of symbols. These symbols, Gardner argued, are exceedingly context and culture dependent with regards to meaning-making (p. 300). We may develop our various intelligences; we may find strengths and/or weaknesses in some areas. However, the implications for pedagogy are clear in Gardner’s
following statement: “An intellectual strength opens up possibilities; a combination of intellectual strengths spawns a multiplicity of possibilities” (p. 317). By promoting a multiliteracies approach within an English Language Arts classroom, a teacher may not only build upon areas of strength students already possess, but allow students to explore and develop intelligences otherwise ignored if print texts, for example, remain dominant over other forms of text that might aid students in meaning-making.

Students, as Gardner (1993) said, are constantly engaged in making meanings of texts within their own social contexts—an incredibly complicated process. “Students don’t just read; they read in a specific time and place, and for a deliberate purpose. That demands that we open our curricula to include new options” (Kajder, 2006, p. 10). Elbow (2000b) understood this constant coming-together of the individual and the social, and believed that one is not necessarily more important than the other:

Though writing is deeply social and though we usually help things by enhancing its social dimension, writing is also the mode of discourse best suited to helping us develop the reflective and private dimension of our mental lives. (p. 345)

It becomes even more complex when one considers the many ways we possess of knowing the world. We are constantly coming in contact with “texts” in many forms. As Scholes (1989) observed, “We can and do read not only words and pictures but faces, clouds, waves, and even stones” (p. 11). Fortunately, this is increasingly being recognized in English Language Arts classrooms and in research; for example, Smagorinsky (1995) provides educators with an invitation to broaden our definitions of composition and of text:
With meaning construction as the goal, the value shifts from endorsing writing as a unique mode of learning to identifying the appropriate medium of communication so that learners can compose appropriate texts in given situations in order to construct meaning. (p. 163)

This shift in perspective creates an interesting possibility for intersecting practices wherein a variety of texts might be treated as valuable meaning-making tools, despite those who view such a shift negatively. Kajder (2006) addressed this timely issue:

Culturally, there is an argument that holds that the competition for reading as a source of stories has become more intense. It proposes that students are captivated by the Internet, television, film, and video games instead of reading. I believe that these media support and promote reading. These students are intensely literate but not in the ways that might allow them to score well on tests. (p. 15, emphasis in original)

In valuing multiple views and definitions of what constitutes being a “literate” being, we welcome students to explore and learn beyond, rather than up to, what our curriculum offers.

Street (1984), another leading scholar in what has been termed “New Literacy Studies,” took a more critical view of how literacy is situated: “I shall contend that what the particular practices and concepts of reading and writing are for a given society . . . are already embedded in an ideology and cannot be isolated or treated as ‘neutral’ or merely ‘technical’” (p. 1). Like Eisner (2001/2004), Street (2000) contended that everything around us becomes a text to be read. He also added that the very act of reading that text is
entirely dependent upon who we are, where we are, and what cultural/contextual forces are at work in shaping how we read that text: “Literacy practices vary with cultural context, there is not a single, monolithic autonomous literacy, whose consequences for individuals and societies can be read off as a result of its intrinsic characteristics” (p. 25).

Like Heath’s (1983) investigation of home-based and school-based literacies in *Ways With Words*, and Barton and Hamilton’s (2000) examination of “local literacies” in Lancaster, England, Street’s (1984) study of literacies used daily by villagers in Iran spotlighted the importance of acknowledging the many kinds of literacy people use each day, and that much of it takes place outside the classroom setting.

If literacy practices take place within, and depending upon, a social context, then Gee’s (1990) preference for the term “Discourse” instead of “literacy” when talking about the social context of text makes a great deal of sense: “Language, as well as literacy, is always and everywhere integrated with and relative to social practices constituting particular Discourses” (p. xix, italics in original). Discourses, Gee argued, three-dimensionalize and contextualize the meaning-making inherent in literacy practices. Gee labeled literacy curriculum that does not take social context into account as “problematic” (p. 49). In other words, we make meaning within different cultures, different groups, different value systems—all dependent on specific social contexts.

Kress (2005), a member of The New London Group, looked at one specific context—the reading of online texts—and picked apart the various literacies that come into play when reading such a text that would not be utilized with book-written text. Indeed, what can, and is, communicated online would be severely limited if held to the
rules governing the simple left-to-right, top-to-bottom conventions of reading book-written text, as he showed in his description of the Institute of Education’s website, where

The author(s) of this page clearly have in mind that visitors will come to this page from quite different cultural and social spaces, in differing ways, and with differing interests, not necessarily known to or knowable by the maker(s) of the page. (p. 9)

Most importantly, however, Kress reminded us that limiting ourselves, and our students, to one mode or one medium of representation (in this case, the dominant mode of book-written text) limits what can be said, and by whom it can be said. In addition, he argued that one cannot, when limited to one mode or medium, *best* express something which does not fit into that mode or medium. “Reading as taking meaning and making meaning from many sources of information, from many different sign-systems, will become the new common sense” (p. 17). Pictures, he argued, may carry information that words cannot, and vice-versa, and these “affordances” vary with the literacy situation. The important thing, Kress reminded us, is that we must help students create a “toolkit” (2003, p. 37) with which to best express that which needs expression.

In a recent article in *Telemedium: The Journal of Media Literacy*, a reprint of a 1984 article by Rowe boldly and clearly shows that calls for an update in concepts of literacy instruction are by no means a new phenomenon:

If children today are not achieving the literacy skills which society expects, it may be that our teaching institutions are not reaching the children of the eighties where their thinking is. A new approach to literacy is needed in this television age: an
approach which acknowledges and uses the world our children know. (2006, p. 22)

Rowe’s voice (2006), and the voices of others who advocate for rethinking our approaches and attitudes toward literacy, have not only been heard, but acted upon in the arena of education practice. Around the same time, Masterman’s (1985) *Teaching the Media* put forth the same kind of warning: “Our formal system of education produces massive casualties, particularly amongst those millions of children who leave school each year believing themselves to be failures” (p. 36). We have the power as educators to right this wrong by engaging students’ literacies, acknowledging the multiplicity of those literacies, and helping students incorporate new ones.

The New London Group (2000), including Courtney Cazden, Bill Cope, James Gee, Gunther Kress, and Mary Kalantzis, among others, met together in New London, New Hampshire in 1994 to “consider the future of literacy teaching” (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 3). Their questions about the teaching of literacy focused on the global context in which it is being taught—and how that context has changed, and will continue to change. This group’s discussion led to their agreement that what students need to learn in today’s schools has changed from the traditional, canonical notions of what a “literate” person needs to know. They agreed that the term *multiliteracies* contains the essence of two important points: “The first argument engages with the multiplicity of communications channels and media; the second with the increasing salience of cultural and linguistic diversity” (p. 5). Their point was that we need to reshape our thinking about literacy, and
how it is taught, to go beyond the narrow set of standards and skills that has traditionally been outlined for print literacy alone.

To this end, The New London Group (2000) offered what they termed a “transformed pedagogy of access” (p. 18) that calls for a pedagogy whose role “is to develop an epistemology of pluralism that provides access without people having to erase or leave behind different subjectivities” (p. 18). They developed a theory which designates multiple modes/elements of meaning-making: Linguistic, Visual, Audio, Gestural, and Spatial (Cope & Kalantzis, 2000, p. 7) tied together by three terms designating how meaning-making is navigated in each of these modes: “Available Designs,” “Designing,” and “The Redesigned” (The New London Group, 2000, p. 20).

“Available Designs” are the rules, grammars, or conventions we follow in various semiotic systems, be they language systems (various discourses, for example) or visual systems such as film. “Designing” is the process the readers or writers of texts go through in order to make meaning, be it reading a piece of art, or composing with film, and in the act of doing so, “the meaning-makers remake themselves. They reconstruct and renegotiate their identities” (The New London Group, 2000, p. 23). “The Redesigned” is, in essence, the new text the reader/writer has created through the act of Designing (pp. 20-23) and may be said to correspond clearly with Rosenblatt’s (1994) “poem,” as the meaning-maker has been transformed in the act of Designing.

These three terms act upon the concept of meaning-making as a way to emphasize its dynamic aspect, as well as the fact that meaning-making is both rooted in traditional concepts and means (Available Designs) as well as new contexts and new interpretations.
(Designing) in the creation of something wholly unique (The Redesigned). This study is focused upon this process of Designing (by giving students pre-existing video footage from which to work), which they approach through their knowledge of Available Designs (such as various genres and convention systems of narrative structure) and the ultimate Redesigned texts produced in this process.

Related Studies of Classroom Multiliteracies

There has been much research, both quantitative and qualitative, on how multiliteracies are being engaged in the English Language Arts classroom. The following studies illustrate a broad scope of literacies involved, the connection between out-of-school literacies and in-school literacies, and some of the various lenses through which researchers might look.

In their study of children’s use of the Internet outside of school, Burnett and Wilkinson (2005) support Kress’ (2005) notion of expanding literacies in the arena of computers. They tied their study to the consideration of skills needed for successful web navigation, and how the development of these skills prompts the utilization of new literacies. In order to justify use of the Internet in school, the authors developed research questions dealing with the purposes children used the Internet outside of school, what approaches they used in reading the web pages, and the experiences students found to be important in making them better web users. This qualitative case study, focusing on six primary aged children, produced data in the form of interviews, both whole-group and sub-groups, and observations.
The authors (Burnett & Wilkinson, 2005) discovered that most of the children used the Internet to support their own individual hobbies and interests, and were often quite specific in the information they sought. Also, the study revealed that the children developed skills in critical awareness, shown in their judgment of various websites and their understanding of the commercial nature of the web. The authors also discovered that the children’s use of the Internet was informally developed, involving trial-and-error and some tutoring by older family members, but that the children found this setup to be even more useful in a problem-solving way than the use of the Internet in school, which was often simplified or censored in a way that made the experience less useful. In reading web-based texts, the children showed an amazing ability to navigate print and visual text, accompanying sound cues and advertising banners, and other elements of websites. “Like adult users, these children seemed to be forming new relationships with texts, new relationships that offered new possibilities and purposes” (p. 164). Burnett and Wilkinson called for more open-ended experiences like the ones these children were experiencing in their homes as more beneficial to the development of multiliteracies than trying to reformat and fit the square peg of Internet use into the round hole of simple printed text literacy.

Willett (2005) addressed the importance of having students create media in multiple forms in order to become better consumers of media. This study looked at elements of pop culture in the lives of eight- to nine-year-olds in one classroom as they created stories using multiple modes of representation. Also a qualitative case study, Willett’s data included not only the work of the students, but observations, group
discussions, think-aloud protocols, individual interviews, and her teacher-journal. For the study, the children completed stories utilizing both printed and visual text. Her guiding questions sought to deal with meaning-making as the children, users of media, became the creators of media themselves, and the roles of the author and reader:

In this view, neither the text nor the viewer is the determiner of meaning. The viewer is not affected in a predetermined way, but neither is the viewer completely free to create any meaning from a given text. Particular readings of text are ‘invited’ by dominant discourses, but alternative readings are also produced within the field of the viewer. At the same time as viewers are choosing their positions, or actively reading media texts, they are also being positioned by the surrounding discourses. (p. 143)

Willett (2005) reminded us of the importance of social and cultural context in the creating and reading of various texts. She discovered that the children were truly exploring meaning-making in a three-dimensional way in trying to extend meaning of text through pictures, and vice-versa, while negotiating the perceived audience, one that called for “school appropriate” products. This became a large part of the discussion between her and her students, and she advocated in her findings for more inclusion of such discussions about censorship and out-of-school products versus in-school products: “If we think of literacy in a broad sense, as including movies and their experience of narrative on computer games as well as conventional writing, such debates help students make sense of their literacy experiences” (p. 147).
In a mixed-methods case study, Vincent (2006) wanted to explore multimodal scaffolding in the teaching of writing. His rationale as a teacher-researcher was very clear: “In the society in which children are growing up, communication through print media is now almost always a mix of images and text, while electronic media incorporate sound, music, hyperlinking, and animations” (p. 51). Vincent, like many other educators today, was concerned with the lack of proper assessment in light of these trends, and sought to investigate what happened when students moved from written text production (use of one mode only) to multimodal text production, and what assessments might be brought into play. Vincent’s participants, members of his own classroom of 26 nine- to ten-year-olds, provided data in the form of both monomodal and multimodal texts.

Whereas his measurement of written/monomodal work was accomplished through the use of a standardized rubric (one given by the Australian Victorian Curriculum Assessment Authority), he found it more troublesome to assess the multimodal work, which consisted of interactive animations-and-text-driven computer generations: “As the study progressed it became clear that there are multiple schemes and rubrics available to assess the skills involved in computer generated multimedia . . . but very few schemes to assess quality or content” (p. 53). He solved the problem by looking at the modes as the students integrated them, not as separate products.

Vincent’s (2006) participants were students of varying abilities, some certainly struggling under the dominant print literacy, and it was these students whom Vincent found to be benefiting greatly from the multimodal nature of their work. Five of his 26 students appeared to seriously need this kind of scaffolding in meaning making, and
Vincent made a strong statement about what this meant for them: “From informal discussions with teachers who had been involved with these students in previous years I gained a clear impression that, in over 5 years of compulsory schooling, their multimodal productions were their first effective tests” (p. 55).

Vincent’s (2006) point about the need for clear methods of assessment is not to be taken lightly; this is a serious bar to many teachers and curriculum decision-makers who are less concerned with equity in the classroom and more concerned about measurable results, skewed though they may be. His study, which shows the benefits of multimodal expression to students less skilled in pen-and-paper literacy, suggested further that we cannot allow difficulty inherent in assessing the “whole child” to prevent us from striving to do just that.

Hobbs and Frost (2003) cited the literature on expanded notions of literacy in the introduction to their study and include a brief discussion of the many reasons print literacy has become, and often still remains, a dominant force in the typical English Language Arts classroom. Of particular interest is their observation that general classroom teachers may feel that working with multimedia, such as film, requires a specialization they do not possess (p. 333). Hobbs and Frost addressed this issue, and others, by taking a look at the effects of one secondary school’s Language Arts curriculum that was rich in media literacy skills on students’ listening, viewing, reading and writing, and how they analyzed messages (p. 335).

The treatment school in question, Concord High School, decided to create media literacy courses specifically for the 11th and 12th grades. Students were naturally grouped
heterogeneously as a rule in this school, and none of the teachers whose classes were involved were to be considered “media experts.” Hobbs and Frost (2003) decided to use a quasi-experimental, nonequivalent groups design because they wanted to quantitatively measure how the instruction affected students’ learning. Their control data came from a random sample of 89 students from a nearby high school whose student demographics were similar and whose instructional program in Language Arts was similar.

The authors (Hobbs & Frost, 2003) specifically looked at how students analyzed messages and comprehended three types of texts: a print article from a news magazine, a radio program commentary, and a television segment from a news show for teenagers; all formats were non-fiction. Hobbs and Frost conducted a pretest at both schools, and then once the students at Concord High had received specific media training and participated in reading the texts, measured those students’ written responses to the media they had experienced, as well as students’ work on other comprehension-focused assessments. Students in both schools then took a posttest.

Upon their analysis, Hobbs and Frost (2003) found statistical significance in higher reading comprehension, listening comprehension, viewing comprehension (for identifying the main idea), writing skills (connected to higher word count), and analysis of nonfiction messages in each of the formats for the students at the treatment school. The authors found that their research “shows that media-literacy instruction embedded in a secondary-level English language arts course can be effective in meeting traditional academic goals” (p. 350). The authors made the point that the ability to critically reflect on various modes of media allowed the students in the treatment school to outperform
those in the control school, and such skills are crucial in a world where the texts with which students engage are not limited to print.

Related Studies in Multimedia Composition

The following examples of work being done in the area of multimedia composition are relevant to examine based upon their participants and methodology, and two of them, Goodman’s (2003) and Bruce’s (2002), because they reflect a viewpoint similar to that of teacher-researcher in the classroom and use video as a composition medium.

In Kist’s (2005) *New Literacies in Action: Teaching and Learning in Multiple Media*, he set out to richly describe the use of multiliteracies in several school settings. Two of these settings are particularly relevant. The first of these is an account of the activities in a self-contained eighth-grade classroom at the Joseph H. Kerr School in rural Manitoba, Canada. The teacher, Clarence Fisher, was lucky enough to be a part of a school-mandated program (called the Challenge program) which called for a restructuring of school curriculum to reflect the media-rich society in which students will find themselves upon graduation. This meant that Fisher was given the freedom to integrate various forms of text—video, audio, print—in the everyday workings of his classroom. Kist pointed out that Fisher created an atmosphere where composition in multimedia, not just reading multimedia, was a large part of the students’ work (p. 48). Fisher said that “the best way of learning something is by doing it” (p. 48), justifying the choice of making students not into relatively passive receivers of messages, but into creators of those messages.
Kist (2005) outlined one particular project conducted within Fisher’s classroom called the Advertising Project, which was for Fisher’s English class. The students’ job was to create advertising campaigns for randomly selected objects using multimedia, specifically print, audio/video, and web technology (p. 53). Much in the same way students in this researcher’s study composed a short story using audio/video and the “grammar” of video they had learned in class, Fisher’s students were to tell the story of a particular product using the “rules” of the various media the students had learned.

Kist’s (2005) observations were centered around the variety of media chosen by the students for their campaigns, and what the students thought of the project; in his discussion about this project Kist observed that many of the students felt they had learned to use fun technology, but were unable to explain how this learning connected to the larger ideas that Fisher was teaching them about truth in advertising, the manipulation of the media, and so forth. However, Kist went on to say that his other data sources, particularly the finished products of the students, actually illustrated that the students did indeed understand more than perhaps they were able to articulate:

Even if students were not very willing to explicitly discuss critical media literacy, their parodies stood without comment, effectively witnessing their acknowledgement of being positioned by the media, and even their own complicity in that positioning both as readers and now as writers of new literacies. (p. 59)

Another school context Kist (2005) studied was that of an educational technology setting in San Fernando High School in San Diego, California. The featured teacher,
Marco Torres, created a space in a school where students could use multimedia to create meaningful projects. Although the setting is vastly different from that of this study, and Torres’ background is in social studies and not English, what sparks interest about what Torres has done is more directed toward connecting the students’ lives at school with their lives at home. As Kist said of Torres,

> Here was a teacher, then, who was unapologetic about not necessarily tying all of his projects to the content of the curriculum, or, at the very least, he went beyond the social studies curriculum to immediately look for some interaction with the community. (p. 64)

Kist’s (2005) observations of the events in Torres’ classroom included how crucial collaboration was in the process of the students who were working on various projects, and also just how process-oriented Torres’ projects were. Regarding the video projects Torres’ students worked on, Kist reported a very powerful statement made by Torres regarding the large amount of work the students put in to them, because of the inherent interest-factor for students working with video: “When they’re learning something new they’re not scared of that failure like most kids in schools” (p. 70).

In another publication, Hull and Katz (2006) took the philosophical position that “new literate spaces and symbolic tools for learning can result in powerful forms of self-representation for both children and adults” (p. 44) and that inviting people to learn through means of interest to them, such as video, can benefit learners in many ways. Much of Hull and Katz’s theoretical underpinnings deal with narrative and finding voice in narrative writing, but they are also attuned to the work of literacy theorists who believe
that it is time to expand our definitions and move beyond tradition, where “linguistic sign systems, writing, and the essay are still the coin of the realm as opposed to photographs, images, and sound” (p. 46). The authors also approached this study looking through the lens of multiliteracies.

This comparative case study follows the digital storytelling processes over three and a half years of two individuals, one being a 24-year-old man named Randy, and the other being a 13-year-old girl named Dara in West Oakland, California. The setting was a community technology center, known as the “Digital Underground Storytelling for Youth,” or DUSTY. Like Torres’ classroom in San Diego, DUSTY offers after-school programs that support in-school activities for children and workshops and programs targeted at adults. This is especially important since the local school districts are too poor to offer such programs themselves, let alone create content classroom spaces that utilize such technology routinely.

Although the participants in their study were not in an English classroom, and were not constructing fictional short stories, nevertheless there are several components which are notable. For example, the data the authors (Hull & Katz, 2006) gathered from both participants included interviews, field notes, and story scripts. Hull and Katz’s findings support the notion that composing with video allows for self-expression beyond that of print text; of Randy they said that “when [he] learned to combine his words and music with visual images and narratives to create digital stories, he was able to author an identity in powerful ways” (p. 54). The authors also commented on how he used this medium to create meaning:
In this digital story Randy used no visual transitions, such as fading one screen into another. Instead, the images change precisely in time to the beat, a technique which emphasizes the rhythmical and musical quality of the narration and the union of the spoken word with background melody. (p. 56)

Of Dara, when describing a teacher’s comments about the high quality of Dara’s video work, the researchers suggested that working with the medium of video allowed Dara to create meaning with greater success than using the usual school-based printed text: “We were surprised by the juxtaposition between this particular teacher’s perception of Dara and the bubbly, cheerful, and engaged writer we knew her to be at DUSTY” (p. 63). The authors discovered that Dara, while working with a DUSTY mentor, was hardworking even in the area of revision, a common stumbling point for many young writers: “Out of a total of 10 invitations to make revisions . . . Dara accepted seven. Of those seven offers, all were ultimately conceived and executed by Dara” (pp. 67-68). These observations justify taking a look at video revision, especially in the areas of student motivation and revision.

Goodman’s (2003) book outlined his work at the Educational Video Center (EVC) in New York City and the video workshops he developed to allow students to interconnect their lives in school with their lives out of school and the concerns of their larger community. His chapter three outlined a case study in which he described his research questions:

What, then, does it look like when students in the classroom practice this kind of community-based and learner-centered media work? What kind of learning takes
place when EVC’s after-school documentary workshop model is implemented in a classroom setting? Which practices change, and which ones remain the same?

And how do the students experience the lesson? (p. 63)

Goodman (2003) was committed to neutralizing the war between many students’ lack of motivation in school and the family/community issues with which they are concerned by bringing them together, and giving the students the agency in a school setting to make meaning while also making a difference in their lives and communities. He provided a justification for his study, and others focusing on classroom data, by saying that “the more we understand about how a media-based pedagogy fits into the life of a class, the more possible it will be to make a large-scale change in the way teaching and learning are practiced” (p. 63). He acknowledged a useful trio of lenses through which he viewed his data—pedagogical, theoretical, and visual (p. 66), which makes a clear argument for the value in role of teacher-researcher.

In this study Goodman (2003) followed the work done in the context of a high school video documentary class over the course of a semester. The students, sixteen 10th and 11th-graders, collaborated on a video documentary about teen suicide, and Goodman’s role crossed into the realm of participant-observer as he worked with the students and filmed their progress. He made the discovery, like Kist (2005) and Hull and Katz (2006), that there was a notable dynamic happening with regards to the students’ approaches to revision; Goodman noted that one particular male student’s English teacher said of him that using “the medium of video literally made visible the problems and the progress in his work. It made self-reflection and self-critique more accessible” (p. 91).
Goodman discovered that because they were so engaged with the topic and learning the process, the students made progress in many areas, both intellectual and emotional. Also, like Torres’ students in Kist’s (2005) study, Goodman’s participants felt the motivation and empowerment of being able to “show” their work: “Working in the medium of video enabled the students’ inner thoughts, questions, and stories to be externalized as a product that could be exhibited to public audiences with pride” (2003, p. 97). Motivation, especially for students who are traditionally unsuccessful in print media, is an important aspect of video composition to examine.

Like Goodman’s study, Bruce’s (2002) dissertation focused on a classroom setting using video as a medium for composition. His research questions, however, centered on the social context of the composition process and constructing a useful video composition model:

1. What are the potential uses of and implications for video composition in the study of English Language Arts? 2. Is it possible to construct an effective working model that accounts for groups composing with video? 3. How are known group factors accounted for in video production groups? 4. To what extent do lower achievement students engage with complex language arts processes during video composition? (p. 60)

Bruce’s participants included the members of his Communications II class, since he wanted to spotlight the students’ work on the process of production rather than their acquisition of media literacy skills. In his review of studies in the area of video production, Bruce observed that “what is missing in the research is a detailed protocol of
decisions students make during the videotaping process” (p. 50), and that further study needs to be done on the process of video composition rather than the finished product.

Bruce’s dissertation, and the other studies outlined in this section, strove to bridge this gap by including methodologies (such as the think-aloud protocol) that will elicit such information.

Bruce’s (2002) participants were in two self-selected (same-sex, as it happens) case study groups who worked to create music videos by producing video to go along with pre-existing music. He outlined parts of the students’ process such as brainstorming, storyboarding, and editing. His participants taped their own video footage, and he made an important point to discuss the students’ overall guiding sense of their final product, what he called “The Project Vision.” He divided this concept into the four considerations of aesthetics, audience considerations, thesis, and authoritative source (p. 89).

Bruce (2002) outlined the work of the two case study groups, one a group of three girls and the other of four boys. He found evidence to support the use of video in the English Language Arts classroom, noting that his students “demonstrated complex reading and writing strategies while composing their videos” (p. 156). He also found that basing his video production model (p. 75) on the Hayes and Flower (1980) written composition model was indeed effective due to its recursive nature, which was supported by evidence of what the students did during the process (Bruce, 2002, p. 159). In addition, Bruce found that students enjoyed most aspects of group work in video composition and that “they stated that the benefits of group work included multiple viewpoints for the projects, the ability to share the workload of production tasks, and the
pleasure of social interaction” (p. 162), only slightly tempered by the frustration of having to rely on the availability and even contributions of all group members. As for the gender makeup of the groups, Bruce found differences where, in the overall process, each gender group spent more or less time and energy (p. 163). Regarding his final research question, Bruce’s findings (especially those connected to the revision process) suggested that the “low-achieving students who struggle with written composition were able to demonstrate strategies that mature writers and mature readers use” (p. 168).

Cooperative Learning

Writing and reading are such private acts that we forget how fundamentally social they are: We hear stories read by others and we like to tell others about the stories we read; we learn to write from others and we write for others to read us. (Rose, 1989, p. 109-110)

Allowing students to work together in small groups creates “opportunities in multiple contexts to understand and interact with diverse perspectives” (Huss, 2006, p. 20). The social aspects of reading and writing can open a door for students to “help and even inspire each other in the composition task” (Smith, 1994, p. 25).

Johnson, Johnson, and Holubec (1994) told us that cooperative learning is a teaching and learning strategy “through which students work together to maximize their own and each other’s learning” (p 4). They posited, however, that certain elements are required for such learning to be called cooperative: positive interdependence (students understanding that success is partially group-based), individual and group accountability (they must work together as well as individually), promotive interaction (the students
actively work to help one another meet the group’s goals), learned social skills (to promote successful negotiations in the work), and group processing (whereby the students are constantly evaluating how they and their group members are working together to accomplish the goal; pp. 10-11). In other words, cooperative learning is of a highly constructed nature, and ideally should be held to high standards in order to achieve the best results (Holubec et al., 1995; Slavin, 1999; Slavin & Cooper, 1997).

Barnes (1992), focusing on the language activities of children working in groups, nevertheless recognized the reflexive, self-aware nature of learning that comes as a by-product of students working and talking together in groups:

Reflexive learning seems to occur when a learner, acting upon purposes which are significant in his life world, is faced with disjunction between his implicit beliefs and those of the persons he is interacting with. This disjunction compels him, if he is to continue his purposed action, to bring to sharp awareness parts of his world which were upon the periphery of his consciousness, and to construct for himself understandings which did not previously exist. (p. 106)

When students are given the opportunity to think aloud, with other students, and contribute their voices to the meaning-making process, the result goes beyond the task at hand to a “bigger picture” of understanding.

Another benefit of group work, particularly in a situation where students are using technology, has to do with pragmatics:

When the number of available computers is limited, collaborative work among students is not only theoretically advocated but practically necessary. Student
computer expertise can supplement the limited availability of the teacher. Moreover, an inherent feature of the technology is that work in progress on the screen is public in a way that paper on a student’s desk is not. (Cazden, 2001, p. 109)

This allows the teacher to remain in contact with the students and the students’ products throughout the cooperative learning process.

Cazden (2001) also pointed out another benefit of group work: It removes the teacher immediately from the equation as an authoritative source: “Theoretically, it seems possible that students will be more apt to actively struggle with new ideas—rephrasing them, arguing with them, conceptually trying them out and verbally trying them on—when they are spoken by (less authoritative) peers than by the (more authoritative) teacher” (p. 111).

Summary of Chapter 2

Theories of meaning-making in reading and writing written texts have much to inform us about how students go about making meaning multimodally—what The New London Group (2000) called “Designing.” The existing literature points to the important role played by knowledge of genre and narrative structure in the meaning-making process, and how cooperative learning can assist this process. This study allowed for an intimate look into the Design process, and the Redesigned texts, of these two groups of students.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

I do not suppose any great argument is needed to prove that breach of continuity between learning within and without school is the great cause in education of wasted power and misdirected effort. (Dewey, 1904/1962, p. 11)

Introduction

This was a study for the purpose of investigating what happened during the course of a narrative reading/composition unit using video as the storytelling medium. This chapter focuses on a description of the study participants and setting, design, and methodology. Also included is a detailed description of the data collection and analysis methods.

Participants and Setting

The study took place in a Midwestern rural high school with a mostly Caucasian population of students, including 238 freshmen (boys $n = 134$, girls $n = 104$), 218 sophomores (boys $n = 111$, girls $n = 107$), 218 juniors (boys $n = 107$, girls $n = 111$), and 191 seniors (boys $n = 95$, girls $n = 96$), for a total of 865. The school had a 95.1% graduation rate, and 95.6% of the high school students scored proficient or higher on the reading portion of the state-mandated proficiency test, whereas 92.1% scored proficient or higher on the writing portion. The school rated “excellent” on the state report card for 2005-2006 and had a per-pupil expenditure of $5,906.94. The school was on a two-
semester (totaling four sets of nine-week periods) timeline. English classes at the high school were divided in grades 9 and 10 into “General” and “Honors;” students were guided into one of these two categories based on past performance and general attitude toward the subject, although many students sought, and were successful, in changing their status if they showed the ability and desire to do so. No student was “forced” to be in either category, although not surprisingly, many of the 10th-grade students in my General class were students who found English to be a challenging and often unrewarding subject, whereas many of the students in my two 10th-grade Honors classes found English to come easier and to be more enjoyable.

Class Context One

Period one was a 10th-grade General English class made up of 22 students who reflected the school’s mostly Caucasian population. Eighteen of those students were given permission to participate in the study. Of those 18 students, 3 were female and 15 were male, all Caucasian. The class averaged a C grade (between 70 and 79%) in English at the time of the project, and self-reported their average grade for English during their freshman year as a C also. Eight of the 18 students reported that their families owned video cameras, and 17 of the 18 students reported they had a computer at home. Most of the students in this class could be described as “reluctant” readers and writers; on average, the class reported that they did not enjoy reading or writing, and on average they did not write outside of school at all. However, the majority of the class reported they enjoyed watching films very much and agreed they felt comfortable using technology. As a group, these students exhibited a negative attitude towards English class; this partly was
exacerbated by poor performance and lack of success in many areas of the mandated English curriculum.

*Class Context Two*

Period three was a 10th-grade Honors English class with 26 students, and 21 of those students had permission to participate in the study. Of those students, 15 were female (14 Caucasian, 1 African-American) and 6 were male (all Caucasian). The class overall averaged an A (between 90 and 100%) in English for the nine-week period at the time of the project, and self-reported their grade in English for their freshman year to be a B average. Ten of the 21 students reported their families as owning a video camera, and all of the 21 students reported having a computer at home. Most of the students in period three were successful in English class; they reported themselves as enjoying both reading and writing, though on average they also reported that they did not write outside of school. The class did, on average, report to enjoying watching films and being comfortable with technology use. As a whole, period three had a positive attitude towards English class and were successful in their performances on the mandated English curriculum.

This study involved a total of two groups (Group 1 and Group 2) of students from two of my English classes. Although I worked with the same students throughout the entire school year of 2005-2006, this study took place within the context of an instructional unit encompassing approximately all of the month of April 2006. The unit served to introduce students to the use of video as a medium for composing a short narrative, which Danesi (1998) defined as “a text that is constructed to reflect a perceived
causal and interconnected sequence of events involving characters in time and space” (p. 134). Students came into this unit with a working knowledge of narrative structure, literary devices, movie editing software, and the grammar of video composition (Golden, 2001). All students, regardless of whether they had permission to be involved in the study or whether they were eventually chosen to be included in the study, participated in this unit. Students’ identities have been protected through the use of pseudonyms.

Both classes had six groups per class. Group 1 was comprised of two girls and two boys from my period one General English class: Sara, Emma, Alan, and Cliff. Group 2 was comprised of three girls and one boy from my period three Honors English class: Brittany, Kim, Felicia, and Rick.

**Study Design**

The collective case study design (Stake, 1995) was appropriate for this study because, although all of the students participated in the actual work of video composition, only some of the students had permission to participate in the study. The two groups in this study were chosen because of their permission, the completeness of their data, and because it was deemed valuable to examine one group from a General class and one group from an Honors class for more variety. According to Stenhouse (1988), educational case study is also appropriate in order to “enrich the thinking and discourse of educators either by the development of educational theory or by the refinement of prudence through the systematic and reflective documentation of experience” (p. 50). This study sought to
do both through documentation of the students’ processes and activities while reading and composing with video in the hopes of contributing to our knowledge base.

The choice of using what Meyers (1985) termed a contextualist design stems specifically from the fact that this researcher was in a position to study students in their natural classroom situation in order to observe what happened as the course evolved and elicit the students’ experiences through various data sources. Therefore, this study is within the frame of teacher research, defined by Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1993) “as systematic, intentional inquiry by teachers” (p. 5) and which, as they also noted, naturally falls into the frame of a case study (p. 59). Particularly because these research questions seek to uncover many of the “invisible” processes involved in student reading and composition within the context of an English classroom, this perspective is especially apt.

In addition, Sipe and Ghiso (2004) reminded us that although qualitative research “at times forefronts the notion of letting data ‘speak’ and categories ‘emerge,’ we do not approach sites or data as blank slates, but are influenced by our prior theoretical readings and life experiences” (p. 473). This study relies on grounded theory, wherein the subjectivity of human experience is acknowledged and valued, and wherein theories and implications are generated based on the data collected for that particular study (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Lather (1986) used the term “reciprocal” when referring to the relationship between data and theory, and defined my stance in examining the data: “The search is for theory which grows out of context-embedded data, not in a way that automatically rejects a priori theory, but in a way that keeps preconceptions from distorting the logic of evidence” (p. 267).
Methodology

This study employs both qualitative and quantitative methods of data analysis, but the methodology is qualitative in nature. Denzin and Lincoln (2005) explained this perspective: “Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world” (p. 3).

This study also has elements of ethnography, which Wiersma and Jurs (2005) described as being a methodology which “takes place in the natural setting and focuses on processes in an attempt to obtain a holistic picture” (p. 17). They also noted that ethnographic study can contain both quantitative and qualitative data; this is indeed true for the data in this study, which include a quantifiable Likert-scale type questionnaire as well as copious amounts of qualitative data such as interviews and think-aloud protocols.

In addition, participants were placed into case study groups based on purposive, rather than random, sampling because these were the students who were given permission by their parents to join in the study, and because random sampling was not feasible in a pre-existing classroom (meaning, there was no control over class makeup) situation.

Data Collection

This case study is focused on the pre-existing data collected from two groups of students during the spring semester of the 2005-2006 school year. At the start of the 2005-2006 school year, the IRB Form and parent letter and permission forms (Appendix A) were presented to the Human Subjects Review Board at Kent State University. I chose to focus on these two classes (General class \( n = 22 \), Honors class \( n = 26 \)) because they
happened early in the day, period one and period three, and second period was a study hall during which I had ample time to add to my teacher journal. Students were assigned to groups based on their permission to participate in the study and were grouped for the composition project not only because of the logistics of computer access, but because such grouping may ultimately inform the research questions in ways richer than if the students were to work alone. As Masterman (1985) observed, in such grouping “members can share a much more varied range of meanings and responses, and have the potential, from a wider range of reference points, to render textual meanings at all levels of analysis more problematic” (p. 29).

**Assignment Activities**

Working in groups of three or four, students completed a story-film approximately 6 minutes long. Students first viewed the raw footage from which they would work, supplied to them in the form of clips. All of the student groups received the same footage from which to Design (The New London Group, 2000) a new narrative text. Then, students brainstormed ideas about a story they could compose using parts of the raw footage, and rationalized where the various types of shots would be used. Next, students took turns on the computer working to manipulate the footage using the moviemaking software to create the story as they wished, keeping in mind the various literary devices and meanings they were hoping to convey. The only limitation (besides pre-existing footage from which to work) given to the students in their assignment sheet (see Appendix B) was that they could not provide narration to their stories in spoken form or with printed text, but they could use sound effects and/or music. This was
because it was of interest to see how students would respond to the directive (quite different to their traditional experience in English class) to use visual text to tell a story. While one or two were working with the video clips, the remaining student(s) were planning any effects they wished to use, transitions they wanted between any clips, and the music or sound effects they wanted to use to add meaning to their story. Each group, at the end of the first week, turned in the first assignment, which was a storyboard and written description of their plan and rationale for the plan. This was given a group grade, although each member of every group also received an individual “participation” grade based on his or her activities during class time.

Finally, students turned in the completed video composition, and a written description of the product, the decision-making process, and any reflections on the final piece. The project was graded according to the rubric supplied to the students at the start of the project (See Appendix C), and once again included both a group grade and an individual grade for each student.

When the video narratives were all completed, students were given the opportunity to show their group videos to the rest of the class in a Film Festival and saw how, even with the exact same raw footage, each group came up with a different story.

**Assignment Directives**

An A (90 to 100%) for the written part of the assignment was achieved when all parts of the assignment had been addressed (storyboard with identified shots, music cues, transitions, and effects; a written analysis of the Literary Devices used; and a written
deconstruction identifying how the group put the film together and why they put it together that way).

For the participation grade, an A was achieved when the student was observed clearly working on some part of his or her group’s project at all times during the class period, be that work directly on the computer, or brainstorming ideas with group members, or working on the written part of the assignment.

For the final video narrative, an A was achieved when the group had addressed all parts of the assignment (a clear title and/or end credits; a narrative with a clear storyline and effective use of transitions and effects; and appropriate and effective use of music and/or sound).

Raw Footage

The students were not asked to film their own footage but instead were given raw footage from which to work. This allowed for this study to focus on the students’ Design process (how they read and composed with the raw footage) and their ultimate Redesigned narratives. This raw footage (see Appendix D) supplied to the students comprised a total of 98 clips varying from 1 second in length to 3 minutes and 25 seconds in length. The entire set of raw footage totaled 20 minutes and 3 seconds in length. Two volunteer students (from my classes) and I shot the footage over two consecutive days, and though some of the shots were inspired by the students’ own interests and initiative, all of the shots were created with the clear directives from me of variety and video grammar. In other words, I directed the students to take shots of as many different places around the building, with as many different people, in as many different situations, as
possible. I also directed them to use what they had learned in class of video grammar to compose the shots.

As a result, the raw footage contained clips shot using different angles, light levels, camera movements, and framing techniques (Golden, 2001). The footage was shot entirely inside, or immediately outside, the school at different times during the two day shooting period, both with and without students. Although most of the students included on the film were shot from the neck down or from behind, there were two students from my classes—Alan from Study Group 1 and Fred from period three—who helped film footage and filmed each other also. There were also two other students—Jim and Anthony—who were my study hall helpers who agreed to be filmed.

**Overview of Data**

Primary data for this study comprised concurrent think-aloud tape recordings made by each group during the brainstorming and composition processes, post-work videotaped interviews (Appendix E) with members of the groups, students’ finished video story projects along with the raw footage from which students chose the clips for their projects (Appendix D), footage chosen by my case study groups (Appendices F and G), and written rationales and descriptions of their video stories and the decision-making process. Secondary data was made up of a Likert scale questionnaire (Appendix H), a teacher journal of classroom observations made during the entire project, a videotape of students working on their projects, post-project open-ended questionnaires, and observations and artifacts from all groups in all classes.
Concurrent think-aloud protocols. As Smith (1994) pointed out, “Something I had to realize about writing is that it covers its own traces. The record is erased of the false starts, the dead ends, the deletions, and the rearrangements” (p. 2). It was most important that I try to amend this by employing data-gathering that would help fill this gap; Flower and Hayes (1984) promoted the value of think-aloud protocol analysis in understanding the composition process:

Unlike the evidence of notes, drafts, and revisions, concurrent protocols (ones in which the subject thinks aloud while working) brings us suddenly closer to the act of writing and yield a rich if unsifted body of data about the development of meaning. (p. 123)

To this end, each of the groups of students was supplied with a tape recorder, on which they recorded their group’s comments about what they saw and thought as they read the video text that was supplied to them. They also used the tape-recorders to record their process of putting the video text together into the form of a story, and any observations they made about the product they were creating. Each group produced approximately three hours of audiotape in a stop-and-start fashion throughout the two-week period of work.

Post-work videotaped interviews. After completion of the project, I interviewed the members of both Group 1 and Group 2 using video as the recording medium (see Appendix E). This was done in the hopes of checking and supporting the information students wrote on their post-work questionnaires, and perhaps allowing students a forum in which they felt their voices would be heard. The medium of video had the added
advantage of being able to clear up any uncertainty regarding tone in students’ answers, which can be a problem with questionnaire answers.

Video projects, footage, and accompanying deconstructions and storyboards. The students’ finished video stories were composed on video software and then saved to a digital video format for viewing. This data was additionally broken down by transcribing the individual clips and audio (See Appendices F and G) used in each of the videos (Group 1 clips $n = 38$, Group 2 clips $n = 54$) using the master raw footage list (Appendix D) and final videos from which to draw.

Each group turned in a rough draft of a storyboard and deconstruction/summary for the film and then a final version of both that detailed what their film was about, the shots they chose to use, and how they manipulated the media (through special effects, transitions, addition of audio, etc.) to create their stories.

Initial Likert scale questionnaire. According to Henk and McKenna (2004), a Likert questionnaire used as an affective scaling technique “allows for the summation and averaging of scaled responses—that is, attaching numbers to levels of meaning” (p. 210). This questionnaire (Appendix H), modified from one used by Bruce (2002) in a similar study, served the purpose of gaining some background information on the students. The 31 questions on it included questions about students’ demographic information (gender, previous English grade last year and this year, and whether their families owned computers or video cameras) in order to better understand what experiences students were bringing to the project. Also, there was a section of questions dealing with attitudes towards reading, writing, peer work, films, and comfort with technology. Finally, there
was an additional section for students to fill out if they had worked with video before that asked questions about their attitudes toward using video with peers, for composing, and preferences and experience using video and video editing software. Students were given this questionnaire during the week of March 13, 2006, before embarking on the unit. I spent the time between collecting the questionnaire and April 10, 2006, when the video project began, tabulating the results. Though I did not use this information to formulate the groups for the study, I did use it when looking at other data sources for evidence of reading and composition processes and preferences, and it served to highlight where the study participants’ answers fell in relation to the classes of which they were a part, and to both classes together.

Teacher journal. During the entire process of the study a teacher-researcher journal was kept in which were recorded observations about what the students were doing and saying about the project and their process, and some of the issues that came up during the course of the study, and specific notes on each of the groups involved. I had the advantage of a class period between the two study classes in which to take notes and prepare for the day’s work, and therefore the information in the journal is rich and accurate.

Group videotapes. During the project, including pre-work on learning the software, I occasionally videotaped classroom activity of the groups in order to supplement the data the students were supplying through their think-aloud protocols. In doing so, I was able to catch all activities; I wanted a classroom view of what the students were doing during the process. Over the course of three different days I videotaped entire
class activities of two classes by setting up the camera in the front of the room, pointing to six computers in the back of the room where students were working. There is footage of both period one and period three at work, including the case study groups.

Post-work questionnaires. Upon completion of the project, the students filled out a questionnaire (see Appendix E) aimed at understanding what the project was like for the students, what were the best and worst parts, and so forth. Because the questions were so similar, this data served as a check for data collected from post-work interviews. It also served to triangulate data from my teacher journal and the group think-aloud protocols.

Data Analysis

Data analysis took the form of coding the data in the constant comparative method outlined by Glaser and Strauss (1967), which allows the development of theory while reviewing the data (p. 102). Also, Creswell and Miller (2000) pointed out the importance of demonstrating credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability, and authenticity in my study. To this end, the data was gathered from several sources, following Denzin and Lincoln’s (2005) definition of triangulation as “the simultaneous display of multiple, refracted realities” (p. 6) to frame the data gathering in the hopes of creating a more three-dimensional picture of the experience of the participants. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1993) described the value of teacher-collected data for this very purpose: “Like university-based qualitative research, a strength of teacher research is that it often entails multiple data sources that can be used to confirm and/or illuminate one another” (pp. 17-18). Because the data is in many different forms, the goal was to create a
holistic narrative that interweaves as much of the data as possible in a three-dimensional manner (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). The major contributing (primary) data sources turned out to be the think-aloud audiotapes, the post-work video interviews, and data connected to the students’ finished films, including the footage used and the accompanying paperwork. The categories for the reading and composition processes were checked against the secondary data sources order to gain a more three-dimensional and rigorous picture of the processes identified. The data analysis of the primary data sources is described in the following section.

**Protocols for audio and video data.** I began my search for a working model of video reading and composition processes with Bruce’s (2002) Video Composition Process Model (p. 75) as a launching-point from which to examine the data from the think-aloud tape-recordings, and video data collected from the post-work interview since these were by far the largest data sets and the ones which were bound to elicit the greatest amount of insight into processes. I went through these data sets and looked for emerging themes and categories, and with a colleague I went through the data once, utilizing categories found in the Bruce model. I then made several more passes through the data, both adding and modifying categories as additional themes emerged with which to provide a useful vocabulary for discussing the students’ processes and activities. I then brought these categories to raters in order to gain an 80% agreement on the categories developed (Lombard, Snyder-Duch, & Campanella-Bracken, 2002). My two colleagues achieved an 85% agreement on the categories examined (see Figure 1).
Authoritative Source (Influences affecting group choices)

Genre: Comments about story type ("catastrophe" or "love story") and how story elements fit that genre.

Narrative Strucutre: Comments about story form (short story) and the accompanying literary elements such as mood, tone, characterization, irony, etc.

Existing Footage: Having pre-existing footage with which to work; comments demonstrate how this limitation shaped choices during the process.

Teacher/Assignment: Instructions from the teacher or the actual assignment; comments are those about how these factors affected the group's choices.

Project Vision (guiding influences of story creation)

Making Sense: Comments dealing with the need to make sense of a sequence for themselves; trying to "make sense" of the story by telling it to each other in the group.

Clarity: Comments dealing with the need to clarify the meaning of a sequence for the audience, such as "Add that clip so they'll know he's the main character."

Aesthetics: Comments on the look of the video, such as "I like how that shot looks" or "That looks dumb."

Logistics (Influences of How to accomplish a task, equipment issues)

How: Comments on how to go about accomplishing a task or fit a story issue, such as "I know, we could..." or "Once thing we could do is..."

Equipment: Comments on software or hardware issues, such as "We can't do that with this program" or "The tape recorder is stuck."

Centralization (Activities of planning or working)

Brainstorming: Planning story elements; comments such as "I have an idea" or "We could do this..."

Editing (activity of editing video and audio during process)

Selection and Sequencing: Comments about which clips to use, and/or where clips should go.

Transitions: The moment between clips; comments about the need for transitions, or how certain transitions could work.

Audio: Includes music or sound effects; comments about which music or sounds should go where for what effect.

Effects: Comments about how certain effects (such as slow motion or added color) can produce certain meanings or outcomes.

Group Behaviors (Contributing Factor of how groups work together during cooperative learning process)

Role-Filling: How each of the group members took on, or was assigned, a specific role in the process. Comments include those such as "I always do the paperwork."

Balancing: The need for each group member to balance his or her needs against those of the entire group. Comments include those such as "I wish I could do this alone because I can control my grade" or "Let's compromise and integrate our ideas."

Member Checking: Comments of group members to each other seeking input, such as "Any ideas?" or "What do you think?"

Outlining: Comments that show where they are in the process, such as "Today we are working on..." or comments about what should happen next.

Figure 1: Video Designing Process Categories
I listened to all sets of tapes (including those of groups not involved in this study) as a means of keeping track of students’ questions, confusions, group issues, participation, and so forth, throughout the project. Some parts of the tapes of other groups with permission to participate were transcribed for purposes of comparison with the two study groups. The study groups’ tapes were transcribed in their entirety.

The post-work video interviews were also transcribed for Group 1 and Group 2, and the same categories were used to go through the students’ answers. The modifications in the categories were applied to more passes through this data and were shaped by the themes that emerged from that data.

*Video projects, footage, and accompanying deconstructions and storyboards.*

Group 1’s video, *The Dream*, totaled 0:06:53 and was created (as were all the projects) on user-friendly PC video-editing software. After watching the video several times, and using the master list of raw footage supplied to the students to create their projects (see Appendix D), I compiled a “script” of the clips this group had chosen for their film (see Appendix F). I then did the same with Group 2’s video, *Deceit and Devastation*, totaling 0:08:49 (see Appendix G). For both films I noted where music and/or sound was added to create meaning as well.

As part of their class project assignment, each group was asked to produce a rough-draft storyboard and summary, and a final storyboard with deconstruction/summary and list of literary devices they could identify in their film projects. Both case study groups turned in these items, and both were examined in connection to their final films.
Summary of Chapter 3

Using a qualitative methodology, this chapter describes the two groups of students, Group 1 and Group 2, within the contexts of their respective classes. By using many data sources, such as think-aloud protocols, interviews, and questionnaires, I was able to effectively create a three-dimensional look into the processes of these groups as they worked over the course of approximately three weeks to create a multimodal video narrative. I found that my primary sources of data came to be the think-aloud protocols, the post-work interviews, and data connected to the students’ finished films, including the footage used and the accompanying paperwork.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

For those students who are “going through the motions” in 11th grade, a media literacy approach to language arts can awaken and inspire students, challenging them to invest the energy and commitment it takes for active development of print literacy skills to occur. (Hobbs, 2007, p. 142)

Introduction

This chapter seeks to describe the video reading and composition (Designing) processes of my two case study groups, within the larger context of the classes in which they operated. In doing so, I am also attempting to explore the following research questions:

1. What processes do students use to Design with video text?
2. What influences students’ decision-making while Designing video texts?

I first contextualize the two case study groups and their experiences in crafting their video narratives, which I outline. Next, I focus on the composition processes revealed through the groups’ influences, activities, and group behaviors (Question One), and the most prominent emergent findings from the analysis of the major influences on the groups’ Designing processes (Question Two).

Case Study Group 1

This group was made up of two boys and two girls from my first period General English class, all 16 years old. I placed these four students together because they all had
permission to participate in the study. I also attempted, within that boundary, to make the
groups as heterogeneous as I could based on what I knew from an entire school year’s
experience with these students. To that end, I chose Alan, Sara, Cliff, and Emma to work
together, and all four students were different from each other in personality, skills, and
attitudes about English class overall. As a group, however, I found their process to be one
in which they were highly cooperative, despite the occasional argument over who got to
do what in the project, and the group received an A on their final project.

Profiles of Group Members

Alan

Alan, an energetic soccer player, prided himself on being the best student he
could be. Although his written text work showed a rather low skill level, he was
enthusiastic, conscientious, and generally took charge of this group. He would come into
the classroom early every day, and consistently demonstrated a willingness to go above
and beyond what was expected in his assignments. He often came in before, during, and
after school to work on his group’s project. My post-work interview with Alan revealed
that this was most likely a control issue. When asked if there was anything he did not like
about working in groups, he replied that he did not like to work in groups for the
following reason: “You have to depend on other people to do the uh work and
information, so you have to depend on them.”

However, Alan did not actively set out to monopolize the project; it was apparent
from my observations of his group that he just felt comfortable being in charge. Alan’s
grades over the course of the year stayed at an A average (his final GPA was 91.3%) because of his willingness to ask questions and work very hard on his assignments.

Sara

Sara was a student who traditionally worked below ability level in my class, although for the most part she was conscientious in getting her work done. She had a bit of a sarcastic nature, but was mostly pleasant and good-humored in working with the group, and was always ready with a smile. She liked to read, but absolutely loved to write, and was successful during the year in the various assignments in which she was interested—and not so much in those she was not. She began the year with an average grade of A, which leveled off at a low B average for the remainder of the year. She was happy about her final A on the project, a group grade, because she felt more in-control of her grade when working alone and was happy that working with a group had not lowered her grade.

Cliff

Cliff, a dedicated athlete, was more interested in sports than English class. However, he was polite and hardworking during most of the school year, though he did slip a bit in his dedication and his grades toward the end of the year, once basketball season was over. His creativity was fairly high, but his skills low in some areas, especially writing and reading comprehension. Although a strong physical presence, Cliff was not a leader during the project. He preferred taking a back seat, commenting on the ideas of the others in the group and contributing to the project paperwork while not feeling the need to take charge of the project or the story. Cliff’s grades began with a low
A average that leveled off to a low B average for the year. His earned A on the project gave him a bit of a boost in attitude towards the end of the school year.

*Emma*

Emma was one of the quietest students in my class. She was shy about raising her hand and at the start of the year would seldom participate because she did not like English class and did not like to write or read very much. However, as the year progressed she became less shy and a bit more involved in class activities, though her involvement in English class was spotty; for a while she would do her work and contribute to class, and then slip, missing several days of school, and fail to turn in projects. She started the year getting Bs and Cs, but failed the last nine weeks—the one with the video project in it—even though her group got an A on the project. This was because she did not do any work for the remainder of the year, which mostly consisted of a research paper. Earning an A on this project made this easily the most successful assignment for her during the entire school year.

*Group 1’s Work*

Sara, Alan, Cliff, and Emma barely waited until the assignment was out before sitting down at their group’s assigned computer to start watching the raw footage I had supplied to everyone. After downloading all of the clips into the film-making software, they began by playing the clips in order and started commenting on what they were seeing, occasionally chastising each other for forgetting to hold the think-aloud tape recorder close enough to the speaker. Alan, who had helped do some of the raw footage filming, occasionally commented about one shot or another, but the rest of the group was
eager to get through all of the footage to see what they had to work with. They did not wait until watching all of the raw footage, but began playing with the clips by dragging them to the timeline to see how they looked together. They were clearly influenced by aesthetics, looking specifically for clips they found “cool” or “interesting” to them. In doing this, they had begun what for them turned out to be an extremely bottom-up, or organic, approach to putting their project together. Their comments that first day were mainly about what the clips looked like, and what genres specific clips in the footage reminded them of (both “dream” and “teen story movie” were mentioned).

As the group progressed in the two days following the initial footage viewing, they shifted their focus from aesthetics (just looking for “cool clips”) and those initial comments about genre (“dream” or “teen story movie”) to an interest in a transition effect included in the software called a “dissolve,” wherein the film clip dissolves, or fades, into the next clip. Alan particularly had become focused on this transition, and he declared as he sat at the computer doing the editing that second day that their film should be called “The Dissolve.” As Cliff or Emma or Sara directed him to include what they thought of as “cool” clips, he would automatically add the dissolve transition between each clip.

However, this free-form manipulation of footage did not last long. Two things happened almost simultaneously. The first was that the group “re-discovered” the assignment sheet and came to the realization that by just throwing clips up and creating transitions between them they were not following the teacher/assignment directive to tell a story with their video narrative. Alan summarized this in his post-work interview:
Um, I think when we started we just, you know, you just put a couple clips together to see where you’re at and stuff, and then as it goes on you’re like, “oh,” you know, you think about that, so each different clip, you think about different stuff and how you can incorporate that . . . basically get a story out of it.

The second thing that occurred was that they began looking—even before checking the assignment sheet—for ways to make sense in their story. At this point there was much arguing as each group member began re-reading the footage they had chosen in order to discover what story that footage told them—and in the process, they began telling the story to each other in an effort to come to a final storyline—which they eventually did. They decided on a story about a boy who falls asleep in English class, experiences a bizarre dream in which he manages to escape from school, and then abruptly wakes from his dream at the end. Although their work had begun in a very bottom-up, organic fashion, reconnecting with the assignment directive changed the direction of their efforts to creating a clear narrative structure.

This process was occasionally blocked by the fact that they only had a limited palette from which to work—pre-existing footage, only so many special effects, only so much the software could do, and this group was particularly frustrated by this at the beginning. Cliff came up with a great plot idea—but Alan chimed in with, “Yeah, but, uh, except that never happened,” referring to Cliff’s desire to use footage that did not exist. They all had to also rely on each other to help stretch the group’s knowledge of the software in order to create the best story, and doing so was an immense source of pride. Sara figured out how to delete clips they did not want, and Alan became an expert on
each of the different transitions available to them. Cliff and Emma worked together specifically to figure out how to time the music and the video clips together, particularly when the group came to what they classified as one of the most important moments in their work: firmly deciding upon the video narrative’s plot.

In focusing their storyline, this group used the written part of the assignment, particularly the storyboard and the deconstruction/summary, as a scaffolding device to help them plan this more carefully. By using scaffolding in this way, this group was able to make progress in their assignment by considering what they knew about narrative structure, thereby reconnecting with the purpose of the assignment—to tell a story.

At this point in their work, Alan clearly wanted to be in control of the editing, and Sara and Emma threatened to “rebel” because Alan was taking over the process. Cliff, more easy-going, was fine with letting Alan do most of the computer editing work, but by the end of the project all had managed to take turns at the computer editing, while they divided up the work of creating the accompanying storyboards and deconstructions.

The group’s story had transformed from a nonsensical jumble of images tied together with a common transition (the dissolve) into a narrative with a clear beginning, middle, and end. In deciding upon a plot, the group was open to the next important decision-making step: choosing the music for their video. They had not been ready to do this until this point, and once they had their story, they suddenly were on a quest for the “perfect” music. This became Alan’s job, which he mapped out very carefully for himself, watching the film they had put together first, making a list of the kinds of music he wanted—slow, medium, fast, action-packed, or sorrowful. His search for music—
mostly in my enormous CD collection open to the students—led him to the soundtrack to 
*Man on Fire*, which has a total of 28 tracks. With the help of his group members Alan 
chose four different tracks that worked for the various parts of the new story they had 
developed and Cliff and Emma incorporated them into the storyline.

Finally, the group had their piece, *The Dream*, ready to go, complete with title at 
the beginning and credits at the end. There were some problematic moments during the 
final days—computers shutting down while trying to save, forgetting which folder in 
which they had saved their work—but they managed to overcome these obstacles in time 
for the Film Festival. All four group members got up in front of the class to introduce 
their film, and during the class viewing with the lights off I heard Sara whisper to her 
neighbors, “The fan was my idea!” What follows is a narrative description of Group 1’s 
video: *The Dream* (See shot list in Appendix G).

Outline of Group 1’s Video: *The Dream*

The title is in glowing blue-white on a black background. The video narrative 
begins with a slow strings and piano classical piece (*Creasy’s Room*) that sets a peaceful 
mood. A clip of the fan circles/spins in, and there is a dissolve to Alan’s eyes looking 
down and back to center; this is repeated. As the shot dissolves into a reveal shot of grass 
outside, the music changes to a percussive section with a repetitive, dreamlike tone 
(*Sanchez Family*) which serves to disjoint the images. There are several shots at this point 
that are repeated, illustrating the unreal nature of the narrative. A cross-fade transition 
superimposes images upon each other, both connecting those images together for the 
reader but also serving the unreal, dreamlike scenario. Shots of the hallway clock at
various times occur and are repeated, creating a sense of confusion about the passage of time, and the music changes from the percussive beat of *Sanchez Family* to a slower, more somber mood in the *Main Title*. Our main character’s dream comes to an end as he sees himself leaving the school building, but then is again where he began—in class, with the fan running, having gone nowhere at all. The ending repetition of the shots of Alan’s eyes and the fan create a parallel structure mirroring the start of the narrative. The video’s end credits, white text on a blue background, enlarge and pause before fading away.

Case Study Group 2

This group from my third period Honors English class was made up of four students, one boy and three girls, all aged 16. As with Group 1, these students were placed together both because they all had permission to participate and because I wanted—as much as possible—to create a heterogeneous grouping. This group was indeed made up of different individuals with the common goal of getting a good grade—typical of my Honors students. This group was made up of strong personalities used to exerting individual control over the grades that were so important to them, and their successful compromise on their project is made all the more impressive because of that. This group’s final project grade was also an A.

*Profiles of Group Members*

*Felicia*

One of the brightest students in this class and a definite leader of this group, Felicia conscientiously prepared and turned in each assignment I gave her throughout the entire year. She possessed a mature, thoughtful nature, and was not at all shy about
stickling up for her side in an argument. On the other hand, she also had a good sense of humor and enjoyed joking with me and with her classmates. She was someone used to performing well as a student overall, consistently achieving an A in English class throughout the year, and was also somewhat of a “control freak” during the course of this project, and did not hesitate to comment on it. Felicia was often found working on the group’s project outside of class time in order to perfect some editing, an area in which she excelled. Her final project grade of an A was a great relief to her.

*Kim*

Kim had a tendency to lack self-confidence, but her attitude towards English and skills were quite good. She also had a rambunctious sense of humor, and showed immense good will toward the other students in the class. One of Kim’s strengths was her willingness and ability to ask for advice and guidance when she thought she needed it, and she served as a strong mediator in her group. Her greatest source of pride was her contribution to the group’s storyboard, since she did not think of herself as an artist. As with most of the Honors students in this class, she had gotten into the habit of performing well in English class. Her grades began with a low A average, which she managed to maintain throughout most of the year. The group project grade of A was no surprise to her because she felt she had enormously creative fellow group members.

*Brittany*

Brittany was perhaps more socially than academically oriented, and was always the first in this class to push the envelope regarding school rules. She tempered this wild side by demonstrating real leadership ability in this project, and shared a great deal of the
editing work with Felicia and Rick. Her overall grades were somewhat inconsistent, varying between Bs and As, and much depended on her interest in the work at hand. She had obviously enjoyed this particular project, and was happy with her group’s A.

Rick

Rick was a class clown—he loved to be the center of attention, but also had at his core a need to do well in school and please himself and his teachers. He was never able to sit for long periods of time. However, he usually produced high-quality work, only occasionally having problems with tests and quizzes. His grades improved throughout the year, going from a high B average to a high A average at the end of the year. In this project, he was at the core of most of the group’s activities and contributed a great deal; if his group needed an idea, Rick was there with one. If they needed some music, he was the one to bring some the group to choose from. If they needed someone to work outside of class on parts of the project, Rick was the first to volunteer, and was often to be found in the back of the room after school working on something. He was one of the main instigators of the final Film Festival, and insisted the other students bring in food. As a central figure within his group, he was not surprised at his group’s A for their film, describing it (especially the end) as “just awesome!”

Group 2’s Work

Upon initially reading the raw footage, these four group members couldn’t seem to get close enough to their computer or their think-aloud tape recorder. They were all very excited to be doing something so new to them, and were from the start eager to please me as their teacher by meeting the requirements of the assignment. They
enthusiastically began commenting into their recorder, with Kim in charge of holding it, before beginning to watch the footage. This group took a top-down, assignment-driven approach as they identified and began discussing the kind of story they thought it would be—a “calamity.” Soon, however, I realized that this group wasn’t finished with their discussion; Felicia and Kim developed one idea for their storyline, and Rick and Brittany another, after having read all of the raw footage. In fact, it soon became clear that some sort of compromise had to be reached, and reach it they did—by combining their two story ideas into one. However, paramount to their discussion about this compromise was whether or not it would make sense, according to the existing raw footage they had available, and how the narrative elements should be combined to best effect.

Occasionally, the limitation of the existing footage proved problematic to their plans. For example, at one point Rick came up with the idea of how to communicate the main character’s name, and Kim thought it important to talk about in the group’s think-aloud:

This is [Rick’s] idea. He wanted to make [Fred] be our main character and he wants his name to be Ray Finkleton. So, we’re gonna have a shot of [Fred] and then like pause it, and then have like a title that says his name . . . And then it would make it like totally obvious that he’s our main character . . . We can do the same thing with [Jim and Anthony] but make their names, like, smaller so we know that they’re not the main characters.
After a short interval, during which he had consulted his assignment sheet, Rick came back to the tape recorder with: “Cancel the text in the film—I guess we’re not allowed to do that.”

Despite this set-back, the group immediately began to find other ways to communicate necessary information—through special effects, audio, and transitions that would communicate the literary elements of narrative structure (such as foreshadowing, symbolism, mood) they wanted to get across. They even managed to add “Ray Finkleton” to the film’s end credits, text that was allowed in the project.

As the group got closer to finishing their video narrative, it became evident that Felicia wanted more control of the editing process, perhaps feeling that in doing so she would have greater control over how the video narrative would meet the assignment guidelines. Although in retrospect Felicia admitted to being “controlling and demanding” (and her groupmates agreed to this assessment) it never really became an issue of argument for them. In fact, all of the group members commented on how beneficial it was working together. In Rick’s words, “Group effectiveness, you know, like Batman and Robin. They get it done.” For example, Felicia solved the problem of how to put in the sound effect for the exploding bomb; Kevin solved the problem of what music to use by bringing in several CDs and flashdrives with music on them as well as an innate knowledge of various music genres; Kim monitored the group’s activities and was well up on what parts of the assignment they needed to be working on; and Brittany worked with Rick to help choose which of the music he brought would work for various parts of the film and supervised some of the precision editing of the music for the final project.
Felicia and Rick, especially, spent an amazing amount of time working on their project after school; they got so used to my admonition to “turn off the lights, close the door on your way out” that they began reciting it for me as I left for the day. They were motivated by trying to figure out how to synchronize a sound effect with a particular visual. They were so well organized toward the end of the project, however, that they were ready for the film festival, and Rick introduced his group’s film wearing a piece of white crepe streamer paper around his head like a Kamikaze fighter prepared for battle. Rick began, “Deceit and Devastation—that’s alliteration!” His group members groaned and rolled their eyes—but they clapped like everyone else as the story they had worked so hard to make into a reality unfolded for their classmates to admire. The following is a narrative overview of Group 2’s film Deceit and Devastation (see shot list in Appendix H).

**Outline of Group 2’s Video: Deceit and Devastation**

The beginning title is plain white on a black background, which is cross-faded and superimposed upon a panning shot of the school parking lot. The beginning riff from *Jack and Diane* by John Cougar Mellencamp repeats over and over as the narrative progresses. We are taken to the front of the school, then inside, and begin experiencing a normal school day. We see kids in the hallways, going up and down stairs, a shot of the hallway clock, a student writing, a girl working at the computer. Suddenly, the music ends as we see a sequence of two hands ready to shake. The theme from *Jaws* begins to show the hands belong to conspirators, and we crosscut to Fred, our victim, coming down the stairs as another crosscut shows us the actual handshake—the deal being made. The
The Jaws theme continues to build until we have a shot of the hallway clock and AC/DC’s Thunderstruck begins playing. As we see a pair of eyes looking and a reveal shot of the emergency alarm, an alarm bell sounds and we see a cafeteria worker yelling into a walkie-talkie. Suddenly, the video goes into fast motion and Thunderstruck continues to play as students hurry up and down stairs in an effort to escape the catastrophe that is imminent. This segment ends with a female student running in slow-motion, and next the Jaws theme repeats as we get several shots of the conspirators meeting in a classroom (filmed from behind the school fan, which adds to the clandestine feel of the meeting).

We next see a male about to drink from the drinking fountain and we hear a ticking noise as his hand presses the drinking fountain button—and there is an enormous exploding sound, coupled with a reddened-hued reveal of a classroom chair.

The film switches gears abruptly by changing to a sepia-toned color scheme coupled with an old-time film effect and a slow, sad song Requiem For A Dream from the film Vanilla Sky. We see several shots of a completely empty high school—empty hallways, stairways, and so forth. The sepia tone and old-film effect disappear when we see Fred re-enter the school, completely unharmed, and walk in slow motion away from the camera, during which time the camera zooms in closely on the Peace sign and “Give Peace a Chance” that can be seen on his t-shirt. The ending credits are white text on black background.
Research Question One: What Processes do Students Follow in Designing Video Texts?

Introduction

I began with Bruce’s (2002) model of Video Composition which gave me a vocabulary from which to start describing my own students’ processes, although I found that the categories named by Bruce required some refocusing because of the differences in our participants’ processes. For example, unlike the participants in Bruce’s study, mine did not plan for and provide their own video footage. Therefore, the parts of Bruce’s model involving the students’ “Visual Conceptualization,” “Group Processes,” and “Visual Production” through such activities became modified as I observed my own students’ processes and influences in Designing with the existing footage which was given to them.

The relatively short amount of time spent on this reading and composition assignment—the space of approximately three weeks—intensified the interconnected and recursive nature of reading and writing. In taking a look at both Group 1 and Group 2’s video Designing processes as a whole, it became increasingly clear that these groups approached their video narratives in quite different ways. Even receiving the same assignment directive and the same footage from which to work, these groups approached the task from nearly opposite points.

Video Designing Process Categories

This close look at what the students did with the medium of video, how they approached the reading of the raw footage, how they began to formulate their stories, and what they ultimately did to create their finished products, led to three sets of categories
(see Figure 1). Using these categories allowed me to frame a three-dimensional look at what these students did during the process. These categories were established from comments (written or verbal) made by the participants in the primary data collected.

(Note: Each of the categories and subcategories are italicized in the discussions that follow.)

One category includes those influences of *Authoritative Source*, *Project Vision*, and *Logistics* on the students’ decision-making process while Designing with video text.

The second category delineates the *Conceptualization* and *Editing* activities in which the students were involved during the Design process.

The third category includes *Group Behaviors* evident that contributed to the groups’ work, such as how they fulfilled certain roles within the group, how they balanced their individual and group roles, and so forth.

These categories were connected at a basic level by the authoritative sources of *genre* (through their understanding of how different types of stories include different elements) and *narrative structure* (through the direct influence of their knowledge of how short stories are put together and the literary devices common to them). Both *genre* and *narrative structure* influenced and directed many of the groups’ decisions, illustrated by a nearly constant presence of referral to various elements of both, including story type, characters, mood, imagery, and so forth. Although I have outlined the influences of *genre* and *narrative structure* in Research Question Two, the following section seeks to outline the other major influences, activities, and group behaviors involved in the processes these two groups followed in Designing their video narratives.
Process Influences

Authoritative Source: Existing Footage

The fact that both groups, and indeed all of the groups in my classes, were given pre-existing footage with which to work certainly influenced their choices. Several times during the process, Group 1 talked about how they were occasionally hampered by not being able to add to the footage, as Emma’s comment illustrates: “Well, it wasn’t really that bad but . . . the fact that our shots, that we can only use certain scenes, kinda cut us down.”

As Group 1 moved in the process from reading the raw footage to manipulating that footage experimentally, I saw them follow a unique course of action in the creation of their narrative. Instead of formulating a clear and set plot for their narrative upon reading the raw footage and then manipulating the raw footage to match their plot, they Designed the existing footage to allow the plot to form organically in a very bottom-up way. In essence, Group 1’s play with the video footage “told” them the story, and they shaped that story and made sense of it to each other.

Group 2 also agreed that being given existing footage with which to work influenced their choices. When asked about whether any limitations were of concern to her, Kim had the following answer:

We would be able to bring together the story better just ’cause we could have said, “Hey, let’s videotape this, and get it to perfectly fit in right here” and we couldn’t do that because we could only use the raw footage, so it was more of a challenge, but we overcame it.
Both Group 1 and Group 2 acknowledged that overall, they managed to overcome the limitation of the existing footage, and indeed, during the Film Festival one of the main topics of conversation was how every film produced was different from the others, despite having begun with the exact same footage. This would perhaps not have been as evident had students been able to supply their own footage.

*Authoritative Source: Teacher/Assignment*

The limitations placed on both groups regarding how the narrative should be put together and what they could or could not include also influenced the groups’ decision-making processes. Because this was a school project, the students were aware of the need to give attention to directives given by me, the assignment directions, and the grading rubric for the project. The students knew they could not add dialogue or print text to the body of the film, and this caused some concerns for Group 1. For example, in his post-work interview, Alan reported that he would have preferred to be able to add dialogue to the film, but this was not allowed by the parameters of the assignment. Cliff agreed that this was also one of his concerns, though it is interesting to note that his reason was connected with making sense for the audience: “You kind of know what’s going on a little bit more when people talk, instead of just watching it with music.”

The members of Group 1 also admitted that their process of Designing changed because they reconnected with the assignment only after beginning to play with the footage. They turned in their first rough draft and I commented to them that they needed to create a much clearer story. This comment helped to re-align the group with the goals
of the assignment and their knowledge of what makes a narrative. Emma talked about this point in their work during her post-work interview:

Well, like, first we just really had everything together, we just like threw clips together and we didn’t like really make a story, but then it came together as a story, at first it was gonna be just a kid going through the day and then it turned into his dream and it changed like a lot.

Thus, Group 1’s organic process was re-shaped by connecting with the authoritative source of both the teacher and the assignment.

Group 2 was also influenced by the limitations placed on them by the *teacher/assignment*. This was a group used to getting good grades on more “traditional” English assignments, and all members began the process with an obvious desire to do well and “get an A.” However, their desire to communicate the name of the main character was foiled by the assignment directive that no print text was allowed in the narrative beyond the title and end credits (as discussed earlier in this chapter). When asked how she and her group overcame this limitation, Felicia revealed how her group had problem-solved to achieve their end: “We just, we made it start with the closeup of him to make it seem like he was the main character and it was the first person that we had a closeup of."

The other group members agreed with Felicia that not allowing dialogue caused them some problems they needed to overcome, but all agreed (including Felicia) that they dealt with those limitations as they arose. Instead of allowing the story to form organically, as Group 1 did, this group decided upon the storyline almost immediately in
the process, and once they had solidified their ideas, they stuck to that idea throughout. They were aware of the goals of the assignment from the beginning, and so were indeed steered by the authoritative source of teacher/assignment.

*Project Vision: Making Sense*

*Making sense* entails how these groups worked to understand the story for themselves as they were in the midst of creating the narratives. Throughout both groups’ work on their video stories, it became obvious that one of their overarching goals in the activities they followed was to create clear meaning for their audiences, but in order to accomplish this they first had to make sense of the footage for themselves.

For example, during the process Group 1 often told and re-told parts of the story to each other in order to make sense of the story. In an exchange between Alan and Emma, Emma questioned Alan’s sequencing of clips toward the end of their movie, wanting to know how it will fit into the story on which they have all decided:

Alan: Uh, then [the clip], um, dissolves into just, just empty stairs signifying that um school’s almost ending and there’s nobody there.

Emma: What, like everybody’s in their last class or something?”

Alan: Then it dissolves into uh um some kids walking the halls, leaving, leaving, leaving the school.

This particular exchange is one example of many during which the members of Group 1 read the footage for each other in order to make clear their thoughts about the direction in which the story could possibly go.
Group 2 also went through the process of making sense of the raw footage to themselves. However, this group began this process much earlier than Group 1 because they were cognizant right away of the assignment directive to “tell a story,” both for themselves and the audience. For example, despite the group having a common agreement on a genre—“catastrophe”—they came to a point where they needed to come to a compromise in their ideas in order to move forward. Felicia and Kim had the idea of some sort of natural calamity happening in the school, and Rick and Brittany had the idea of having two students (Jim and Anthony) making a plot to burn down the school. The following exchange took place during this part of their process as they tried to problem-solve how to combine their two ideas and thus make sense of the narrative for themselves:

Kim: Because you would, you can add it, you can combine them together, and you can have, um, [Jim] and [Anthony] plotting against [Fred] and then it turning into a big, big problem for the whole school, like they did something and it involved the whole school. We could . . .

Rick: I like that.

Kim: —do it that way and then this way it’s mixed together.

Felicia: There’s a problem, though, because there’s no scenes of just [Jim] and [Anthony] trying to go against [Fred], so, like . . .

Brittany: Yeah there is, there’s a scene of [Jim] and [Anthony] shaking hands like they’re making a deal.
Felicia: Yeah, but that doesn’t mean that they’re going against [Fred], so how would you know they’re going against [Fred]?

Rick: Wooooo!!! (makes funny noise)

Kim: Well, you can have um [Fred] walking and then [Jim and Anthony] and then [Fred] walking again, or like you can put [Fred] in there somehow or like [Fred] and then dissolve, or just dissolve and [Fred], or . . .

Brittany: We can have like a canted angle on [Jim and Anthony] to make it like they’re doing something shady.

This sort of problem-solving happened throughout the process, but this conversation clearly shows how this group worked together to make sense of the story for themselves before they took the next step of making it meaningful—providing clarity—for the audience.

*Project Vision: Clarity*

*Clarity*, or clear meaning for the audience, was an issue of extreme importance to both groups, and came up often during their processes of Designing their stories. Group 1 often discussed (sometimes argued) the need to make their video narrative clear to the audience. For example, Sara of Group 1 commented on the value of using the medium of video as a meaning-making tool during her post-work interview:

Sara: Well, with pen and paper you, people visualize what they think it would look like, but with the video it shows them what you thought it looked like.
Me: Ooo, can you give me a specific example from your film that is so true, like you show them that thing?

Sara: Like in the beginning, there’s like, it goes from the title, and the fan like swirls in. You can’t visualize that . . . You have to see it.

Their final video narrative, as the group members agreed, is far from their original vision and ideas; all group members felt that this was a good thing, and in fact, Cliff said that the group’s focus on *clarity* was his big “Aha” moment in the project:

Yeah, when we were finally, when we were making the story idea I had some ideas about, like, how to make it go, ’cause like we kind of made the film first and then we kind of put the storyline to it.

Because Group 1 was slower than Group 2 to come to this point in the process, their attention to *clarity* was especially concentrated for a period of time as they sought ways to make their ideas clear to the audience.

Group 2 was also highly motivated to get their meaning across. Although this group all agreed upon a catastrophe *genre* for their film, Brittany and Rick had one idea for the video narrative, and Felicia and Kim had another. Therefore, in the composition process they had to compromise in order to meet the needs of all group members and to fit the identified *genre* on which they had agreed. Felicia was concerned about how compromising their ideas would be clear to the audience, and her think-aloud reveals this:

Okay, what we were thinking of doing was the calamity thing, and I then I guess their idea was to have the [Jim-Anthony] scene and have them actually plan out the calamity on attacking [Fred] . . . and I don’t know what that’s all about.
Her concern over whether or not the audience would understand the story was a point Felicia brought up over and over again, especially regarding narrative elements such as characterization, and several of the group’s discussions (mentioned earlier) reflect this issue.

Kim also illustrated her concern over clarity for the audience during our discussion of revision during the post-work interview. I asked her how much revision she did when working with both written and video text, and she answered with the following:

Um, I do a lot [of revision] for written. Um, because, I always have to go back and make sure my point is being put across and um that like if the transitions were easily done and everything, and on the video um it’s kind of the same way. Like, you have to do the transitions, you have to make sure that . . . people are understanding what’s going on, so it’s kind of the same.

Brittany agreed with this assessment, saying her group had re-ordered the clips “to make them make more sense” for the audience, an issue that came up in their discussions often.

*Project Vision: Aesthetics*

Both groups were influenced by *aesthetics*, or how the video clips look when put together. Naturally, the look of the video clips was important in some of their decision-making because of the visual nature of video media. As the groups read the initial footage there were often comments about a clip being “cool,” or “looking good.” This influence remained during the composition process, especially as they worked to revise their video narratives. Group 1’s process was highly influenced by *aesthetics* right from the start, as
they chose clips that had a certain “look.” Even after aesthetics became more of a background concern, it still proved important throughout the Design process.

For example, in Group 1, Sara commented about an idea that she contributed to the film that was mostly driven by aesthetics: “With our video, we have a fan and [Alan’s] face, and I told them that that would look good together, and it turns out fantastic . . . and that’s great.”

Emma went one step further about the importance of aesthetics in the revision process when I asked her how much revision she and her group seemed to do for their final video as opposed to when she had revised for written text in the past:

Yeah . . . you seem to like [revise] more often [with video], ’cause if it doesn’t look right, you seem to like change it right away, instead of like waiting . . . you’ll just forget about it if you’re writing ’cause then you just kinda read over it, but if you’re watching, then you have to change it.

Group 1 revised not only for the aesthetics of the images, as Emma stated, but also with regards to the music they chose to accompany those images. There was a sense that their choice of music was partially influenced by the pleasing effect it created in conjunction with certain parts of the film, and they spent considerable time—particularly Alan—in search of just the right music.

Aesthetics was also an influence for Group 2, though it was not a foregrounded issue for them right away. Yes, they wanted their piece to “look” good to the audience, and were especially pleased by how their ending turned out. However, their main goal
early in the process was to create *clarity* for the audience. They attempted to achieve this end in many ways, including by controlling *aesthetics* through their editing activities.

For example, at the end of their film is the final shot (#54) of Fred walking first away, and then toward, the camera. The group manipulated the footage by adding two digital effects. The first was to add “slow motion” to existing footage, and the second was to add a digital zoom on Fred’s t-shirt in order to give their ending the look, and emphasis, they wanted it to have. Rick commented about this during his post-interview, when asked about what he thought was his biggest “Aha” moment: “Probably, I would say, I would agree with [Felicia], the end . . . We stayed, [Felicia] and I, we stayed after school and we got that end pretty good. I was pretty excited about that.”

Group 2’s attention to *aesthetics*, therefore, was yet another motivator for the group to Design their film as often as needed in order to create the overall visual experience they sought. Audio, too, was a piece tied to *aesthetics*; Group 2 paid close attention to the pleasing sense of how the music and the sound effects molded the clips to which they were attached, and this too influenced how the narrative was shaped.

*Logistics: How/Equipment*

*Logistics*, or those issues of how to accomplish a task, fix a story issue, or equipment limitations, also had somewhat of an influence on the students’ decision-making process. For example, in Group 1, Alan was motivated to figure out how to manipulate the software to create the story elements that he and his group wanted, and he described this as his big “Aha” moment: “The software, like my whole group didn’t know how to do it, and then like I really didn’t, and then I finally figured out how to do it
by myself and I’m like, ‘Yeah!’ you know?” As he learned how to use the equipment, Alan became more fluid in his ability to work with the story elements.

The limitations of software and equipment sometimes caused problems, as is evident in Sara’s final comment during the following exchange while Group 1 was attempting to manipulate the clips in their story:

Cliff: Go back to when they’re walking down the stairs.

Alan: Okay.

Cliff: Right there, where it’s marked. It’s marked. Just hit play.

Alan: Yeah?

Cliff: Just hit play.

Sara: It’s down here.

Alan: Oh, on this one?

Cliff: It’s when he jumps down the stairs.

Sara: I don’t think we’re gonna get it at that one spot. We don’t have the technology.

Like Group 1, Group 2 was influenced by logistics in their decision-making process. For example, Kim talked about her big “Aha” moment with regards to figuring out how to manipulate story elements: “Um, I didn’t understand how we were going to, um, put in an explosion for us, and [Felicia] was able to come up with an idea, and I very much like that because it was a very great point.” The logistical influence of how to go about accomplishing something was particularly important for this group; Felicia and Rick worked especially hard to figure out how to match the sound and the video clips
together in the way they wanted, and both made a point to mention this in their interviews. Though occasionally troubled by equipment glitches—such as the tape recorders not working properly, computers freezing up, and so forth—both groups managed to overcome these glitches in order to meet the needs of the task.

**Summary of Process Influences**

Each of the influences entailing *Authoritative Source, Project Vision*, and *Logistics* moved the students in Group 1 and Group 2 to make certain decisions during the process. Although both groups were influenced in similar ways, those influences worked on the groups differently because of each group’s approach to the assignment. Group 1’s bottom-up, organic approach saw the process influences work on them in a way that molded their work most notably when they had arrived at the understanding of the purpose of the assignment and in the ways they could create a narrative from the organic parts that they had pieced together. Group 2’s top-down, assignment-driven approach saw the process influences driving them from an early point to mold the existing footage into the genre they had named, and the narrative outline upon which they had decided.

**Process Activities**

Process Activities included what the students in these groups actually did during the process. These activities include the *Conceptualization* activity of **brainstorming**, and the *Editing* activities involved with **selection/sequencing, transitions, audio, and effects.**
Conceptualization: Brainstorming

Both groups engaged in brainstorming activities—during which they were experimenting with story ideas. Group 1’s organic, bottom-up approach of first playing with the clips and then allowing those clips to “tell” them a story shaped how (and when) they engaged in brainstorming activities. However, even Group 2 was influenced by how they Designed the story and made sense of it for each other in the process. Their brainstorming activities, especially, created a context in which their conversation about the story molded their eventual choices in the rest of their activities. For example, their conversation (discussed earlier in this chapter) early on about how to compromise their two ideas into one storyline led to a clearly new direction for their story to follow.

Most importantly, because they were given existing footage, both groups had to read and infer what was already there. They did not have to conceptualize what the footage was, but they did have to brainstorm the story and they had to decide how to use the existing footage to mold the narratives they were directed to create.

Editing

Editing involves the actual activities of physically putting together the elements of the video—the images and audio that comprise the film, and any additional elements added for effect. Editing comprised the largest activity of the project, and included the selection and sequencing of the clips of the film, the use of transitions, or the moments between clips, how audio, or music/sound effects, were manipulated in the videos, and any digital effects added to shape the footage.
Selection and sequencing. Group 1’s process of selection and sequencing their video clips began as a result of their focus on aesthetics, but changed at the point in their work when they reconnected with their assignment directives. At this point, the group’s selection of clips, and how they sequenced them in order to create the story on which they had decided, was driven by the need for clarity (audience understanding) and the desire to create their piece according to what they knew about narrative structure. In fact, Group 1 would work in sequencing small segments that they would, as a group, watch to determine if the sequence was “working.”

For example, in putting the final touches on their sequencing, this group decided to parallel the shots of Alan’s eyes and the running fan both at the very beginning of the film and at the very end. This was a nod to the group’s understanding that many short stories use this convention to illustrate a flashback or some other change in time. In Group 1’s story, they were using this sequencing technique to create a connection between the shot of the character before the dream, and the shot after he wakes up. In creating this sequence, the group watched the segment again and again to determine if it did what they wanted it to do.

Group 2 also showed a very recursive method of selection and sequencing. As they progressed each day through their work in sequencing their video narrative, it became increasingly clear that they were heavily influenced by their understanding of narrative structure and the approach to the process they had taken—very driven by the need to create a narrative that was clear to the audience. Their attention to selecting and sequencing the clips for clarity helped them tell the story they wanted to tell.
In order to accomplish this, Group 2 selected their clips, sequenced them according to their discussions about *making sense*, and then re-read those sequences in order to determine if they would provide *clarity* to the audience. They, like Group 1, felt the need to select, sequence, and watch the segments over again as they made adjustments, and replayed the larger finished sequences several times to accomplish this same goal.

Both Group 1 and Group 2 exhibited a strategy—reworking small parts in order to create meaning in the whole—that I had not typically seen in their print compositions. Normally, these students would write out an entire piece and then go back to make structural changes, if any.

*Editing: Transitions.* Group 1’s attention to *transitions*, or the moment between clips, is obvious when looking at how this group’s story evolved from day one. When they first began manipulating the footage, their focus was on the aesthetic concern of putting together as many surreal images as they could and using a dissolve transition between the clips, because this fit the title they had decided upon at the time. This exchange between Cliff and Alan during the think-aloud illustrates this:

Cliff: *The Dissolve of People.*

Alan: Dissolve [all the clips], though. That’s why it’s called *The Dissolve.*

When Group 1 reconnected with their assignment, they dropped their attention to *transitions* as an aesthetic device and began to use *transitions* for specific effect. For example, they included several *transitions* that allowed for clips to be superimposed on each other; this further added to the dreamlike mood they were attempting to
communicate. Therefore, the use of transitions became for this group less about aesthetics and more about creating clarity for the audience.

Group 2, on the other hand, did not begin using transitions as an aesthetic tool, but incorporated them as a way to steer the audience into connecting images together to create a meaningful whole. For example, they used the crosscut—quickly moving from one clip to the next—as a way to make clear that those two clips were connected in some way, and this became important as the group sought to find ways to make clear which characters were the conspirators, and against whom they were conspiring.

Therefore, both groups used transitions, but Group 2 demonstrated a better understanding of how they are used as a rhetorical device. All of the groups in the two classes used transitions in a variation of these ways; some groups used them at first because they could, some groups did not use transitions until putting together the final version of their videos. However, all groups did come to a point—some sooner than others—wherein they used transitions as a way to provide clarity in their stories.

Editing: Audio. Group 1’s process of choosing and adding audio to their video narrative was an event saved until most of the visuals had been put together. Group 1 also used the music they chose for their piece to create clarity. In his post-work interview, Cliff made the following comment when asked about whether he thought their narrative worked better as a video or would work better as a written story:

I think it worked better as a film . . . because the music adds to it. Like, our music’s kind of like a, like eerie, kinda weird music, and it’s a dream, so it kind of works so you can see what’s happening.
Later, when I asked Cliff about how the group went about making the choice for the music, he elaborated on how their choice was driven by their knowledge of the kind of music that fits their idea of a “weird,” or mysterious, genre:

Well, it’s a dream and we kinda did some like weird music, you know, like do it like soft, and then like, in the middle of the thing it gets louder and then at the ending, he’s waking up and it goes back to like soft.

Cliff’s comments about making sure the audience “can see what’s happening” and his explanation about how their choice of music at certain points—like when the character is waking up—demonstrate how this group had come to a substantial change in their goals for their video assignment. They went from simply playing with images to trying to create a meaningful whole fueled by meaningful music.

Similarly, during my discussions with Group 2 about their process, all of the group members agreed that one of the most important aspects of their film was how the audio worked together with the video to create clarity for the audience. Group 2 began earlier than Group 1 to experiment with ideas about how to create meaning through audio, perhaps because they had an earlier start in identifying a definitive storyline. Group 2’s editing of the audio allowed them to influence how the audience read their finished piece.

For example, they knew what they were looking for just a few days into the process, and began throwing out ideas to each other. Finally, Kim came to me during class on April 20th, as the group was beginning their search for appropriate music for their film:
Kim: We need music for, like uh they’re running away from something, and it’s like really . . .

Me: Is it scary, or is it just really . . . just really a lot of action?

Kim: It’s not scary, it’s kind of . . . fast paced, a lot of action, yeah.

Kim’s description of the music her group needed is very much about trying to get the point across; she and her group members were influenced by the desire to make the story clear through music they chose. For example, in her post-work interview Brittany explained what they were looking for much in terms of the film genre (catastrophe) they were creating:

Um, well, we needed something for like the beginning and something that kind of had to do with the whole, and it was kind of like foreshadowing, ’cause we used Thunderstruck by AC/DC . . . So, it’s not really thunder but it’s the bomb [exploding], so it kind of deals with the whole ending.

Rick, in his post-work interview, described their process of choosing the audio much in terms of decisions about mood-shaping:

Um, like, we chose a happy song at the beginning you know, just to show that everything’s good and everything’s normal, and then we, the middle song was kinda like crazy, like Jaws is like that suspense, kind of, and then at the end it’s just kinda like creepy and mysterious sound, music.

Regarding the sound effects Group 2 added to create further clarity—the ticking sound of the bomb during shot #45, and the explosion during shot #46—Rick’s comments during the think-aloud reveal the idea that led him to go home and find a
sound-effects CD his group could use: “I just got an idea. We have a clip of [Alan], we’re thinking about, uh, having him, while he’s getting a drink hitting the button and it’s gonna blow up the school . . . KaBOOM!”

Unlike Group 1, Group 2 decided to include additional sound effects in their video. Doing so entailed additional work for Group 2 (finding the appropriate recordings, looking for just the right sounds), but they were motivated by their desire for *clarity*.

It is interesting to note that every single group involved in making the video narratives chose to use music, though only two groups—Group 2, and another group from period 3—chose to use sound effects. This may be perhaps because sound effects were not mentioned in the assignment directive, whereas music was. However, it was clear that every group had used *audio* in some way to manipulate meaning in their stories.

*Editing: Effects.* Both groups were initially excited about the various *effects* available in the filmmaking software for them to use. However, after we had all spent time learning about *effects* and in what ways they could be used, Group 1 all but forgot about them until the very end of their Design process. This may have been because video was still a new medium to them, and their process led them along a path that caused them to focus strongly (because of the authoritative source of the assignment) on finalizing their narrative. Therefore, in their finished piece the only two *effects* they used were connected with their strongest story element—the paralleled shots of the fan at the beginning and again at the end of the film. They used a spin effect in the beginning to create the illusion of the main character’s dream starting, and a zoom on the fan as the
character is waking up. Perhaps because this group did not overuse *effects*, the two they did use are especially successful.

Group 2, however, incorporated several *effects*, and they were also quite successful. This was partially due to the amount of time and effort that went into designing these *effects*. The most notable example had to do with manipulation of color to assist in shaping mood. In Appendix H, shot #23, a close-up of male eyes looking right, they have added a blue wash effect that gives the shot a mysterious, off-kilter look. Because this shot is at the very beginning of the film’s climactic sequence, they wanted to place particular emphasis on this part of the film and knew, from past movie-watching experience and from the class meta-discussion on symbolism, that altering color is a way to achieve that end. They used this technique twice more during the film. The next time happens in shot #46, as the bomb is exploding; they have taken the reveal shot of a classroom chair (clip #003), cut it to remain close-up on the chair, and colored the frame red to represent the explosion. Their final use of color happens in the story’s falling action and conclusion; immediately after the explosion, the group imposed a sepia tone and an old film effect to shots #47 through 52 to indicate the empty school after the explosion. This manipulation of color was designed specifically to shape the perception of the audience.

A second notable example of Group 2’s addition of *effects* to create *clarity* of meaning is their manipulation of film speed. In the raw footage with which they were supplied, this group had no footage of a great number of students running, or any students walking very slowly. However, they knew that in a disaster film such *effects* add a sense
of urgency or emphasis, and they manipulated speed to achieve this. In the film, immediately after shots #24 and #25 of the emergency alarm and the cafeteria worker yelling into a walkie-talkie, shots #26 through #34 are sped up, showing students running as if in a panic. However, this changes with shot #35, when the footage of a female student running down the hall is slowed down to emphasize the horror of the situation. Group 2 again used slow motion to emphasize the conclusion of the film, which all group members agreed was the best part of their film—because it communicated the story’s theme. The slow motion is on the very last shot, #54, of Fred walking down the hallway after returning to a now empty school—having foiled the two plotter’s plan of blowing him up. The group used the slow motion to help the reader focus on the writing on the student’s t-shirt—“Give Peace A Chance”—the message they wanted to get across.

**Summary of Process Activities**

The groups’ activities of *Conceptualization* and *Editing* were clearly backgrounded by a need to fit both the *genre* agreed upon by each group, and the *narrative structure* of the short story each was compelled to follow. In particular, these groups used their activities as a way of *making sense* for themselves, and creating *clarity* for the audience. Their *brainstorming* involved telling the story to each other to help them understand how their activities of *selection and sequencing*, and manipulating the *transitions*, *audio*, and *effects* could best allow for others to understand the narratives they were trying to create.
Process Group Behaviors

Group Behaviors were exhibited as the students worked together in their cooperative groups. I divided the behaviors I observed into role filling, balancing, member-checking, and orienting. I focused on these four since they were most closely tied to their on-task work of creating the video narratives.

Group Behaviors: Role Filling

Role filling had to do with how each of the group members took on, or was assigned, a specific role within the group. These roles were both fixed and fluid, or sometimes both. Sometimes these roles were looked on positively, as evidenced by Alan’s comment in Group 1:

> What our group did is basically, I... drew [the storyboards] out, and then one of the other persons in our group did the uh, writing and stuff like that... so I think definitely group-wise, it made, I think it made a better movie, I think.

Emma also commented on the positive side of group work regarding how each member filled the role of idea generator at different times: “Well, ’cause you can... get like more opinions that way so like, if you think something’s good someone else might not think that so you can see what other people think about it.” All group members, in some way, echoed this opinion. However, sometimes the roles were perceived less positively, as when (discussed earlier) Alan’s groupmates commented on how they wanted to “rebel” against his taking over the editing work.

Group 2 also had both positive and negative perceptions about role filling. Brittany’s comment represents all of her groupmates’ opinion that sharing the role of idea
generator was a positive too: “Um you get to share your ideas and opinions with everyone else and not just figure it out all by yourself.” Kim agreed with this positive aspect, noting that not all group members had the same talents and therefore role filling was beneficial: “Um, I’m not as creative as I would like to be, so I had very creative people in my group and we all were able to come up with a great story.” Both groups, then, saw both the benefits and the drawbacks when filling roles in a group, but all group members agreed to some degree that they managed those roles well overall.

Group Behaviors: Balancing

Balancing was an issue of making sure that both the needs of the group and the needs of the individuals within the group were being met. These could include behaviors that were involved with balancing grade issues, or those involved in working to compromise.

Balancing most often manifested itself in Group 1 in terms of how to balance the issue of grades, as explained by Alan: “For me, I just like doing it on my own because I know what I’m capable of and what I can do and I’ll do it.” Of all four group members, only Alan and Sara talked to any degree about the issue of being in control of grades and it being a conflict (though a fairly small one) in their group, and their process was only affected by this towards the very beginning of their work, as they began to get used to working together.

Group 2 also was concerned about the issue of balancing, and it was Felicia in particular who was concerned about balancing her need for control of her grade with sharing the work with others in her group; she was the only one to actively comment
upon it. However, the issue of balance also came out regarding the need for creative control, as Kim explained: “Um, we weren’t always able to agree on things, and there were some creative disagreements.”

Still, like Group 1, Group 2 managed (on the whole) to work these balancing issues out to work to everyone’s advantage. However, unlike Group 1, Group 2 was also concerned to balance their story ideas, as the issue of compromising their two story ideas (discussed earlier) illustrates. Group 1 exhibited some moments of this kind of balancing behavior, but never actively sought to combine different ideas together on the scale that Group 2 showed.

*Group Behaviors: Member-Checking*

*Member-checking* was evidenced by comments one group member made to another in order to elicit an opinion. This happened quite frequently in both groups, and the *member-checking* behaviors were almost always positive in tone. For example, towards the end of the project Sara from Group 1 asked Cliff, “[Cliff], what do you think about the music?” in order to gauge his opinion on what they had chosen for a particular segment.

Group 2 also displayed this positive behavior, as evidenced by Rick’s comment: “Right now [Felicia’s] very frustrated; [Felicia], please tell me about it.” This is also illustrated by Kim’s question for Brittany: “Are you getting that thought process? What do you think, [Brittany]?”

Overall, *member-checking* proved to be an important behavior in that it allowed for group members to include each other in the conversations they were having about the
construction of their narratives in order to create a sense that they were working together as a team. All group members commented, to some degree, about how sharing the ideas and the work contributed to the success of their projects, and member-checking was a behavior that seemed to help maintain that sense of sharing.

*Group Behaviors: Orienting*

Orienting behaviors occurred when the group members talked about what was happening when in the process, and also about what they thought they should do next in the process.

For example, both groups at first found themselves unsure of what to do with their think-aloud tape recorders. I found it necessary to remind the students (mostly during the first few days) that their goal was simply to say their thoughts out loud, and eventually they grasped this concept. Still, occasionally both groups used the think-aloud tape recorders for orienting both themselves (as they were speaking aloud) and presumably me (as I listened to their tapes) about what they were doing at that moment in the process.

For example, the following comment from Alan in Group 1 toward the end of the project illustrates his desire to speak to me, the teacher, about where they were in the day’s process: “[Sara’s] telling about our scenes and what they’re doing. We’re done with the storyboard, we’re done with the summary, we’re done with the lit device stuff, which there was a lot of, I was surprised by that.” Most of Group 1’s orienting comments were similar to the above, and seemed to help them in the way a checklist might—to decide what they had done, and what they still needed to do.
Group 2 engaged in similar behavior, as evidenced by Brittany’s comment: “For the past couple days we’ve been just working on getting the clips together and today we’re gonna work on doing transitions and special effects.” Like Group 1, Group 2’s orienting comments were geared toward helping them figure out where they were in the process at any given moment.

By orienting both themselves and me with regards to where they were in the process and what they planned to do next, these students evidenced a high degree of awareness regarding their assignment and the place each of them held within the group.

Summary of Group Behaviors

Both Group 1 and Group 2 exhibited behaviors typically found in cooperative learning situations (Johnson et al., 1994). However, in terms of their task of creating a video narrative, their behaviors of role-filling to get the task done, balancing to make sure that everyone’s needs were met, member-checking to create a sense of community, and orienting to maintain focus on the task at hand, were most relevant.

Discussion

All of the video narratives, including those of the study groups, took shape through processes that, though sharing many characteristics, nevertheless had interesting variations. Group 1 approached their story in a bottom-up, organic way, allowing genre and narrative structure to influence their composition process only after a period of reading and re-reading the text in a context of “manipulative play” (Britton, 1982, p. 65). However, Group 2’s process was much more top-down, directed by genre from the very
start and molded accordingly through their understanding of *narrative structure* to fit the assignment.

All of the groups in the classes shared this sense of manipulative play, even those groups that were more top-down, such as when Group 2 played with the sound effects to get them just right. Manipulative play in this case is therefore neither top-down or bottom-up, but about how the medium of video allows for the focus to be upon the process itself.

Although I saw nearly every group working through the same influences, activities, and group behaviors, it was their individual processes that differed. Some groups were very bottom-up, deciding on an extended amount of time for manipulative play before making decisions. Others were much top-down, focusing on the needs of the assignment and deciding upon a storyline before manipulating the clips to any degree. Other groups were a combination of approaches. For example, another group from period one decided early on doing an action genre, but changed their story several times before they decided that it would be a fly having those adventures.

Ultimately, the films made by the students in these two classes had several common elements that could be accounted for by the Design process, but were each still quite different from each other, despite the fact that they began with the same collection of existing clips. In addition, each of the films were created through processes that, though they too shared some common elements, were not linear, precise, or scripted in any way. These students’ Redesigned texts, and the Design processes they followed to create them, shared a depth brought by meaning-making with multimodal texts.
Research Question Two: What Influences Students’ Decision-Making While Designing Video Texts?

Introduction: Genre and Narrative Structure

“Designing,” based on The New London Group’s (2000) concept of creating a new text (The Redesigned) from an existing one, involved both the reading and composing activities in which these groups were involved. Though there were several salient issues that emerged from the data related to their Designing processes, these two groups were influenced most notably by the authoritative sources of genre and narrative structure. This reinforces claims made by many scholars (Danesi, 1998; Hobbs, 2007; Hubbard, 1989; Messaris, 1994; Murray, 2004; Smith, 1994; Wilhelm, 1995) that students draw on their past experiences with these elements to bring meaning to new texts. Every group was influenced in some way by both genre and narrative structure, whether or not they explicitly named a genre or referenced a specific narrative structure. Each group’s language in talking about their process returned time and again to issues of the type of story they were trying to create (genre), and how to create and organize the short story elements they thought to be important (narrative structure). Therefore, though I talk about genre and narrative structure among the other influences already discussed, I focus on the role both genre and narrative structure filled among these influences.

The Influence of Genre and Narrative Structure on Designing

While Group 1’s identification of genre went through a metamorphosis during the course of the project and Group 2’s did not, it is notable that both groups did indeed use their initial impressions of genre—“Dream” for Group 1, and “Catastrophe” for Group
2—in their final pieces. Group 1’s process showed that genre was a present influence on their work most clearly after they had reconnected with the authoritative source of the teacher/assignment. This came at a point later for Group 1 than for Group 2, whose connection with the teacher/assignment was clear from the start and therefore genre was foregrounded at an earlier point in their process.

For example, though Group 1 foregrounded the importance of aesthetics almost immediately upon reading the raw footage in class, they still commented upon what (at this point) was a background issue of genre. They first identified two genres—“Dream,” and “Teen Story Movie.” My teacher journal (TJ) entry for April 10, 2006, the day of reading the raw footage, reflects this group’s activities:

In watching the clips, both Alan and Sara took the lead in commenting on the various clips, and I heard Alan say “It’s like a dream.”

The individual nature of genre identification was also made clear in another statement from the TJ for that day:

All four seemed very involved in watching the clips, and there was some argument (mild) about the “story” they were reading. This group just cracks me up! Alan very obviously has some STRONG ideas about what will happen, but so does Sara . . . hmm. They seem to think this will be a “Teen Story Movie,” Sara’s term.

In the think-aloud protocol for Group 1, there is evidence of how genre was a background influence on their Designing process as they were making sense of what they had so far:

Sara:    Ours is more like creepy than anything. Like, instead of, like it’s not like a comedy, it’s like a whole bunch of . . .
Alan: Clips put together?

Sara: No, like the way that we have it, like we have [Janet] screaming and then like, action.

Sara was making sense of what they had at this point in their project as being “creepy” based on what she knew about the images found in that genre’s movies. In doing so, she and her groupmates began to reconnect with the assignment directive to follow the narrative structure of a short story. This group made the connection that certain clips—such as the cafeteria worker screaming into the walkie-talkie—communicated something that would feed into this narrative structure.

At this point in their process, Group 1 was Designing in the very bottom-up, organic way of playing with the clips through various editing activities (like transitions and effects). As they became more strongly influenced by narrative structure, their goal became to produce a meaningful story. The following exchange, at about the halfway point in their composition process, demonstrates again that both genre and narrative structure were background influences in their process of making sense:

Sara: [Alan], what’s the story?

Alan: Um, our story is basically about, is it about me or just a person?

Sara: You.

Alan: Okay, it’s about me, where I’m dreaming and I wake up and I go through my day of school and I dream about being a normal kid . . . and after I basically walk outside, I’m lookin’ around, and then I, and then it
goes back to me dreaming and then I wake up and so it was basically all a dream and then I go to my locker and then I leave from school.

Group 1 continued to rely on both *genre* and *narrative structure* to guide their foregrounded focus on *making sense*. Alan’s description of the story so far, during the think-aloud, reflects his group’s understanding of what dream sequences in films look like:

Our story is going to be about a kid going through the day, uh, and I guess it’s gonna be, our weird shots are gonna be like him like in his like mental state, like his like imagination, um.

In order to make sense of his group’s story, Alan used language that framed his group’s *genre* choice: his identification of “weird” shots being those used to communicate when the main character is dreaming clearly showed familiarity with the effect such shots would bring about in the audience. In addition, his description of “a kid going through the day” implies a chronological *narrative structure*.

Group 1 also showed an implicit knowledge of *genre* and *narrative structure* while engaged in the foregrounded activities of *Editing*. For example, in Appendix G, shots #3 through #31 particularly exhibit choices to use the dissolve transition and the superimposition of images this transition creates in order to emphasize the bizarre, surrealistic nature of the dream world they were trying to create. They further emphasize the disjointed nature of time in the midst of a dream by repeatedly showing clips of the school clock at different times in shots #26 through #28, paralleling the earlier shots of
the clock in shots #10 and #14. The group’s attention to the genre of “dream” is evident in their manipulation of transitions and selection and sequencing activities.

Group 1’s most effective use of selection and sequencing, however, comes because of their implicit knowledge of narrative structure. The group creates a parallel structure with clips #2 and #3, which begin the main character’s descent into the dream. These two shots are paralleled at the end of the video (shots #37 and #38) by repeating these same images, leading us out of the main character’s dream. Narrative structure here is clearly linked through these editing activities to the group’s desire to create clarity of meaning for the audience.

Group 1 exhibited more implicit knowledge of genre when involved in editing the audio for their film. As the group members began the editing activities, they started searching for music that would create a certain mood in their story, again connected to creating clarity. Like the other groups in the class, they searched my CD collection and listened to music while they worked in order to find exactly what they wanted; in the end, they chose the soundtrack to Man on Fire from which to get the four tracks they eventually used in their narrative. Alan, the driving force in choosing the music, described this process in the post-work interview:

I went through our whole film and basically said, okay, what parts do we want slow, what parts do we want medium, and what parts do we want fast, you know what I mean, for exciting parts, so that’s the first thing we did. Then we had to actually think, okay, what kind of uh instruments and stuff like that do we want to
use in it? So then we went and got, took some CDs and okay, what best matches the descriptions we want for each part?

Group 1 members showed a sophisticated knowledge of how music works in video to add to the *narrative structure*, especially in the literary device of mood. In being influenced by both *genre* and *narrative structure*, their foregrounded goal was in creating *clarity*. More importantly, Alan’s description of what he wanted shows that he could articulate this knowledge in a clear description of what the group was looking for. They were then able to place the music at certain key points in the story to make the audience “see” what they wanted them to see. Not only do their comments reveal this, but their actual finished film does as well. For example, the group used their understanding of the kind of music they might see in a film with a dream sequence, or that is in some way surreal, to choose music they felt would communicate that mood within the *narrative structure* of a short story (see Appendix G).

Though there were many influences that were foregrounded in Group 1’s Designing process, I noted that *genre* and *narrative structure* remained influential to a degree in each of them. This group recognized a “dreamlike” quality in the footage which led them to create a *narrative structure* based firmly upon what they knew of that *genre*—in each of the activities in which they engaged.

In the end, Group 1 came full circle in their identification of *genre*. When they began, they identified two genres, “Dream” and “Teen Movie.” Then their bottom-up process produced a collection of surreal collection of images tied together by *aesthetics* and their liking of *transitions*. Finally, once they had reconnected with the need to create
a clear *narrative structure*, they identified the *genre* of “Dream” for their final video, and worked to create *clarity* through their knowledge of the elements of a short story’s *narrative structure* such as mood (in their choice of different pieces of music for different parts of the video) and parallel structure (the repeated shots of the fan to create a flashback/flashforward effect).

Like Group 1, Group 2 also demonstrated a reliance on past experience and knowledge of conventions of *genre* and *narrative structure*. However, unlike Group 1, Group 2 was much more immediate in their identification of *genre* and their connection with the need to attend to *narrative structure*.

For example, upon reading the raw footage, they quickly named a “catastrophe” *genre*, a reading with which they worked through the entire project. My TJ for the day of reading this footage reveals how this influenced their decisions:

*These guys started grabbing clips right away that could be construed as “catastrophe” or “calamity” (Felicia’s term) clips—they seem all to read some sort of disaster flick in this, though I left them arguing about the storyline!*

In essence, Group 2’s top-down approach was driven by the authoritative source of the *teacher/assignment*, which foregrounded the need for them to use their knowledge of *narrative structure*. They framed this narrative for themselves by naming a *genre* with which they could construct a clear story and maintained that *genre* as a clear background influence on their subsequent decision-making. This was clearly different from Group 1’s initial approach in Designing, which was an organic manipulation of the video text foregrounded first by *aesthetics*. Group 1 only attended to *genre* and *narrative structure*
once they had reconnected with the teacher/assignment, and at that point their process, like that of Group 2, was clearly driven in the background by these two influences as they worked.

As Group 2 continued in their work that first day, Rick, Brittany, and Kim agreed with Felicia that some of the footage did indeed seem to indicate that a catastrophe story could be made from it. They began scanning for other footage that would support such a plot. They recognized clearly that certain clips—of the cafeteria worker on the walkie-talkie, of the fire extinguisher in the school hallway, of students in hallways—fit their understanding of the narrative structure of calamity or catastrophe films. From this point on, this group was actively engaged in making sense of the footage in order to achieve their goals for the story—and provide clarity for the audience. Kim commented on this process in her post-work interview:

I had no idea what we were gonna do, cause the raw footage, there was just like a bunch of different scenes and I didn’t know how it was going to come together, so um when we sat down and started talking about what we were gonna do, um, I started getting ideas from what they were saying, and I, I love how our story came out, it’s a very great story and I feel like you’re able to understand what’s going on.

As Group 2 began Designing in an effort to build a sequence of clips to tell their story, they were driven not only by their identified genre of “catastrophe” but also by their understanding of the short story narrative structure, especially the elements of characterization and literary devices such as foreshadowing and symbolism.
For example, as the narrative progressed, the group talked about how to spotlight the main character in their story. In doing so, their understanding of the *narrative structure* element of characterization was a background influence on their desire for *clarity*. In their discussion during a *brainstorming* session, Kim explained why she thought they should show repeated shots of the main character: “So, if you have someone who is always in a scene, wouldn’t you assume he’s your main character? Wouldn’t it be like, oh, they want you to notice him, because he’s the main character?”

From the class meta-discussion on *narrative structure* we had several times throughout the school year, these students clearly relied on knowledge of how characterization works in the short story structure in order to create *clarity* in the video narrative they were putting together.

As their work progressed, this group continued to pay attention to the “catastrophe” *genre* itself, and though at no time did I hear this group make specific comparisons to other catastrophe films, their discussions during editing—specifically when selecting clips—indicated that *genre* was still influencing their thinking while their main focus was on *making sense* for each other, and providing *clarity* for the audience. For example, early in their discussions, the following exchange took place between Rick and Felicia:

Rick: To do something with [Fred] we can have him walking and then just have it fade into darkness. And have like music.

Felicia: But what would that mean? What would that do?

Rick: That’d mean that something had happened to [Fred].
A bit later in the process, the group had another brainstorming session in which the group’s choices for selecting and sequencing and transitions are clearly designed to create clarity for the audience by following the rules they know for the catastrophe genre, and how such narratives are structured:

Brittany: Okay, have [Fred] walking and then switch back to [Jim and Anthony] shaking hands like they’re making a deal and then have like two seconds of [Fred] and then like fade out to black.

Felicia: Oh my gosh! And then we show that scene of like [Fred] walking outside the door . . . so then, like they’re plottin’, they do something to cause the school to have a fire or something so then everybody dies except for [Fred] so it would be like irony, which would go along with the literary devices thing.

Rick: [clapping in the background]

Brittany: Okay, I think we have a winner!

This group understood the importance of sequencing the narrative structure of a “catastrophe” film to make it clear for the audience which characters are bad and which are good. They also fell back on their knowledge of literary devices (foreshadowing and irony) with which to build a good catastrophe narrative.

Group 2’s choices regarding audio—sound effects and music—were also influenced by knowledge of genre and narrative structure, while their foregrounded goal was again creating clarity. In order to make the audience see what they wanted them to see, Group 2 had to pool their knowledge of what catastrophe films sound like. This led
them to choices designed to manipulate the narrative element of mood—especially the
*Jaws* theme and the sound effects for the ticking bomb and the explosion.

Though other influences were foregrounded as Group 2 designed their story, the
influences of *genre* and *narrative structure* consistently surfaced to inform the group’s
decisions as they brainstormed their story. From the very start of their work, Group 2 was
influenced by the authoritative source of the *teacher/assignment*. Because they were also
given *existing footage*, their brainstorming focused on how to build a *narrative structure*
that would tell the story according to the *genre* on which they had decided, and by far
their biggest influence was *clarity*; their efforts were driven by the need to make sure the
audience understood the story they were trying to tell. To accomplish this, Group 2 relied
heavily on their knowledge of the elements of *narrative structure*, such as the creation of
mood, how symbolism works (such as in their final shot of Fred’s t-shirt saying “Give
Peace A Chance,” and with their use of color for effect), and how music and sound
effects can work together with images to create meaning.

Because of the multimodal nature of this project, both Group 1 and Group 2 found
themselves with more compositional choices than they had ever experienced with any
other print assignments in my class. Groups 1 and 2 were clearly influenced by their
knowledge of the *narrative structure* of the short story, narrative conventions, and *genre*
conventions in their decision-making process.

Other groups in period one and period three showed evidence too of how *genre*
and *narrative structure* informed other foregrounded influences and activities. For
example, one group in period one (mentioned earlier) decided almost immediately that
their film would be a comic adventure film. Later, they were influenced by narrative structure to develop a main character, and decided upon a fly. In the narrative they developed, the fly spent the day zipping about the school’s hallways, eventually meeting an unpleasant end in the classroom fan. During the process, they were also influenced by music in their desire to create clarity for the audience; one group member mentioned a song with which some of the other members were familiar, high pitched and fun to listen to, that would work well as the fly’s theme song. Having this piece of music as a framing device, they continued to “look for all the shots of empty hallways” in order to take their fly through the school. Their final film was titled Bye Bye Fly.

Another group from period one included a member who was a fan of David Lynch (although none of his groupmates were familiar with the filmmaker/director). Upon noticing the raw footage that provided several shots of the hallway clock at different times during the day, this student explained to his groupmates about Lynch’s “surreal” vision, an issue of aesthetics with which the other members related right away. They decided to name their video “Dirty Clock,” a tale of a student having an unending day at school. Even using the identified genre of “surreal,” this group was influenced to create a clear narrative structure. The film would be centered around the clock, which would seemingly skip around in time. As this group’s leader said, “That’s not a normal day. Yeah, ’cause that’s how school works; everything is wrong, very wrong.” This group knew that, while they were after a certain look and a way to make clear their message, they needed to work with what they collectively understood about the “surreal” genre in order to achieve that goal.
One group from period three also immediately agreed on the “love story” genre upon reading certain clips in the footage of a girl’s face, and closeup of her eyes. However, their final film, Holding Hope, was partly molded by the male group member’s desire to use a specific song by Coheed and Cambria, because the group also wanted to include the narrative element of a tragic climax to the story. He knew that the song’s lyrics would help create the mood they were looking for, and provide clarity for the audience. Because this group decided to use a song with meaningful lyrics, they were also influenced heavily by their understanding of the narrative structure of music videos, which their final film closely resembled.

Another group in period 3, on the other hand, went through a rather long brainstorming process among them as they read the footage and talked about what they saw. One of the girls in the group thought they should make a “spooky” film based on the raw footage clips of the empty stairs. A second member thought it looked like a movie about “a day in the life” at school. This kind of “biography” genre sparked a conversation about how such a movie—obviously about a teenager going about his or her day in school—would be structured. However, a third group member put an interesting spin on this idea when she put the focus on the narrative element of characterization: “Instead of following like a student, I can see like as if we were the students’ eyes throughout the day, like a foreigner, that, someone who feels really out of place at the high school.” This comment, part of the group’s effort in making sense of the footage into a workable narrative structure, stuck: Her idea was eventually used in this group’s film, Bienvenidos.
a [school name], a story about a foreign exchange student coming to an American school.

Of all the influences working on the students’ decision-making in creating their video narratives, by far the most pervasive were genre and narrative structure. These background issues were steeped throughout the entire process. In their work, the students exhibited both tacit and explicit knowledge of genre and narrative structure, including those narrative elements such as mood, symbolism, irony, characterization, and so forth. Although some of the groups never explicitly named a genre or some elements of narrative structure—and this was true of a few groups in both period one and period three—they implicitly followed the form even if they did not name it. And several of the groups in fact did explicitly name a “horror movie” or “love story” or talked about the elements of narrative structure they wanted to manipulate. How these groups read the footage that was given to them was highly driven by these two background influences. Their knowledge of these influences came largely from those many out-of-school experiences and literacies that effectively allowed them to make meaning in the Design process.

Summary of Chapter 4

Group 1’s finished video story reflects the process of a group of students who, instead of planning out a storyline from the start and making the raw materials fit that story, found themselves truly “shaping at the point of utterance” (Britton, 1994), allowing the Design process to be influenced as they made sense of the footage to themselves and
each other. This process, however, became influenced heavily by genre and narrative structure once they had reconnected with the directives of the teacher/assignment.

Group 2’s process, on the other hand, was much more directed by the authoritative source of the assignment and their almost immediate identification of a genre which they maintained throughout the Design process. Ultimately, there were many influences on the Design activities of these two groups, but the influences of genre and narrative structure were pervasive, backgrounding many of the other influences that were at work.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS
FOR TEACHING AND RESEARCH

The 20th century ushered in cultural and technological upheavals that called into question the relationship between literacy and schooling. As much as the public might wistfully long for the little red schoolhouse of times past, there is no going back to a world defined only by the printed and spoken word. (Tyner, 1998, p. 230)

Introduction

This study, conducted in the context of two high school English Language Arts classrooms, had at its center two research questions:

1. What processes do students use to Design with video text?

2. What influences students’ decision-making while Designing video texts?

In chapter 2, I discussed meaning-making in the processes of reading and composing with print text, and how these processes intersect importantly in the areas of genre and narrative structure. I also discussed how meaning-making in multiliteracies is an approach allowing for expansion of our definitions of what constitutes “text” and “literacy” in today’s world, and several of the studies conducted in both multiliteracies and with the alternative text of video illustrate the thinking of scholars in this area. I also touched upon how cooperative learning is a learning strategy especially conducive to helping students co-construct meaning in both reading and composition.
Analysis of the data provided from the work of two groups of students in the process of Designing with video suggests the following implications regarding possibilities for curriculum and research in Designing with video, as well as the processes involved in Designing with video.

Discussion

Several important scholars have made inroads into our understanding of what constitutes “text” and “literacy” (Britton, 1970; Eisner, 1998; Gee, 1990; Smagorinsky, 1995, 2002; Street, 1984, 2000). What the participants in this study did while Designing with video suggests that educators need to expand the definitions of “text” as well as “literacy” in the English classroom. As the primary English teacher of these students, I saw them demonstrate through the multimodality of video the very same skills that they struggled with in written texts. One implication is that if we expand what constitutes “text” in today’s classrooms, we can in effect expand students’ access to meaning-making strategies in both reading and writing.

This study suggests that these students’ in school and out-of-school knowledge and experiences with genre and narrative structure greatly influenced their Designing with video text. Scholars (Danesi, 1998; Hobbs, 2007; Messaris, 1994; Murray, 2004; Smith, 1994; Wilhelm, 1995) remind us that knowledge of story types and story forms serve to enhance and expand the meaning-making process. For example, these students showed a great deal of tacit knowledge about movie genres that they were able to apply to their reading of the video text in effort to construct a meaningful “Redesigned” narrative. This clearly parallels what The New London Group (2000), Scholes (1989),
Iser (1978), and Rosenblatt (1994) asserted about the act of reading: Children bring their own life experiences to the reading of any text, and such reading lead to the creation of new texts in the reader. When the students involved in this study designed their video texts, they not only were literally creating a new text from a previous one, but metaphorically designing new understanding for themselves, as the scholars above emphasize.

Therefore, it becomes clear that such out-of-school knowledge can be a crucial raw material in the creation of understanding about the in-school teaching and learning taking place regarding many forms of text. Most students exhibit a keen interest in reading video texts, and therefore such texts should not be ignored by the English curriculum. Much learning can be accomplished when we connect with what students are doing outside of school as an entree to not only engaging them in learning, but as a way to talk about the highly constructed nature of those texts in an effort to understand and reproduce that construction—yet another goal in working with print texts.

The literature on the print composition process demonstrates the value placed by scholars (Braddock et al., 1963; Emig, 1971, 1994; Hayes & Flower, 1980; Shaughnessy, 1977) on discovering more about what happens during the process of writing—what those “invisible” processes might be. This study made the effort to follow that directive through the use of multiple data sources, including a concurrent think-aloud protocol, allowing those processes to be made more tangible—in this case, with video as the text. Volumes have been written about process with written text, but relatively little has been
written about process with multimodal texts, especially video. This is an incredibly rich area of research in which future scholars may contribute to our knowledge base.

Writing with video exhibits students’ knowledge of composition processes and skills in ways they may not necessarily be able to articulate, but nevertheless can demonstrate, and in fact these skills are many of the same deemed valuable in written texts. For example, what is perhaps most interesting about Group 2’s manipulation of color in their film (using red for the explosion, a sepia-tone to indicate emptiness and decay) is that at no time, in any of their think-alouds, interviews, or other data sources, did they talk about using color to this effect; they simply did it. They knew the effect they wanted, and though they did not explicitly discuss this manipulation for effect, it is noteworthy that they were able to create that effect based on both out-of-school, prior knowledge (since they had not in the past ever been asked to create a video narrative in school) as well as explicit knowledge taught them in school (about the short story genre and literary devices).

Designing—the process of composing a new text from an existing one, and creating new understanding from existing understanding—is a process that is highly recursive and involves sophisticated problem-solving. These are both characteristics we should hope to see in students’ written texts as well. Our English class meta-discussion about writing had taught these students that writing involved a process, which many of the students continued to think of as linear—brainstorming, outlining, rough-drafting, revising, and final-drafting. Group 1’s process of video composition, however, combined the processes of brainstorming, outlining, and rough-drafting, after which they returned to
the brainstorming process to Design yet again the video text they had manipulated. Their efforts were a clear example of Britton’s (1994) “shaping at the point of utterance”—which continued as the group members told and re-told the story to each other throughout the process, not just at some pre-determined step in a recipe for a narrative.

On the other hand, Group 2’s approach to their video narrative had begun very much in the way of this linear process—but the process also became increasingly iterative as the group, partially because of the limitation of existing footage, manipulated that footage using every available meaning-making resource they had—transitions, special effects, audio, and selection and sequencing. They could not stick to a step-by-step procedure either, but instead learned about how text—in whatever form—is shaped by the very act of shaping.

In other words, the act of creating something—in this case a video text—helped these students communicate meaning with an ease that had been elusive for many of them with traditional print text. Encouraging students, particularly those struggling with print text, to work multimodally with media whose conventions are much clearer to them—video and music—can help provide a bridge of understanding to those texts whose conventions are less clear. The overall effect would be to help students more fully connect those texts with which they are most familiar at home to those they are encountering at school.

There is a three-dimensionality inherent in multimodality—that allows students to express that which needs to be expressed in a way that makes sense to them. For example, not only were the students in this study highly
engaged with the visual texts with which they were working, but the addition of the mode of sound—in either music or sound effects—allowed a dimension of meaning-making that was highly important in these students’ narratives. In fact, the students’ familiarity with the power music holds to create mood, according the various genres available, was one of the most important findings of this study. Audio became a crucial meaning-making tool that helped these students express their knowledge of genre.

Combining multiple modes—beyond this study’s use of visual and audio media—can possibly lead to greater utility in communicating meaning for today’s students. For example, Group 2’s problem-solving was motivated by their desire to create meaning for the audience, and their process was highly influenced by such considerations. Kim’s response to being asked how the medium of film helped shape her group’s story illustrates this: “’Cause, with the film you could see everybody and see how it was all playing out and with just a story, like a written story, you couldn’t see all the chaos.” In making sure audience members “see all the chaos,” this group actively tried to achieve what English teachers often find lacking in students’ written texts: the higher-order concern of meaning.

It is also notable that both groups worked outside the patterns previously observed as common in the creation of written text narratives. For example, traditionally I observed that when low-achieving students were given the task of revising a print text narrative, little attention was paid to reworking the text so that the audience might understand the story better, or that the story might be more pleasing to read. However, in
working with video text, Group 1 in particular showed repeated attention to Clarity and Aesthetics to a degree not found when they were working on print texts.

Group 2, a high-achieving group of Honors students who often found themselves doing the bare minimum in English class in order to maintain their A averages, instead found themselves doing more work, and spending time above and beyond what they traditionally did when working with print text. One implication of this for both Group 1 and Group 2 is that working multi-modally provided an intrinsic motivation to make their video narratives better that they did not experience with print text.

This study also suggests that having students co-create video texts in cooperative learning groups works, and that the group processes evident in this study were a major influence in shaping each group’s work. Even though these students began, especially the Honors students, with a very wary attitude towards group work because of their protective nature towards their grades, they eventually came to work together well within this structure. These students experienced what Barnes (1992) referred to as “reflexive learning” as they found themselves stretching the boundaries of their knowledge in order to work together. Other studies with video (Bruce, 2002; Goodman, 2003) show that group interaction is a key to the students’ creative process, and this was indeed the case with both case study groups here. Their process of Designing involved problem-solving through brainstorming and re-reading the video footage to each other. In addition, both groups commented on how the contribution of the ideas of others was the best part of working together in cooperative groups.
This study is perhaps the first in which students were asked, in the context of an English classroom, to use pre-existing video as a narrative meaning-making tool. Though the medium of video was new and strange to them within this context, these two groups demonstrated a degree of learning about composing narratives that was even better than the learning demonstrated by my past English classes—who were limited to print text. It is my hope that the methodology used in this study may be replicated by other practitioners to aid such learning in other classrooms.

The value of providing these groups with pre-existing footage is the suggestion that, despite this limitation, students were still quite able to problem-solve their way into meaning-making. However, it is notable that the focus of this study, and the focus of the classroom assignment, was on the process of work above and beyond the final product. This was partially due to the design of the assignment, which provided students with pre-existing footage instead of allowing students the creative control of providing their own. One implication is that this should be taken into consideration when deciding which is the focus of the students’ work—process or product. It may very well be that a subsequent assignment would allow students to provide their own footage, thus giving them the tools with which to fully construct the meaning they are trying to get across to the audience through their final product.

Summary of Chapter 5

This grounded-theory study sought to examine the influences and processes on the work of two groups of high school English students as they Designed multimodal video texts. By using multiple data sources, I noted these students’ decision-making was
influenced by several factors. The most pervasive of these influences was the students’
knowledge of genre, and their processes showed how their activities were ultimately
driven by the desire to create meaning—for themselves and for their audiences. The
power of multimodal texts lies in its ability—above and beyond print text—to aid in the
creation of that meaning, especially for students whose experiences and knowledge of
how to do so with print text alone is limited.
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APPENDIX A

PARENT LETTER/STUDENT PERMISSION SLIP
January, 2006

Dear Parents:

For the past 4 ½ years, I have been working with students in writing composition in the English 10 classroom. Over those years I have worked to find out how students might be more successful in composition, and where their areas of interest might be best included in that process.

For the past 3 years I have been working on my doctorate at Kent State University. My principle area of study has been on student writing, and I have recently become interested in how students might use video in the composition process. I want to do research on how students compose with video because there has been little research done on this growing area of education. This is an important area because early research has shown that working with video can increase students’ ability to work with print.

I would like you to let your child take part in this project. If you decide to do this, your child will be asked to document the process during which they create their videos. They will complete a survey (explaining their video production experience and technology comfort level), and keep a tape recorder log as they make their video. In addition, they may be videotaped and/or interviewed throughout their video project. In any reporting of the information, your child will be assigned a different name to ensure anonymity. You are free to view videotapes or listen to audiotapes at any time before they are used.

Rest assured, any work the students do will take place as part of the normal classroom activities, and your child will not be required to perform much extra work. My goal is to study students’ composition with this new media in the context of the normal English 10 classroom. Every project that your child will do in this project is part of the Crestwood Board of Education approved course of study for English 10. This research will attempt to document the process of how students create with video. If your child chooses to take part, s/he will receive extra credit for participating. However, if your child chooses not to take part, s/he will have other opportunities to complete extra credit work. Taking part in this project is entirely up to you, and no one will hold it against your child if you decide not to do it. If your child does take part, s/he may stop the documentation process at any time, though they will need to complete the assigned video composition project to receive course credit.

If you want to know more about this research project, please call me at (330) 274-2214 voice mail #416 or email at japowers@kent.edu. My doctoral advisor is Dr. David Bruce and can be reached at (330) 672-2580. The project has been approved by Kent State University. If you have questions about Kent State University's rules for research, please call Katherine Light, IRB Administrator, Division of Research and Graduate Studies, Telephone: (330) 672-2704.

Please read the next page and sign your name and have your student sign as well. Please let me know if you have any questions before signing. Then, have your student return this form to me as soon as possible. You will get a copy of this consent form.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Powers

English/Drama/Speech/Yearbook Teacher, Crestwood High School
AUDIO/VIDEOTAPE STUDY CONSENT FORM FOR VIDEO STUDY

I agree to allow my child _____________________________________________________
to participate in audio and video taping at Crestwood High School for the purpose of
this study. I agree to let my child take part in this project. I know what s/he will have to do
and that s/he can stop at any time. I have been told that I have the right to (hear)/(see) the
(audio)/(video) tapes before they are used if I so request.

_______________________________________________________________________________

Parent Name (Print)                          Signature                          Date

_______________________________________________________________________________

Student Name (Print)                          Signature                          Date

Ms. Powers and other researchers approved by Kent State University

______ may

______ may not

use the tapes made of my child STRICTLY for research purposes. The original tapes or
copies may be used for (check all that apply):

_____ this research project _____ teacher education _____ presentation at professional
meetings
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VIDEO COMPOSITION ASSIGNMENT SHEET
VIDEO COMPOSITION ASSIGNMENT SHEET

You will be working in a group for the next few weeks to create a composition using visual images (in the form of video) and music, but there’s a catch: **YOU WILL RECEIVE RAW FOOTAGE TO USE INSTEAD OF CREATING YOUR OWN.**

In this way, you will be using pre-existing shots much in the same way as pre-existing words to create a story. It may seem like there would not be much to do, but there will be PLENTY for your group to consider as you begin manipulating the shots:

1. As you view the entire group of individual shots, what *kind* of story starts to come to mind?
2. In what *order* do you see the individual shots coming together to create a clear story?
3. What kinds of **transitions** will you have to create in order to help create the story you want to tell?
4. How will you manipulate the **pacing** of the individual shots in order to help tell your story?
5. Are **special effects** necessary to help tell the story or make a point clear? If so, which ones?
6. What kind of **music** will you include to help create the mood you want to create? To emphasize the parts of the story you want to emphasize?

**You jobs and assignments will include the following:**

1. **Learn how to use the software** with some practice footage (this will happen this week and any other time you are available—before/after school, during study halls, lunch, etc. **MY ROOM IS AVAILABLE FOR YOUR USE DURING 2ND PERIOD, 7TH AND 8TH PERIODS, AND SOMETIMES DURING 10TH PERIOD.** Check with me first.
2. Look at the raw footage and decide with your group what story you wish to tell AND the music you want to use to help you do it.
3. **CREATE YOUR VIDEO STORY!** This will be the arrangement of clips and accompanying music.
4. Eventually, you will **Storyboard** your story by putting the clips in the order you wish to use them. **REMEMBER: YOU CAN SPLIT A CUT TOO!** The only thing you cannot do is add footage you have not been given.
5. **Underneath each storyboard panel, list the type of shot being used.** Also, note any sound/music cue.

6. **Write an analysis of the LITERARY DEVICES** your group employed to tell the story with visuals and music.

7. **Write an analysis of how the film is put together to make the scene work.** In other words, **WHY** did your group decide to put the clips together in this way? Why this music? Why those transitions/effects?

8. **Create a group AUDIO TAPE DIARY** during the process of working on your film. Your group will be supplied with a tape recorder and tape—all you need to do is talk about what you all are thinking as you plan your story, and some reflections on the result. **THESE TAPES WILL BE DUE AT THE END OF EVERY WEEK,** and be a significant part of your grade. All group members should participate in getting your thoughts on tape!

9. **SHARE YOUR VIDEO STORY!** We will have a “film festival” during which your group will show your story and talk about it.

**This project will be graded along several DEADLINES that will be made clear to your group ahead of time.**

**As with most of the assignments in this class, participation and effort will seriously impact your grade. Have fun with it! Also take the project seriously.**

**Your final storyboard and written pieces may be put together in a group folder to be presented during the film festival.**
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VIDEO COMPOSITION ASSIGNMENT RUBRIC
VIDEO COMPOSITION ASSIGNMENT RUBRIC

FILM STORY (100 possible points)

• _____ / 5 Clear Title and/or End Credits
• _____ / 80 Clear storyline with effective use of transitions and effects
• _____ / 15 Appropriate and effective use of music

WRITTEN WORK (100 possible points)

• _____ / 60 Storyboard with identified shots, music cues, and transitions/effects
• _____ / 20 Literary Device Analysis
• _____ / 20 Film Deconstruction identifying WHAT you did and WHY you did it

+ “Above-and–Beyond” work

FINAL GRADE = __________ OUT OF 200 POINTS
APPENDIX D

SHOT LIST OF RAW FOOTAGE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clip Number</th>
<th>Clip Length</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Close-up of locker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Canted shot of school hallway and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>0:00:12</td>
<td>Reveal shot of classroom chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>High-angle shot of two classroom chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>0:00:07</td>
<td>Close-up shot of running fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Male student eyes looking right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Male student eyes looking down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Male student eyes looking left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>0:00:03</td>
<td>Male student eyes looking up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>0:00:17</td>
<td>Reveal shot of male student at red locker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>0:00:12</td>
<td>Reveal shot of male student at red locker, closing locker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>0:00:10</td>
<td>Pan shot of student walking to drinking fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>0:00:13</td>
<td>Zoom of student at drinking fountain; hand on button</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Medium shot of drinking fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>0:00:03</td>
<td>Low angle shot up empty, dark staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>0:00:03</td>
<td>Low angle shot up empty, lighted staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>0:00:11</td>
<td>Reveal shot looking up staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>High angle shot down empty, lighted staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>High angle shot down empty, dark staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>0:00:16</td>
<td>Reveal shot down empty, dark staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>021</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Shot of open bathroom door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>022</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Medium shot of rear exit of school from indoors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>023</td>
<td>0:00:07</td>
<td>Male Student walking out rear exit of school from inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clip Number</td>
<td>Clip Length</td>
<td>Descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>024</td>
<td>0:00:14</td>
<td>Male student walking out rear exit, continuing down sidewalk, from inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>025</td>
<td>0:00:09</td>
<td>Reveal shot of male student in black t-shirt closing black locker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>026</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Medium shot of fire extinguisher in school hallway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>027</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of clock at 10:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>028</td>
<td>0:00:10</td>
<td>Reveal shot of emergency alarm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>0:00:10</td>
<td>Medium shot of student pratfall in busy hallway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>030</td>
<td>0:00:11</td>
<td>Close-up of female student eyes looking around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>031</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Close-up of cafeteria worker yelling orders into a walkie-talkie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>032</td>
<td>0:00:07</td>
<td>High-angle shot of tray with fries and ketchup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>033</td>
<td>0:00:09</td>
<td>High-angle shot of student with tray and fries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>034</td>
<td>0:00:11</td>
<td>Close-up of female face looking in different directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>035</td>
<td>0:00:12</td>
<td>Close-up of female eyes winking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>036</td>
<td>0:00:09</td>
<td>High-angle shot of male student writing at desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>037</td>
<td>0:00:07</td>
<td>Perspective shot of male student writing on paper at desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>038</td>
<td>0:00:11</td>
<td>Close-up, reveal shot of male student writing on paper at desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>0:00:08</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of male student writing at desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Canted close-up shot of male student’s hand writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Close-up of male student’s hand, writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Close-up of female eyes looking from side to side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Close-up of female eyes looking surprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td>0:00:03</td>
<td>Close-up of female mouth, smiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>045</td>
<td>0:00:40</td>
<td>Two perspective shots from inside locker as door opens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>0:00:10</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of female at computer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clip Number</td>
<td>Clip Length</td>
<td>Descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>047</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Medium shot of female at computer, from side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Medium shot of female at computer, from behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>049</td>
<td>0:00:15</td>
<td>Reveal shot of grass, into classroom window, room plants, fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Traveling perspective shot going out classroom door, down hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of clock at 11:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of clock at 1:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Long-distance shot of feet and legs going down hallway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>054</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Long-distance shot of students walking down hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>0:00:22</td>
<td>Reveal shot of “Welcome to Crestwood High School” sign, then panning left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>0:00:08</td>
<td>Upward panning shot of front inside steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>0:00:15</td>
<td>Panning shot of school parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>058</td>
<td>0:00:21</td>
<td>Perspective shot of female student looking at front of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>059</td>
<td>0:00:09</td>
<td>Reveal shot of hallway floor, panning up to ceiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>0:00:08</td>
<td>Canted shot of female drinking at fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>061</td>
<td>0:00:18</td>
<td>Female student running down hallway, close-up of keyboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>062</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Male student running down hall toward camera, stops at camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>063</td>
<td>0:00:07</td>
<td>Students walking down hallway, posing for camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>064</td>
<td>0:00:10</td>
<td>Female student walking down hallway away from camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065</td>
<td>0:00:11</td>
<td>Female student walking down hallway toward camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>0:00:08</td>
<td>Female student running down hall away from camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td>0:00:08</td>
<td>Male student walking down hallway toward camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>068</td>
<td>0:00:12</td>
<td>Several students walking back and forth in hallway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069</td>
<td>0:00:32</td>
<td>Student wearing “Give Peace a Chance” t-shirt walking down hallway, out door, back in toward camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clip Number</td>
<td>Clip Length</td>
<td>Descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>0:00:44</td>
<td>Panning perspective shot up and down hallway, ending on two students walking toward camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>071</td>
<td>0:00:07</td>
<td>Several students walking into a classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072</td>
<td>0:00:13</td>
<td>Male student running away from camera, falling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>073</td>
<td>0:01:04</td>
<td>Students walking away from camera; pan to intersecting hallway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074</td>
<td>0:00:07</td>
<td>Male student walking toward camera in hallway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075</td>
<td>0:01:05</td>
<td>Students walking in hallway; two females stop to talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>076</td>
<td>0:00:22</td>
<td>Two female students walking down hallway away from camera, then turning around and walking toward camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>077</td>
<td>0:00:19</td>
<td>Male student drinking at fountain, then walking away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>078</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of Administrator walking up stairway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>079</td>
<td>0:00:15</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of two female students walking up steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080</td>
<td>0:03:25</td>
<td>Many students walking up and down steps between classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>081</td>
<td>0:00:11</td>
<td>Male student running up steps and pratfalling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>082</td>
<td>0:01:19</td>
<td>Students walking, milling about, and horseplaying in hallway; student in crutches moving down hallway away from camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>083</td>
<td>0:00:15</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of male student walking slowly up steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>084</td>
<td>0:00:14</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of male student walking down steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>085</td>
<td>0:00:34</td>
<td>Several students walking up steps; one girl making a zig-zag pattern up steps, then down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>086</td>
<td>0:00:03</td>
<td>Medium shot of two male students shaking hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>087</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Close-up shot of two hands shaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>088</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
<td>Medium shot of two students finishing handshake, turning away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>089</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
<td>Close-up of extended male hand #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
<td>Close-up of extended male hand #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091</td>
<td>0:00:03</td>
<td>Medium shot of two female students running together, hugging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
<td>Female student #1 approaching camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clip Number</td>
<td>Clip Length</td>
<td>Descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>093</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
<td>Perspective shot of female student #2 approaching #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>094</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Medium shot of two female students hugging from side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095</td>
<td>0:00:03</td>
<td>Perspective shot of running fan from behind fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>096</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Perspective shot of fan looking into classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>097</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Closeup of fan perspective shot looking at students in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>098</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
<td>Medium shot of fan running from the side</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR POST-WORK VIDEO INTERVIEW AND QUESTIONNAIRE
GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR POST-WORK VIDEO INTERVIEW AND QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What did you like working best in the group? How do you think that made the project stronger?

2. What did you like working least in the group? How do you think that hindered the project?

3. What are you most proud of regarding your contributions to this video?

4. How did the final product differ from your original concept that was in your head?

5. What was your best “a-ha” moment as you were putting this project together?

6. How was this video project like writing a paper? Different?

7. When you write a paper, how much do you tend to revise? When you composed this video, how much did you revise? Why the difference (if any)?

8. Looking back, what do you wish you knew before you had started this production?
APPENDIX F

GROUP 1 VIDEO MAP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Sequence Number</th>
<th>Music Cue</th>
<th>Clip Number</th>
<th>Clip Length</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shot #1</td>
<td>Creasy's Room</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>0:00:07</td>
<td>Close-up shot of running fan (EFFECT: SPIN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #2</td>
<td></td>
<td>007</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Male student eyes looking down and up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #3</td>
<td>Sanchez Family</td>
<td>049</td>
<td>0:00:15</td>
<td>Reveal shot of grass, into classroom window, plants, fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #4</td>
<td>(techno)</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>0:00:12</td>
<td>Reveal shot of classroom chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #5</td>
<td></td>
<td>003</td>
<td>0:00:12</td>
<td>Reveal shot of classroom chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #6</td>
<td></td>
<td>004</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>High-angle shot of two classroom chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #7</td>
<td></td>
<td>036</td>
<td>0:00:09</td>
<td>High-angle shot of male student writing at desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #8</td>
<td></td>
<td>040</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Canted close-up shot of male student’s hand writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #9</td>
<td></td>
<td>041</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Close-up of male student’s hand, writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #10</td>
<td></td>
<td>051</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of clock at 11:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #11</td>
<td>The Rooftop</td>
<td>050</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Traveling perspective shot going out classroom door, down hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #12</td>
<td></td>
<td>002</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Canted shot of school hallway and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #13</td>
<td></td>
<td>011</td>
<td>0:00:12</td>
<td>Reveal shot of male student at red locker, closing locker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #14</td>
<td></td>
<td>027</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of clock at 10:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #16</td>
<td></td>
<td>031</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Close-up of cafeteria worker yelling into a walkie-talkie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #17</td>
<td></td>
<td>033</td>
<td>0:00:09</td>
<td>High-angle shot of student with tray and fries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #18</td>
<td></td>
<td>031</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Close-up of cafeteria worker yelling into a walkie-talkie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Sequence Number</td>
<td>Music Cue</td>
<td>Clip Number</td>
<td>Clip Length</td>
<td>Descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #19</td>
<td>Sanchez Family (techno)</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>0:00:12</td>
<td>Reveal shot of male student at red locker, closing locker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #20</td>
<td></td>
<td>059</td>
<td>0:00:09</td>
<td>Reveal shot of hallway floor, panning up to ceiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #21</td>
<td></td>
<td>053</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Long-distance shot of feet and legs going down hallway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #22</td>
<td></td>
<td>059</td>
<td>0:00:09</td>
<td>Reveal shot of hallway floor, panning up to ceiling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #23</td>
<td>End of Sanchez Family (ringing)</td>
<td>061</td>
<td>0:00:18</td>
<td>Female student running down hallway, close-up of keyboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #24</td>
<td></td>
<td>068</td>
<td>0:00:12</td>
<td>Several students walking back and forth in hallway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #25</td>
<td>Creasy's Room</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>0:03:25</td>
<td>Many students walking up and down steps between classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #26</td>
<td>Main Title</td>
<td>027</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of clock at 10:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #27</td>
<td></td>
<td>052</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of clock at 1:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #28</td>
<td></td>
<td>052</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of clock at 1:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #29</td>
<td></td>
<td>028</td>
<td>0:00:10</td>
<td>Reveal shot of emergency alarm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #30</td>
<td></td>
<td>015</td>
<td>0:00:03</td>
<td>Low angle shot up empty, dark staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #31</td>
<td></td>
<td>016</td>
<td>0:00:03</td>
<td>Low angle shot up empty, lighted staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #32</td>
<td></td>
<td>019</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>High angle shot down empty, dark staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #33</td>
<td></td>
<td>069</td>
<td>0:00:32</td>
<td>Student wearing “Give Peace a Chance” t-shirt walking down hallway, out door.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #34</td>
<td></td>
<td>057</td>
<td>0:00:15</td>
<td>Panning shot of school parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #35</td>
<td></td>
<td>058</td>
<td>0:00:21</td>
<td>Perspective shot of female student looking at front of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Sequence Number</td>
<td>Music Cue</td>
<td>Clip Number</td>
<td>Clip Length</td>
<td>Descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #36</td>
<td>Main Title</td>
<td>024</td>
<td>0:00:14</td>
<td>Male student walking out rear exit, continuing down sidewalk, from inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #37</td>
<td></td>
<td>005</td>
<td>0:00:07</td>
<td>Close-up shot of running fan (EFFECT: ZOOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #38</td>
<td></td>
<td>006</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Male student eyes looking right</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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GROUP 2 VIDEO MAP
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story Sequence Number</th>
<th>Music Cue</th>
<th>Clip Number</th>
<th>Clip Length</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shot #1</td>
<td><em>Jack and Diane</em></td>
<td>057</td>
<td>0:00:15</td>
<td>Panning shot of school parking lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #2</td>
<td><em>Jack and Diane</em></td>
<td>058</td>
<td>0:00:21</td>
<td>Perspective shot of female student looking at front of school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #3</td>
<td></td>
<td>056</td>
<td>0:00:08</td>
<td>Upward panning shot of front inside steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #4</td>
<td></td>
<td>055</td>
<td>0:00:22</td>
<td>Reveal shot of “Welcome to Crestwood High School” sign, then panning left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #5</td>
<td></td>
<td>054</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Long-distance shot of students walking down hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #6</td>
<td></td>
<td>002</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Canted shot of school hallway and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #7</td>
<td></td>
<td>080</td>
<td>0:03:25</td>
<td>Many students walking up, down steps between classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #8</td>
<td></td>
<td>069</td>
<td>0:00:32</td>
<td>Student wearing “Give Peace a Chance” t-shirt walking down hallway, out door, back in toward camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #9</td>
<td></td>
<td>080</td>
<td>0:03:25</td>
<td>Many students walking up, down steps between classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #10</td>
<td></td>
<td>027</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of clock at 10:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #11</td>
<td></td>
<td>080</td>
<td>0:03:25</td>
<td>Many students walking up, down steps between classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #12</td>
<td></td>
<td>020</td>
<td>0:00:16</td>
<td>Reveal shot down empty, dark staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #13</td>
<td></td>
<td>036</td>
<td>0:00:09</td>
<td>High-angle shot of male student writing at desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #14</td>
<td></td>
<td>047</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Medium shot of female at computer, from side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #15</td>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>090</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
<td>Close-up of extended male hand #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #16</td>
<td><em>Jaws Theme builds</em></td>
<td>089</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
<td>Close-up of extended male hand #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #17</td>
<td></td>
<td>084</td>
<td>0:00:14</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of male student walking down steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot Sequence Number</td>
<td>Music Cue</td>
<td>Clip Number</td>
<td>Clip Length</td>
<td>Descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #18</td>
<td><em>James Theme builds</em></td>
<td>086</td>
<td>0:00:03</td>
<td>Medium shot of two male students shaking hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #19</td>
<td><em>James Theme builds</em></td>
<td>069</td>
<td>0:00:32</td>
<td>Student wearing “Give Peace a Chance” t-shirt walking down hallway, out door, back in toward camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #20</td>
<td><em>James Theme builds</em></td>
<td>088</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
<td>Medium shot of two students finishing handshake, turning away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #21</td>
<td><em>AC/DC Thunder Struck</em></td>
<td>069</td>
<td>0:00:32</td>
<td>Student wearing “Give Peace a Chance” t-shirt walking down hallway, out door, back in toward camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #22</td>
<td><em>AC/DC Thunder Struck</em></td>
<td>051</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Low-angle shot of clock at 11:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #23</td>
<td><em>AC/DC Thunder Struck</em></td>
<td>006</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Male student eyes looking right (EFFECT: BLUE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #24</td>
<td><em>Alarm Bell effect</em></td>
<td>028</td>
<td>0:00:10</td>
<td>Reveal shot of emergency alarm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #25</td>
<td><em>AC/DC Thunder Struck</em></td>
<td>031</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Close-up of cafeteria worker yelling into walkie-talkie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #26</td>
<td><em>AC/DC Thunder Struck</em></td>
<td>080</td>
<td>0:03:25</td>
<td>Many students walking up, down steps between classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #27</td>
<td><em>AC/DC Thunder Struck</em></td>
<td>095</td>
<td>0:00:03</td>
<td>Perspective shot of running fan from behind fan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #28</td>
<td><em>AC/DC Thunder Struck</em></td>
<td>080</td>
<td>0:03:25</td>
<td>Many students walking up, down steps between classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #29</td>
<td><em>AC/DC Thunder Struck</em></td>
<td>066</td>
<td>0:00:08</td>
<td>Female student running down hall away from camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #30</td>
<td><em>AC/DC Thunder Struck</em></td>
<td>080</td>
<td>0:03:25</td>
<td>Many students walking up, down steps between classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #31</td>
<td><em>AC/DC Thunder Struck</em></td>
<td>062</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Male student runs down hall toward camera, stops at camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #32</td>
<td><em>AC/DC Thunder Struck</em></td>
<td>080</td>
<td>0:03:25</td>
<td>Many students walking up, down steps between classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #33</td>
<td><em>AC/DC Thunder Struck</em></td>
<td>062</td>
<td>0:00:06</td>
<td>Male student runs down hall toward camera, stops at camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #34</td>
<td><em>AC/DC Thunder Struck</em></td>
<td>080</td>
<td>0:03:25</td>
<td>Many students walking up and down steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Sequence Number</td>
<td>Music Cue</td>
<td>Clip Number</td>
<td>Clip Length</td>
<td>Descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #35</td>
<td>AC/DC Thunder Struck</td>
<td>061</td>
<td>0:00:18</td>
<td>Female student running down hallway, close-up of keyboard (EFFECT: SLOW-MOTION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #36</td>
<td>Jaws Theme</td>
<td>097</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Closeup of fan perspective shot looking at students in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #37</td>
<td></td>
<td>096</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Perspective shot of fan looking into classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #38</td>
<td></td>
<td>097</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Closeup of fan perspective shot looking at students in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #39</td>
<td></td>
<td>098</td>
<td>0:00:01</td>
<td>Medium shot of fan running from the side (EFFECT: SPIN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #40</td>
<td></td>
<td>097</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Closeup of fan perspective shot looking at students in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #41</td>
<td></td>
<td>096</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Perspective shot of fan looking into classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #42</td>
<td></td>
<td>096</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Perspective shot of fan looking into classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #43</td>
<td>Ticking noise</td>
<td>097</td>
<td>0:00:04</td>
<td>Closeup of fan perspective shot looking at students in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #44</td>
<td>BOOM</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Medium shot of drinking fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #45</td>
<td>Requiem for a Dream</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>0:00:13</td>
<td>Zoom of student at drinking fountain; hand on button</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #46</td>
<td></td>
<td>003</td>
<td>0:00:12</td>
<td>Reveal shot of classroom chair (EFFECT: RED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #47</td>
<td></td>
<td>016</td>
<td>0:00:03</td>
<td>Low angle shot up empty, lighted staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #48</td>
<td></td>
<td>021</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Shot of open bathroom door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #49</td>
<td></td>
<td>022</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>Medium shot of rear exit of school from indoors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #50</td>
<td></td>
<td>017</td>
<td>0:00:11</td>
<td>Reveal shot looking up staircase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #51</td>
<td></td>
<td>004</td>
<td>0:00:05</td>
<td>High-angle shot of two classroom chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Sequence Number</td>
<td>Music Cue</td>
<td>Clip Number</td>
<td>Clip Length</td>
<td>Descriptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #52</td>
<td>Requiem for a Dream</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>0:00:02</td>
<td>Medium shot of drinking fountain (EFFECT: SEPIA, OLD FILM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #53</td>
<td></td>
<td>069</td>
<td>0:00:32</td>
<td>Student wearing “Give Peace a Chance” t-shirt walking down hallway, out door, back in toward camera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shot #54</td>
<td></td>
<td>069</td>
<td>0:00:32</td>
<td>Student wearing “Give Peace a Chance” t-shirt walking down hallway, out door, back in toward camera (EFFECT: SLOW-MOTION, ZOOM ON PEACE SIGN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

INITIAL LIKERT SCALE QUESTIONNAIRE
**Please fill in the bubble to match your description:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>4.0-3.6</td>
<td>3.5-3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Level</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>Honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade in English last year</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family owns a video camera:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family owns a computer:</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The following statements have been made by students like you. Please fill in the bubble to best match your agreement/disagreement with the statement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am a good writer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I can express my thoughts/feelings well with writing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am knowledgeable about using word-processing software:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My writing benefits from revising/editing my essays with peer-revision groups:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I brainstorm (pre-writing strategies) before I begin writing my essays:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I write outside of school assignments (journals, poems, stories, etc.):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I prefer working on my writings with no peer input (all by myself):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I enjoy writing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I have difficulty expressing my thoughts in writing:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I seek outside help (parents, tutors, teachers, peers) with my writings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I enjoy sharing my writings with others:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I enjoy reading:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I enjoy organizing and structuring my ideas into finished writings (essays, stories, etc):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel comfortable using technology:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I have made films with video before:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I enjoy watching films:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I have used film editing software before:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IF YOU HAVE WORKED WITH VIDEO BEFORE, CONTINUE TO THE QUESTIONS BELOW. IF NOT, STOP HERE.

1. I have made film projects outside of school before (family productions, music videos, spoofs, etc.):
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]

2. I prefer working on my video productions with no peer input (all by myself):
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]

3. I enjoy working with video:
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]

4. I have difficulty expressing my thoughts with video:
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]

5. I feel knowledgeable about using a video camera:
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]

6. I enjoy sharing my video projects with others:
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]

7. I enjoy organizing individual clips in putting together a video:
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
   - [ ]
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