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The underachievement of boys as evidenced in national statistics has recently become a cause for concern amongst educationalists and government officials alike. It is in the practise of creative writing that the gap between girls’ and boys’ levels of achievement is most pronounced. This study looks at the issue of boys and writing in a large, rural primary school where standards in boys’ writing had been declining. It sets out to examine possible causes for the decline and to consider the effectiveness of newly implemented changes to pedagogical practices and how these impact on the drive to raise standards in boys’ writing.
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Rationale

The Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF, 2009) National Curriculum Assessment statistics show that during a three year period from 2006 to 2008 the percentage of boys achieving level four or above in English at the end of key stage two nationally, was on average approximately 9% lower than that of girls, where level four is generally accepted to be the average level of attainment (Directgov, 2009). However, when these statistics are broken down further to specifically represent reading and writing data, a more accurate assessment of the situation is revealed. Whilst boys lagged behind girls in reading on average by 6% over the three year period, the biggest variance lies in writing where the gap widens to an average of 15%.

An inspection carried out by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate in my own workplace during the summer term of 2009, flagged up that here too, boys in particular were not making sufficient progress in literacy and that their standards in writing were in fact declining. This fact is borne out in data extracted from key stage two end-of-year assessments which reveal that where writing is concerned boys in our school have fallen behind girls by an average of 12%, slightly lower than national statistics for the same period. The table below demonstrates this trend.
Table 1 – Writing data for academic years 2006 - 2008

However, as the chart below indicates, data for 2009 saw this figure increase to 35%, far surpassing statistics at both local and national levels.

Table 2 – Writing data for academic years 2006 - 2009

In the light of such data, writing became a target for improvement and, following consultations with local education authority literacy experts, specific changes to pedagogical practices began to be implemented.

This study can be broken down into three parts. Firstly, it set out to consider why boys appear to consistently underachieve in writing compared to girls. Secondly, it examined the changes made to pedagogical approaches in the teaching of writing and thirdly, consideration was given to how those changes might impact on raising standards overall but most specifically
for boys. This study drew on the experiences of the pupils themselves together with those of the teaching staff and research was carried out to map the progression in teaching and learning from the point of view of both educationalists and pupils.

**Literature Review**

Commonly referred to as the ‘gender gap’ (Cassidy, 1999, DCFS, 2009, p. 1, Rafferty, 1998, online and Younger and Warrington, 2005, p. 9), the difference in the levels of achievement between boys and girls has attracted much attention and research on boys’ underachievement in literacy, particularly writing, is plentiful as are suggested strategies to overcome it. The gender gap however, appears not to be a recent phenomenon. Anecdotally, Cohen (cited in Skelton, 2001, p.12) suggests that even as far back as 1693 it was perceived that schools were ‘failing to develop ‘writing and speaking’ skills in young gentlemen’. In more recent times, Francis and Skelton (2005, p. 43) point out that as schools became more accountable with the introduction and publication of league tables for primary schools back in 1996, attention to the variance in levels of achievement between boys and girls became an educational priority. As a result, by 1998 the then new Labour Government introduced the Literacy Hour as part of its practical implementation of educational reforms to raise standards in literacy in all primary schools in England (DfEE, 1998). However, not only were educationalists concerned with issues of raising standards, but more specifically with the underachievement of boys (Pidgeon, 2002, p. 2).

In its report ‘English at the Crossroads’ published in 2009 (p.5), the Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Schools, (Ofsted) state that standards are rising albeit slowly, although for certain groups of children, ‘some minority ethnic groups’ and ‘white British boys eligible for free school meals’, the gap remains persistent. A preceding DfES publication (2005, p. 4) primarily concerned with white working class boys and writing states that there is a ‘substantial link’ between underachievement and the social background of pupils. While the purpose of such reports might be to address issues of raising standards through pedagogical practices, they go no way towards substantiating such claims and rather appear to focus on the effects of social background and achievement rather than address what they indicate to be a significant cause. Conversely, the publications also focus on solutions to improve writing from a pedagogical viewpoint and explicitly state that ‘reasons for low achievement were not believed to lie outside schools’. Whilst this might be the case, this does little to rationalise the assertions made in respect of underachievement and social class. If factors which may underlie the underachievement of boys in writing do have their roots outside the classroom, this may well be beyond the remit of policy makers and educationalists when drawing up practical guides to bridge the gender gap. However, the effectiveness of such interventions and strategies might be called in to question where outside influences are not explored and where they are based on purely a pedagogical point of view. As Alloway and Gilbert (1999, p. 52) warn, social background and gender ‘impact significantly on .... achievement of literacy skills’.

Safford et al (2004, p.10) consider further the national response to the underachievement of boys’ in writing and suggest that in addition to the focus on pedagogical practices, government initiatives also centre around boys’ behaviour and attitudes as suggested in guidelines introduced in 2003 as part of the Healthy Schools initiative. These refer to the ‘negative aspects of a school’s culture and ethos that might have been created by boys’ (DfES, 2003, p. 4), suggesting boys’ attitudes are in some way responsible for the gender gap.
Younger and Warrington (2005, p. 18) suggest that boys’ efforts to protect their ‘macho image’ is crucial to the debate on why differences in levels of achievement are so pronounced. They proffer that the importance for boys to be accepted by other boys and belong within the peer group is great and often requires them to adopt what they refer to as ‘laddish’ behaviour; behaviour that is frequently at odds with the expectations of teachers. As well as causing tension between themselves and their teachers, as Skelton (2001, p. 104) comments, for some boys being a school boy and being a boy can be the source of conflict within the masculine hierarchy of the peer group. As Francis and Skelton (2005, p.44) point out, perhaps as a result, educational policy documents of the 1990s construed boy’s as becoming ‘socially excluded’ or ‘outsiders.’ Perceived ‘laddish’ behaviour was conveyed as largely problematic or, alternatively, boys themselves were seen as being vulnerable and needing support. Not surprisingly perhaps, this served only to fuel the debate on boys and schooling and in the educational literature of the time and as Francis and Skelton continue, appeared to perpetuate the notion that boys, per se were somewhat troublesome within an educational setting. Whilst acknowledging the existence of this ‘laddish’ culture, Younger and Warrington (2005, p. 18) caution that the issue of boys’ underachievement is ‘far more complex and multifaceted’ and point out that not all boys underachieve and, in the same way, not all girls are high-achievers. However, they do concede that whilst viewpoints that ignore diversity in gender may be deemed simplistic, their own research reveals that there are ‘typical patterns of behaviour to which many boys conform.’

Newman (2005, p.41) argues that while factors of social background and ‘laddishness’ might be causes for resistance, it is possible for boys to ‘engage with English in a purposeful way’. Whether or not the subjects of her research were wholly representative is questionable since the boys in the study were predominantly middle class and many from families employed in the media suggesting that background may be a significant factor. This, however, would require further investigation and goes beyond the remit of this study. The point Newman makes however, is that, at odds with the stereotypical image of ‘laddishness’, boys’ approach to literacy can become more positive where the home environment regards literacy as being high status and where literacy skills are of particular relevance. In concluding, she suggests that rather than viewing ‘laddishness’ as merely a reason for boys’ underachievement, awareness of the diversity in socio-economic backgrounds and modes of masculinity should inform pedagogical practice. However, whilst this might be sound advice, further issues exist within pedagogy itself. Maynard and Lowe (1999, p. 6) suggest that creating motivation for writing, and encouraging the use of ‘descriptive or figurative’ language are two such issues while research undertaken by Warrington et al (2003, p. 144) further adds the concern that boys are often unable to cope with the ‘multiple demands’ of story writing. As government statistics prove, for some boys, writing continues to be problematic though whether their difficulties stem from socio-economic factors, pedagogical practice or a combination of both remains unclear.

Choice of Research

My own research took place in a large, rural, primary school. The study employed both quantitative and qualitative methods of research, quantitative in the gathering of specific data and qualitative where opinions and experiences were sought. Initially, data for end of key stage two assessments in writing was examined to obtain a clearer picture of the extent to which boys were underachieving in comparison with girls. To try to establish possible reasons for the apparent gender gap in my own workplace, a series of observations, semi
structured interviews, group discussions and questionnaires were undertaken in order that the views of pupils, teachers and researcher were represented in the process of evaluation and analysis (Warrington and Younger, 2006, p.146). The sample, four boys and two girls in year six, had been identified by the class teacher as children who were making some progress but regularly produced work that she described as being the ‘bare minimum’ despite having, in her opinion, the potential to improve further. The depiction ‘can and don’t’ (Barrs, 2002, p. 10) used to describe the participants in Barr’s study of children’s reading patterns might be equally as appropriate to this sample. While most of these pupils certainly appeared to have the potential to achieve level 4b in writing, it was seldom realised despite corresponding levels in reading being, for the most part, higher. Although the study primarily concerned boys, girls were also included in the sample on the basis that gender differences between general attitudes to writing, how tasks are approached and orchestrated and the overall quality of writing achieved might be observed.

The pupils took part in a discussion about their literacy experiences, drawing comparisons between lessons before and after new literacy strategies had been implemented. A two week observation then took place, following the pupils’ progress through a study of journalistic writing together with a pupil questionnaire.

Three teachers also took part in the study, all of whom held positions of literacy co-ordinators in the school and who represented both key stages one and two. Semi-structured interviews were conducted and though some common themes emerged, the nature of the interviews meant that responses were somewhat generalised. Of these responses, the three most common themes, and, it might be argued, rather stereo-typical ones, were that some boys, usually the less able, were ‘disinclined’ towards writing. Writing styles too, in their opinion, tended to be short and to the point and, in addition, boys tended to favour non-fiction writing, a view that is ‘over-generalised’ according to Daly (2002, p. 9). The literacy co-ordinators were united in citing ‘talk for writing’ (DLDP, 2009, online) as being the single most effective strategy implemented in raising standards in writing. It is the integration of talk in literacy that forms the basis for my own study.

Informed consent was obtained prior to carrying out the study and the names of the participants have been changed in order to uphold confidentiality.

**Results and Discussion**

In the first instance, informal discussions took place with the sample. The pupils were all reasonably new to year six which enabled them to recall their experiences in year five and therefore, the teaching of literacy before and after the implementation of new strategies. During the discussions, pupils were asked open-ended questions in order to elicit their general feelings towards writing. This revealed that, irrespective of gender or ability, they overwhelmingly felt that their experiences in literacy had improved overall in year six and since the introduction of new strategies implemented under the guidance of external literacy advisors. When prompted to talk about their experiences of literacy in year five, comments such as “it was boring, “I hated it when I didn’t know the answer” and “I got worried about it” were proffered. The pupils described lessons that were teacher led, where they were expected to achieve and yet felt they lacked the skills to fulfil their tasks. Comments too, similar to those quoted by Warrington and Younger (2006, p. 146), such as ‘I didn’t know
how to get started’ and ‘I didn’t know what to write’ were prevalent and a general feeling of being inadequately equipped to tackle their tasks prevailed.

By contrast, a more positive picture of literacy was promoted in respect of their feelings towards year six literacy. Particular references were made with regard to the new strategies being applied. One pupil said “it’s more exciting and you get more help” whilst another commented on the use of story maps, “I like drawing best because it helps me know what I want to write”. The pupils also enjoyed using their new writing journals where they could jot down ideas and ‘magpie’ words and phrases that they liked and felt they could use themselves. The overall consensus of opinion regarding literacy in year six might be usefully summed up by one boy who declared that “they (the teachers) don’t expect you to know it without teaching it first”.

The table below shows the pupils’ levels of ability in writing in assessments carried out at the end of year five. The generally accepted average writing level for pupils at the end of year five is level 3a rising to 4b by the end of year six. It also shows how the pupils rated literacy where the lower scores denote a dislike of the subject and vice versa. As the results indicate, the accomplishment of a higher level does not necessarily imply a predilection for the subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JACK</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLLY</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATALIE</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOE</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 – Sample group writing level data and scale of enjoyment

Having analysed data and gleaned an insight into how the sample viewed their literacy experiences in school, the next task was to observe the group over a period of two weeks to glean an insight into how the pupils would respond to the tasks they were set. The sample was to embark on a study of journalistic writing under the guidance of the class teacher which would culminate in their own writing of a piece in the style of a newspaper report. The pupils commenced their study by researching, examining and discussing media styles and techniques from a range of multimedia to familiarise themselves with the key features of journalistic writing. A specific newspaper article was then introduced which would provide the context on which a series of scaffolding activities including ‘hear it, map it, step it, say it’ sequences (DLDP, 2009, online) guided reading and guided writing would be based before progressing to the final writing task. The activities were designed to exemplify the new strategies being promoted by the external literacy body.
One might suppose that the boys who achieved level 4c would be the most successful in the given tasks. However, this was not always the case and some pupils did not perform as expected. The girls in the group both achieved level 3a although one was able to apply literacy skills more effectively than the other. This was similar to the level 4c boys where one produced work of a generally higher standard than the other. Further discrepancies in abilities arose in different tasks where, for instance, the girls showed both competence and confidence in speaking activities over the boys. The boys on the other hand preferred to invest time in producing detailed story maps but were more reluctant in speaking activities. Not only were there variations in ability, differences in ‘attitudes, aspirations and commitment’ were also prevalent (Warrington and Younger, 2006, p. 141). The more successful overall in the scaffolding activities appeared to be the most confident, immersing themselves fully in lessons and appeared more likely to take risks. These attributes were not so apparent in the less successful children who made fewer contributions in lessons and appeared less confident overall. Perhaps as Pajares and Valiente (2001, p. 3) point out this is borne out by theory based on the notion that self-belief is an important factor in academic achievement, something that they suggest is stronger in girls than in boys where language is concerned. Although this might be difficult to prove given the size of the sample, there does appear to be a link between this theory and the less confident boys, who, by their own admission, felt that literacy was not their forte. This theory is but one of many and, as Younger and Warrington (2005, p. 36) point out, differing perspectives of analysis, varying types of evidence and shifting concepts in research methods result in the relationship between boys and writing becoming very complex.

The discrepancies between the pupils reflect the intricate nature of individual learning processes and preferences. They also highlighted a specific issue which appeared to have direct links with the outcome of the given tasks. The pupils that were more successful in their tasks appeared fuelled by their imagination. This was particularly evident in a reporter and eye-witness activity where the children worked in pairs, one adopting the role of reporter formulating questions while the other answered as an eye-witness. The ability for the pupils to ‘get into role’ was crucial to this exercise but for ‘Joe’ and ‘Harry’ particularly, it proved extremely difficult. Much of the work around journalistic writing until this point had been based on finding information and facts where all the pupils had been able to contribute. This sudden change from fact to fiction appeared to be a major obstacle to these pupils who seemed unable to extend their understanding of facts and translate them in to a scenario where they were producing fictional work based on their interpretation and extension of those facts. This was further evidenced in the final written report work where the pupils were encouraged to include both facts and fictional writing techniques.

Cassidy, (2000, online) suggests that boys relate better to ‘clear cut’ literacy tasks that rely on the ‘retrieval of information’ and struggle with interpreting information. However, if as Maynard (2002, p. 40) suggests, boys favour writing about themselves, scattering their work with superheroes, action and adventure, then the subject matter of a small fishing village being devastated by a storm should surely have appealed.

Research undertaken by Parks (2007, online) in a middle school classroom suggests that boys’ conversations tend to focus on factual information and furthermore states that ‘they don’t allow their imaginations to take over’. Whilst at face value this might be congruent with my own findings, the validity of such a sweeping statement must be called in to question. This stance appears to generalise that boys per se lack imagination when a more realistic viewpoint might acknowledge that in particular circumstances, some boys may have difficulty in
activities that are dependent on imaginative prowess. Perhaps then, more pertinent to the debate on boys and underachievement is the question: Why some boys ‘can’t allow their imaginations to take over?’

Andrews and Fisher (cited in Maynard 2002, p. 135) states that ‘stories and other narratives are one of the ways we can remember and share common experience.’ It is the word experience which is significant in this statement. From the teacher interviews, a common theme which emerged was the sense that children must have experience of that about which they are writing. Linking this back to the sample, their only experience of the village and the storm was limited to the factual newspaper article – had they been given a ‘way into writing’ (Pidgeon, 2002, p. 5) through visual stimuli such as ICT or video, through drama or storytelling, the task of interpreting factual text to produce a narrative prose may have been more accessible. Younger and Warrington (2005, p. 47) particularly advocate the use of drama to improve boys’ writing. They suggest that drama offers a ‘greater creative and sensory experience’ giving pupils first hand experiences, stimulating imagination leading to descriptive writing and allowing pupils to write with a sense of reality. NTRP (2009, p. 2) also advocate drama as a tool for promoting ideas for writing. In this instance, both ‘Joe’ and ‘Harry’ had found the task of forming questions and answers around a subject in which they had little familiarity, a difficult one. Indeed they, along with two others, expressed ‘getting ideas’ as being an area in which they had the greatest difficulty, a finding which concurs with research undertaken by Maynard (2002, p. 106) Millard and Walsh (2001, p.2) and Safford et al (2004, p.30). In this instance, they had no sense of reality, either in their own life experience, or a simulated one through the use of drama. Had their task been to produce reporter and eye-witness accounts based on, for instance the school table tennis championships, the outcome might have been quite different. As Maynard (2002, p. 99) discovered in the course of her research, children wanted to write most about ‘their own reality’. This is further borne out by the pupil questionnaires where two of the boys particularly noted their dislike of not being able to write about what they chose to.

In accordance with DCFS guidelines ‘to foster greater gender equity’ (2009, p. 7), Pidgeon (ibid) suggests ‘oral rehearsal’ as being the means by which the mediums of drama, ICT, story telling and the like are assimilated. In her opinion, it allows children, most especially boys, to prepare for writing. She maintains that through talking boys can ‘shape’ their ideas and ‘articulate their writing’ and perhaps most pertinent, can ‘get into the fictional situation and the characters more fully’. Safford et al (2004, p.37) too see drama as not only an oral and interactive part of literacy but most importantly from the point of ‘getting into role’, that it ‘could provide a strikingly immediate route into a fictional situation’. The sample had experienced aspects of talk in their literacy tasks but this had been confined to non-fictional aspects which had not prepared them for a predominantly fictional role.

In addition to adding to the sense of reality in writing tasks, Warrington and Younger (2006, p. 145) support the role in which talk, including that promoted in drama, can lead to successful writing. They proffer that for children to become writers, they need to learn more than the technical aspects; they need to develop ‘personal voice’. Daly (2002, p. 16) too proclaims it to be ‘inherent to the scaffolding process’ while DLDP (2009, online) stresses that it is a ‘tool to embed language patterns that are longer, deeper and make a more lasting impact than just attending to surface features of writing.’ This was very much the opinion of the teachers interviewed who cited ‘talk for writing’ (DLDP ibid) to be the most useful strategy implemented under the guidance of the external literacy experts. They deemed it to
be particularly effective in increasing confidence in underachieving boys both in key stage one and two and felt it appealed broadly to different learning styles.

It is, perhaps, ironic that in the pupil questionnaire, only the girls expressed enjoyment for the talking activities, while the boys, without exception, chose ICT. Whilst further research on these outcomes is required in order to ascertain the exact reasons for this, one such reason might be that the talking activity had assumed the acquisition of certain literary skills. Rather than being a talking activity through the medium of drama, the pupils’ experience of talk had been a somewhat isolated activity, where they were asked to organise, recall and articulate a series of events from a previously drawn story map. The success of such an activity depended on their ability to undertake such complex skills as ‘creating, choosing between, retaining, transforming, ordering, transcribing and developing their ideas’ (Maynard, 2002, p. 107). Furthermore, the pupils were then individually required to present their recital to the class. It is, perhaps, unsurprising given the nature of the activity and the lack of preparation for such a task, that for the majority of the group and, most certainly the males within it, this was not identified as an activity that they enjoyed or found useful. Although the activity might have gone some way towards embracing talk for writing, it was perhaps confined to being ‘overly narrow and utilitarian’ (Cameron cited in Safford et al, 2004, p. 16) where the process was hindered by the deficiency of prior collaborative exploration of the text through a medium such as drama. As Safford et al (2004, p. 37) point out it is active and enactive approaches that ‘enable children to enter the world of a text more fully’.

An alternative point of view might be to consider the willingness of boys to participate in such activities rather than to focus on their ability to carry them out. Whilst the characteristics of ‘laddishness’, defined in the classroom environment as being overtly dominant with ‘little respect for the business of learning’ (Newman, 2005, p. 37) certainly appeared not to be present amongst the boys, there may, however, have been a lack of self-confidence. The stark comparison between girls, who showed not only competence but enjoyment for talking activities might, as Warrington et al (2003, p. 146) suggest, demonstrate a ‘lack of self-confidence beneath a veneer of masculinity’ especially had the activity been viewed by the boys as ‘feminine’ in its role of ‘creative expression’ (Rowan et al, 2002, p. 31). As Warrington and Younger (2006, p. 21) indicate, if this were the case, preserving status within the peer group might have been considered more important than showing interest in something that might potentially threaten it. In these circumstances, as Rowan et al, (2002, p. 121) conclude, while boys may be unable or unwilling to abandon ‘traditional masculine subjectivities’, the role of teachers is important in forging connections between boys, taking them from being ‘basic boys’ to ‘becoming something more’.

The new strategies, whether wholly successful or successful in part, for all or for some, had a positive effect on writing and, it appears, most noticeably in boys’ writing. As the table below indicates, progress in writing based on the final written piece, was largely reflected in the improvement in levels.
Table 4 – Sample group writing data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>PREVIOUS LEVEL</th>
<th>CURRENT LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JACK</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Secure 4B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIEL</td>
<td>4C</td>
<td>4B – aspects of 4A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOLLY</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>3A – aspects of 4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATALIE</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>3A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOE</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td>3A – aspects of 4C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HARRY</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>3A – aspects of 4C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As this study suggests, strategies to improve standards in writing will require further development and ongoing evaluation for them to become more effective. As Maynard (2002, p. 125) concludes, our role as educators will be to develop the confidence to experiment with new approaches and strategies and seek to develop our pedagogical practice through ‘sustained reflection on teaching and learning’ (Younger and Warrington, 2005, p. 132).

Conclusion

This study set out to examine possible causes for the under-achievement of boys in writing in my own workplace and considered whether socio-economic or pedagogical issues might be to some degree responsible. As the study highlights, in this instance, pedagogical issues seemed to be more apparent although it should be pointed out that a sample of, for instance, older pupils in an urban location might have produced different results. In addition, the research was carried out from an educationalist’s perspective and therefore with a greater awareness of pedagogical procedure over socio-economic issues. Had the research been carried out from an alternative aspect, evidence of socio-economic factors and how they impact on pupils may have been more apparent.

The study also considered the effectiveness of newly implemented strategies as promoted by local education authority literacy advisors to improve writing overall although with an emphasis on boys’ writing skills. Whilst these have on the whole been successful as borne out by improved pupil writing levels, the study highlights that further development on the aspect of oral rehearsal would appear beneficial. Certainly there seems to be ample evidence to suggest that drama and the opportunity it provides for talk are widely believed to have a place in pedagogical practice and have an important place in the role of developing literacy skills, especially in the drive to raise standards in boys’ writing. Indeed, as Younger and Warrington (2005, p. 48) indicate, evidence of progression goes beyond the realms of writing and extends to improvements in pupil attitudes, motivation and confidence. Along with Safford *et al.* (2004, p. 38), they do however caution that these benefits rely heavily on the ‘confidence, experience and knowledge’ of teachers, and suggest that careful and flexible planning and a school culture that embeds drama steadily into the curriculum are critical to its overall effectiveness. This perhaps mirrors the observations in this study that in
implementing new strategies for writing, it is not only learners but teachers and the wider school environment that need time to develop skills and expertise to support such strategies. As Younger and Warrington (2005, p. 51) point out, new initiatives take time to develop and should be very much a matter of ‘evolution, not imposition’.
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