



# **Bridging the Gap in Moving Image**

**Final Report**

**Sol Snelvedt**

**September 2009**



**University of Brighton**



**Royal College of Art**  
Postgraduate Art & Design

## **Contents**

|                           |     |
|---------------------------|-----|
| 1. Abstract               | p3  |
| 2. Introduction           | p3  |
| 3. Methods                | p5  |
| 4. Results And Discussion | p8  |
| 5. Annotated Bibliography | p11 |
| 6. Appendices             | p15 |

## **Abstract**

*The project aimed to identify gaps between generations with regard to perceptions, attitudes and expectations of digital technology in relation to the learning and teaching of the moving image, and to help bridge any gaps and enhance communication between students, academic and support staff.*

*This ethnographic study includes a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods including digital video as research practice with 34 recorded interviews: 50% with students, 30% academic and 20% support staff at the University of Brighton and at the Royal College of Art, London.*

*We found that there is a gap between expectations and experiences of digital technology, attitudes to the learning and teaching of the moving image vary in complex ways between generations and perceptions of quality are in a state of flux.*

## **Introduction**

Moving image is a broad term that include video and animation for screenings off or online; video installations, video sculpture, pop-up ads, tv and cinema advertisement but not film production as such. This research project has first and foremost investigated the learning and teaching of the moving image as an integral element of Art and Design rather than as a stand-alone subject.

The project team consisted of Co-investigators Senior Lecturer Phil Taylor, Senior Technician John Warr and Video Demonstrator Sina Krause; Advisors Academic Leader Lawrence Zeegen and Subject Leader Judith Katz; Project Leader Lecturer & Researcher Sol Sneltvedt, all University of Brighton (UoB), and Partner Royal College of Art (RCA) Tutor Stuart Croft.

In tandem with the project Sol Sneltvedt completed the Post Graduate Certificate in Teaching and Learning, Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL), UoB. From the outset she sought to obtain synergy between the two related activities. The CTL Course Team commented this clear intention in their assessment and concluded that it had been achieved efficiently especially through the PGCert Special Study for which part of the project was used and thereby approved through the CTL Ethical Review. The Ethical Review for the entire project was approved by CETLD, Tier 1.

The project duration was 7 months part-time 1<sup>st</sup> October 2008 - 30<sup>th</sup> April 2009.

## **Objectives and briefly, what happened:**

### 1) Identify possible generation barriers between staff and students with regards to Moving Image:

Through a series of recorded interviews with students, academic and support staff we researched perceptions of, attitudes and expectations to the current learning and teaching of the Moving Image included any evidence of barriers between staff and students, particular to learning and teaching digital technology.

Attitudes in this area vary in complex ways between generations, which reflect the tempo of the developments in digital technology as part of mass culture over the past 15 years.

### 2) Built bridges between new and traditional technologies across the arts:

Through analysis of the collected data and a series of research activities such as our Interim Design Scholarship Seminar; RCA exchanges and UoB Student Focus Group across Art and Design, we found that fundamental perceptions of what is new and what is traditional is thought of in a new way by the new generation. This resonates with Malcolm Le Grice proposed cultural schism; see the annotated bibliography page 11.

### 3) Enhance effective knowledge transfer between students, academic and support staff:

We received much positive feedback from interviewees and others for the fact that our research involved all three groups, which supported our view that good communication between all is vital for progress in learning and teaching the Moving Image.

Effective knowledge transfer seems challenged by an apparent blur between areas of responsibility within digital technology. The blur or overlap links to the tempo of developments in digital technology but also connects to challenges in the wider context of practice-led teaching and learning as such.

## **Methods**

Throughout the project period Sol Sneltvedt, Phil Taylor, John Warr and Sina Krause met fortnightly to appoint ongoing work arrangements and evaluate the research in progress. Sol Sneltvedt undertook the main workload (0.4 FTE) with assistance from Phil Taylor and John Warr relative to their project time (0.1 FTE each). Sina Krause was not part of our originally proposed project team but generously contributed her own time to participate in the project.

The CETLD Pedagogic Advisor Allan Davies provided valuable advice for the qualitative and quantitative data collection both in terms of the design of the questions but also with regard to qualitative interview techniques.

The project leader consulted the UoB Research Ethics & Governance Committee in order to ensure that the Ethical Guidelines were observed and reflected in the consent forms, information sheet and invitation (see appendix 1.1-1.3).

We interviewed students from level 2 and 3 at the following courses at the University of Brighton: Graphic Design; Illustration; Editorial Photography and Fine Art Sculpture. The participating members of staff were from a greater range of courses and levels within Art and Design that included cross-disciplinary MA/PGDip levels such as Digital Media Arts, and Fine Arts.

We compared differences and similarities in Moving Image learning and teaching at the Royal College of Art and the University of Brighton and accomplished two recorded student interviews as well as a comprehensive interview with RCA Tutor Stuart Croft.

Each interviewee completed a questionnaire before the recorded interview commenced. In this way, we divided the quantitative questions into the questionnaire and the qualitative open-ended questions into the interview (see appendices 2 and 3).

The main themes for the qualitative interviews were as follows:

- 1) Perceived differences between professional and amateur MI*
- 2) Expectations versus experiences of the MI working processes*
- 3) Perception of division between technical and artistic MI qualities*
- 4) Connections between new and traditional technologies*
- 5) Ideas for improvements*

Academic and Support Staff were asked to think about the students' rather than their own experiences of the MI working process and '*Perception of division between technical and artistic MI qualities*' included the sense of network between technical and artistic support. For academic staff only, there was an additional question about MI coursework assessment.

As a rule, one co-investigator would act as a camera operator and the project leader would conduct the interview.

In total we carried out 34 interviews with students (50%), academic (30%) and support staff (20%) at the University of Brighton and at Royal College of Art, London.

The practice-led ethnographic analysis that followed was divided into 4 stages:

### **Stage One**

The first stage of the analysis included a review of the recorded material; material transferred to the computer totalled 20 hours.

### **Stage Two**

3.5 hours of the footage was edited and transferred to DVD. The editing process included removal of any compromising interviewee comments and those irrelevant or too personal to shed light on the subject matter. Still, the different viewpoints were generously represented. The clips were organised into the following six key areas:

*MI-favourites/examples; Perceived differences between professional and amateur MI; Learning process and learning motivation; Assessment; Connections between New and Traditional Technologies; Ideas for Improvements and Developments.*

The DVDs were distributed to the three co-investigators for feedback and comments. Each co-investigator compiled a collection of strap-lines or specific interviewee comments that caught his/her interest. The written strap-lines were later edited into a video clip that consisted of interviewee portraits in order to serve as a backdrop for oral presentations and debate, first shown at our CETLD Interim Design Scholarship Seminar 25<sup>th</sup> February 2009.

### **Stage Three**

We utilised our interim seminar to discuss our preliminary findings and ongoing research with students, academic and support staff. We presented 8 short video clips especially designed to stimulate discussion about certain issues and thus particular perceptions, expectations and attitudes to the learning and teaching of the moving image. The seminar informed our further research constructively and helped progress the subject matter across disciplines.

The clips illustrated preliminary findings and were entitled *Timelessness; Digital and Analogue; State of Mind; Lost in Editing: How lost? Impatience; Network* and *Strange Collision* (see below for descriptions of the final clips).

There was ample time for what became a lively discussion. The range of issues under debate included conceptualisation of the moving image either as a stand-alone subject or as an integral part of another discipline. In connection to the latter we discussed the multifarious nature of the integrity and for example the specifics of moving image in sculpture. Other issues were students' expectations of individual support; learning networks; forms of teaching and demonstration that encourage independent learning and comparisons between different institutions' teaching strategies and curriculum.

We carried out a focus group with 7 students across art and design courses at the University of Brighton. This enabled us to go deeper into some of our preliminary findings for example the issue of students' use of software help functions and online resources.

### **Stage Four**

As part of completing the online documentary-style video "Bridging the Gap in Moving Image" we edited the video material into 5 chapters each of 1-3 minutes duration:

- *Timelessness* illustrates the changing perceptions of differences and similarities between new and traditional technologies. Attitudes in this area vary in complex ways between generations, which reflect the tempo of the developments in digital technology as part of mass culture over the past 15 years.
- *Amateur versus Professional* shows how perceptions of moving image quality are in a state of flux.

- *Impatience* illustrates the gap between expectations and experiences with regard to the time involved in the learning and teaching of the moving image.
- *Strange Collision* shows the commercial and contemporary context of the moving image in a cultural and historic perspective.
- *Network* links to the importance of student networks or 'communities of practice' for software learning.

The different chapters/clips were edited individually in such a way that they can be combined flexibly for different purposes. Four of the clips did for example make out the supporting material for Sol Sneltvedt's PGCert conference presentation 10<sup>th</sup> June 2009. The clips are available at the CETLD website on the following link: <http://cetld.brighton.ac.uk/projects/current-projects/bridging-the-gap-in-moving-image>

## **Results And Discussion**

We established that there is a gap between students' and staff's expectations and actual experiences of time consume with regard to digital technology. Staff talks about how incredibly fast digital technology is but also how students are frustrated and may spend a lot of time to for example perform basic video editing. Quote: "*Time consume is not always apparent*" (academic interviewee). Students talked about a waiting game that could last up to one week, which they found much too long.

In this connection it is important to note that the course concerned are characterised by high energy and thus a fast turnover of ideas through learning and teaching strategies especially designed for fast productivity for example periods of weekly assignments in Graphic Design or the Interyear Crit-event in Fine Art Sculpture.

The current generation of staff tends to refer to the differences between analogue and digital when they conclude that digital is incredibly fast. This does not necessarily resonance with the young generation who grows up with digital. The gap that students experience may not be related to digital technology as such but has perhaps more to do with their overall expectations to teaching and individually supported learning as such.

With the rapid developments in digital technologies over the past 15 years, it may not be surprising that perceptions of new and traditional technologies are changing. As one student interviewee put it: "*I'm not*



*sure how useful it is to say what is old and what is new. There is always new stuff and then how old is the old stuff so that it is categorised as old? It is not about what is old and what is new, it is about what is there [...] You can buy a computer now and it will be old in a years time"*

A result of the increasing access to digital technology is that perceptions of quality are in a state of flux. The definitions of what is amateur and what is professional Moving Image are blurring. As one of our student interviewees pointed out: *"People who are making films professionally might want to make it look like it is done by amateurs"*. Simultaneously there is a notion that 'everyone' can be a filmmaker, a composer etceteras simply because the tools are commonly available. Some interviewees talked about the maker's knowledge to the medium as a decisive factor or the degree of compromise that had resulted from a lack of knowledge whereas several stated that the quality of moving image depended on the quality i.e. originality of the idea behind it.

Many of our interviewees talked about problems learning software. Student interviewees stated that their learning motivation increased significantly when they were able to work with their own footage and thus learnt software through development of individual ideas as opposed to group inductions. They suggested extended individual software support given by a dedicated member of staff to improve the learning situation.

However, to for example employ software instructors to demonstrate particular software functions individually to students would be an unrealistic and costly solution that would not necessarily promote independent learning. A surface approach to software learning could actually have devastating consequences for professional practice because the technological developments as illustrated by the annual Horizon-report (see annotated bibliography), demand life-long learning due to frequent releases of new software types; versions within each; and media formats. It is therefore very important to take a deep approach to software learning and encourage students to learn how to solve problems rather than to solve particular, individual problems for them.

Our questionnaire showed that students mainly use each other for artistic and technical support. A more realistic and economically feasible improvement could be to strengthen the network or community of practice with regard to software learning.

Several students talked about a right and wrong way of using software. To expect that there is a correct and an incorrect way of learning to use software is not very useful because there are many different routes to how you can achieve identical results. Subsequently different persons may show a student different ways of performing the same action within one and the same software, which can be confusing for a beginner especially if s/he expects one correct, and fast, learning process.

Students seemed to be confused about roles and who to ask for help. The common policy is that academic staff teaches academic including artistic aspects while support staff demonstrate and give students support with technical issues. However, the borders within practice-led learning and moving image technology in particular are not clear to all, which may in part be caused by the high tempo of development and the different generations and roles perceptions, expectations and attitudes to the media and how they meet perceived expectations to themselves in their respective roles.

The increasing access to digital technology is good news in many ways. In view of this we find that it is important to address the quality confusion that has followed. We think that the constructive way forward would be to strengthen the connections between the 'new' means of expression to the disciplinary traditions that they link to and thus harness the coherent learning and teaching of the moving image beyond distinctions between new and traditional media.

## **Annotated bibliography**

The project aimed to identify gaps between generations with regard to perceptions, attitudes and expectations of digital technology in relation to the learning and teaching of the moving image, and to help bridge any gaps and enhance communication between students, academic and support staff.

Four clusters of literature have been important:

The first cluster is about changes in perceptions, attitudes and expectations to the moving image that reflect recent and ongoing developments in digital technology which is relevant to "Bridging the Gap in Moving Image" and in particular to its finding that perceptions of quality are in a state of flux.

The second cluster is about artists' moving image in a historical and contemporary context. This is relevant to "Bridging the Gap in Moving Image" because it gives a context to the changing attitudes to differences and similarities between new and traditional technologies, and to how these vary in complex ways between generations, which has a great impact on the current learning and teaching of the moving image.

The third cluster is about research methods relevant for "Bridging the Gap in Moving Image": The first item was relevant because the research project combines quantitative and qualitative survey methods in the form of a quantitative questionnaire, qualitative interviews and focus group discussion. The second item was relevant because we employed digital video as a research tool. It was indeed useful because the use of such technology raises important issues of interpretation, impact and validity.

The fourth cluster is about communities of practice: this links to the finding in "Bridging the Gap in Moving Image" that has to do with the importance of student networks for learning software for example for animation, video-editing and dvd authorisation.

\* \* \*

CLUSTER 1:

### **"New Digital Cinema, reinventing the moving image" Holly Willis published by Short Cuts 2005**

The book sketches some of the shifts that have taken place over the last decade in conjunction with the rise of digital film making tools and the evolution of a new form of moving digital media art, one situated at the intersection of the formerly separate realms of filmmaking, music video animation, print design, live club events and video art.

Willis describes a shift in emphasis from production to post-production, from cinematography and lighting to editing and special effects in independent filmmaking across the 1990s. These changes in image making have been charted in magazines such as Wired, RES and The Independent. Rather than passively receiving images, these publications suggest, we can now more readily engage in the production of images. The accompanying sense of moviemaking literacy and empowerment, while indisputably circumscribed by the overwhelming power of mainstream media, is nonetheless characteristic of a remarkable transformation in our fundamental relationship to moving image culture.

### **The Horizon Report 2008 edition, The New Media Consortium and the Educause Learning Initiative**

This is an annual report that seeks to identify and describe emerging technologies likely to have a large impact on teaching, learning or creative expression within learning-focused organisations. It claims that video content production has gone grassroots, predominately with the 2-3 minute piece designed for viewing in a three-inch browser window or on a mobile phone and explains that the proliferation of video is due in large part to how easy it has become to share clips with sharing sites like YouTube, Google Video etceteras.

\* \* \*

#### CLUSTER 2:

### **Experimental Cinema in the Digital Age, Malcolm Le Grice, British Film Institute, 2001**

The book is a collection of Le Grice essays 1970 – 1999 that gives a historic account of experimental art filmmakers' thinking. He describes experimental art film as an extension of modernism in which definition of the intrinsic characteristics of a medium is a major component, and states that this is difficult to do with digital media because you can hardly define it as a single form with own characteristics. The computer is an eclectic medium that incorporates almost all previous media: the written word; pictures; cinema; tv; music and telephone.

According to Le Grice mass media and telecommunication have created a cultural schism between representation and the physical object, a cultural habit of reading the electronic representation as if it were present:

"Our discourse with the real has become a discourse with the represented image, a presence of the image not in conflict with its lack of physical proximity. In addition, the recorded documentation, photo, audio and cinematic, has begun to bring the historically remote into

the same condition of presence as the physically remote. Telecommunication and mass media have produced a near simultaneity of representation across space and time, which, we may treat as the real world. The image represents presence and mass culture has become wholly semiotic linking equally space, historical time, fiction and fact”.

### **Film Art Phenomena, Nicky Hamlyn, British Film Institute, 2003**

The author gives an insight into concepts of experimental or artists’ film such as framing, digital media, installation, interactivity, point of view and sound. He considers a number of works by central characters around the London Film-makers’ Co-op. He takes cue from modern trends in painting and sculpture which is relevant to “Bridging the Gap in Moving Image” because of its aim to inspire connections between new and traditional technologies.

Especially beneficial was the way in which Hamlyn describes interaction with a painting or a sculpture (p.156): “When we interact with a painting or a sculpture, we are constrained in various ways. But these constraints do not prevent us from retuning to a work repeatedly, each time to find something new, or rather to experience a different kind of interaction. It is the fact that the work exists in a certain form, with which we then engage, that makes the experience meaningful. Furthermore, the constraints we experience come increasingly to be seen as contributory, as we come to a better understanding of a given work”.

\* \* \*

### CLUSTER 3:

#### **“A Methodological Framework for Combining Quantitative and Qualitative survey methods”, Marsland N, Wilson I, Abeyaskera S, Kleih U**

The paper discusses the benefits of combining quantitative and qualitative methods and different ways of doing this. It details a variety of ways in which qualitative and quantitative methods may be combined to improve trustworthiness of survey and experiment findings.

#### **“Digital Video as Research Practice: Methodology for the Millenium” W. Shrum, R. Duque and T. Brown, Journal of Research Practice 1 (1), Article M4, 2005**

The article provides a primer on digital video, focusing on the technology as a methodology rather than simply a new medium for recordings. It gives a very clear overview of digital video methodology

and its roots in ethnography, current practice, and why and how their international project came to employ it as a research tool.

**Learn Higher website:** [www.learnhigher.ac.uk/analysethis](http://www.learnhigher.ac.uk/analysethis) accessed **29/01/2009**

The site has been useful e.g. for general approaches to identify research problems, searching the existing literature base and developing questions and/or hypothesis.

\* \* \*

CLUSTER 4:

**"Communities of practice", the encyclopaedia of informal education, M.K. Smith, 2003**

**Etienne Wenger (1999) Communities of Practice. Learning, meaning and identity, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 318 + xv pages.**

The book offers extended discussion of the concept of community of practice and how it might be approached within organisational development and education. Wenger does for example discuss how it is more important for students to have experiences that allow them to take charge of their own learning rather than to cover a lot of material. This corresponds with the "Bridging the Gap in Moving Image" finding that students perceive that they learn better when working with their own video footage and that their learning motivation increases when they thus learn software through exploring ideas they already have an interest in.

# Appendices

## **Appendix 1:**

- 1.1. Interview Invitation
- 1.2. Information Sheet
- 1.3. Consent Form

## **Appendix 2:**

- 2.1. Student Questionnaire
- 2.2. Academic Staff Questionnaire
- 2.3. Support Staff Questionnaire

## **Appendix 3:**

- 3.1. Student Interview Themes
- 3.2. Academic Staff Interview Themes
- 3.3. Support Staff Interview Themes

## **Appendix 4:**

- 4.1. Student Focus Group Invitation
- 4.2. Information Sheet
- 4.3. Consent Form

[MI Interview Invitation]

Dear Students/Academic Staff/Support Staff [delete as appropriate and use personal name when appropriate],

“Bridging the Gap in Moving Image: Connecting New and Traditional Technologies for Enhanced Communication between Students Academic and Support Staff Across Design and Arts” (*MI* for short) is a research project being carried out across the Schools of Architecture and Design and Arts and Communication, and in partnership with the Royal College of Art, London.

We would like to invite you to undertake an interview to help identify attitudes, expectations and perceptions of the current Learning and Teaching Moving Image. An example question would be: “What kind of connections do you see between new and traditional technology, how do they conflict or complement each other?”

The interview will be of an informal nature and take about 20 minutes.

We will maintain confidentiality and respect your privacy. Should you wish we would ensure that your contribution is made anonymous, and you would be able to withdraw from the interview at any point without giving a reason.

Participants are welcome to our interim Design Scholarship Seminar 25<sup>th</sup> February. 2 students each from Photography, Sculpture, Graphic Design and Illustration will be invited to participate in a focus group Spring 2009. We will make a documentary-style video of the research and would therefore like to record the interviews (see the attached consent form).

The interviews will take place [location] [date & hour]

The attached information sheet outlines the project’s aims and activities, and more background information is available on the following link:

<http://cetld.brighton.ac.uk/projects/current-projects/bridging-the-gap-in-moving-image>

All the best,

The MI Core Project Team

Sol, Phil, John and Sina

S.Sneltvedt@brighton.ac.uk



**“Bridging the Gap in Moving Image: Connecting New and Traditional Technologies for Enhanced Communication between Students, Academic and Support staff Across Arts and Design”** (*MI* for short)

This CETL-D project is being carried out across the Schools of Architecture and Design and Arts and Communication, and in partnership with the Royal College of Art, London. The purpose of the research is to help identify attitudes to, and expectations and perceptions of the learning and teaching of the moving image. We are interested in the differences and similarities in moving image learning and teaching structures at the RCA and UoB.

Through a series of recorded interviews, students and staff are invited to share their views of the current learning and teaching of moving image. We are going to use a short paper questionnaire and conduct individual interviews of approximately 20 minutes with all participants. We intend to record approximately 30 interviews divided between students (15), academics (9) and support staff (6). If you don't want to be recorded, that's fine. If you're happy for your interview to be recorded but then change your mind about appearing in it, that's fine too: we would edit you out or make your image anonymous. If anyone accidentally gives confidential information in a recording, this will be edited out.

If you would like to see how the project is going, you're welcome to our Work-In-Progress Design Scholarship Seminar will take place at CETL-D 25<sup>th</sup> February 2009 16:00 – 17:30

We would also like to carry out a focus group discussion in four afternoon workshops with two students from each of the departments of Photography; Graphic Design; Illustration and Sculpture over 4 weeks. If there are more volunteers for this than places available, we'll draw lots. The focus group discussion and workshops will take place in Spring 2009.

Our outcomes include a documentary video of our research activities that we will publish on the CETLD website. Anyone who wants a summary version of our research results, please contact Sol Sneltvedt [S.Sneltvedt@brighton.ac.uk](mailto:S.Sneltvedt@brighton.ac.uk) More information about the background for the project is available on the following link:

<http://cetld.brighton.ac.uk/projects/current-projects/bridging-the-gap-in-moving-image>

Our project team includes Senior Lecturer Phil Taylor, Senior Technician John Warr, Video Demonstrator Sina Krause, Academic Leader Lawrence Zeggen, Subject Leader Judith Katz and Partner RCA Tutor Stuart Croft. Lecturer and Researcher Sol Sneltvedt is the project leader.

All the best,

The MI Core Project Team  
Sol, Phil, John and Sina

**UNIVERSITY OF BRIGHTON**  
**Participant Consent Form**  
**Bridging the Gap in Moving Image**

- ◆ I agree to take part in this research which is to ***Identify attitudes, expectations and perceptions of the current learning and teaching of Moving Image***
  
- ◆ The researcher has explained to my satisfaction the purpose, principles and procedures of the study and that there are no possible risks involved.
  
- ◆ I have read the information sheet and I understand fully the principles, procedures and possible risks involved.
  
- ◆ I am aware that I will be required to answer questions.
  
- ◆ I understand that any confidential information will be seen only by the researchers and will not be revealed to anyone else.
  
- ◆ I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason.
  
- ◆ I agree that should I withdraw from the study, the data collected up to that point may be used by the researcher.
  
- ◆ I give the Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning through Design full copyright and authority to publish or place on the CETL-D website, extracts from sound and video recordings for educational purposes.

Name (please print)

.....

Signed

.....

Date

.....















## **Interview Questions 1) STUDENTS**

**Moving Image** [video and animation for screenings off or online; video installations, video sculpture, pop-up ads, tv and cinema advertisement – film production exempt]

GROUND RULES: LET THE INTERVIEWEE TALK, DO NOT INTERRUPT, ALLOW SILENCES/ TIME FOR INTERVIEWEE TO THINK, PROMPT WHEN NECESSARY BY SAYING THINGS LIKE THIS SOUNDS INTERESTING, TELL ME MORE ETCETERAS

**Intro question:** What is your favourite MI artwork/design? Where and when seen?

### **1) Perceived differences between professional and amateur MI:**

Fine art students: What do you think are the major differences between an art film/video and a video only intended for friends & family/home video?

Design and Illustration students: What do you think are the major differences between a television ad and a home video?

### **2) Expectations versus experiences of the MI working processes:**

Tell us about your experience of working with moving image:

ONLY USE THE BELOW IF NECESSARY

- Have you had any surprises with regards to **how much time** you've used compared to how much time you expected to use when working with MI?
- Have you had any surprises with regards to the **level of artistic and/or technical challenges** compared to what you expected to use when working with MI?

Tell me more (prompt if necessary with easiest and/or most difficult part of the working process, change over time 1Y until now)

*(Working processes: Filming/collection of video footage; Editing that footage; Publishing including exhibitions; installations; screenings, web publication; Documenting MI work (as part of your course work))*

### **3) Perception of division technical and artistic MI qualities**

Does it make sense to you to distinguish between artistic and technical support for MI? Why/why not?

### **4) Connections new and traditional technologies**

Do you see any connections between today's MI technologies and traditional technologies (for example art film/video and painting/sculpture)?

### **5) Ideas for improvements**

What would improve the learning & teaching of MI on your course or at the University? Any other comments?

## **Interview Questions 2) ACADEMIC STAFF**

**Moving Image** [video and animation for screenings off or online; video installations, video sculpture, pop-up ads, tv and cinema advertisement – film production exempt]

GROUND RULES: LET THE INTERVIEWEE TALK, DO NOT INTERRUPT, ALLOW SILENCES/ TIME FOR INTERVIEWEE TO THINK, PROMPT WHEN NECESSARY BY SAYING THINGS LIKE THIS SOUNDS INTERESTING, TELL ME MORE ETCETERAS

*Intro question: Do you have favourite mi artwork/design? Where and when seen?*

### **1) Perceived differences between professional and amateur MI:**

Fine art staff: What do you think are the major differences between an art film/video and a video only intended for friends & family (home video)?

Design staff: What do you think are the major differences between a television ad and a home video?

### **2) Expectations versus experiences of the MI working processes:**

Tell us about your students' experience of working with moving image

ONLY USE THE BELOW IF NECESSARY

- Any surprises with regards to your students **time** consume or **level of artistic and/or technical challenges**?

Tell me more (prompt if necessary with easiest and/or most difficult part of the working process, change over time)

*(Working processes: Filming/collection of video footage; Editing that footage; Publishing including exhibitions; installations; screenings, web publication; Documenting MI work (as part of your course work))*

### **3) Sense of network technical and artistic support / Perception of division technical and artistic MI qualities**

When you come across a technical MI problem beyond your own expertise what do you do?

ONLY USE THE BELOW IF NECESSARY

How do you in general find the MI communications between academic, support staff and students?

Does it make sense to you to divide between technical and artistic MI qualities? ONLY USE THE BELOW IF NECESSARY

Would you say that artistic and technical qualities collide? Do you find that technical challenges in general decide over artistic qualities and challenges or the other way around? How are the connections between technical challenges and artistic implications as a result?

### **4) Assessing MI work**

Is there a difference in how you assess MI work compared to other artwork/design and in case how? ONLY USE THE BELOW IF NECESSARY

Does it make sense to you to divide between artistic and technical qualities when assessing a student's MI work? How much would you say that artistic and technical qualities impact upon each other when assessing MI work?

How are the connections between technical and artistic qualities as a result?

### **5) Connections new and traditional technologies**

Do you see any connections between today's MI technologies and traditional technologies (for example art film/video and painting/sculpture)? What is/ is anything special with new technology?

**Ideas for improvements**

### **Interview Questions 3) SUPPORT STAFF**

**Moving Image** [video and animation for screenings off or online; video installations, video sculpture, pop-up ads, tv and cinema advertisement – film production exempt]

GROUND RULES: LET THE INTERVIEWEE TALK, DO NOT INTERRUPT, ALLOW SILENCES/ TIME FOR INTERVIEWEE TO THINK, PROMPT WHEN NECESSARY BY SAYING THINGS LIKE THIS SOUNDS INTERESTING, TELL ME MORE ETCETERAS

*Intro question: Do you have favourite mi artwork/design? Where and when seen?*

#### **1) Perceived differences between professional and amateur MI:**

Fine art staff: What do you think are the major differences between an art film/video and a video only intended for friends & family (home video)?

Design staff: What do you think are the major differences between a television ad and a home video?

#### **2) Expectations versus experiences of the MI working processes:**

Tell us about your students' experience of working with moving image

ONLY USE THE BELOW IF NECESSARY

- Any surprises with regards to your students **time** consume or **level of technical and/or artistic challenges**?

Tell me more (prompt if necessary with easiest and/or most difficult part of the working process, change over time)

Do you follow a student's project through all/some/which the stages of the working processes

*(Working processes: Filming/collection of video footage; Editing that footage; Publishing including exhibitions; installations; screenings, web publication; Documenting MI work (as part of your course work))*

#### **3) Sense of network technical and artistic support / Perception of division technical and artistic MI qualities**

How do you in general find the MI communications between support staff, academics and students?

When you come across a technical MI problem beyond your own expertise what do you do?

Does it make sense to you to divide between technical and artistic MI qualities? ONLY USE THE BELOW IF NECESSARY

Would you say that artistic and technical qualities collide? Do you find that technical challenges in general decide over artistic qualities and challenges or the other way around? How are the connections between technical challenges and artistic implications as a result?

#### **4) Connections new and traditional technologies**

Do you see any connections between today's MI technologies and traditional technologies (for example art film/video and painting/sculpture)? What is/ is anything special with new technology?

#### **5) Ideas for improvements**

Dear [Student name],

“Bridging the Gap in Moving Image: Connecting New and Traditional Technologies for Enhanced Communication between Students Academic and Support Staff Across Design and Arts” (*MI* for short) is a research project being carried out across the Schools of Architecture and Design and Arts and Communication, and in partnership with the Royal College of Art, London.

We would like to invite you to take part in an afternoon focus group session to help identify attitudes, expectations and perceptions of the current learning and teaching of the moving image. We are particularly interested in your expectations and experiences of the time involved in learning the moving image.

The focus group session will take place in the Grand Parade Board, Mezzanine floor room M2 Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2009 at 13:00 pm until 17:00 pm

Lunch will be provided at 13:00 pm. Please RVSP to [S.Sneltvedt@brighton.ac.uk](mailto:S.Sneltvedt@brighton.ac.uk) to confirm your attendance.

We will make a documentary-style video of the research and would therefore like to record the session (see the attached consent form).

We will maintain confidentiality and respect your privacy. Should you wish we would ensure that your contribution is made anonymous, and you would be able to withdraw from the focus group session at any point without giving a reason.

The attached information sheet outlines the project’s aims and activities, and more background information is available on the following link:

<http://cetld.brighton.ac.uk/projects/current-projects/bridging-the-gap-in-moving-image>

All the best,

The MI Project Team

Sol, Phil, John and Sina

[S.Sneltvedt@brighton.ac.uk](mailto:S.Sneltvedt@brighton.ac.uk)

**“Bridging the Gap in Moving Image: Connecting New and Traditional Technologies for Enhanced Communication between Students, Academic and Support staff Across Arts and Design” (MI for short)**

The CETL-D project with the above title is taking place across the Schools of Architecture and Design and Arts and Communication, and in partnership with the Royal College of Art, London. The purpose of the research is to help identify attitudes, expectations and perceptions of the learning and teaching of the moving image.

The research began in October 2008 and since then more than 30 recorded interviews with students and staff at the University of Brighton and the Royal College have been accomplished. We now would like to carry out a focus group discussion in order to go deeper into some of the issues that were raised during our interviews for example the expectations and experiences of the time involved in the learning of the moving image.

We are inviting two students from each of the departments of Photography; Graphic Design; Illustration and Sculpture. If there are more volunteers for this than places available, we'll draw lots.

The focus group session will take place in the Grand Parade Board, Mezzanine floor room M2 Thursday 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2009 at 13:00 pm until 17:00 pm

We will make a documentary-style video of the research and would therefore like to record the session (see the attached consent form).

We will maintain confidentiality and respect your privacy. If anyone accidentally gives confidential information in the recording, this will be edited out. Should you wish we would ensure that your contribution is made anonymous, and you would be able to withdraw from the focus group session at any point without giving a reason. The video will be published at the CETL-D website for educational purposes.

Anyone who wants a summary version of our research results, please contact Sol Sneltvedt [S.Sneltvedt@brighton.ac.uk](mailto:S.Sneltvedt@brighton.ac.uk) More information about the background for the project is available on the following link:

<http://cetld.brighton.ac.uk/projects/current-projects/bridging-the-gap-in-moving-image>

Our project team includes Senior Lecturer Phil Taylor, Senior Technician John Warr, Video Demonstrator Sina Krause, Academic Leader Lawrence Zeggen, Subject Leader Judith Katz and Partner RCA Tutor Stuart Croft. Lecturer and Researcher Sol Sneltvedt is the project leader.

All the best,

The MI Core Project Team  
Sol, Phil, John and Sina

**UNIVERSITY OF BRIGHTON**  
**Participant Consent Form**  
**“BRIDGING THE GAP IN MOVING IMAGE”**

- ◆ I agree to take part in this research which, is to ***Identify attitudes, expectations and perceptions of the current learning and teaching of Moving Image***
  
- ◆ The researcher has explained to my satisfaction the purpose, principles and procedures of the study and that there are no possible risks involved.
  
- ◆ I have read the information sheet and I understand fully the principles, procedures and possible risks involved.
  
- ◆ I am aware that I will be required to participate in discussion. The discussion is to be recorded, and parts of the recordings may be published for educational purposes. All recordings will be stored securely and only used for the purpose of the project.
  
- ◆ I understand that any confidential information will be seen only by the researchers and will not be revealed to anyone else.
  
- ◆ I understand that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason.
  
- ◆ I agree that should I withdraw from the study, the data collected up to that point may be used by the researcher.
  
- ◆ I give the Centre for Excellence in Teaching and Learning through Design full copyright and authority to publish or place on the CETL-D website, extracts from sound and video recordings for educational purposes.

Name (please print)

.....

Signed

.....

Date

.....