STARS

Electronic Theses and Dissertations, 2004-2019

2011

Media Literacy Standard Implementation In Florida Perceptions Of High School Principals And Language Arts Curriculum Leaders

Andrew L. Ritchie
University of Central Florida

STARS Citation

University of Central Florida

STARS
Showcase of Text, Archives, Research & Scholarship

MEDIA LITERACY STANDARD IMPLEMENTATION IN FLORIDA:
PERCEPTIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS AND LANGUAGE ARTS
CURRICULUM LEADERS

by

ANDREW L. RITCHIE
B.A. Rollins College, 1997
M.A. Rollins College, 2003

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the School of Teaching, Learning, and Leadership
in the College of Education
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, FL

Fall Term
2011

Major Professor: Rosemarye T. Taylor

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to measure the extent to which educators in Florida public high schools perceived the Florida Media Literacy Standard to be implemented within their schools. This study also identified strategies that school leaders were using to successfully implement the Florida Media Literacy Standard and any perceived barriers to the implementation process. The Florida Media Literacy Standard was designed to address decision-making and critical thinking skills with regards to research, evaluation, and communication with various types of media. The standard was introduced in Florida public schools in 2007 with its inclusion in the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. High school principals and Language Arts Curriculum Leaders (LACLs) in the English/ Language Arts area were participants in this research because of their role in determining curriculum goals in Florida public schools. The Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire was sent to the principal and the department head of the English department in each participating school district. The results of this study suggested that those high school principals and LACLs that completed the Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire perceived the Florida Media Literacy Standard to be implemented in their schools. Over 80% of principals and LACLs reported "strongly agree" or "agree" with statements that reflected active implementation processes in school classrooms. Principals and LACLS reported use of the school Media Specialist, attendance at

professional development and learning sessions, and making use of Professional Learning

Communities as valuable strategies toward implementing the Florida Media Literacy

Standard. Time and access to technology were two of the most commonly cited

perceived barriers to the implementation process. Principals and LACLs both reported

limited Media Center access for teachers due to standardized testing practices in Florida

public high schools. Although many principals and LACLs reported that they perceived

the Florida Media Literacy Standard to be implemented in their schools, the low response

rate of 24.18% and conflicting data with regards to perceived barriers raise questions

about the extent to which the results of this study can be generalized to the population of

Florida public high schools. Further research is recommended to clarify the conflicting

responses related to perceived barriers to implementation such as interviewing

participants.

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, Michele. You are the best thing that ever

happened to me and I love you no matter what.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people worked long, difficult hours to make this dissertation happen. I'd like to start by thanking my parents for all their love and financial support. I know they believed in me and wanted me to succeed the entire time. Their positive influence and encouragement helped me get through some long nights. The deadline for financial support was also a strong motivator.

I'd like to thank my wife Michele for her never-ending support and encouragement. She never once let me doubt that I could make it. She was the one who got to see this in the making. She was on the front lines dealing with the thrills of each success and the valleys of each draft that was sent back with more edits to make. She always believed I could make it even when I fell on the floor asleep.

I'd like to thank my son Owen for being such a ray of sunshine through a sometimes difficult journey. His smiles and joy helped me remember why I was accomplishing this. I want him to know that I accomplished this so he can be proud of his dad and know that if you set your mind to something, it can be done. This dissertation is proof that if I can accomplish great things, he can too.

I'd like to thank Dr. Rose Taylor for her endless editing, feedback, and timely encouragement. Obviously, without her this would not have been finished. She was patient with me when I lost my patience and wise when I needed wisdom. I appreciate her dedication to this process because I know her schedule was extremely full as well.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

The need for students to learn about and master skills associated with critical thinking, comprehension, and production of communication mediums has become increasingly relevant and is called media literacy. Media literacy is defined by the National Association for Media Literacy Education (NAMLE) (2011) as, "The ability to access, analyze, evaluate, and communicate information in a variety of forms including both print and non-print messages" (p.1). Research indicated the amount of media usage among people had steadily increased with advancements in communication mediums (Postman, 1985; Potter, 2011; Tyner, 1998). Ransford (2005) found that almost 70% of an average person's day included some form of media use. In particular, media use among children ages 8-18 was so common that a report by the Kaiser Family Foundation (2010) referred to this generation as the "M Generation." According to Turow (1997), advertising and entertainment programs had the ability to shape people's understanding of their society. This shaping included the development of cultural patterns and other social, political, and economic activities. The Ontario Ministry of Education reported in the 1980s that, "All the mass media with which we come into contact contain messages about values, beliefs, and behaviors and, in addition, are shaped by economic factors" (1989, p.3). Research by Semali (2000) suggested that students in various academic settings should have the opportunity to analyze mass media and popular culture. Semali

reported that this analysis should include the study of television, magazines, popular music, and other media avenues.

In response to the growing prevalence of a variety of communication mediums among high school aged students, the state of Florida established a Media Literacy Standard for all grades K-12. The section of the standard that targeted 9-12 students required that, "The student develops and demonstrates an understanding of media literacy as a life skill that is integral to informed decision making" (FDLOE, 2011). This Media Literacy Standard was embedded in the Reading/Language Arts Subject Area of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards adopted in 2007 (FLDOE, 2011). Its accompanying benchmarks stressed that students be able to:

> . . . distinguish between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in print and non-print media. . . . ethically use mass media and digital technology in assignments and presentations, citing sources according to standardized citation styles. . . . demonstrate the ability to select print and non-print media appropriate for the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation. (FLDOE, 2011, Standards Page)

Although Media Literacy incorporated the use of technological devices, its emphasis was on the development of critical thinking skills that were "integral to informed decision making" (FLDOE, 2011). This emphasis was echoed in many

standard definitions of media literacy, including the one from NAMLE (2011) that

defined media literacy in the following way: ". . . to help individuals of all ages develop

the habits of inquiry and skills of expression that they need to be critical thinkers,

effective communicators and active citizens in today's world" (p. 1). Older definitions of

media literacy stressed the importance of critical thinking as well. Media literacy,

according to Hall (1998), proposed that literacy involved learning to understand the

socially constructed nature of knowledge and experience as expressed in written and

spoken language, "It is essentially about being aware of the processes that produce

knowledge" (p. 185). Other earlier definitions, such as this passage from Lewis and

Jhally (1998), highlighted the importance of what purpose media messages had in society

and why it was important for citizens to understand the role messages played in the larger

cultural context:

> Media literacy, in short, is about more than the analysis of messages, it is
>
> about an awareness of why those messages are there. It is not enough to
>
> know that they are produced, or even how, in a technical sense, they are
>
> produced. To appreciate the significance of contemporary media, we need
>
> to know why they are produced, under what constraints and conditions,
>
> and by whom. (p. 111)

Megee (1997) stated that the basic tenets of media literacy were access, analysis, evaluation, and production. "Media literacy is a new, expanded view of traditional literacy, which acknowledges and includes the role and the impact of the mass media" (p.2). One of the earliest, most widely accepted definitions came from Aufderheide (1993) who stated that media literacy was, "The ability of a citizen to decode, evaluate, analyze and produce both print and electronic media" (p. 1). Media literacy was also defined as citizenship education, "Only an individual with access to, and mastery of, the tools of modern communication is adequately prepared for responsible citizenship" (Megee, p. 4).

With these definitions in mind, the Media Literacy Standard was embedded in the Reading/Language Arts subject area of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. Although there are benchmarks for all grade levels, this study is only focused on implementation practices for grades 9-12. Implementation of this standard was the responsibility of Florida public school English/Language Arts and Reading Teachers. In addition, principals also had a responsibility for ensuring that the Media Literacy Standard was taught in the classrooms of their schools. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to assess the extent to which high school principals and language arts curriculum leaders (LACLs) reported implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in grades 9-12.

Conceptual Framework

As far back as 1989, the Ontario Ministry of Education stated, "The need to study the media in a critical and coherent way has become increasingly obvious in the recent years, as they have come to occupy a central position in the cultural and political life of the Western world" (p. 5). More recent research indicated that teaching new media literacies such as credibility assessment could be useful for 21st century citizenship (Kahne, Feezell, & Lee, 2010). To be a participating member of modern society it was important to understand how new technologies worked to create messages, who created those messages, and for what purpose those messages were being created (Hobbs, 2007; P21).

Research by Galligan (2001) found that students who took courses in the arts and humanities developed skills such as creativity and innovation. These skills, she suggests, were important to America's ability to stay competitive in the international economy. Hobbs (2005) summarized the perception of many media educators when she stated that, "Media literacy is recognized as an essential skill required for citizenship" (p. 16).

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills defined Information and Media Literacy Skills as, "Analyzing, accessing, managing, integrating, evaluating and creating information in a variety of forms and media" (P21, 2002, p. 9). Developing media literacy skills had the potential to make students more marketable in the workplace, more effective as global citizens, and more aware of the cultural forces working to shape their values, beliefs, and behaviors (Hobbs, 2007; P21, 2011).

In addition to defining the term media literacy, researchers took the approach of defining what constituted a media literate person. A media literate person was defined by the Canadian Association of Media Education Organizations (CAMEO) (2010) as: "one who has an informed and critical understanding of the nature, techniques and impact of the mass media as well as the ability to produce media products" (p.1). The Center for Media Literacy (CML) took the simple definition of media literacy and created core concepts to facilitate media education in the classroom. CML's Five Core Assumptions were: (a) all media messages are constructed; (b) media messages are constructed using a creative language with its own rules; (c) different people experience the same media message differently; (d) media have embedded values and points of view; and (e) most media messages are organized to gain profit and/or power (CML, 2005, p.8).

Media Literacy as a 21st Century Skill

Media literacy was widely recognized as an important skill for success in the 21st century global job market (Buckingham, 2003; CAMEO, 2010; CML, 2010; FLDOE, 2007; Gallagher, 2007; Hall, 1998; Hobbs, 2005; P21, 2011; Trilling & Fadel, 2009). However, little progress was made in the U.S. to fully integrate media literacy standards into the mainstream educational curriculum compared with countries like Canada, Australia, Scotland, and other European nations (Arke & Primack, 2009; Kubey, 2003; Megee, 1997). Sixty percent of teachers surveyed by Cable in the Classroom responded that media literacy was emphasized in schools, "Less than it should" (Gallagher, p. 10).

6

In addition, as far back as the 1980s, other countries had integrated media literacy standards into their mainstream educational courses as prerequisites, regular courses, and college preparatory classes (Kubey, 2003).

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2011), reported that media literacy was an important 21st century skill for students to know. According to the partnership, media literacy was one of the ". . . critical systems necessary to ensure 21st century readiness for every student" (p. 1). They also stated that "Twenty-first century standards, assessments, curriculum, instruction, professional development and learning environments must be aligned to produce a support system that produces 21st century outcomes for today's students" (p. 1). Providing professional development, supporting the ongoing efforts of teachers to improve their teaching, and supervising the teaching of state standards were all important functions of effective school leaders (Glatthorn & Jailall, 2009).

Research by Hobbs and Frost (1998) found that media literacy initiatives attempting to reach large numbers of students needed a program of staff development plus support and enthusiasm from a large number of faculty. In their research, they found that teachers also needed to feel confident before introducing new approaches in their classrooms. Hobbs and Frost found that media literacy skills were highest for those students who participated in programs of instruction where the following criteria were met: media education activities were integrated across all subject areas; teachers generated their own activities; connections were developed across subject areas; analysis

and production activities were included; and instruction in various genres were used including news, documentary, and advertising.

Jolls and Grande (2005) stated that the principle behind media literacy and the arts was that they should inform each other as disciplines for teaching and learning and that both disciplines could be integrated into other academic areas while meeting state standards. Project SMARTArt demonstrated that when teachers combined media literacy and the arts, they met education standards if teachers had proper training, practice, and structure. Jolls and Grande stated that, "With a deeper understanding of media literacy, teachers help their students to learn in a new way, preparing students with lifelong-learning skills of critical analysis and self-expression applicable in a global media culture" (p. 25).

Barnwell (2009) stated, "If we forsake teaching and assessing such skills [media literacy], our schools will not be helping facilitate the growth of responsible citizens" (p. 23). Providing instruction in media literacy could help further the educational goals and objectives of educational institutions striving to develop critical thinkers and critical thinking skills as part of the overall curriculum (Arke & Primack, 2009). Megee (1997) reported, ". . . the inability to exchange ideas through text has denied nonreaders and non-writers full access to the richness of their own culture, has limited educational, social and professional opportunities, and has hampered informed participation in local and national policy decisions" (p. 23).

The Role of the Principal

The role of the principal in the school setting was instrumental in ensuring that there was a coherent plan to a media literacy program (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1989). The Ministry of Education reported that a sequential media-studies program was essential in avoiding overlap, duplicating activities, and using media production technology from year to year. "To avoid duplicating activities and audio-visual materials each year, teachers, department heads, and principals will have to plan a coherent and, in many cases, a sequential media-studies program" (p.13).

The atmosphere of high stakes testing, global competition and accountability highlighted the role of the principal as a 21st century curriculum leader (Glatthorn & Jailall, 2009). Several media educators argued that media literacy was not only an important curriculum (AASL, 2007; Hobbs, 2005; Trilling & Fadel, 2009), but that it also should be implemented across the curriculum (Jolls & Grande, 2005; Ontario Ministry of Education, 1989; Vance, 2010; Wheatley, Dobbs, Willis, Magnan, & Moeller, 2010). According to Glatthorn and Jailall, "Curriculum integration does not just evolve; the principal deliberately leads the process as part of curriculum leadership" (p. 107). Megee (1997) stated that the role of the principal was important in determining support for in-service training and professional learning. Jolls and Grande reported teachers needed proper preparation before teaching new subjects such as media literacy. Proper preparation came in the form of professional learning, consistent practice, and developing knowledge, understanding, and skills. The conclusion of their study revealed that teachers

were able to meet state education standards while teaching media literacy if they had the right training, practice, and structure.

Obstacles to Media Literacy Implementation

Kubey (2003) stated, "The fact that the term *media literacy* is now increasingly recognized by citizens and political leaders marks a substantive advance in the U.S. Still, most calls for formal media literacy training in the United States have gone unheeded" (p. 59). According to Kubey, there were many obstacles to the process of implementing media standards into school curriculum. One problem was the relative isolation of media educators from one another in the United States. Other problems involved parents who stated they would rather have their children *computer* literate than *media* literate. Parents reported feeling that computer literacy would have a greater earning potential in the future for their child. Kubey found that ethnic, racial, and religious diversity tended to increase debate and slow the ability of various education groups to gain consensus on numerous issues. The lack of advanced level examinations to legitimize the field, lack of recognition that language arts instruction might extend beyond print, and very few central locations where teachers could get support, encouragement, and/or instruction were also hindrances to media literacy's acceptance.

Additional obstacles found by Kubey (2003) included the following: a lack of formal teacher training in colleges and universities; educational systems that focused almost exclusively on reading and writing; teachers who voiced concerns over adding

10

more to the curriculum; veteran teachers who felt threatened by the encouragement of student's critical autonomy; and competing voices from the Popular Arts paradigm versus the Inoculative paradigm. What has received little attention in the research has been the extent to which the Florida Media Literacy Standard has been implemented in public high school classrooms.

Statement of the Problem

According to a survey conducted by the California based Strategies for Media Literacy, teachers in the U.S. stated they would like to teach media literacy more often, but were inhibited by lack of time and teaching materials (Megee, 1997). With so many obstacles to the successful implementation of media literacy education and so little awareness around how media literacy was defined, the problem to address was identifying when and where successful implementation of the Florida Media Literacy Standard was taking place. The roles of the principals and LACLs were important features of implementing media literacy programs in schools.

Purpose of the Study

Principals and LACLs were the main participants in the implementation process of the Florida Media Literacy Standard because the Media Literacy Standard was embedded in the Reading and Language Arts subject area of the Florida Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. The aim of this study was to assess the extent to which

principals and LACLs reported implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in their schools. This study also attempted to identify specific strategies and perceived barriers used by principals and LACLs to successfully implement the Florida Media Literacy Standard.

Definitions of Terms

Central Florida: Region of Florida defined by Florida Counties Maps (2011) as "Central Florida," "Central East," and "Central West."

Florida Media Literacy Standard: Standard 3 within the Strand of Information and Media Literacy in the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (see Appendix G).

High School Principal: Current principal of a high school in the central Florida region.

Language Arts Curriculum Leader (LACL): Chair, Leader, Organizer, or Head of a High School English/Language Arts Department.

Literacy: The ability to encode and decode symbols and to synthesize and analyze messages (NAMLE, 2011).

Media: All electronic or digital means and print or artistic visual used to transmit messages (NAMLE, 2011).

Media Education: The study of media, including 'hands on' experiences and media production (NAMLE, 2011).

Media Literacy: The ability to access, analyze, evaluate, and communicate information in a variety of forms including both print and non-print messages (NAMLE, 2011).

Media Literacy Education: The educational field dedicated to teaching the skills associated with media literacy (NAMLE, 2011).

Technology Standard: "The student develops the essential technology skills for using and understanding conventional and current tools, materials and processes" (FLDOE, 2011, p.1).

Research Questions

1. To what extent do high school principals report implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard?

2. To what extent do Language Arts Curriculum Leaders report implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard?

3. What are strategies used to implement the Media Literacy Standard in Florida high schools?

4. What barriers exist to the successful implementation of the Media Literacy standard in Florida high schools?

Table 1

Research Questions and Data Sources

Research Questions	Data Sources
Question #1	Questions 2-15
To what extent do high school principals report implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard?	
Question #2	
To what extent do Language Arts Curriculum Leaders report implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard?	Questions 2-15
Question #3	
What are strategies used to implement the Media Literacy Standard in Florida high schools?	Questions 1, 16, 17, 20
Question #4	
What barriers exist to the successful implementation of the Media Literacy standard in Florida high schools?	Questions 18, 19, 21

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to assess the extent to which principals and LACLs

reported implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in Florida high schools using

a non-experimental, mixed-mode research design. High school principals and LACLs

14

were selected using a stratified cluster sampling. Stratification was based on region, size of the school district, and personnel role.

School districts that had more than five high schools that served any portion of the student population in grades 9-12 in the central Florida region were invited to participate. A request to conduct research was submitted to the school district. Once the research request was accepted by the school district, questionnaires were then administered to principals and LACLs in each of the participating schools. Data were analyzed at the conclusion of the collection process using an evaluation of means and standard error, exploratory factor analysis, and qualitative analysis.

Participants

Of the 67 school districts in Florida, 14 were invited to participate in this research. Requests to conduct research were sent to all 14 districts and 11 school districts granted permission to conduct research in their district. Principals in this study were defined as those who were active high school principals in the central Florida region within one of the 11 school districts that participated in this study between May 1 and October 15, 2011. LACLs were defined as any active department chair, department head, or leader in a language arts department of their high school during the same time period. The total population invited to participate in the study was 150 principals and 156 LACLs.

Instrumentation

The Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire (MLQS) (Appendix A) was used to assess the perceptions of principals and LACLs towards the implementation of media literacy in their school curriculum. The questionnaire was developed and conducted using the Tailored Design Method which was, ". . . a set of procedures for conducting self-administered surveys that produce both high quality information and high response rates" (Dillman, 2000, p. 29). A focus group of one assistant principal and eight Language Arts teachers at a central Florida high school was convened prior to sending questionnaires to actual participants. This focus group gave expert input concerning the content of the questionnaire providing content validity.

Procedures

After approval by the University of Central Florida Internal Review Board, a focus group was conducted with one assistant principal and eight Language Arts teachers at a central Florida high school. Questions were edited based upon the feedback from the focus group participants. Once the questions were determined to be easily understood, clear, concise, and in a logical order, the final questionnaire was programmed into SurveyMonkey.com. Participants were then notified of the questionnaire either on-line or through the USPS.

Participants received an introduction letter notifying them of a questionnaire they were about to receive, the purpose of the questionnaire, and specific instructions for

16

completing and returning the questionnaire to the researcher (Appendix B). The second

contact notified the participant that the questionnaire was available by either following

the attached link in an email message or completing the paper and pencil version included

with the letter (Appendix C). Three subsequent contacts were delivered to those

participants who had not responded that reminded them of the importance of the research

and the time restraint required to complete it. The first reminder (or third contact) was

the "Reminder/Follow up Letter One" (Appendix D). The second reminder (or fourth

contact) was the "Reminder/Follow up Letter Two (Appendix E). The third reminder (or

fifth contact) was the "Final Contact Notification" (Appendix F). A five contact method

had shown increased response rates in survey research (Dillman).

The questionnaire was completed and submitted either electronically or through

the United States Postal Service back to the researcher. Each questionnaire was codified

in alpha-numeric order to maintain participant anonymity and confidentiality and entered

into PASW Statistics GradPack 18.

Data Analysis

This study utilized exploratory factor analysis to assess the factor groupings of

questionnaire items, an evaluation of mean scores among principals and LACLs, and

qualitative analysis to analyze potential barriers and successes to implementing the

Florida Media Literacy Standard.

Delimitations

One delimitation deals with the make-up of the sample. A stratified cluster sampling procedure incorporating districts from all regions could have been employed to better represent principals and LACLs in Florida.

Limitations

One limitation was the limited sample to the central Florida region. Of the 67 school districts in the state of Florida, 14 school districts were invited to participate in the research study. Of the 14 districts invited, 11 school districts granted permission for the research to be conducted. The sample consisted of 150 principals and 156 LACLs from these 11 school districts in central Florida.

The limited overall response rate of 24.18% was another limitation to this study. The highest rate of return was 75.00% in School District 3 where paper and pencil questionnaires were sent to participants. The participants in the other districts received the questionnaire through the email system. The highest rate of return for a school district that used the email system was 38.10% in School District 7. This overall low response rate raised concerns that there may have been something systematically different about the majority of participants who did not respond.

Significance of the Study

Assessing the extent to which principals and LACLs perceived the implementation process in their schools provided a greater understanding of the state of implementation in Florida in 2011. Also, any obstacles to implementation that existed were identified. By comparing perceptions between principals and LACLs, this research helped identify potential barriers to implementing the Media Literacy Standard across the curriculum. It also helped identify effective methods for delivering media literacy instruction with the potential to help teachers better prepare students for participation in the 21st century workplace.

Summary

In 2007, the state of Florida introduced the Media Literacy Standard in the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS). The standard was embedded in the language arts subject area of the NGSSS under the strand of Information and Media Literacy. Principals and Language Arts teachers were the primary people in Florida public schools who were responsible for implementing the Media Literacy Standard into their curricula. The purpose of this study was to understand the extent to which principals and LACLs perceived the Media Literacy Standard to be implemented within the classrooms of their schools. The following chapters outlined how this research question arose. This researcher utilized journals, online journals, books, internet resources, and curriculum materials to gather information about Media Literacy and leadership.

19

Chapter Two contains a review of the literature in media literacy implementation, school leadership, and school standards for media literacy in Florida. This researcher used journals, online journals, books, and internet resources to gather information for the literature review. The chapter contains a discussion of the role that school leaders play in implementing curriculum standards along with a historical look at the definition of literacy and how it has changed.

Chapter Three contains an outline of how the research was conducted. Chapter Three has a full description of the methodology, participants, and the procedures involved in conducting the study and analyzing the results.

Chapter Four details the findings of the study and presents important data concerning the number of principals and LACLs who responded and how their responses compared between leadership positions. Chapter Five contains important findings and conclusions that were drawn from the results as well as recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The introduction of the Florida Media Literacy Standard into Florida Public Schools occurred in 2007 with its inclusion in the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. By introducing the media literacy standard into Florida Public Schools, Florida made the statement that media literacy was an important skill for students to know. However, there was still a question as to how many teachers were actually teaching media literacy skills as outlined in the Media Literacy Standard. This study reviewed literature from online and print journals such as the Journal of Media Literacy Education, American Behavioral Scientist, Canadian Journal of Educational Communication, Educational Media International, Screen Education, Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, Social Education, Journal of Communication, Journal of Popular Film and Television, Teacher Librarian, Journal of Advertising, Australian Screen Education, Communication Education, New Jersey Journal of Communication, Arts Education Policy Review, The Harvard Journal of Communications, Television and New Media, Journal of Visual Literacy, Emergency Librarian, International Journal of Learning and Media, and Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media. A number of databases were utilized such as Communication and Mass Media Complete, PsycARTICLES, Directory of Open Access Journals, Education Full Text, Wiley-

Blackwell Online, Academic Search Premier, DMLcentral Working Papers, ERIC, and

JSTOR. Key words used in the searches for articles were media literacy, critical

thinking, standards, advertising literacy, visual literacy, language arts standards,

leadership, communication standards, principal and media literacy.

The internet was used as well to search for information. The internet search

included websites such as the Florida Department of Education, the Center for Media

Literacy, the National Association for Media Literacy Education, frankwbaker.com, and

the Partnership for 21st Century Skills. Books that contained information about media

literacy, standards, leadership, and curriculum were also referenced throughout to provide

a complete review of relevant literature.

This chapter is organized into three sections to provide the reader with a thorough

explanation of how media literacy was defined, a historical perspective on how media

literacy has changed, and an exploration of the role school leaders in high schools play in

implementing media literacy curriculum. The first section presents how society has

changed over the past 100 years with the introduction of new technologies, how

educators around the world have responded to this change, and what specifically Florida

has done to incorporate these changes into its curriculum. The section ends with an

explanation of how media literacy educators defined media literacy and what constituted

media literacy education.

The second section includes a historical review of how media literacy education

began, a documentation of the successes and failures of some of the major strategies for

teaching students about media, and an explanation of where media literacy resided in relation to school curriculum.

The final section explored the role teachers and school leaders played in implementing the media literacy standard in Florida. Obstacles to implementing the standards in classrooms as well as successful experiences from schools and school districts that have contributed to the media literacy of their students were discussed as well.

The topic of media literacy centered around the definition of the term literacy. The Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2004) reported that a person who was literate is, "educated" and "able to read and write" (p. 420). However, the world went beyond the printed word as a major medium for communication – there was an evolution of technology which included the television, the internet, photography and motion pictures (Postman, 1992; Tyner, 1998). Within each of these mediums lies a unique set of procedures to make communication possible (Postman, 1992). Research by Baker (2011) showed that all 50 states currently have media literacy as a standard embedded within the English/Language Arts subject area. The problem was that most teachers were still unaware of what media literacy was and how it should be taught (Kubey, 2003).

The M Generation

With a growing number of technologies available for communication, Americans spent more and more time with various media (Potter, 2011). Although television was

23

the most prominent medium, other mediums such as MP3 players, Internet, video, and personal computers were so commonly used among children ages 8-18, a report by the Kaiser Family Foundation (2010) referred to this generation as "M Generation" for their focus on media use. Average Americans spent nearly half of all their free time watching television (Kubey, 2003). According to Levine & Levine (1996), more than half of U.S. students watched more than three hours of television per day on weekdays, and 60% of parents rarely or never limited their child's television viewing habits. Miller (2005) reported children sat in front of television, video, and computer screens from four to five hours per day. In the United States, 79% of people ages 12 and older reported having been online in 2005 (Project for Excellence in Journalism, 2006). The Center for Media Design (2005) reported on an average day people spent about two-thirds of their waking hours interacting with media. A survey of 1,100 adolescents aged 12-17 conducted by Pew Internet & American Life Project in 2005 found that 87% of participants surveyed used the Internet, 51% went online daily, 81% played online games, 76% obtained news online, 75% of online adolescents used instant messaging, and 33% had used a cellphone to send a text message (Lenhart, Madden, & Hitlin, 2005). In Australia over half of children aged 5-12 used media – in particular television– for more than two hours per day (RACP, 2004).

Advertising and entertainment programs shaped peoples' understanding of society (Maeroff, 1998; McLuhan, 1964; McLuhan & Fiore, 1967; Postman, 1985, 1992; Pratkanis & Aronson, 2001; Turow, 1997; Zengotita, 2005) and media literacy was

becoming a focus of attention in education (Hobbs, 2007; Potter, 2011). The Ontario

Ministry of Education (1989) put it simply, "All the mass media with which we come

into contact contain messages about values, beliefs, and behaviors and, in addition, are

shaped by economic factors" (p.3). Educators were faced with the reality of the

information age (P21, 2011). The question of what skills students needed to be prepared

to function with technological tools arose out of the growing awareness of a changing

social, political, and economic world (FLDOE, 2007; P21, 2011). The consequences of

not teaching media literacy were potentially destructive (Pratkanis & Aronson, 2001;

Collins, 2009; McLuhan & Fiore, 1967; Postman, 1992.) People who did not learn to

understand and be critical of their media use could possibly fall victim to its seductions

and ploys, and may passively consume harmful material in the form of information and

material products (Pratkanis & Aronson).

Research by RobbGreico & Hobbs (2009) found that when students actively

processed media they thought about what they viewed and what it meant to them in

relation to their beliefs, values, and habits thereby improving their critical thinking skills.

However, when students passively used media, they reacted emotionally without active

cognition. Megee (1997) reported that people who could not read and write might not

have had the same opportunities to participate fully in their society for lack of ability to

communicate and be involved in the democratic process. Megee suggested that the same

may be true for people who are media illiterate.

Media Literacy Around the World

In 1993, Aufderheide reported that Canada had mandated media literacy as part of their formal schooling curriculum for grades 7-12 in Language Arts programs. There were many important elements to the integration of media literacy into the curriculum such as having a grassroots base, active support from boards of education, in-service training, consultation for staff members, teacher materials, professional organizations, evaluations, and collaborative opportunities among parents, teachers, and researchers. Aufderheide also reported that a voluntary program had begun in Germany in grades 5-10 with the following goals: (a) to compensate for negative media effects, (b) to lead students to reflective reception, (c) to educate students to authoritative use of all media, and (d) to encourage students to create media themselves.

A survey of media literacy initiatives worldwide in 1992 revealed at least 20 countries that had some form of media education available for school aged children (Bazalgette, Bevort, & Savino, 1992). In Europe alone, six countries had developed media education programs (French & Richards, 1994). Burton (2006) reported media literacy was included in the curriculum for very young children in Australia since at least the time of his report in 2006.

In Australia, changes in the curriculum to include media literacy were implemented as a positive strategy that recognized the importance of media education for children from a very young age (Burton, 2006). However, little progress was made in the United States to fully integrate a media literacy curriculum into the mainstream

educational agenda compared with countries like Canada, Australia, Scotland and other

European nations (Kubey, 1998, 2003; Megee, 1997). Other countries integrated media

literacy standards into their mainstream educational courses as prerequisites, regular

courses, and college preparatory classes (Kubey, 2003). Tyner (1998) stated that the

language arts subject area was a logical place to embed media education within a

discipline, and Zancanella (1994) reported that traditional disciplines needed to embrace

media education in an environment of high-stakes testing.

Florida's Media Literacy Standard

The Florida Media Literacy Standard was created to address the needs of a 21st

century world. It was developed with the understanding that media literacy is an

important life skill that is important for effective life functioning (Yecke, 2007). The

standard read, "The student develops and demonstrates an understanding of media

literacy as a life skill that is integral to informed decision making" (FLDOE, 2011). The

FLDOE (2007) reported the information rich world students engage with required skills

for accessing, evaluating, and using information to solve problems and make decisions.

In a report by Jerald (2008) for the National Governor's Association, education

was seen as one of the most important levers in the age of globalization. Specifically,

jobs were requiring that students be proficient in math, reading, solving unfamiliar

problems, and communication. According to the report, the United States was seeing a

decline in international competitiveness as a result of lower rankings on international

27

tests. American 15-year-olds ranked 25th in math and 21st in science achievement on the most recent Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) conducted in 2006.

The changing face of the global economy led to the development of the Florida Media Literacy Standard and because of its focus on communication and critical thinking skills determined that it should be housed in the Language Arts Subject Area (Yecke, 2007). The benchmarks for grades 9-12 stated that: (a) The student will distinguish between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in print and non-print media, (b) the student will ethically use mass media and digital technology in assignments and presentations, citing sources according to standardized citation styles, and (c) the student will demonstrate the ability to select print and non-print media appropriate for the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation. According to Yecke, one reason for revising the Florida standards to include Media Literacy was to ensure the teaching of skills that were needed for postsecondary success and work in the 21st century.

Media Literacy and 21st Century Skills

Media literacy was widely recognized as an important skill for success in the 21st century global job market (Buckingham, 2003; CAMEO, 2010; CML, 2010; FLDOE, 2011; Gallagher, 2007; Hall, 1998; Hobbs, 2005; P21, 2011; Trilling & Fadel, 2009). However, little progress was made in the U.S. to fully integrate media literacy standards

into the mainstream educational curriculum compared with countries like Canada, Australia, Scotland and other European nations (Kubey, 2003).

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills (2011) reported that media literacy was an important 21st century skill to learn. According to the partnership, media literacy is one of the ". . . critical systems necessary to ensure 21st century readiness for every student" (p. 1). They said, "Twenty-first century standards, assessments, curriculum, instruction, professional development and learning environments must be aligned to support a system that produces 21st century outcomes for today's students" (p. 1).

Media literacy educators emphasized that students should have opportunities to analyze mass media and popular culture from televisions, magazines, popular music, advertising, newspapers, videogames, and the internet (Collins, 2009; Semali, 2000; Stein, 1979). Research conducted by Galligan (2001) found that students who study arts and humanities developed skills such as creativity and innovation that were important to America's ability to compete in the international economy. Hobbs (2005) summed up a perception of media literacy education by stating, "Media literacy is recognized as an essential skill required for citizenship" (p. 16).

Providing instruction in media literacy helped further the educational goals and objectives of educational institutions striving to develop critical thinkers or critical thinking skills as part of the overall curriculum (Arke & Primack, 2009; Mihailidis, 2009). "If we forsake teaching and assessing such skills [media literacy], our schools will not be helping facilitate the growth of responsible citizens" (Barnwell, 2009, p. 23).

29

As far back as 1989, the Ontario Ministry of Education reported, "The need to study the media in a critical and coherent way has become increasingly obvious in the recent years, as they have come to occupy a central position in the cultural and political life of the Western world" (p. 5). Regardless of the value placed upon various forms of media it was important to understand how new technologies worked to create messages, understand who created the messages, and for what purpose the messages were being created (Aufderheide, 1993; Beach, 2007; CML, 2010; Hobbs, 2007; Potter, 2011). Developing media literacy skills had the potential to make students more marketable in the workplace, more effective as global citizens, and more aware of the cultural forces working to shape their values, beliefs, and behaviors (CML, 2010; FLDOE, 2007; Hobbs, 2007; P21, 2011; Potter, 2011).

What is Media Literacy?

As new technologies for communication became mainstream, the need for a new definition of literacy became apparent (Kress, 2003; Schwarz, 2005; Semali, 2000; Tyner, 1998). The old definition of literacy as being able to read and write printed text was no longer sufficient when information was transmitted through many different mediums (CML, 2010). Media literacy has often been included with other types of literacy such as advertising literacy (Malmelin, 2010), commercial media literacy (Eagle, 2007), television literacy (Morris, 1993), information and technology literacy (Derry, 2008), and digital literacy (Berson & Berson, 2003). Some research has even divided

media literacy into three distinct types of media literacy; media content literacy, media grammar literacy, and medium literacy (Meyrowitz, 1998).

There were many definitions of media literacy with almost all of them variations of Aufderheide's (1993) which was, "The ability of a citizen to decode, evaluate, analyze, and produce both print and electronic media" (p.1). Another definition was the one from Potter (2011) that suggested media literacy was a set of perspectives that were actively used to expose ourselves to the mass media and interpret the meaning of the messages we encountered. Megee (1997) found the basic tenets of media literacy were access, analysis, evaluation, and production. Megee also described media literacy as citizenship education, "Only an individual with access to, and mastery of, the tools of modern communication is adequately prepared for responsible citizenship" (p. 4).

Research by Baker (2004) found that media literacy referred to composing, comprehending, interpreting, analyzing, and appreciating the language and texts of both print and non-print media. This, according to Baker (2004), suggested an expanded definition of text which could include both print (books, magazines, newspapers, etc.) and non-print (photographs, videos, movies, performing arts, etc.) media. Beach (2007) reported that media literacy developed the kinds of skills that traditionally have been associated with print – comprehending messages, interpreting social purposes, defining connections or links, critiquing assumptions and formulating ideas. A media literate person was defined by the Canadian Association of Media Education Organization (CAMEO, 2010) as: "one who has an informed and critical understanding of the nature,

techniques and impact of the mass media as well as the ability to produce media products" (p.1) According to Potter (2011),

> When you are media literate, you have clear maps to help you navigate better in the media world so that you can get to those experiences and information you want without becoming distracted by those things that are harmful to you. You are able to build the life that *you* want rather than letting the media build the life *they* want for you. (p.9)

The Center for Media Literacy (CML) (2005) went beyond the simple definition of media literacy to propose core concepts to accompany media education. CML's Five Core Assumptions were: (a) all media messages are constructed, (b) media messages are constructed using a creative language with its own rules, (c) different people experience the same media message differently, (d) media have embedded values and points of view, and (e) most media messages are organized to gain profit and/or power (p.6).

The National Association for Media Literacy Education (NAMLE) (2010) defined media literacy as a system of critical thinking, ". . . to help individuals of all ages develop the habits of inquiry and skills of expression that they need to be critical thinkers, effective communicators and active citizens in today's world" (p. 1). According to NAMLE, a media literate person was capable of doing two things: analyzing media and creating media products.

What tied these definitions together was the focus on the development of critical thinking skills. As Lewis and Jhally (1998) explained, media literacy was not just about being aware that media messages were there and how to create them. Media literacy was about knowing why those messages existed and how they got there. For a student to be "educated" or "literate" in today's world, media literacy educators were suggesting students needed to learn to think critically about the messages they received and created in a variety of formats (CML, 2010; Hobbs, 2007; Lewis & Jhally).

Media Literacy Perspectives

According to research by Tyner (1998), the question of literacy goes back at least as far as Plato and before the time of written language. Prior to writing, cultures relied mainly on oral traditions to pass information from one generation to another. An educated person relied on memory to recall important dates, facts, and information to solve problems. Developing a person's capacity for memory was seen as an essential skill for participation in a democratic society. Debate ensued between those who felt the invention of writing was a useful tool for education and those who felt strongly that the oral tradition should remain.

As the technology of writing became more widespread with Gutenberg's invention of the printing press in the 15th century, the technology of writing became a permanent fixture in the modern world (Tyner, 1998). However, with the invention of the color photograph, moving pictures, the internet, computers, interactive digital

programs and other mediums of electronic communication in the 20th century, another

debate had emerged (CML, 2010). The increased number of television sets in people's

homes, the increased use of the internet, and the growing supply of and demand for

information were road signs pointing to the direction of 21st century skills that included

media literacy (P21, 2011).

Emery & Rother (2002) reported that since the late 1960s a philosophical stance

regarding the teaching and learning of English had been developed that enabled teachers

to include the study and production of media. Since the development of literacy was seen

as directly tied to the learning of language, the concepts of literacy had, likewise, evolved

to include all forms of media. By the 1960s, Canada and Britain were teaching radio,

film, television, and popular music alongside poetry, fiction, creative writing and

grammar (Emery & Rother). "Language Arts education is about providing learners

opportunities to use and investigate language in all its various dimensions, so that they

can come to terms with the ideas of the world in which they live and can act critically,

creatively and consciously on that world" (Emery & Rother, p. 101). According to

Emery & Anderson (1995, as cited in Emery & Rother) the evolution of literacy had

come to include all forms of symbolic communication created for the purpose of

communication. Ideas in a variety of forms could be considered text suitable for

discussion in the English classroom.

Masterman (1993) summarized the media literacy evolution as it moved through

three distinct phases of theoretical conceptualization. The inoculative paradigm

(McLuhan, 1964; Postman, 1985), the Popular Arts paradigm, and the representational

paradigm. According to Masterman, each paradigm had its own distinct approach to the

way in which people answered questions about the importance of studying the media.

The Inoculative Paradigm

The inoculative paradigm viewed media as a social disease. The emergence of

media literacy was in large part a response to the growing awareness that media, in

particular the television, was having an effect on the behavior and attitudes of young

children. In order to counter the effects of media consumption, as the theory was

supported, people needed to be protected against strategies the media used to manipulate

the audience. Some of the first researchers to illustrate the effect that people had on each

other were Bandura, Ross, and Ross (1961). Bandura et al.'s research demonstrated the

theory of social learning and modeling. Bandura et al. revealed that children would

repeat aggressive acts if they saw others do them. They were among the first researchers

to question how much of an impact a medium like television could have on children.

Bandura et al.'s research raised the concern that with students spending as much time as

they did interacting with various media, should they be educated about the impact various

media have on human behavior?

Other researchers, educators, and authors proposed similar questions of media's

influence over people - in particular, children. McLuhan (1964) was one of the most

popular educators to voice his opinion that people needed to be cautious of the power of

new technologies to influence others. Postman & Powers (1992) also warned against

media's influence over people. As a result of these early warnings against media's

influence over the thoughts and behaviors of people, Masterman (1993) concluded that

media literacy took on a protectionist approach against media technology. Masterman's

research revealed that the new technology was so engaging, educators were often at odds

with their students about appropriate mediums to study in school. As a result, students

were often turned off by media literacy because it contradicted their positive experiences

with the various technological mediums. Educators then took a different approach. They

realized that the new technology was there to stay and decided that it must claim its right

to a place in the popular culture (Masterman).

The Popular Arts Paradigm

As educators that grew up in the generation before television began to move out

of the school system, a new generation of teachers emerged that were quite familiar with

new technologies of learning. Masterman (1993) explained that new teachers were much

more willing to see media technologies as important parts of popular culture. However,

there was still a view that there were certain types of media that were better than others.

Therefore, much of media education during the Popular Arts period was aimed at

distinguishing between good quality media and poor quality media (Masterman).

Unfortunately, this paradigm did not last for some of the same reasons the

inoculative paradigm did not. For one, since there was still the sense of good quality

media vs. poor quality media, there still existed the belief that electronic media was poor and much of this idea again contradicted the experiences of most students. Teachers were still taking the stance that certain types of media were superior to others and the goal of the educational experience was to enlighten students to those more refined tastes (Masterman, 1993). Media literacy was primarily concerned with the artistic expression of film and had run its course by the 1970s. It wasn't until the field of semiotics offered another perspective on understanding media that the next paradigm was ushered in.

The Representational Paradigm

The approach that is most widely accepted among media educators in the past 20 years was referred to as the representational paradigm (Masterman, 1993). This approach to media education saw media as representing reality through various mediums with a variety of implications socially, economically, and politically. The field of semiotics was able to release media studies from its specific hold on the idea that it simply reflected reality. Semiotics ideology suggested that all media were representations of reality. Values, beliefs, and other factors played a major role in shaping the medium's message.

From this paradigm, educators saw their role in educating students to think critically about, analyze, and create their own media texts. According to the Ontario Ministry of Education (1989), this current view of media held that media was not necessarily good or bad just representative of a certain point of view.

Virtually all that we know, or think we know, about the world beyond our immediate experience comes to us through the media. There would be little problem with this if the media simply reflected reality. But, in fact, we now know that each medium of communication shapes or "codifies" reality in different ways, and we can no longer consider any message in any medium to be neutral or value free. (p. 3)

Therefore, it was important to think critically about who created the text, for what purpose, and using which strategies. With this approach, a variety of mediums were open to discussion about issues such as power, politics, values, and hegemony. The educational system as a powerful hegemony was open for debate (Friere, 1970). Media literacy was becoming less learning with technology and media and more learning about it (Masterman, 1993). The understanding that media was not the dispenser of an objective knowledge base but a co-creator of knowledge was an important shift in thinking that led to the critical media literacy approach (Masterman).

The Critical Media Literacy Approach

With the representational paradigm of media and a new awareness of the importance of teaching about technology instead of just teaching with it, some media educators pointed to the importance of addressing a critical pedagogy (Cortes, 2000; Friere, 1970; McLaren, Hammer, Sholle, & Reilly, 1995; Nowak, Abel, & Ross, 2007;

Sholle & Denski, 1994). Critical pedagogy examined media from the standpoint of its

influence on people from a societal perspective. What messages did the media send?

Who owned the media and what was their political, personal, or economic agenda?

Critical media literacy proposed that literacy involved learning to understand the socially

constructed nature of knowledge and experience as expressed in written and spoken

language, and that "It is essentially about being aware of the processes that produce

knowledge" (Hall, 1998, p. 185). Lewis and Jhally (1998) summed up their definition of

critical media literacy when they said,

> Media literacy, in short, is about more than the analysis of messages, it is
>
> about an awareness of why those messages are there. It is not enough to
>
> know that they are produced, or even how, in a technical sense, they are
>
> produced. To appreciate the significance of contemporary media, we need
>
> to know why they are produced, under what constraints and conditions,
>
> and by whom. (p. 111)

The call for critical media literacy stressed the importance of decoding social

hegemony (Kellner & Share, 2005), introducing critical pedagogy at the earliest ages of

schooling (Hall, 1998), learning to be a critical consumer of media as well as cultural

creators (Collins, 2009), and unraveling the difficulties of applying critical theory to

media production (Kavoori & Matthews, 2004). Critical media literacy was not so much

about using technology to help educate students but understanding how the use of technology shaped our thoughts, beliefs, and behaviors.

<center>Implementing Media Literacy</center>

Baker (2011) found that 100% (50) of states now have a media literacy standard in the English/Language Arts Standards, 78% (39) have standards embedded in Social Studies/ History, 98% (49) have standards embedded in Health courses, and 14% (7) mandate media literacy as a separate strand in their state standards. Since media literacy was primarily an exercise in communication and critical thinking, the Florida Media Literacy Standard was embedded within the English/Language Arts Subject Area of Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (2007). Goulden (1998) found after a review of state standards on media literacy that: (a) states had adopted and were promoting a strong policy of including speaking, listening, and viewing in the Language Arts curriculum; (b) states had an acceptable, but often rudimentary vision, of the teaching and practice of speaking, listening, and media literacy; (c) states assumed the increase in speaking, listening, and viewing instruction would be carried out primarily by reading, Language Arts, and English teachers in their classrooms. Although Florida adopted a media literacy standard in 2007, there were still questions regarding the extent to which teachers actually implemented this standard into their daily teaching practice (Kubey, 2003). The lack of research on the relatively new topic opened the door to many questions about how much administrators and teachers knew about this new standard.

<center>40</center>

Despite its large size, the study of media literacy was a relatively new scholarly undertaking with almost all of the literature produced in less than three decades (Potter, 2010).

Regardless of where the media literacy standard may have been housed, Pungente (1993), identified seven elements that were crucial for media education to be implemented in schools: (a) teachers wanted to teach about media in the classroom, (b) school administrators were supportive of the program, (c) teacher-training institutions had faculties and policies capable of training teachers who practiced media literacy concepts, (d) school districts supplied ongoing in-service opportunities, (e) consultants were available for training support and to establish communications networks with teachers, (f) media education resources were readily available to teachers and students, and (g) support groups, preferably run by teachers, were established to arrange workshops and conferences, disseminate media education news, and to develop curricula.

Research by Scheibe (2004) found that best practices in media literacy started with posing the following six questions to students at the beginning of the year. The questions were: (a) Who made – and who sponsored – this message, and what is their purpose? (b) Who is the target audience and how is the message specifically tailored to that audience? (c) What are the different techniques used to inform, persuade, entertain, and attract attention? (d) What messages are communicated (and/or implied) about certain people, places, events, behaviors, lifestyles, and so forth? (e) How current, accurate, and credible is the information in this message? And (f) what is left out of this

message that might be important to know (p. 63)? According to Scheibe, basic principles for curriculum integration included: (a) identifying erroneous beliefs about a topic fostered by media content, (b) developing an awareness of issues of credibility and bias in the media, (c) comparing the ways different media present information about a topic, and (d) using media as an assessment tool (p. 65).

Before integrating media literacy into a curriculum unit, explained Scheibe (2004), it was important for teachers to have some training in media literacy theory and analysis. Staff development workshops and trainings were two learning options mentioned in her research. Sheibe explained, "Once teachers have developed an awareness themselves of the basic concepts and practices of media literacy, they begin to see opportunities for incorporating media literacy into their classrooms on an ongoing basis" (p. 62).

Research by Scheibe found that although students benefit from specific lessons focusing on media literacy, media production, and other media-related issues, experience revealed that most public school teachers did not provide time for this due to demands for time spent on content requirements and a "back to basics" approach (Scheibe, 2004). Despite media literacy's success, difficulties arose when teachers felt that they could not integrate media literacy skills into an already crowded curriculum (Considine, 2002).

Teacher Professional Learning

Sixty percent of teachers surveyed by Cable in the Classroom responded that media literacy was emphasized in schools, "Less than it should" (Gallagher, 2007, p. 10). However, the effective teaching of media literacy in the schools required teacher preparation that included pre-service and in-service opportunities and professional learning (Bazalgette, 1993; Goetze, Brown, & Schwarz, 2005). Unfortunately, teachers did not receive adequate professional learning in teaching media literacy (Beach, 2007).

Research by Taylor & Gunter (2009) found an important starting point for making curriculum change was recognizing that a substantial barrier to changing instructional literacy strategies was based on the teachers' lack of confidence, collaborative opportunities, and leadership abilities. Literacy leaders, said Taylor and Gunter, needed to provide professional learning that could help teachers build their confidence. Collaborating with literacy leaders afforded opportunities for teachers to learn with technology, observe literacy infusion in classroom-like environments, and teach with innovative tools in expert-supported nurturing environments (Taylor & Gunter).

"Teachers cannot teach what they have not learned, and learned to value, themselves" (Goetze, et al., 2005, p. 161). According to Yates (1997), based on a survey of 350 teachers nearly half (48%) reported lack of training as a barrier to their teaching media literacy and 84% agreed future teachers should receive training in college. The National Council of Teachers of English reported recognizing the need for more formal

education in college and professional learning opportunities for current teachers (Goetze, et al.).

Research by Jolls and Grande (2005) known as Project SMARTArt demonstrated that when teachers combined media literacy and the arts, they met education standards if teachers had proper training, practice, and structure. "With a deeper understanding of media literacy, teachers helped their students to learn in a new way, prepared students with lifelong-learning skills of critical analysis and self-expression applicable in a global media culture" (Jolls & Grande, p. 25).

According to Hobbs and Frost (1998), media literacy programs needed staff development plus support and enthusiasm from a large number of faculty members. Hobbs and Frost also noted that teachers needed to feel comfortable and confident to include new approaches, topics, and activities into their classrooms. Hobbs and Frost reported that media literacy skills were highest for those students who participated in a program of instruction where media education activities were integrated across all subject areas, teacher generated activities and materials were used, explicit connections were developed across subject areas, analysis and production activities were included, and explicit instruction in various genres were used including news, documentary, and advertising.

In order for schools to increase their overall literacy skills in students there must be many literacy leaders (Taylor & Gunter, 2009). In the case for media literacy, this meant that professional learning, improved understanding of literacy practices, and

administrative support for teachers to implement media literacy across the curriculum were necessary for successful teaching. The teaching of media literacy could not fall to just one or a few isolated teachers (Brown, 1998). Distributed literacy leadership throughout the school community was essential (Taylor & Gunter).

Obstacles to Implementation

Although there has been progress in the last two decades to define media literacy and develop some core assumptions and terminologies, media literacy still has to wait as reading, mathematics, and science take center stage. Kubey (2003) stated the term *media literacy* is now increasingly recognized by citizens and political leaders. Although this marks a substantive advance in the U.S., most calls for formal media literacy training have been left unfulfilled.

Kubey (2003) found many obstacles to the process of implementing media standards into the school curriculum. One problem was the relative isolation of media educators from one another in the U.S. Other problems involved parents who stated they would rather have their children *computer* literate than *media* literate. Parents reported feeling that computer literacy would have a greater earning potential in the future for their children. Ethnic, racial, and religious diversity tended to increase debate and slow the ability of various education groups to gain consensus on numerous issues. The lack of advanced level examinations to legitimize the field, lack of recognition that language arts instruction might extend beyond print, and very few central locations where teachers

45

could get support, encouragement, and/or instruction were also hindrances to media literacy's acceptance.

Additional obstacles included a lack of formal teacher training in colleges and universities, a lack of professional development opportunities (Kline & Stewart, 2007), an educational system that focused almost exclusively on reading and writing, teacher concerns over adding more to the curriculum, veteran teachers that found encouragement of student's critical autonomy to be threatening, and competing voices from the Popular Arts versus the Inoculative paradigm.

According to Thomas, (1987 as cited in Tyner, 1998) barriers to making successful school change in general, and media literacy specifically, included: (a) teachers' inertia, (b) satisfaction with present methods of teaching, (c) dislike for outside interference in planning instruction, (d) unwillingness to yield center stage to mechanical devices, (e) a misperception of the complexity of technology and (f) fear of making embarrassing errors when attempting unfamiliar instructional techniques.

The literature of media literacy and media education suggested that the most successful changes, the ones that move from innovation to implementation, are the ones where personal ownership and autonomy existed (Considine, 2002). A survey of media literacy programs by Pungente (1993) suggested that in countries outside the U.S. the key ingredient for success was that it was led by teachers from a grassroots level. However, media literacy was not without its critics. Media education has also been criticized as a bogus curriculum that lured students with the hopes of learning about technology and 21st

century skills but really just distracted them from the important skills of reading and writing (Hobbs, 1998). In the United States, institutional directives (ie, standards) were turning the media literacy movement into a "top-down" movement. This, Pungente explained, was antithetical to what worked in other countries.

The Role of the 21st Century Principal

Lunenburg and Irby (2006) stated, "It is the principal who must facilitate and monitor the curriculum – *and the implementation of it, instruction* – because that is the powerful vehicle by which students are transported to learning" (p.86). It became a widely accepted idea among media educators that media education is not only an important curriculum (AASL, 2007; Hobbs, 2005; Trilling & Fadel, 2009) but that it should be implemented across the curriculum (Jolls & Grande, 2005; Ontario Ministry of Education, 1989; Vance, 2010; Wheatley, Dobbs, Willis, Magnan, & Moeller, 2010). Brown (1998) explained that if principals were to successfully implement the media literacy standard throughout the curriculum they would need to collaborate with other administrators and teachers in order to build media literacy into the systematic education process. Brown also said that media literacy should not be left to itself. It should be integrated across the curriculum and across age groups to satisfy varying cognitive abilities, and it should not be left to the energy of isolated teachers. This type of curriculum integration did not just happen on its own. Glatthorn and Jailall (2009) stated, "Curriculum integration does not just evolve; the principal deliberately leads the process

as part of curriculum leadership" (p. 107). Providing professional development, supporting the ongoing efforts of teachers to improve their teaching, and supervising the teaching of state standards were all important functions of effective school leaders (Glatthorn & Jailall).

Effective school leaders focused on providing meaningful professional learning, participated in teams to establish meaningful schedules that reflected the school's vision and mission, and communicated expectations clearly with regards to state and national standards (Crow, Hausman, & Scribner, 2002; Lunenburg & Irby, 2006). Megee (1997) found the role of the principal was important in determining support for in-service training and professional learning. Pawlas and Oliva (2008) stated that it was the role of the supervisor to stimulate teachers to improve their teaching and curriculum, provide meaningful professional learning, and evaluate if that professional learning was effective.

Hobbs (1998) stated, "The most successful efforts to include media literacy in schools have taken two or more years of staff development to build a clearly defined understanding of the concept as it relates to classroom practice among a substantial number of teachers and school leaders within a school district" (p. 23-24). The Ontario Ministry of Education (1989) reported that the role of the principal in the school setting was instrumental in ensuring that there was a coherent plan to a media literacy program. The Ministry also said a sequential media-studies program was essential in avoiding overlap, duplicating activities, and using media production technology from year to year.

Research done by Lunenburg & Irby (2006) found the principal's role in the teaching and learning process was: (a) to accommodate teachers in their quest for gaining knowledge related to how the diverse student body learned best, (b) to assess the teaching as it relates to the outcome – learning, and (c) to facilitate the instructional planning process. Teachers needed to have time to make sense of experiences and transform professional knowledge into daily teaching habits (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 1999, as cited in Lunenburg & Irby). When teachers: (a) understood the practice, (b) had it modeled, and (c) practiced it in a risk-free settings with feedback, they internalized the practice, became comfortable with the practice, and attained the goals of the campus (Lunenburg & Irby).

Lunenburg and Irby (2006) also found that teachers needed to understand the "why" behind their practice in order to embrace the teaching. Therefore professional learning was pivotal to a successful media literacy program or even implementing the standard throughout the curriculum. Lunenburg and Irby noted that there was a strong relationship between a principal's leadership in curriculum project efforts and the success of both teachers and students. They went on to say that it was the principal's primary role to focus the entire staff on curriculum development, revision, or reform and empower them in their work. They also stated that the principal determines the curriculum goals and objectives related to the mission of the school and these goals may be derived from any of four sources (a) studies of society, (b) studies of learners, (c) suggestions from subject-matter specialists, and (d) from standards. In the case for media

literacy, suggestions from media literacy educators and the Media Literacy Standard were important sources of information.

The principal's role in the implementation of the Florida Media Literacy Standard in Florida Public Schools was significant. Without their understanding of the standard, their support of the implementation process and their active involvement in the professional development of their teachers, educators found it difficult to understand their role during the implementation phase of new curriculum.

Summary

The future of media literacy in Florida greatly depended upon administrators and teachers working together to establish working solutions to the problems of implementing a new curriculum in an environment of high stakes testing (Hobbs, 1998, 2005, 2007). Although it was clear that Florida Public Schools were expected to teach media literacy skills as evidenced by the standard in the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, there still seemed to be a need for implementation practices that were effective in delivering instruction. Most teachers were still unaware of what media literacy was and how to implement the skills and curriculum into their classrooms (Gallagher, 2007).

According to a survey conducted by the California based Strategies for Media Literacy, teachers in the United States stated they would like to teach media more often, but were inhibited by lack of time and teaching materials (Megee, 1997). Therefore, the role of the principal was an important feature of implementing media literacy programs in

schools. According to Hobbs (2007), in order for integration of media literacy to be realized in the U.S., it needed the support of principals and teachers. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to understand the extent to which principals and language arts curriculum leaders in Florida High Schools implemented the Florida Media Literacy Standard.

In the next three chapters, the methodology, analysis of results, and conclusions from the study are discussed. Chapter Three outlines the methods used for this study to gather data concerning the extent to which the Florida Media Literacy Standard has been implemented in Florida public high schools. Chapter Four presents the results of the Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire that was administered to principals and LACLs in Florida public high schools. Chapter Five contains a discussion of the results found from the surveys. Conclusions and recommendations for future research are addressed in Chapter Five as well.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter includes an overview of the methodology and procedures utilized to examine the extent to which principals and Language Arts Curriculum Leaders (LACLs) in Florida public high schools reported implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. The data analysis served to determine the extent to which principals and LACLs perceived implementation to be occurring in their schools. The statistical procedures used for analysis along with rationale validating the procedural choices were included.

This chapter is organized into six sections. The purpose of this study can be found in section one. Section two describes the participants for this research. Section three explains the instrument used and how it was created. Section four outlines the procedures. Section five explains the data analysis methods. Lastly, section six provides a summary of the chapter.

Purpose of the Study

Principals and LACLs were the main participants in the implementation process of the Florida Media Literacy Standard because the Media Literacy Standard was embedded in the Reading and Language Arts subject area of the Florida Next Generation

Sunshine State Standards. The aim of this study was to assess the extent to which

principals and LACLs reported implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in

their schools. This study also attempted to identify specific strategies and perceived

barriers used by principals and LACLs to successfully implement the Florida Media

Literacy Standard. Therefore, the following research questions were addressed:

1. To what extent do high school principals report implementing the Florida Media

   Literacy Standard?

2. To what extent do language arts curriculum leaders report implementing the

   Florida Media Literacy Standard?

3. What strategies are used to implement the Media Literacy Standard in Florida

   high schools?

4. What barriers exist to the successful implementation of the Media Literacy

   Standard in Florida high schools?

Participants

The population under study for this research was high school principals and

LACLs in the state of Florida. Florida had 67 school districts in 2011. A stratified

cluster sampling procedure was used to select those school districts that had more than 5

high schools and were located in the central Florida region. Of the 67 districts in the

population studied, 14 were invited to participate in this study. Of the 14 school districts

invited to participate, 11 granted permission for this research to be conducted. The

FLDOE School Indicator Report (FLDOE, 2011) provided data from the 2008-2009

school year that was used to provide a description of each school district that can be

found in Tables 2, 3, and 4.

Table 2

Student Data for School Districts 1-14

School District	Student Population by Grade 9, 10, 11, 12				Racial Distribution %						% Free & Reduced Lunch
	9	10	11	12	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Indian	Multi-Racial	
1	3372	3383	3094	3057	58.7	19.6	14.7	1.6	0.6	4.8	54.9
2	3327	3038	2977	2521	62.3	15.6	16.9	2.2	0.6	2.5	44.8
3	5992	5417	5011	4396	58.2	13.3	18.2	3.8	0.2	6.2	34.4
4	14477	13612	12264	10264	33.6	27.3	31.3	4.3	0.4	3.0	48.6
5	4588	4285	3859	2977	30.1	10.7	50.6	2.5	0.3	5.8	65.1
6	7552	7138	6154	5574	50.1	21.9	22.4	1.4	0.2	3.9	57.7
7	5721	5064	4635	3990	63.2	14.5	15.8	1.7	0.2	4.5	46.6
8	6762	5590	5192	4959	69.1	14.6	8.4	2.1	0.3	5.6	34.4
9	3299	3177	2902	2181	41.0	29.5	22.3	1.7	0.3	5.2	57.7
10	5800	5239	4668	3741	73.2	5.7	13.9	2.3	0.3	4.6	46.0
11	8331	8916	9752	7406	61.9	19.1	9.7	3.9	0.3	5.1	43.5
12	15677	14015	12911	11369	41.2	21.8	27.8	3.1	0.3	5.8	51.5
13	3594	3131	2862	2487	55.5	15.2	23.5	1.7	0.1	4.0	46.8
14	3498	3377	2972	2711	70.8	9.5	12.3	2.0	0.2	5.2	40.9

Table 3

Teacher Data for School Districts 1-14

School District	Degrees Held by Teachers				Average Years of Teaching Experience
	BA	MA	Spec.	Dr.	
1	69.5	28.0	1.6	0.9	13.52
2	69.8	29.0	0.5	0.8	11.47
3	56.4	39.8	1.9	1.9	14.26
4	70.2	28.4	0.7	0.7	11.91
5	68.9	29.4	1.2	0.6	10.13
6	76.2	22.5	0.6	0.7	11.61
7	61.5	36.2	1.5	0.9	14.16
8	65.8	32.6	0.7	1.0	13.63
9	72.9	25.5	0.6	1.0	12.09
10	68.9	30.0	0.3	0.7	11.27
11	66.9	31.8	0.4	0.9	13.96
12	68.7	28.9	2.3	0.1	11.19
13	61.9	35.2	1.4	1.4	11.93
14	48.3	49.9	0.5	1.4	13.22

Table 4

District Data for School Districts 1-14

School District	Graduation rate	Dropout Rate	District Grade
1	78.9	2.6	B
2	80.8	2.9	B
3	93.0	0.4	A
4	77.4	1.1	A
5	79.2	1.0	B
6	74.7	4.0	B
7	82.0	1.3	A
8	95.3	0.6	A
9	81.1	1.4	B
10	83.5	1.2	A
11	80.6	2.1	B
12	84.6	1.0	A
13	79.4	3.6	B
14	85.1	1.8	A

Principals in this study were defined as those who were active in the central

Florida region within one of the 11 school districts that chose to participate in the study

between May 1 and October 15, 2011. LACLs were defined as any active department

chair, department head, or leader in a language arts department. The total sample in the

study was 150 principals and 156 LACLs from 11 school districts. Some English

departments had teachers serving as co-chairs which resulted in more LACLs than

principals for this study.

Instrumentation

The Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire (MLQS) (Appendix A) was used to

assess the extent to which principals and LACLs implemented the Florida Media Literacy

Standard in their school curriculum. The questionnaire was developed and conducted

using the Tailored Design Method which is, ". . . a set of procedures for conducting self-

administered surveys that produce both high quality information and high response rates"

(Dillman, 2000, p. 29). Prior to administering the questionnaire to participants, an expert

panel was convened consisting of one assistant principal and eight language arts teachers

at a high school in central Florida.

The instrument was divided into four main sections and addressed three main

constructs. The first three sections used a Likert scale of 1-5 (1=strongly disagree,

2=disagree, 3=not sure, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree). The three main constructs were

"Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard," "Strategies for Successfully

Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard," and "Barriers to Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard."

Construct 1, Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard, was designed to assess the extent to which participants perceived the Florida Media Literacy Standard to be implemented by the Language Arts teachers in their school. For example, item 2 stated that "Language Arts teachers incorporate the Media Literacy Standard into their lesson plans." By agreeing to this statement, participants were reporting that they were aware that the Florida Media Literacy Standard was a part of the Language Arts curriculum and ought to be taught in their classrooms. Item 15 directed the attention of the participant towards one of the specific benchmarks of the Florida Media Literacy Standard. Item 15 stated, "Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in non-print media." Construct 1 is illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5

Construct 1: Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard

Item #	Statement
2	The Language Arts teachers incorporate the Media Literacy Standard into their lesson plans.
3	Language Arts teachers teach students to develop an understanding of media literacy as a life skill that is integral to informed decision making.
4	Language Arts teachers teach students to present information in print formats (such as essays, papers, written reports).
5	Language Arts teachers teach students to present information in non-print formats (such as video, art, or oral presentations).
6	Language Arts teachers teach students how to utilize print media.
7	Language Arts teachers teach student how to utilize non-print media.
8	Language Arts teachers teach students to use mass media in assignments and presentations.
9	Language Arts teachers teach students to use digital media in assignments and presentations.
10	Language Arts teachers teach students how to cite sources from print media.
11	Language Arts teachers teach students how to cite sources from non-print media.
12	Language Arts teachers teach students to select print media appropriate to the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.
13	Language Arts teachers teach students to select non-print media appropriate to the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.
14	Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in print media.
15	Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in non-print media.

The second construct— Strategies for Successfully Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard— prompted participants to report the extent to which they were made aware of the Florida Media Literacy Standard through their school leadership. Construct 2 identified strategies that led to more successful implementation of media literacy standards in schools (Hobbs, 2007). Construct 2 is illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6

Construct 2: Strategies for Successfully Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard

Item #	Statement
1	Language Arts teachers have been made aware of the Florida Media Literacy Standard.
16	The Language Arts department has met at least once during this school year to discuss ways of effectively implementing the Media Literacy Standard.
17	The Language Arts teachers in my school have attended at least one professional development training to learn more about implementing the Media Literacy Standard within the past year.
20	What is the most important action taken this year by you or the Language Arts Department to implement the Media Literacy Standard in your school?

The third construct, Barriers to Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard, prompted participants to consider potential barriers to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in Language Arts classrooms. Two major barriers identified in previous research included teachers reporting not enough time

in the day and too much attention to standardized testing (Gallagher, 2007; Kubey, 2003).

Construct 3 was illustrated in Table 7.

Table 7

Construct 3: Barriers to Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard

Item #	Statement
Item 18	The Language Arts department feels there is not enough time in the day to include the Media Literacy Standard in their lesson plans.
Item 19	Language Arts teachers do not incorporate the Media Literacy Standard because it is not assessed on the FCAT.
Item 21	What barriers exist to the successful implementation of the Media Literacy Standard in your school?

In addition to the Likert scale items 1-19, a free response section provided an opportunity for participants to write a response to questions 20 and 21. The two questions were, "What is the most important action taken this year by you or the Language Arts Department to implement the Media Literacy Standard in your school?" and, "What barriers exist to the successful implementation of the Media Literacy Standard in your school?"

Procedures

After approval by the Internal Review Board of the University of Central Florida, an expert panel was convened with one assistant principal and eight LACLs at a central

Florida high school. Questionnaire responses were compiled and feedback was used to edit questions for readability, clarity, and logic of sequence. Questions were written and organized based upon the feedback from the expert panel.

The researcher then proposed the study to the 14 identified school districts and requested permission to conduct the research. Of the 14 school districts invited, 11 either granted permission or responded to the request in time to be included in the study. Once permission was granted from the school district to administer the questionnaire to high school principals and LACLs, email addresses were obtained using the school's website and/or phone calls to the schools directly. The questionnaires were administered using the researcher's email system and delivered to the participant's school district email address via SurveyMonkey.com. One school district requested this researcher not to use the district email system. Therefore, in School District 3, surveys were printed and sent through the United States Postal Service (USPS).

Participants received an introduction email notifying them of a questionnaire they were about to receive, the purpose of the questionnaire, and specific instructions (Appendix B). In School District 3 the same procedures were followed. The difference being that the letters and surveys were sent through the USPS. The second email notified the participant that the questionnaire was available by following the attached link in the email message (Appendix C). Three subsequent emails were delivered to those participants that had not responded encouraging them to participate. The first reminder (or third contact) was the "Reminder/Follow up Letter One" (Appendix D). The second

63

reminder (or fourth contact) was the "Reminder/Follow up Letter Two (Appendix E).

The third reminder (or fifth contact) was the "Final Contact Notification" (Appendix F).

A five contact method was shown to increase response rates in survey research (Dillman,

2000). The questionnaire was completed and submitted either electronically or by USPS

back to the researcher. Each returned questionnaire was codified in alpha-numeric order

to maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of the participants.

At the conclusion of the data collection process, 11 school districts participated in

the study. School Districts 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 and 14 gave permission to

conduct the questionnaire. Although School District 12 granted permission to conduct

the research, they required that only one contact be made with the potential participants

with no follow-up reminders. Thus, the 5-contact strategy was abbreviated to one contact

in School District 12.

School Districts 6 and 13 did not grant this researcher permission to conduct the

research. School District 13 stated, "Due to budget cuts and the migration to a new

student software system there has been a limit on accepting new research projects at this

time." School District 6 denied the proposal for conducting research but did not offer an

explanation. School District 3 gave permission to conduct the study but required the

researcher to send the surveys through an alternative method other than the school

district's email system. In School District 3, the data collection process was then

conducted utilizing the United States Postal Service. After multiple attempts at obtaining

permission to conduct research in School District 9, the district did not respond and was therefore not included in the study.

Data Analysis

Exploratory factor analysis was used to assess the construct validity of the questionnaire items. An evaluation of means and standard errors was used to assess the extent to which principals and LACLs perceived the Florida Media Literacy Standard to be implemented in their respective schools. The open-ended questions— 20 and 21— gathered data concerning implementation practices and barriers associated with the implementation of the Florida Media Literacy standard. Qualitative analysis was used to identify important implementing practices and perceived barriers.

Summary

In the remaining two chapters, the results collected from the Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire will be discussed. Chapter Four reports the analysis of the data that were collected through the questionnaire. Chapter Five contains a discussion of the conclusions drawn from the analysis of results, and explains any recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Introduction

In this section, the results of the Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire will be analyzed. This chapter is divided into four main parts to address each of the four research questions. For each research question a thorough analysis of the results, including statistical procedures, is explained. The following research questions were addressed using the Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire:

1. To what extent do high school principals report implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard?

2. To what extent do Language Arts Curriculum Leaders report implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard?

3. What are strategies used to implement the Media Literacy Standard in Florida high schools?

4. What barriers exist to the successful implementation of the Media Literacy standard in Florida high schools?

The Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire

The Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire (MLSQ) was designed to measure the perceptions of high school principals and LACLs regarding the implementation of the

Florida Media Literacy Standard in their school. The instrument was created using

Dillman's (2000) Tailored Design Method as a framework for organizing questions,

sending the questionnaire to recipients, and following up using the 5-contact system.

The instrument consisted of a total 21 items. Of the 21 items, 19 were statements

that reflected various aspects of the Florida Media Literacy Standard and its

accompanying benchmarks that required participants to rate the degree to which they

agreed or disagreed with the statement. The 5-point Likert scale ranged from 1-5

(1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=not sure, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree). Items 20 and

21 were open ended questions that required participants to provide a written response.

The questionnaire was designed to assess three major constructs: (a) Implementing the

Florida Media Literacy Standard, (b) Strategies for Successfully Implementing the

Florida Media Literacy Standard, and (c) Barriers to Implementing the Florida Media

Literacy Standard.

Construct 1, Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard, was designed to

assess the extent to which participants perceived the Florida Media Literacy Standard to

be implemented by the Language Arts teachers in their school. For example, item 2

stated, "Language Arts teachers incorporate the Media Literacy Standard into their lesson

plans." By agreeing to this statement, participants reported that they were aware that the

Florida Media Literacy Standard was a part of the Language Arts curriculum and ought to

be taught in their classrooms. Item 15 directed the attention of the participant towards

one of the specific benchmarks of the Florida Media Literacy Standard. Item 15 stated,

"Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical

reasoning strategies in non-print media." Construct 1 is illustrated in Table 8.

Table 8

Construct 1: Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard

Item #	Statement
2	The Language Arts teachers incorporate the Media Literacy Standard into their lesson plans.
3	Language Arts teachers teach students to develop an understanding of media literacy as a life skill that is integral to informed decision making.
4	Language Arts teachers teach students to present information in print formats (such as essays, papers, written reports).
5	Language Arts teachers teach students to present information in non-print formats (such as video, art, or oral presentations).
6	Language Arts teachers teach students how to utilize print media.
7	Language Arts teachers teach student how to utilize non-print media.
8	Language Arts teachers teach students to use mass media in assignments and presentations.
9	Language Arts teachers teach students to use digital media in assignments and presentations.
10	Language Arts teachers teach students how to cite sources from print media.
11	Language Arts teachers teach students how to cite sources from non-print media.
12	Language Arts teachers teach students to select print media appropriate to the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.
13	Language Arts teachers teach students to select non-print media appropriate to the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.
14	Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in print media.
15	Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in non-print media.

The second construct, Strategies for Successfully Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard, prompted participants to report the extent to which they were made aware of the Florida Media Literacy Standard through their school leadership personnel. Construct 2 identified strategies that led to more successful implementation of media literacy standards in schools (Hobbs, 2007). Construct 2 is illustrated in Table 9.

Table 9

Construct 2: Strategies for Successfully Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard

Item #	Statement
1	Language Arts teachers have been made aware of the Media Literacy Standard.
16	The Language Arts department has met at least once during this school year to discuss ways of effectively implementing the Media Literacy Standard.
17	The Language Arts teachers in my school have attended at least one professional development training to learn more about implementing the Media Literacy Standard within the past year.
20	What is the most important action taken this year by you or the Language Arts Department to implement the Media Literacy Standard in your school?

The third construct, Barriers to Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard, prompted participants to consider potential barriers to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in Language Arts classrooms. Two major barriers identified in previous research were not enough time in the day and too

much attention to standardized testing (Gallagher, 2007; Kubey, 2003). Construct 3 is

illustrated in Table 10.

Table 10

Construct 3: Barriers to Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard

Item #	Statement
Item 18	The Language Arts department feels there is not enough time in the day to include the Media Literacy Standard in their lesson plans.
Item 19	Language Arts teachers do not incorporate the Media Literacy Standard because it is not assessed on the FCAT.
Item 21	What barriers exist to the successful implementation of the Media Literacy Standard in your school?

In addition to the Likert scale items 1-19, a free response section provided an

opportunity for participants to write a response to questions 20 and 21. The two questions

were, "What is the most important action taken this year by you or the Language Arts

Department to implement the Media Literacy Standard in your school?" and "What

barriers exist to the successful implementation of the Media Literacy Standard in your

school?"

Population

The sample of this study included High School Principals and Language Arts

Curriculum Leaders (LACLs) from central Florida high schools who were employed

71

between May 1 and October 15, 2011. This sample consisted of 306 educators in high

schools across the central Florida region. Of the 306 educators, there were 150 principals

and 156 LACLs invited to participate in this study. A total of 29 principals and 45

LACLs (24.18%) returned a completed questionnaire. The percentage of participants

who returned a completed questionnaire ranged from as low as 5.56% in School District

14 to as high as 75.00% in School District 3. School District 12 gave permission for the

researcher to send the questionnaire to principals and LACLs under the condition that

there would be no follow-up reminders. Therefore, in School District 12, the initial

introduction email was sent and then two days later the email with the link to the

questionnaire was provided. School District 3 required the questionnaires be sent

through an alternative means other than the school district's email system. This

researcher printed the MLQS and sent questionnaires through the USPS. The sample of

principals and LACLs with their rate of completed questionnaire returns is illustrated in

Table 11.

Table 11

Sample of High School Principals and Language Arts Curriculum Leaders

School District	Total Principals and LACLs	Number of Principals Responded	Number LACLs Responded	Total % Response Rate
School District 1	17	1	3	23.53
School District 2	14	2	3	35.71
School District 3	16	7	5	75.00
School District 4	37	6	7	35.14
School District 5	20	1	2	15.00
School District 6*	--	--	--	--
School District 7	21	2	6	38.10
School District 8	32	3	3	18.75
School District 9*	--	--	--	--
School District 10	34	3	5	23.53
School District 11	32	4	5	28.13
School District 12	65	0	5	7.69
School District 13*	--	--	--	--
School District 14	18	0	1	5.56
Totals	306	29	45	24.18

Note. A (*) identifies a school district that was invited to participate but either denied the request to conduct research in their district or did not respond within the time frame of the data collection process.

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Evidence for construct validity of the first 19 items of the MLSQ was tested using exploratory factor analysis. The first step in determining the factorability on the MLSQ was to review communalities. Communalities were reviewed to ensure that no value exceeded 1.0. Based on this review, there were no items removed from the analysis.

The initial factorability of the nineteen items was examined using common criteria, including: (a) Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy, (b) Bartlett's test of sphericity, and (c) communalities. First, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .803 which was larger than the recommended value of .50. Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant χ^2 (171) = 775.44, p < .01. It is also desirable to have communalities of .40 or above to provide evidence of shared variance among items. Communalities for all 19 items were above .40.

The principal axis factoring with direct oblimin rotation was utilized to extract factors from the data. Initial eigenvalues indicated the first six factors explained 77.77% of the variance. The remaining factors did not have eigenvalues greater than one.

Each item except Item 5 fell into one of six factors. Item 13 loaded on two factors: Factors 1 and 5. Table 12 provides the factor loading pattern matrix for the final solution for factor loading >.40.

Table 12

Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Direct Oblimin Rotation

			Factor			
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Item						
8	.84					
7	.61					
13	.60				-.51	
9	.53					
5						
1		.84				
2		.77				
16		.75				
17		.69				
3		.58				
6			.79			
4			.73			
18				.85		
19				.67		
14					-.75	
12					-.52	
15					-.43	
11						-.79
10						-.74

Note: Item 5 did not have a factor loading of .40 or above with any of the 6 factors.

Factor 1: Utilizing Non-print Media

Item 8	Language Arts teachers teach students to use mass media in assignments and presentations.
Item 7	Language Arts teachers teach student how to utilize non-print media.
Item 13	Language Arts teachers teach students to select non-print media appropriate to the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.
Item 9	Language Arts teachers teach students to use digital media in assignments and presentations.

Factor 2: Knowledge of Standard

Item 1	Language Arts teachers have been made aware of the Florida Media Literacy Standard.
Item 2	The Language Arts teachers incorporate the Media Literacy Standard into their lesson plans.
Item 16	The Language Arts department has met at least once during this school year to discuss ways of effectively implementing the Media Literacy Standard.
Item 17	The Language Arts teachers in my school have attended at least one professional development training to learn more about implementing the Media Literacy Standard within the past year.
Item 3	Language Arts teachers teach students to develop an understanding of media literacy as a life skill that is integral to informed decision making.

Factor 3: Utilizing Print Media

Item 6	Language Arts teachers teach students how to utilize print media.
Item 4	Language Arts teachers teach students to present information in print formats (such as essays, papers, written reports).

Factor 4: Barriers to Implementation

Item 18	The Language Arts department feels there is not enough time in the day to include the Media Literacy Standard in their lesson plans.
Item 19	Language Arts teachers do not incorporate the Media Literacy Standard because it is not assessed on the FCAT.

Factor 5: Propaganda and Presentations

Item 13	Language Arts teachers teach students to select non-print media appropriate to the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.
Item 14	Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in print media.
Item 12	Language Arts teachers teach students to select print media appropriate to the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.
Item 15	Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in non-print media.

Factor 6: Citing Sources

Item 11	Language Arts teachers teach students how to cite sources from non-print media.
Item 10	Language Arts teachers teach students how to cite sources from print media.

The first factor was named Utilizing Non-print Media, as these four items addressed non-print material implementation in the classroom. The second factor was named Knowledge of Standard as the five items addressed the understanding of media literacy as a Florida State Standard. The third factor was named Utilizing Print Media as the items addressed skills related to teaching students how to access and analyze print mediums. The fourth factor was named Barriers to Implementation, as the two items addressed issues related to difficulties surrounding the implementation process of the Florida Media Literacy Standard in the school curriculum. The fifth factor was named Propaganda and Presentations as the four items addressed issues related to students being able to acquire the skill of presenting information and identifying the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies through a variety of mediums. The sixth factor was named Citing Sources, as the two items addressed the skill of citing sources with print and non-print material. Internal consistency for these subscales was examined using Cronbach's alpha. The Cronbach Alpha for Factor 1 was .86, Factor 2 was .88, Factor 3 was .78, Factor 4 was .71, Factor 5 was .86 and Factor 6 was .87.

Table 13

Reliability Measures for Six Factors

	Items	Cronbach Alpha
Factor 1	8, 7, 13, 9	.86
Factor 2	1, 2, 16, 17, 3	.88
Factor 3	6, 4	.78
Factor 4	18, 19	.71
Factor 5	13, 14, 12, 15	.86
Factor 6	11, 10	.87

Research Question 1

To what extent do high school principals report implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard?

To address Research Question 1, participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with Items 2-15 on the Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire (MLSQ). Participants responded using a Likert scale from 1-5 (5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree, NA=not applicable). Items 2-15 on the MLSQ were organized into a construct called, "Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard" and designed to assess the extent to which principals and LACLs reported implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in their schools.

To understand the degree to which participants believed the standard was being implemented, responses would be answered with "5" (strongly agree) or "4" (agree). If a participant did not perceive the media literacy standard to be implemented in their school they would be more likely to have "1" (strongly disagree) and "2" (disagree) responses to Construct 1.

The extent to which high school principals reported implementing the media literacy standard was illustrated by the mean scores and cumulative percentages for each of the items 2-15. The average of the mean scores was M = 4.12 (SD = .71). The standard error was within acceptable range (SE < .20). The overall average percent of respondents that reported either "strongly agree" or "agree" with the survey items that formulated Construct 1: Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard was 83.99% (24). The highest percentage of agreement among principals was 93.10% (27) for Item 4: "Language Arts teachers teach students to present information in print formats (such as essays, papers, written reports)." The lowest percentage of agreement between principals was 65.50% (19) for Item 2: "The Language Arts teachers incorporate the Media Literacy Standard into their lesson plans." Table 16 illustrates the extent to which principals agreed that the Florida Media Literacy Standard was being implemented in their schools.

Table 14

High School Principals Report on Construct 1(N=29)

Construct 1: Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	% agree or strongly agree
Item 4: Language Arts teachers teach students to present information in print formats (such as essays, papers, written reports).	28	4.50	.69	93.10
Item 6: Language Arts teachers teach students how to utilize print media.	28	4.36	.56	93.10
Item 10: Language Arts teachers teach students how to cite sources from print media.	28	4.36	.73	89.60
Item 12: Language Arts teachers teach students to select print media appropriate to the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.	28	4.25	.44	96.60
Item 5: Language Arts teachers teach students to present information in non-print formats (such as video, art, or oral presentations).	28	4.25	.70	89.70
Item 11: Language Arts teachers teach students how to cite sources from non-print media.	28	4.21	.74	86.20
Item 14: Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in print media.	28	4.14	.59	86.20
Item 13: Language Arts teachers teach students to select non-print media appropriate to the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.	28	4.07	.54	86.20
Item 9: Language Arts teachers teach students to use digital media in assignments and presentations.	28	4.04	.88	82.80

Construct 1: Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	% agree or strongly agree
Item 7: Language Arts teachers teach students how to utilize non-print media.	28	4.00	.94	75.80
Item 8: Language Arts teachers teach students to use mass media in assignments and presentations.	28	4.00	.82	79.30
Item 15: Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in non-print media.	28	3.89	.63	79.30
Item 3: Language Arts teachers teach students to develop an understanding of media literacy as a life skill that is integral to informed decision making.	29	3.76	.83	72.40
Item 2: The Language Arts teachers incorporate the Media Literacy Standard into their lesson plans.	29	3.66	.90	65.50
Overall		4.12	.71	83.99

Note: The changing N value is a result of principals not responding to every item on the questionnaire.

Research Question 2

To what extent do Language Arts Curriculum Leaders (LACLs) report implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard?

To address Research Question 2, participants were asked to rate the degree to which they agree or disagree with Items 2-15 on the MLSQ from 1-5 (5=strongly agree, 4=agree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 2=disagree, 1=strongly disagree, NA=not applicable). Items 2-15 on the Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire were designed to

assess the extent to which LACLs reported implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in their schools. To understand the degree to which participants believed the standard was being implemented, responses would be answered with "5" (strongly agree) or "4" (agree). If a participant did not perceive the media literacy standard to be implemented in their school they would be more likely to have "1" (strongly disagree) and "2" (disagree) responses to questionnaire Items 2-15.

The extent to which LACLs reported implementing the media literacy standard was illustrated by the mean scores and cumulative percentages for each of the items 2-15. The average of the mean scores was M = 4.25 (SD = .77). The standard error was within an acceptable range (SE < .20). The overall average percent of respondents that reported either "strongly agree" or "agree" with the survey items that formulated Construct 1: Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard was 82.38% (37). The highest percentage of agreement among LACLs was 95.60% (43) on Item 4: "Language Arts teachers teach students to present information in print formats (such as essays, papers, written reports)." The lowest percentage of agreement among LACLs was 62.20% (28) on Item 2: "Language Arts teachers incorporate the Media Literacy Standard into their lesson plans." Table 17 illustrates the extent to which LACLs agreed that the Florida Media Literacy Standard was being implemented in their schools.

Table 15

LACLs Report on Construct 1(N=45)

Construct 1: Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	% agree or strongly agree
Item 4: Language Arts teachers teach students to present information in print formats (such as essays, papers, written reports).	43	4.74	.44	95.60
Item 6: Language Arts teachers teach students how to utilize print media.	42	4.55	.59	88.90
Item 10: Language Arts teachers teach students how to cite sources from print media.	42	4.48	.55	91.10
Item 11: Language Arts teachers teach students how to cite sources from non-print media.	42	4.38	.70	86.60
Item 7: Language Arts teachers teach students how to utilize non-print media.	43	4.37	.69	88.80
Item 12: Language Arts teachers teach students to select print media appropriate to the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.	43	4.28	.77	86.70
Item 5: Language Arts teachers teach students to present information in non-print formats (such as video, art, or oral presentations).	42	4.21	.90	77.80
Item 14: Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in print media.	43	4.21	.74	82.30
Item 8: Language Arts teachers teach students to use mass media in assignments and presentations.	43	4.16	.84	77.80

Construct 1: Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	% agree or strongly agree
Item 15: Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in non-print media.	42	4.14	.78	80.00
Item 13: Language Arts teachers teach students to select non-print media appropriate to the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.	42	4.12	.86	77.70
Item 9: Language Arts teachers teach students to use digital media in assignments and presentations.	43	4.12	.85	80.00
Item 3: Language Arts teachers teach students to develop an understanding of media literacy as a life skill that is integral to informed decision making.	45	4.00	1.00	77.80
Item 2: The Language Arts teachers incorporate the Media Literacy Standard into their lesson plans.	45	3.78	1.04	62.20
Overall		4.25	.77	82.38

Note: The changing N value is a result of LACLs not responding to every item on the questionnaire.

Research Question 3

What are strategies used to implement the Media Literacy Standard in Florida high schools?

To address Research Question 3, principals and LACLs responded to the open-ended prompt of Item 20. In addition, the responses to Items 1, 16, and 17 were tabulated to assess the degree to which they perceived those actions to be taking place in their

respective schools. Item 1 stated, "Language Arts teachers have been made aware of the Florida Media Literacy Standard." Item 16 stated, "The Language Arts department has met at least once during this school year to discuss ways of effectively implementing the Media Literacy Standard." Item 17 stated, "The Language Arts teachers in my school have attended at least one professional development training to learn more about implementing the Media Literacy Standard within the past year." The scores from these responses are tabulated with the open-ended responses from Item 20 to address Research Question 3.

Principals

Getting assistance from the Media Specialist to provide information, give professional learning seminars, and offer individual help was the most frequently reported strategy (4) by principals for successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. Teacher learning and professional development options were reported two times by principals and the use of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) was reported twice by principals as well. The use of a senior project and incorporating projects that required students to access multiple disciplines were also reported as effective strategies to deliver the Florida Media Literacy Standard. One time a principal reported "Discussion" as a strategy for implementing the standard and another principal incorporated Journalism and Writing classes into the curriculum. One time a principal reported that "no action" had been taken this year to implement the Florida Media Literacy Standard. The results of Item 20 are illustrated in Table 18.

Table 16

Principal Reports of Implementation Actions (N=29)

Implementation Strategies	Frequency of Strategy Reported
Assistance/Training from Media Specialist	4
Training/Professional Development Options	2
Professional Learning Communities	2
Cross-discipline Projects/Articulation	2
Senior Project/Research Paper Incorporating Standards	2
Lesson Study	1
Discussion	1
Introduced Journalism and Writing Classes	1
No Action	1

Note: Of the 29 principals who returned a questionnaire, 11 did not respond to Item 20. Some principals reported more than one strategy.

The percentage of principals that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" to Item 1 on the MLSQ which was making Language Arts teachers aware of the Florida Media Literacy Standard was 65.50% (19). The percentage of principals that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" that the Language Arts department met at least once during the school year to discuss ways of implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard was 51.70% (15). The percentage of principals that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" that Language Arts teachers had attended at least one professional development experience to

learn more about implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard was 31.00% (9).

The results to Items 1, 16, and 17 are illustrated in Table 19.

Table 17

Principals Reporting for Construct 2 (N=29)

Construct 2: Strategies for Successfully Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	% agree or strongly agree
Item 1: Language Arts teachers have been made aware of the Florida Media Literacy Standard.	29	3.59	1.02	65.50
Item 16: The Language Arts department has met at least once during this school year to discuss ways of effectively implementing the Media Literacy Standard.	27	3.48	1.12	51.70
Item 17: The Language Arts teachers in my school have attended at least one professional development training to learn more about implementing the Media Literacy Standard within the past year.	27	3.00	1.11	31.00
Overall		3.36	1.08	49.40

Note: The changing N value is a result of principals not responding to every item on the questionnaire.

LACLs

The two most frequently reported actions by LACLs in response to Item 20 was "No Action" and "project based real world learning that utilized technology" by five LACLs. The second highest frequency of responses was from four LACLs that reported "acquired knowledge of standard" as a successful implementation strategy for the Florida Media Literacy Standard. Two times LACLs reported senior projects incorporating print and non-print media. Other strategies reported only one time by LACLs were re-

evaluating the entire curriculum to find ways of including the Florida Media Literacy

Standard, using the SpringBoard curriculum, and utilizing Professional Learning

Communities. A complete list of reported strategies is provided in Table 20.

Table 18

LACL Reports of Successful Implementation Actions (N=45)

Implementation Strategy	Frequency of Strategy Reported
No Action Reported	5
Project-based Real World Learning that Utilized Technology	5
Acquired Knowledge of Standard	3
Senior Project Incorporated Print and Non-print Media	2
Re-evaluated Curriculum to Include Media Literacy	1
SpringBoard Curriculum	1
Professional Learning Communities	1
Revised Assessment to Include MLS Measurement Tools	1
Delegated to LA Teachers	1
Help from Media Specialist	1
Incorporated Into Other Standards	1
Educated Students	1
Standard was Embedded in 9-12 Curriculum	1
Communicated MLS Verbally and in Email	1
Action Research Project	1
Added Mass Media Course to Curriculum	1
Research Paper and Literary Analysis at Each Grade Level	1
Used IPads and Available Technology for Daily Research	1
Vertical Planning	1
Used Internet Articles, Online News and Newspapers in Class.	1
Youtube and Audio	1
Made Technology Available	1
Scaffolded 9-12 Plan	1
School-wide Literacy Strategy	1

Note: Of the 45 LACLs who returned a questionnaire, 12 did not respond to Item 20. Some LACLs reported more than one strategy.

The percentage of LACLs that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" to Item 1 on the MLSQ which was making Language Arts teachers aware of the Florida Media Literacy Standard was 60.00% (29). The percentage of LACLs that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" that the Language Arts department met at least once during the school year to discuss ways of implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard was 44.40% (20). The percentage of LACLs that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" that Language Arts teachers had attended at least one professional development experience to learn more about implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard was 24.40% (11). The results to Items 1, 16, and 17 are illustrated in Table 21.

Table 19

LACLs Reporting for Construct 2 (N=45)

Construct 2: Strategies for Successfully Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	% report "agree" or "strongly agree"
Item 1: Language Arts teachers have been made aware of the Florida Media Literacy Standard.	45	3.64	1.07	60.00
Item 16: The Language Arts department has met at least once during this school year to discuss ways of effectively implementing the Media Literacy Standard.	41	3.17	1.36	44.40
Item 17: The Language Arts teachers in my school have attended at least one professional development training to learn more about implementing the Media Literacy Standard within the past year.	41	2.88	1.12	24.40
Overall		3.23	1.18	42.93

Note: The changing N value is a result of LACLs not responding to every item on the questionnaire.

Research Question 4

What barriers exist to the successful implementation of the Media Literacy standard in Florida high schools?

To address Research Question 4, principals and LACLs responded to the open-ended prompt of Item 21 and responses were tabulated. In addition, the responses to Items 18 and 19 were tabulated to assess the degree to which they reported barriers in their schools. Item 18 stated, "The Language Arts department feels there is not enough time in the day to include the Media Literacy Standard in their lesson plans." Item 19

stated, "Language Arts teachers do not incorporate the Media Literacy Standard because it is not assessed on the FCAT." The scores from these responses were tabulated with the open-ended responses from Item 21 to address Research Question 4.

Principals

Ten times principals reported "time" as a barrier to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in their school. Five times principals reported that access to technology, including computers was a barrier to successful implementation of the standard. "Access" not only referred to physical access in most cases but also the cost of purchasing and maintaining computer equipment. Five times principals cited lack of complete understanding of the Florida Media Literacy Standard as a barrier to implementation. Two times principals reported that "no barriers" existed to successful implementation. Two times principals reported high stakes testing as a barrier including a focus on FCAT. Other barriers reported only one time each by principals were awareness of the value of the Media Center, a lack of consistency among teachers, and entrenched teachers who are unwilling to change their teaching methodology or are afraid to try new things. The results of Item 21 are illustrated in Table 22.

Table 20

Perceived Barriers to Implementation Reported by Principals (N=29)

Perceived Barriers to Implementation	Frequency of Perceived Barrier Reported
Time	10
Access to Technology/Computers/Materials (including cost)	5
Lack of Complete Understanding of Standard	5
No Barriers Exist	2
High Stakes Testing (FCAT)	2
Awareness of Value of Media Center	1
Consistency Among Teachers/Grade Levels	1
Entrenched Teachers	1

Note: Of the 29 principals who returned a questionnaire, 10 did not provide a response to Item 21. Some principals reported more than one barrier.

The percentage of principals that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" to Item 18 on the MLSQ which identified time as a barrier to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard was 24.10% (7). The percentage of principals that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" that attention to the FCAT was a barrier to implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard was 24.10% (7). The results of Items 18 and 19 are illustrated in Table 23.

Table 21

Principals Reporting on Construct 3 (N=29)

Construct 3: Barriers to Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	% agree or strongly agree
Item 18: The Language Arts department feels there is not enough time in the day to include the Media Literacy Standard in their lesson plans.	27	2.89	1.01	24.10
Item 19: Language Arts teachers do not incorporate the Media Literacy Standard because it is not assessed on the FCAT.	27	2.59	1.15	24.10
Overall		2.74	1.08	24.10

Note: Two principals who returned questionnaires did not respond to Items 18 and 19.

LACLs

 Twelve times LACLs reported that access to computers (including physical access in the Media Center and cost for purchasing and maintaining) was a barrier to implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. Eight times LACLs reported standardized testing, (including FCAT) to be a barrier. One time an LACL reported that out of 180 school days, the media center was only available for 73 days. The media center was closed the other 107 days for standardized testing. Time was reported seven times by LACLs as a barrier. Lack of knowledge regarding both the standard and use of technology was reported seven times by LACLs. Three times LACLs reported "none" with regards to barriers to implementing the standard. Three times LACLS reported lack of teacher buy-in or acceptance of Florida Media Literacy as a barrier to implementing

the standard. Other barriers that were reported no more than one time by LACLs were lack of relevant material for use, too many demands on Language Arts teachers, expectations to teach to the test, inability to access information due to district internet security settings, teachers being discouraged from using film in class, and a lack of understanding regarding how to execute cross curricular teaching strategies.

Table 22

Perceived Barriers to Implementation Reported by LACLs (N=45)

Perceived Barriers to Implementation	Frequency of Perceived Barrier
Access to Computers/ Media Center (including cost)	12
Standardized Testing (Including FCAT)	8
Time	7
Lack of Instructor Knowledge of Standard and Technology Use	7
None	3
Teacher Buy-in/Acceptance	3
Relevant Material	1
Too Many Demands on LA Teachers	1
Teaching to the Test	1
Inability to Access Information that is Blocked	1
Discouraged Use of Films in Classrooms	1
Understanding Cross Curricular Strategies	1

Note: Of the 45 LACLs who returned a questionnaire, 10 did not provide a response to Item 21. Some LACLs reported more than one barrier.

The percentage of LACLs that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" to Item 18 on the MLSQ which identified time as a barrier to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard was 13.30% (6). The percentage of LACLs that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" that attention to the FCAT was a barrier to implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard was 6.60% (3). The results of Items 18 and 19 are illustrated in Table 25.

Table 23

LACLs Reporting on Construct 3(N=45)

Construct 3: Barriers to Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	% agree or strongly agree
The Language Arts department feels there is not enough time in the day to include the Media Literacy Standard in their lesson plans.	41	2.66	1.09	13.30
Language Arts teachers do not incorporate the Media Literacy Standard because it is not assessed on the FCAT.	41	2.05	.92	6.60
Overall		2.36	1.01	9.95

Note: Four LACLs who returned questionnaires did not respond to Items 18 and 19.

Summary

Chapter Four presented the analysis of data collected from the sample's responses on the Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire which consisted of three Constructs that identified the extent to which principals and LACLs in Florida public schools perceived the Florida Media Literacy Standard to be implemented in their respective schools. The

questionnaire also identified important strategies that principals and LACLs reported

their teachers or themselves using to implement the Florida Media Literacy Standard.

The questionnaire also identified reported perceived barriers to the implementation

process. In the final chapter, Chapter Five, conclusions from the analysis of data in

Chapter Four are drawn and recommendations for further research are discussed.

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

In Chapter Five a discussion of the results is presented and recommendations for further research are given. This chapter is divided into four sections. In the first section, the purpose of the study is restated. The second section provides conclusions reached for each of the four research questions. The third section presents a discussion of the results. The fourth section includes recommendations for further research and suggestions for further studies regarding the Florida Media Literacy Standard or other media literacy topics.

Purpose of the Study

Principals and Language Arts Curriculum Leaders (LACLs) were the main participants in the implementation process of the Florida Media Literacy Standard because the Media Literacy Standard was embedded in the Reading and Language Arts subject area of the Florida Next Generation Sunshine State Standards. The aim of this study was to assess the extent to which high school principals and LACLs reported implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in their schools. This study also

98

attempted to identify specific strategies and perceived barriers used by principals and LACLs to successfully implement the Florida Media Literacy Standard.

Conclusions

Research Question 1

To what extent do high school principals report implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard?

The extent to which high school principals reported implementing the media literacy standard was illustrated by the overall percentage of 83.99% (24) of the respondents who reported either "strongly agree" or "agree" with the survey items that formulated Construct 1: Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. This high percentage of agreement indicated that principals perceived the Florida Media Literacy standard to be implemented in central Florida classrooms. Although the return rate for questionnaires was very low (24.18%), this finding did suggest that a trend among principals was the perception that teachers were implementing media literacy practices. Principals may have been motivated to report agreement with questionnaire items out of a desire to appear consistent with Florida state standards but this researcher makes the assumption that principals had no reason to be deceptive. There were no recognized financial or professional risks or benefits associated with reporting that schools were not implementing the Florida Media Literacy standard or that they were.

99

The four items with the highest level of agreement among principals dealt with "print" media. This finding was not surprising given that traditional Language Arts education tends to focus on written text language. The results indicated that principals perceived print media to be utilized while non-print sources remained an area of uncertainty.

Principals did not agree as strongly when Items from the MLSQ dealt with topics such as, "teaching the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in non-print media" and "teaching students to utilize non-print media." The results were consistent with findings from Kubey (2003) and Hobbs (2007) who both found that teachers had difficulty finding time and resources to teach using non-print media. This conclusion is consistent with previous research (Hobbs, 2007; Kubey, 2007) that indicated a lack of understanding amongst teachers about what media literacy was and how it should be taught. These results indicated that although media literacy was included in public school standards (Baker, 2011), principal perceptions indicated that it was not yet fully implemented in classrooms. Principals who participated in this study perceived that Language Arts teachers were implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in classrooms so long as they believed print media was being utilized.

The extent to which they agreed depended somewhat upon what type of school they worked in. One principal reported that the students at their school used Ipads daily and had continuous access to the internet. Since most schools did not offer Ipads to any of their students, this explained the lower rate of agreement among items investigating

100

the use of non-print media. Unless a school made a specific, school wide effort to incorporate technology, students often missed out on opportunities to learn media literacy skills.

Research Question 2

To what extent do language arts curriculum leaders report implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard?

The extent to which LACLs reported implementing the media literacy standard was illustrated by the overall percentage of 82.38% (37) of the respondents who reported either "strongly agree" or "agree" with the survey items that formulated Construct 1: Implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. The results suggested that LACLs in central Florida perceived that Language Arts teachers were implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in the classrooms.

The items with the highest level of agreement all included print formats. This finding was consistent with the traditional focus of Language Arts classrooms which rely heavily on printed text and writing skills to deliver Language Arts curriculum. LACLs appeared to agree more consistently when asked about the perceptions regarding print media versus non-print media. This finding is consistent with other research by Hobbs (2007), that indicated most teachers were still not sure what media literacy was and how it should be taught utilizing non-print sources.

LACLs agreed less on Items 8, 9, 13, and 15 where teachers dealt with non-print formats. Item 8 dealt with using media in assignments and presentations. Item 9 dealt with the use of digital media. Item 13 dealt with selecting non-print suitable for the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation. Item 15 dealt with distinguishing between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in non-print media. Kubey (2007) found that one of the barriers to successfully implementing media literacy in classrooms was the lack of willingness to learn how to use technology and teach through mediums with which teachers are not familiar. LACLs indicated less confidence that teachers were utilizing non-print materials compared with print materials.

Summary of Research Questions 1 and 2

The percentage of principals and LACLs that reported they perceived the Florida Media Literacy Standard to be implemented in their schools was a higher percentage than expected based on research by Kubey (2003) who reported many obstacles were in the way of successfully implementing media literacy standards in the United States. Gallagher (2007) also reported that teachers would like to teach media literacy but were inhibited by a lack of time. However, the results indicated that principals and LACLs agreed more when it came to items that addressed print media than they did when items dealt with non-print or digital media. This indicated that although principals and LACLs reported agreeing that the Florida Media Literacy Standard was being implemented in

102

their schools, the stronger perception of implementation was with print sources. There appeared to be less confidence that teachers were implementing non-print media.

Since research by Kubey and Gallagher was done in the early 2000s, it was possible that schools and school leaders have worked to implement media literacy standards since their research was conducted. Baker (2011) reported that 100% of states had media literacy standards embedded in their Language Arts curriculums. The results from this study suggested that although media literacy was perceived by principals and LACLs to be implemented in classrooms there still seemed to be a misunderstanding about what constituted non-print media. Some principals and LACLs felt that non-print was being utilized while others indicated less confidence in this practice.

Research Question 3

What are strategies used to implement the Media Literacy Standard in Florida high schools?

<u>Principals</u>

There were a number of strategies identified by principals for implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. The most commonly reported strategy, identified four times by principals, was getting assistance from the Media Specialist to provide information, give professional learning seminars, and offering individual help to teachers. Teacher training and professional development options were reported twice by principals and the use of Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) was reported twice by principals as well. The use of senior projects and incorporating projects that required

students to access multiple disciplines was also reported by 2 principals as effective strategies to deliver the Florida Media Literacy Standard. One principal reported "Discussion" as a strategy for implementing the standard and another principal reported incorporating Journalism and Writing classes into their curriculum.

The percentage of principals who reported "strongly agree" or "agree" on Item 1which was making Language Arts teachers aware of the Florida Media Literacy Standard suggested a perception of active leadership in ensuring that teachers were aware of the standards needing to be taught in classrooms. The percentage of principals who reported "strongly agree" or "agree" that the Language Arts department met at least once during the school year to discuss ways of implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard suggested that about half of the high school principals in the central Florida region perceived their Language Arts departments to be discussing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. The percentage of principals that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" that Language Arts teachers had attended at least one professional development experience to learn more about implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard suggested that principals who participated in the study were either unclear or disagreed regarding their perceptions that Language Arts teachers were attending professional learning focused on the implementation of the Florida Media Literacy Standard.

LACLs

The most frequently reported actions by LACLs in response to Item 20 which directed participants to report specific actions taken to implement the Florida Media

Literacy Standard was "No Action" and "Project –based real world learning that utilized technology." Both strategies were reported 5 times (11.11%) by LACLs. The second highest frequency of responses was for "Acquired Knowledge of Standard" and was reported 3 times (6.67%) by LACLs. Senior projects incorporating print and non-print media were reported 2 times (4.44%) by LACLs. Other strategies reported once by LACLs were re-evaluating the entire curriculum to find ways of including the Florida Media Literacy Standard, using the SpringBoard curriculum, and utilizing Professional Learning Communities.

The percentage of LACLs that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" to Item 1 which was making Language Arts teachers aware of the Florida Media Literacy Standard suggested that LACLs were making some efforts to ensure that Language Arts teachers were addressing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in their classes. The percentage of LACLs that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" that the Language Arts department met at least once during the school year to discuss ways of implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard suggested that less than half the LACLs were meeting with Language Arts teachers to discuss ways of successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. The percentage of LACLs that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" that Language Arts teachers had attended at least one professional development experience to learn more about implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard suggested that professional development opportunities were either unavailable or Language Arts teachers were not being encouraged to attend.

The results for Research Question 3 indicated that many of the principals and LACLs perceived that teachers in their schools were being made aware of the Florida Media Literacy Standard. However, they were less confident that teachers were meeting to discuss ways of implementing the standard or that teachers were attending professional learning opportunities. The findings indicated a low level of leadership with regards to making professional learning opportunities available to teachers.

Research Question 4

What barriers exist to the successful implementation of the Media Literacy standard in Florida high schools?

<u>Principals</u>

Ten principals (34.48%) reported "time" as a barrier to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard in their school. Five principals (17.24%) reported that access to technology, including computers, was a barrier to successful implementation of the standard. "Access" not only referred to physical access in most cases but also to the cost of purchasing and maintaining computer equipment. Five principals (17.24%) cited lack of complete understanding of the Florida Media Literacy Standard as a barrier to implementation. Two principals (6.90%) reported that "no barriers" existed to successful implementation. Two other principals (6.90%) reported "Lack of Instructor Knowledge." Two principals (6.9%) reported high stakes testing as a barrier including a focus on FCAT. Other barriers reported by only one principal (3.44%) each were awareness of the value of the Media Center, a lack of consistency

106

among teachers, and entrenched teachers who were unwilling to change their teaching methodology or were afraid to try new things.

The percentage of principals that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" to Item 18 on the MLSQ which identified time as a barrier to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard suggested that most principals did not perceive time as a barrier to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. These results were inconsistent with other findings that had "time" as the most frequently reported barrier reported on open-ended Item 21. Ten principals (34.48%) reported "time" was a barrier to successful implementation. The percentage of principals that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" that attention to the FCAT was a barrier to implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard appeared to be quite low given that two principals (6.90%) cited the FCAT directly in the open-ended Item 21 as a barrier to successful implementation.

There appeared to be inconsistent reporting about the issue of time and the presence of the FCAT in school curriculum. Principals indicated on Likert items 18 and 19 that they did not agree that time and FCAT were barriers to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy standard but it was then cited in the open-ended item 21. This inconsistent responding raises questions about the confidence principals have towards a clear understanding about what the Florida Media Literacy standard is and how it is to be implemented in their schools.

<u>LACLs</u>

Twelve LACLs (26.67%) reported that access to computers (including physical access in the Media Center and cost for purchasing and maintaining) was a barrier to implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. Eight LACLs (17.78%) reported standardized testing, (including FCAT) to be a barrier. One LACL reported that out of 180 school days, the media center was only available for 73 days. The media center was closed the other 107 days for standardized testing. Time was reported by seven LACLs (15.56%) as a barrier. Lack of knowledge regarding both the standard and use of technology was reported by seven LACLs (15.56%). Three LACLs (6.67%) reported "none" with regards to barriers to implementing the standard. Three LACLS (6.67%) reported lack of teacher buy-in or acceptance of Media Literacy as a barrier to implementing the standard. Other barriers that were reported by no more than one LACL (2.22%) included lack of relevant material for use, too many demands on Language Arts teachers, expectations to teach to the test, inability to access information due to district internet security settings, teachers being discouraged from using film in class, and a lack of understanding regarding how to execute cross curricular teaching strategies.

The percentage of LACLs that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" to Item 18 on the MLSQ which identified time as a barrier to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard appeared quite low regarding time as a barrier to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. LACLs frequently reported "time" as a barrier in the open-ended Item 21 and also "access" in reference to the Media Center.

LACLs reported that standardized testing often interrupted their efforts at utilizing the Media Center therefore making "time" a significant barrier when included with "access."

The percentage of LACLs that reported "strongly agree" or "agree" that attention to the FCAT was a barrier to implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard indicated that FCAT specifically was not seen as a direct barrier. The results of Item 21 however clearly identified standardized testing practices as a barrier to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. Standardized testing was frequently cited as a perceived barrier to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. Utilization of the computers for standardized testing reduced the amount of time teachers could utilize computers for practices that addressed the benchmarks of the Florida Media Literacy Standard.

Discussion

Principals and LACLs in central Florida appeared to be identifying strategies that supported successful implementation of the Florida Media Literacy Standard in their schools. Over 80% of participating principals and LACLs reported that they perceived the Florida Media Literacy Standard to be implemented in their Language Arts classrooms. However, the key feature of the most strongly agreed upon items was print media. There appears to be a less confident perception on the part of principals and LACLs that non-print media sources were being utilized to teach media literacy skills in high schools. This finding indicated that although there was reporting of media literacy

practices there still seemed to be a lack of understanding about how to include non-print media.

Specific strategies that were identified as successful included assigning projects for students to complete that required them to utilize various mediums of information for not only research but presentations as well. Other strategies included utilizing Professional Learning Communities to assist teachers with understanding the standard and learning strategies to successfully implement the standard into their daily teaching. Professional learning opportunities were also identified as well as working closely with the Media Specialist to learn about technology and most importantly schedule time for Media Center use.

This study revealed inconsistent responding when it came to the topic of time. Principals and LACLs appeared to perceive that time was a barrier to successfully implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. However, there were some responses that indicated time was not a barrier to successful implementation practices. The demands on time appeared to be for preparing students to take the FCAT and using computers and Media Center time for standardized testing. It appeared that the focus on standardized testing and FCAT were the biggest barriers to implementing media literacy skills.

The availability of the Media Center was identified as a barrier to implementing the Florida Media Literacy Standard. One LACL reported that their school closed the

Media Center to classroom use for 107 of the 180 school days due to standardized testing practices. This included the FCAT.

The lack of representation from all Florida regions in the sample made it difficult to generalize these results. It was possible that the 24.18% of principals and LACLs who responded were unique in a systematic way. It was possible that the other 76% of the sample that did not respond did not know what the Florida Media Literacy Standard was or did not respond because it was not important to them. This possible lack of interest could be explained by the high stakes testing environment that sets learning skills needed to pass standardized tests above all other learning. It could also represent a need for more professional learning opportunities to understand the importance of the Florida Media Literacy Standard.

<center>Recommendations for Further Research</center>

1. The first recommendation is to consider conducting the study near the middle of the school year when principals and LACLs are currently active with their job responsibilities. Conducting the study during the summer months may have led to a decreased response rate due to LACLs being away on summer break and principals being busy preparing for the upcoming school year.
2. The response rate of School District 3 was significantly higher with the regular mail questionnaires than the internet method was able to acquire. Given this finding, future

<center>111</center>

research should consider alternative forms of data collection in addition to electronic surveys.

3. The state of Florida has 67 school districts. Expanding this research to include schools from every region in Florida could better represent the population of Florida high schools.

4. Identify reasons for the low rate of questionnaire return. Why did high school principals and LACLs not return the questionnaire? Was it due to lack of knowledge of the standard? Was it lack of time, interest, or importance?

5. Interviewing high school principals and LACLs to gather in-depth information regarding their perceptions of the implementation process could reveal more than a questionnaire. Interview questions that focused on what strategies they themselves have practiced to implement the Florida Media Literacy Standard could provide evidence of actual practice instead of perceived practices.

6. Gathering demographic data on the gender, number of years serving as a principal or LACL, race and educational background are all important characteristics that could lead to differences in implementation practices and should be considered in future studies.

7. According to Key Points in English Language Arts (2011), an important aspect of Media and Technology in the Common Core Standards Initiative was that media and technology were integrated throughout the standards. "Just as media and technology are integrated in school and life in the twenty-first century skills related to media use

(both critical analysis and production of media) are integrated throughout the standards" (p.1). Further research can explore how the Florida Media Literacy Standard will be incorporated into the Common Core Standards.

8. Since principals and LACLs in this study perceived the implementation of "non-print" material differently, further research could explore how educators define "non-print" material to clarify misperceptions regarding its implementation.

9. "Time" was an important theme that arose from the data collection process. Time can be understood to be relative to preparation for FCAT testing each spring. Teachers may report time as a barrier simply because the demands to teach the skills necessary for passing the FCAT seem to take up much of the school day. Further research could focus on explaining why the concept of "time" seems to interfere with teaching the Florida Media Literacy Standard.

APPENDIX A: MEDIA LITERACY STANDARD QUESTIONNAIRE

Media Literacy Standard Questionnaire
Andrew Ritchie

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly Agree
A. The Media Literacy Standard Please respond to the following questions as they pertain to teachers at your school.	SD	D	NS	A	SA
1. Language Arts teachers have been made aware of the Florida Media Literacy Standard.	1	2	3	4	5
2. The Language Arts teachers incorporate the Media Literacy Standard into their lesson plans.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Language Arts teachers teach students to develop an understanding of media literacy as a life skill that is integral to informed decision making.	1	2	3	4	5
B. Media Literacy Benchmarks Please respond to the following questions as they pertain to teachers at your school.					
4. Language Arts teachers teach students to present information in print formats (such as essays, papers, written reports).	1	2	3	4	5
5. Language Arts teachers teach students to present information in non-print formats (such as video, art, or oral presentations).	1	2	3	4	5
6. Language Arts teachers teach students how to utilize	1	2	3	4	5

print media.					
7. Language Arts teachers teach students how to utilize non-print media.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Language Arts teachers teach students to use mass media in assignments and presentations.	1	2	3	4	5
9. Language Arts teachers teach students to use digital media in assignments and presentations.	1	2	3	4	5
10. Language Arts teachers teach students how to cite sources from print media.	1	2	3	4	5
11. Language Arts teachers teach students how to cite sources from non-print media.	1	2	3	4	5
12. Language Arts teachers teach students to select print media appropriate to the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.	1	2	3	4	5
13. Language Arts teachers teach students to select non-print media appropriate to the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.	1	2	3	4	5
14. Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in print media.	1	2	3	4	5
15. Language Arts teachers teach students the difference between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in non-print media.	1	2	3	4	5
C. Potential Barriers to Successful Implementation Please respond to the following questions as they pertain to the teachers at your school.					
16. The Language Arts department has met at least once during this school year to discuss ways of effectively	1	2	3	4	5

implementing the Media Literacy Standard.					
17. The Language Arts teachers in my school have attended at least one professional development training to learn more about implementing the Media Literacy Standard within the past year.	1	2	3	4	5
18. The Language Arts department feels there is not enough time in the day to include the Media Literacy Standard in their lesson plans.	1	2	3	4	5
19. Language Arts teachers do not incorporate the Media Literacy Standard because it is not assessed on the FCAT.	1	2	3	4	5

D. Free Response Section

Please provide a response to each of the two questions in this section. Please be as specific as possible with regards to projects, activities, or other information.

20. What is the most important action taken this year by you or the Language Arts Department to implement the Media Literacy Standard in your school?	Free Response
21. What barriers exist to the successful implementation of the Media Literacy Standard in your school?	Free Response

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

APPENDIX B: INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

University of
Central
Florida

Dear Educator,

A few days from now you will receive an invitation to participate in a confidential study to learn more about implementing the Media Literacy Standard in Florida Public High Schools. As an educator, your perspective is invaluable to the research and your participation would be greatly appreciated. *This electronic survey should take approximately 10 minutes to complete.*

Your participation in this research is voluntary. You can decline to participate in this survey without repercussions at any time. However, there are no anticipated professional or financial risks and to ensure the confidentiality of your identity you will be assigned an alpha- numeric code. This survey code, as well as all the information gathered through the use of the survey instrument, will be held confidential to the extent of the law and discarded upon completion of the research. The results of this study may be published although they will not include your name or any information that could personally identify you or your school in any way.

Questions or additional information may be obtained by contacting me at alritchi@volusia.k12.fl.us or my faculty advisor, Dr. Rosemarye Taylor, at (407) 823-1469 or at rosemarye.taylor@ucf.edu. Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Questions or concerns about research participants' rights may be directed to UCF Institutional Review Board Office at the University of Central Florida, Office of Research and Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246. The phone numbers are (407) 823-2901 or (407) 882-2276.

The submission of the online survey will indicate your consent to participate in this study. Thank you in advance for your assistance with this research.

Sincerely,
Andrew L. Ritchie, Doctoral Candidate, University of Central Florida
University High School, Volusia County Schools
alritchi@volusia.k12.fl.us
(407) 681-0087

APPENDIX C: LINK TO SURVEY LETTER

University of
Central
Florida

Dear Educator,

A few days ago you received an email inviting you to participate in a confidential survey regarding the Media Literacy Standard in Florida High Schools. You are receiving this email to direct you to the questionnaire.

This link is uniquely tied to this questionnaire and your email address. Please do not forward this message.

It should take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Here is the link to the questionnaire:

[SurveyLink]

If you decide that you would prefer not to participate, you may opt out by clicking the link below and your name will be removed from our mailing list so you do not receive any further communications.

[RemoveLink]

Thank you for your participation!

Sincerely,
Andrew L. Ritchie, Doctoral Candidate, University of Central Florida
University High School, Volusia County Schools
alritchi@volusia.k12.fl.us
(407) 681-0087

APPENDIX D: REMINDER/FOLLOW UP LETTER ONE

Dear Educator,

About a week ago a survey via e-mail was sent to you. I am interested in your perceptions of the implementation process at your school. As of today, I have not received a completed survey from you. I realize this is a busy time of year. However, I have contacted you and others in hopes of obtaining perceptions only educators in your position can provide. As I mentioned before, answers are confidential and will be combined with other responses providing results to this important research question. In case the previous questionnaire has been deleted from your e-mail account, the link below is included for your convenience.

Should you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me, Andrew Ritchie, at (407) 681-0087 or alritchi@volusia.k12.fl.us. Thank you for your participation.

Andrew Ritchie

[Survey Link]

P.S. If for any reason you would rather not complete the survey, please click on the link below and you will be removed from the mailing list.

[Remove Link]

APPENDIX E: REMINDER/FOLLOW UP LETTER TWO

University of
**Central
Florida**

Dear Educator,

About 3 weeks ago a survey was sent to you. To the best of my knowledge it has not yet been returned.

The people who have responded already include a wide variety of perceptions regarding the implementation of the Media Literacy Standard in Florida. I think the results are going to be very useful to educational leaders in a variety of academic settings.

I am writing again because of the importance that your survey has for helping to get accurate results. Although I sent surveys to people in a variety of schools and districts, it's only by hearing from nearly everyone in the sample that I can be sure that the results are truly representative.

Here is the link to the survey:
[Survey Link]

I hope that you will fill out and return the questionnaire soon, but if for any reason you prefer not to answer it, please let me know by clicking on the "Remove" link below.
[Remove Link]

Andrew L. Ritchie
Doctoral Candidate, University of Central Florida

P.S. Should you have any questions or concerns, feel free to contact me, Andrew Ritchie, at (407) 681-0087 or alritchi@volusia.k12.fl.us. Thank you for your participation.

APPENDIX F: FINAL CONTACT NOTIFICATION

University of Central Florida

Dear Educator,

About a month ago I sent you a survey via e-mail. It was my purpose to learn more about the implementation process to better deliver the Media Literacy Standard in Florida's High Schools.

The study is drawing to a close, and this is the last contact that will be made with the sample of people who I think, based on their leadership positions in Florida's High Schools, can provide the most meaningful perceptions for this research question.

I am sending this final contact because of my concern that people who have not responded may have different perceptions than those who have. Hearing from everyone in this statewide sample helps assure that the survey results are as accurate as possible.

Here is the link to the survey:
[Survey Link]

I also want to assure you that your response to this study is voluntary, and if you prefer not to respond that's fine. You may indicate that you would prefer not to participate by clicking the Remove link below.

[Remove]

Finally, I appreciate your willingness to consider my request as I conclude this effort to better understand the implementation process of the Media Literacy Standard in Florida. Thank you very much.

Andrew L. Ritchie
Doctoral Candidate, University of Central Florida

APPENDIX G: NEXT GENERATION SUNSHINE STATE STANDARDS FOR INFORMATION AND MEDIA LITERACY

<p align="center">Standard 1: Informational Text</p>

LA.910.6.1 & LA.1112.6.1:

The student comprehends the wide array of information text that is part of our day to day experiences.

<p align="center">Benchmarks Grades 9-12</p>

LA.910.6.1.1 & LA.1112.6.1.1:

The student will explain how text features (e.g., charts, maps, diagrams, subheadings, captions, illustration, graphs) aid the reader's understanding.

LA.910.6.2 & LA.1112.6.2:

The student will analyze the structure and format (e.g., diagrams, graphics, fonts) of functional workplace, consumer, or technical documents.

LA.910.6.3 & LA.1112.6.3:

The student will use the knowledge to create a workplace, consumer, or technical document.

<p align="center">Standard 2: Research Process</p>

LA.910.6.2 & LA.1112.6.2:

The student uses a systematic process for the collection, processing, and presentation of information.

<p align="center">Benchmarks Grades 9-12</p>

LA.910.6.2.1 & LA.1112.6.2.1:

The student will select a topic and develop a comprehensive flexible search plan, and analyze and apply evaluative criteria (e.g., objectivity, freedom from bias, topic format) to assess appropriateness of resources.

LA.910.6.2.2 & LA.1112.6.2.2:

The student will organize, synthesize, analyze, and evaluate the validity and reliability of information from multiple sources (including primary and secondary sources) to draw conclusions using a variety of techniques, and correctly use standardized citations.

LA.910.6.2.3 & LA.1112.6.2.3:

The student will write an informational report that integrates information and makes distinctions between the relative value and significance of specific data, facts, and ideas.

LA.910.6.2.4 & LA.1112.6.2.4:

The student will understand the importance of legal and ethical practices, including laws regarding libel, slander, copyright, and plagiarism in the use of mass media and digital sources, know the associated consequences, and comply with the law.

Standard 3: Media Literacy

LA.910.6.3 & LA.1112.6.3:

The student develops and demonstrates an understanding of media literacy as a life skill that is integral to informed decision making.

:

Benchmarks grades 9-12:

LA.910.6.3.1 & LA.1112.6.3.1:

The student will distinguish between propaganda and ethical reasoning strategies in print and non-print media.

LA.910.6.3.2 & LA.1112.6.3.2:

The student will ethically use mass media and digital technology in assignments and presentations, citing sources according to standardized citation styles.

LA.910.6.3.3 & LA.1112.6.3.3:

The student will demonstrate the ability to select print and non-print media appropriate for the purpose, occasion, and audience to develop into a formal presentation.

<u>Standard 4: Technology</u>

LA.910.6.4 & LA.1112.6.4:

The student develops the essential technology skills for using and understanding conventional and current tools, materials and processes.

Benchmarks Grades 9-12

LA.910.6.4.1 & LA.910.6.4.1:

The student will use appropriate available technologies to enhance

communication and achieve a purpose (e.g., video, digital technology).

LA.910.6.4.2 & LA.910.6.4.2:

The student will routinely use digital tools for publication, communication and

Productivity (FLDOE, 2011).

LIST OF REFERENCES

American Association of School Librarians (AASL) (2007). *American Association of School Librarians (AASL): Standards for the 21ˢᵗ century learner.* Chicago, IL: American Libraries Association.

Arke, E. T., & Primack, B. A. (2009). Quantifying media literacy: Development, reliability, and validity of a new measure. *Educational Media International. 46*(1), 53-65. doi: 10.1080/09523980902780958

Aufderheide, P. (1993). Media Literacy: A report of the national leadership conference on media literacy, Queenstown, MD: The Aspen Institute. Retrieved November 15, 2010 from Education Full Text database.

Baker, F. (2004). To kill a mockingbird: Seeing the film through the lens of film language and media literacy. *Screen Education, 36*, 153-156. Retrieved April 27, 2011 from Communication and Mass Media Complete.

Baker, F. (2011). State by state standards for media literacy. *Media Literacy Clearninghouse.* Retrieved June 17, 2011 from http://www.frankwbaker.com/state_lit.htm

Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63*(3) p. 575-582. Retrieved June 29, 2011 from PsycARTICLES.

Barnwell, P. (2009, September 23). Literacy accountability in a new-media age. *Education Week. 29*(4), 23.

Bazalgette, C., Bevort, E., & Savino, J. (Eds.). (1992). *New directions: Media education worldwide.* London: British Film Institute.

Bazalgette, G. (1993). Setting an agenda for training. *Canadian Journal of Educational Communication. 22*(1), 27-36. Retrieved November 15, 2010 from Directory of Open Access Journals database.

Beach, R. (2007). *Teachingmedialiteracy.com: A web-linked guide to resources and activities.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Berson, I. R., & Berson, M. J. (2003). Digital literacy for effective citizenship. (Advancing Technology). *Social Education, 67*(3), 164. Retrieved June 1, 2011 from Education Full Text.

Brown, J. A. (1998). Media literacy perspectives. *Journal of Communication, 48*(1), 44-57. Retrieved March 22, 2011 from Wiley-Blackwell Online.

Buckingham, D. (2003). *Media education: Literacy, learning and contemporary culture.* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Burton, L. (2006). Getting started: Media education in the early years. *Screen Education*, *44*, 90- 96. Retrieved April 20, 2011 from Communication and Mass Media Complete.

Canadian Association of Media Education Organization (CAMEO) (2010). Retrieved on November 14, 2010 from http://interact.uoregon.edu/MediaLit/CAMEO/

Center for Media Design (2005). *Middletown media studies: Observing consumers and their interactions with media.* Retrieved June 17, 2011, https://www.bsu.edu/webapps2/cmdreports/product_select.asp?product_id=11

Center for Media Literacy (CML). (2005). C*ML: Media lit kit.* Retrieved November 15, 2010 from http://www.medialit.org

Center for Media Literacy (CML). (2010). *CML's Five Key Questions and Five Core Assumptions.* Retrieved November 15, 2010 from http://www.medialit.org

Collins, P. H. (2009). *Another kind of public education: Race, schools, the media, and democratic possibilities.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Considine, D. M. (2002). Media literacy: National developments and international origins. *Journal of Popular Film and Television, 30*(1), p. 7-15. Retrieved April 27, 2011 from Communication and Mass Media Complete.

Cortes, C. E. (2000). *The children are watching.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Crow, G. M., Hausman, C. S., & Scribner, J. P. (2002). Reshaping the role of the school principal. In Murphy, J. (Ed.). *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (p.189-210). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Derry, B. (2008). Information and technology literacy. *Teacher Librarian. 36*(1), 22-25. Retrieved June 21, 2011 from Education Full Text.

Dillman, D. A. (2000). *Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method.* (2nd ed.) New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Eagle, L. (2007). Commercial media literacy: What does it do, to whom – and does it matter? *Journal of Advertising. 36*(2), 101-110. DOI: 10.2753/JOA0091-3367360207.

Emery, W., & Rother, L. (2002). Media education as literacy education. *Australian Screen Education, 28*, p. 100-104. Retrieved April 20, 2011 from Communication and Mass Media Complete.

Florida County Maps. (2011). Retrieved March 29, 2011 from www.floridacountiesmap.com.

Florida Department of Education (FLDOE). (2007). 2007 Language arts, writing, and communication skills specifications for the 2008-2009 Florida state adoption of instructional materials. Retrieved June 1, 2011 from http://www.firn.edu/doe/instmat/home0015.htm.

Florida Department of Education (FLDOE). (2011). *Next Generation Sunshine State Standards*. Retrieved April 12, 2011 from http://www.floridastandards.org/Standards/ FLStandardSearch.aspx

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.

French, D., & Richards, M. (Eds.). (1994). *Media education across Europe.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Gallagher, F. (2007, June 23) *The status of media literacy: Insights from a survey of state departments of education.* Report presented at the AMLA Research Summit.

Galligan, A. (2001). Creativity, culture, education and the workforce. *Center for Arts and Culture.* Retrieved from National Arts Policy Database June 17, 2011. http://culturalpolicy.org/pdf.education.pdf.

Glatthorn, A. A., & Jailall, J. M. (2009). *The principal as curriculum leader: Shaping what is taught and tested.* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Goetze, S. K., Brown, D. S., & Schwarz, G. (2005). In Schwarz, G. & Brown, P. U. (Eds.). *Media literacy: Transforming curriculum and teaching.* Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education.

Goulden, N. R. (1998). The roles of national and state standards in implementing speaking, listening, and media literacy. *Communication Education. 47*(2), 194-208. Retrieved June 21, 2011 from Education Full Text database.

Hall, K. (1998). Critical literacy and the case for it in the early years of school. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum, 11*(2), 183-194. Retrieved from Communication and Mass Media Complete database.

Hobbs, R. (1998). The seven great debates in the media literacy movement. *Journal of Communication, 48*(1), 16-32. Retrieved June 21, 2011 from Communication and Mass Media Complete.

Hobbs, R. (2005). Strengthening media education in the twenty-first century: Opportunities for the state of Pennsylvania. *Arts Education Policy Review. 106*(4), 13-23. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Hobbs, R. (2007). *Reading the media: Media literacy in high school English.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Hobbs, R., & Frost, R. (1998). Instructional practices in media literacy education and their impact on students' learning. *The New Jersey Journal of Communication, 6*(2), 123-148. doi: 10.1080/15456879809367343

Jerald, C. D. (2008). Benchmarking for success: Ensuring U.S. students receive a world-class education. *A report by the National Governors Association, Council of Chief State School Officers, and Achieve, Inc.,* Retrieved June 21, 2011 from www.nga.org.

Jolls, T., & Grande, D. (2005). Project SMARTArt: A case study in elementary school media literacy and arts education. *Arts Education Policy Review.107*(1), 25-30. Retrieved May 30, 2011 from Academic Search Premier database.

Kahne, J., Feezell, J. T., & Lee, N. (2010). *Digital media literacy education and online civic and political participation.* DMLcentral Working Papers.

Kaiser Family Foundation (2010). *Generation m2: Media in the lives of 8- to 18-year-olds.* Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, Menlo Park, CA. Retrieved April 12, 2011 from http://www.kff.org/entmedia/upload/8010.pdf

Kavoori, A., & Matthews, D. (2004). Critical media pedagogy: Lessons from the thinking television project. *The Harvard Journal of Communications*, *45*, 99-114. Retrieved April 27 from Communication and Mass Media Complete.

Kellner, D., & Share, J. (2005). Toward critical media literacy: Core concepts, debates, organizations, and policy. *Discourse: studies in the cultural politics of education, 26*(3), p. 369-386. DOI: 10.1080/01596300500200169.

Kline, S., & Stewart, K. (2007). *Assessing the field of media education in British Columbia: A survey of teachers in the present-day BC school system.* Unpublished manuscript, Simon Fraser University.

Kress, G. (2003). *Literacy in the new media age.* London: Routledge.

Kubey, R. W. (1998). Obstacles to the development of media education in the United States. *Journal of Communication.* 48(1), 58-69. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1998.tb02737.x

Kubey, R. W. (2003). Why U.S. media education lags behind the rest of the English-speaking world. *Television and New Media, 4*(4), 351-370. DOI: 10.1177/1527476403255808.

Lenhart, A., Madden, M., & Hitlin, P. (2005). *Teens and technology: Youth are leading the transition to a fully wired and mobile nation.* Retrieved June 18, 2011, http://www.pewinternet.org/Reports/2005/Teens-and-Technology.aspx

Levine, D. U., & Levine, R. F. (1996). *Society and education.* (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Lewis, J., & Jhally, S. (1998). The struggle over media literacy. *Journal of Communication.* 48(1), 109-120. DOI: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1998.tb02741.x

Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2006). *The principalship: Vision to action.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Maeroff, G. I. (Ed.). (1998). *Imaging education.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Malmelin, N. (2010). What is advertising literacy? Exploring the dimensions of advertising literacy. *Journal of Visual Literacy, 29*(2), p. 129-142. Retrieved April 20, 2011 from Communication and Mass Media Complete.

Masterman, L. (1993). The media education revolution. *Canadian Journal of Educational Communication. 22*(1), 5-14. Retrieved November 15, 2010 from Directory of Open Access Journals database

McLaren, P., Hammer, R., Sholle, D., & Reilly, S. S. (1995). *Rethinking media literacy: A critical pedagogy of representation.* New York: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.

McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

McLuhan, M., & Fiore, Q. (1967). *The medium is the massage: An inventory of effects.* New York: Bantam.

Megee, M. (1997). Media literacy: The new basic. *Emergency Librarian. 25*(2), 23-26. Retrieved from Academic Search Premier database.

Merriam-Webster. (2004). *The Merriam-Webster Dictionary.* Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Meyrowitz, J. (1998). Multiple media literacies. *Journal of Communication, 48*(1), 96-108. Retrieved March 22, 2011 from Wiley-Blackwell Online.

Mihailidis, P. (2009). Beyond cynicism: Media education and civic learning outcomes in the university. *International Journal of Learning and Media 1*(3), 1-13.

Miller, E. (2005). Fighting technology for toddlers. *The Education Digest.* November, 55-58. Retrieved June 29, 2010 from Education Full Text.

Morris, B. S. (1993). Two dimensions of teaching television literacy: Analyzing television content and analyzing television viewing. *Canadian Journal of Educational Communication. 22*(1), 37-45. Retrieved November 15, 2010 from Directory of Open Access Journals database.

National Association for Media Literacy Education (NAMLE). (2010). *Vision for NAMLE.* Retrieved November 15, 2010 from http://www.namle.net

National Association for Media Literacy Education (NAMLE). (2011). *Core principles of media literacy education in the United States.* Retrieved February 24, 2011 from http://www.namle.net

Nowak, A., Abel, S., & Ross, K. (2007). *Rethinking media education: Critical pedagogy and identity politics.* Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.

Ontario Ministry of Education (1989). *Media literacy: Resource Guide.* Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Partnership for 21st Century Skills (P21). (2002). Learning for the 21st century: A report and mile guide for 21st century skills. Retrieved April 14, 2011 from http://www.p21.org/downloads/P21_Report.pdf.

Partnership for 21st Century Skills (P21). (2011). *Framework for 21st century learning.*
     Retrieved January 23, 2011 from http://www.p21.org/index.php?option=com_
     content&task=view&id=254&Itemid=120

Pawlas, G. E., & Oliva, P. F. (2008). *Supervision for today's schools.* (8th Ed.) New
     Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Postman, N. (1985). *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of
     showbusiness.* New York: Penguin Books.

Postman, N. (1992). *Technopoly: The surrender of culture to technology.* New York:
     Vintage Books.

Postman, N., & Powers, S. (1992). *How to watch tv news.* New York: Penguin Books.

Potter, W. J. (2010). The state of media literacy. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic
     Media, 54*(4), p. 675-696. Retrieved April 27, 2011 from Communication and
     Mass Media Complete.

Potter, W. J. (2011). *Media literacy* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Pratkanis, A., & Aronson, E. (2001). *Age of propaganda: The everyday use and abuse of
     persuasion.* New York, NY: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Project for Excellence in Journalism (2006). Audience. *The State of the News Media
     2006: An Annual Report on American Journalism.* Retrieved June 18, 2011,
     http://stateofthemedia.org/2006/online-intro/audience/#audience

Pungente, J. J. (1993). The second spring: Media education in Canada's secondary
     schools. *Canadian Journal of Educational Communication. 22*(1), 47-60.
     Retrieved November 15, 2010 from Directory of Open Access Journals database.

Ransford, M. (2005, September 23). *Average person spends more time using media than
     anything else.* Retrieved April 12, 2011,
     http://www.bsu.edu/up/article/0,1370,32363-2914-36658,00.html

RobbGreico, M., & Hobbs, R. (2009). Media use & academic achievement among
     African american elementary children. Philadelphia: Temple University.
     Retrieved from http://mediaeducationlab.com/publications/list.

Royal Australasian College of Physicians (RACP) (2004). Children and the media:
     Advocating for the future. A Policy Paper retrieved from

http://www.racp.edu.au/index.cfm?objectid=D7FAA93E-E091-4209-
15657544BA419672

Scheibe, C. L. (2004). A deeper sense of literacy: Curriculum-driven approaches to media
literacy in the K-12 classroom. American Behavioral Scientist, *48*(1), 60-68.
Retrieved April 27, 2011 from Communication and Mass Media Complete.

Schwarz, G. (2005). Overview: What is media literacy, who cares, and why? In Schwarz,
G. & Brown, P. U. (Eds.). *Media literacy: Transforming curriculum and teaching.*
Chicago, IL: National Society for the Study of Education.

Semali, L. M. (2000). *Literacy in multimedia america: Integrating media education
across the curriculum.* New York: Falmer Press.

Sholle, D., & Denski, S. (1994). *Media education and the (re)production of culture.*
Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Stein, J. W. (1979). *Mass media, education, and a better society.* Chicago, IL: Nelson
Hall, Inc.

Taylor, R. T., & Gunter, G. G. (2009). Literacy leaders: Changing student achievement.
The New England Reading Association Journal. 45(1), 20-26. Retrieved April
16, 2011 from Education Full Text.

Trilling, B., & Fadel, C. (2009). *21st century skills: Learning for life in our times.* San
Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Turow, J. (1997). *Media systems in society: Understanding industries, strategies and
power.* New York: Longman.

Tyner, K. (1998). *Literacy in a digital world: Teaching and learning in the age of
information.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Vance, A. L. (2010). Interdisciplinary high school teams for 21st century academic skills.
The Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin. 76(3), 20-22.

Wheatley, W., Dobbs, C., Willis, V., Magnan, S., & Moeller, J. (2010). Introducing 21st
century research and information literacy skills: A yearlong process. *Science
Scope. 33*(9), 67-72. Retrieved January 24, 2011 from Education Full Text.

Yates, B. L. (1997, June). Media education's present and future: A survey of teachers.
Paper presented at the meeting of the National Media Literacy Citizenship

Project, Birmingham, AL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED424601.)

Yecke, C. P. (2007). Florida's new standards: Rigorous, Measureable, Clear and Concise. Increased student achievement in Florida. *Florida's K-12 Leadership Conference.* Retrieved April 13, 2011 from http://www.justreadflorida.com/conference/leadership/Florida's_New_Standards.pdf.

Zancanella, D. (1994). Local conversations, national standards, and the future of English. *English Journal, 83*(3)*,* 24-28. Retrieved June 18, 2011 from www.jstor.org.

Zengotita, T. D. (2005). *Mediated: How the media shapes your world and the way you live in it.* New York: Bloomsbury.