SECTION FIVE

THE VALUE OF MUSEUMS TO TEACHERS

5.0 Introduction

This section examines how teachers value museums. It presents evidence of the importance of museums to teachers, and the importance in their view of the Generic Learning Outcomes that may result for their pupils from a museum visit.

The importance of the five GLOs (Q.19) is examined from a number of different perspectives and compared with the answers in the 2003 study. Two important variables are identified which impact on teachers' views. These are the age of the pupils with whom teachers are working, and whether or not the work carried out at the museum is linked to the curriculum.

The importance of museums to teachers is examined, and here, the degree of importance is affected by whether or not the work at the museum is curriculum-linked. As we saw in Section 4, the use of museums for curriculum-related work has fallen slightly, and this may account for an apparent drop in the importance of museums to teachers. Discussions in the focus groups and case-studies confirm the continued high importance of museums for teachers, especially in offering something different from what can be achieved in school and in opening up local issues. Museums also contribute to the professional development of teachers.

This Section also reviews the satisfaction of teachers with their museum experience. Substantial difficulties were raised in discussions with teachers in using museums, some of which can be addressed by museums, and some which are more generic. However, the questionnaire shows that the vast majority of teachers are satisfied with their museum visit, in spite of the difficulties. Most teachers are very confident about using museums.
5.1 The value of the five GLOs

The Teachers' Questionnaire, Form A (Q.19) asked teachers to rate the importance of each of the five GLOs in relation to a scale running from ‘very important’ to ‘not at all important’. The teachers were not expected to grade the outcomes against each other, but to value them independently.

This year a column for ‘don’t know’ was added to the 5-point scale ranging from ‘very important’ to ‘not at all important’, in order to make a clearer distinction between teachers who did not complete this question (missing values) and those teachers that left the relevant box blank because they did not understand the question or were not quite sure about the answer.

In the event, the ‘don’t know’ box was very rarely used by teachers. As the chart below shows, this value stands at 0% except for Action, Behaviour, Progression, where 1% of teachers ticked ‘don’t know’. It is not clear whether teachers were not completing some or all of Q.19 because they did not understand it, and just preferred to do this rather than tick the ‘don’t know’ box. The chart below shows that missing values stand at 5% and 6% except for Action, Behaviour, Progression, where they suddenly grow to 15%. This does seem to indicate that some teachers felt unclear about this particular GLO, and just left the box blank.
Q.19 asked: ‘For each of the following potential outcomes from the use of the museum please could you rate the importance of each one in your view: (tick one box for each)’.

**Fig 5.1a:** Form A, Q.19: ‘For each of the following potential outcomes from the use of the museum, please could you rate the importance of each one in your view?’, 2005

The first thing to note about the responses to Q.19 is that, looking at the ‘very important’ responses, there is a clear scale of relative importance of the GLOs. Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity is the GLO that more teachers value as ‘very important’.
• Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity 76%
• Increase or change in Knowledge and Understanding 68%
• Change or development in Attitudes and Values 61%
• Action, Behaviour, Progression 48%
• Increase in Skills 46%

Reviewing the importance accorded to the GLOs by teachers using museums in the Phase 1 and the Phase 2 Hubs reveals very little difference. In the chart below, the ratings of the teachers are compared across the Phase 1 and the Phase 2 museums, using the ‘very important’ values for clarity.

Table 5.1b: Comparing the percentages of teachers who stated ‘very important’ across type of museum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All museums 2005</th>
<th>Phase 1 2005</th>
<th>Phase 2 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and Values</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action, Behaviour, Progression</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers’ responses to Q.19: ‘For each of the following potential outcomes from the use of the museum, please could you rate the importance of each one in your view?’, ‘very important’ only, 2005 (1632)

It is illuminating to consider all the positive values together. Taking both ‘very important’ and ‘important’ together, the huge enthusiasm for museums becomes very clear, while the hierarchy of positive outcomes become less differentiated:

• Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity 94%
• Increase or change in Knowledge and Understanding 95%
• Change or development in Attitudes and Values 92%
• Increase in Skills 89%
• Action, Behaviour, Progression 81%

When comparing the 2003 and 2005 study it is clear that when all positive values are added together, the total percentage of positive teachers compares consistently with the first study, except for Action, Behaviour, Progression which is affected by a large increase in the proportion of ‘missing’ responses, rising from 4% to 15% in 2005.

When comparing the 2003 and 2005 study it is clear that when all positive values are added together, the total percentage of positive teachers compares consistently with the first study, except for Action, Behaviour, Progression which is affected by a large increase in the proportion of ‘missing’ responses, rising from 4% to 15% in 2005.
Fig 5.1c: Form A, Q.21: ‘For each of the following potential outcomes from the use of the museum, please could you rate the importance of each one in your view?’, 2003

Base: all teachers’ responses to Q.21: ‘For each of the following potential outcomes from the use of the museum, please could you rate the importance of each one in your view?’, 2003 (936)

However, there does appear to be some difference in teachers rating the GLOs ‘very important’ between the two studies. In order to explore this issue further the GLOs were considered individually for 2003 and 2005 with ‘don’t know’ and ‘missing’ values removed. ‘Not very important’ and ‘not at all important’ categories contained very small numbers and so were combined to make an ‘unimportant’ category to enable a chi square test to be performed.

The test showed that, when all categories of response were considered, there were no significant differences in the teachers’ views of the importance of each GLO when answers in 2003 and 2005 are compared.
However, when the analysis is restricted to those responding ‘very important’ and ‘important’ only, it appears that Attitudes and Values have increased in importance by 4%, while the importance of Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity has decreased by 3%.

In order to investigate these findings further, they are analysed in relation to first visit, link to the curriculum and Key Stage.

These analyses are presented in the next few pages.

Teachers’ rating Knowledge and Understanding ‘very important’ shows a slight decrease in 2005, however this difference is too small to be considered statistically significant.¹

Fig 5.1d: Form A, Q.19: Knowledge and Understanding, 2005 compared with Q.21: Knowledge and Understanding, 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers’ responses Q.19a: Knowledge and Understanding, 2005 (1554); Q.21a: Knowledge and Understanding, 2003, (908), missing and ‘don’t know’ excluded.

¹ There is no significant difference in teachers’ rating the importance of Knowledge and Understanding between 2003 and 2005 (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=2462)= 3.45, p >0.05.
Teachers rating Skills as ‘very important’ can be seen to increase by 2% in 2005; this is mainly accounted for by the decrease in teachers rating skills as neither ‘important’ or ‘unimportant’, again overall these differences are too small to be considered statistically significant.2

**Fig 5.1e: Form A, Q.19: Skills, 2005 compared with Q.21: Skills, 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers’ responses Q.19b: Skills 2005 (1534); Q.21b: Skills, 2003 (897), missing and ‘don’t know’ excluded.

2 There is no significant difference in teachers’ rating the importance of Skills between 2003 and 2005 (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n= 2431)=6.03, p >0.05.
A comparison of teachers' rating of Attitudes and Values between 2005 and 2003 shows an increase in the percentage of teachers rating the GLO 'very important'. However, when the overall responses are considered no significant difference is identified.³

**Fig 5.1f: Form A, Q.19: Attitudes and Values, 2005 compared with Q.21: Attitudes and Values, 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005</strong></td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003</strong></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers' responses Q.19c: Attitudes and Values, 2005 (1535); Q.21c: Attitudes and Values, 2003 (899), missing and 'don't know' excluded.

³ There is no significant difference in teachers' rating the importance of Attitudes and Values between 2003 and 2005 ('missing' and 'don't know' categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=2434)=5.62, p >0.05.
When Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity is compared between the two studies the proportion of teachers rating it as ‘very important’ is slightly lower in 2005. However, when teachers’ ratings are considered overall for this GLO no significant difference is found.  

**Fig 5.1g: Form A, Q.19: Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity, 2005 compared with Q.21: Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity, 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2005</strong></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2003</strong></td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers’ responses Q.19d: Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity, 2005 (1544); Q.21d: Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity, 2003 (906), missing and ‘don’t know’ excluded.

---

4 There is no significant difference in teachers’ rating the importance of Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity between 2003 and 2005 (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=2450)=3.89, p >0.05.
Teachers’ rating of Action, Behaviour, Progression in 2005 shows a small decrease in the ‘very important’ category, with slightly more teachers’ rating the GLO as ‘unimportant’ in 2005. Again overall the differences cannot be considered statistically significant.\(^5\)

**Fig 5.1h: Form A, Q.19: Action, Behaviour, Progression, 2005 compared with Q.21: Action, Behaviour, Progression, 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers’ responses Q.19e: Action, Behaviour, Progression, 2005 (1381); Q.21e: Action, Behaviour, Progression, 2003 (895), missing and ‘don’t know’ excluded.

When all categories of teachers’ responses are considered between the two studies no significant differences can be identified. However, an inspection of the graphs and the observed and expected figures in the chi square test indicates that the proportion of teachers responding ‘neither’ and ‘unimportant’ remain relatively stable between the two studies. Numbers of teachers’ responses in these categories were also very small. Differences in percentages of teachers’ responses between 2003 and 2005 seem to be mainly restricted to the ‘very important’ and ‘important’ categories. In order to investigate these differences further a chi square test was carried out comparing the five GLOs between 2003 and 2005 but restricting the analysis to only the ‘very important’ and ‘important’ categories. The results of this analysis revealed no significant difference between 2003 and 2005 for;

\(^5\) There is no significant difference in teachers’ rating the importance of Action, Behaviour, Progression between 2003 and 2005 (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, \(n=2276\))=5.65, \(p >0.05\).
Knowledge and Understanding, Skills, and Action, Behaviour, Progression. However, Attitudes and Values and Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity do show a significant difference between the two studies as illustrated in the graphs below.

**Fig 5.1i: Form A, Q.19: Attitudes and Values 2005 and Q.21: Attitudes and Values 2003, teachers responding 'very important' and 'important' categories only**

Base: all teachers responding 'very important' and 'important' Q.19c: Attitudes and Values, 2005 (1497); Q.21c: Attitudes and Values, 2003 (875)

---

6 There is no significant difference in teachers rating Knowledge and Understanding 'very important' or 'important' between 2003 and 2005 ('missing', 'don't know', 'neither' and 'unimportant' categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 1, n=2441)=2.99, p >0.05.

7 There is no significant difference in teachers rating Skills 'very important' or 'important' between 2003 and 2005 ('missing', 'don't know', 'neither' and 'unimportant' categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 1, n=2271)=0.21, p >0.05.

8 There is no significant difference in teachers rating Action, Behaviour, Progression 'very important' or 'important' between 2003 and 2005 ('missing', 'don't know', 'neither' and 'unimportant' categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 1, n=2186)=1.77, p >0.05.

9 There is a significant difference in teachers rating Attitudes and Values 'very important' or 'important' between 2003 and 2005 ('missing', 'don't know', 'neither' and 'unimportant' categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 1, n=2372)=4.15, p <0.05.

10 There is a significant difference in teachers rating Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity 'very important' or 'important' between 2003 and 2005 ('missing', 'don't know', 'neither' and 'unimportant' categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 1, n=2425)=3.85, p <0.05.
Teachers rating Attitudes and Values as ‘very important’ have increased by 4% in 2005; this change can be regarded as statistically significant. Conversely teachers rating Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity as ‘very important’ has decreased by 3% in 2005.

**Fig 5.1j: Form A, Q.19: Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity 2005 and Q.21: Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity, 2003, teachers responding ‘very important’ and ‘important’ categories only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers responding ‘very important’ and ‘important’ Q.19d: Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity, 2005 (1528); Q.21d: Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity, 2003 (897)

In order to probe what this might mean, the responses to Q.19 were examined further to compare the responses of:

- primary and secondary teachers
- teachers on their first visit to the museum with teachers who had visited previously
- teachers whose work was linked to the curriculum with those whose work was not linked to the curriculum.

The tables of cross-tabulations are displayed below, with each of the GLOs treated separately for the sake of clarity.
Q.19: cross-tabbed by Key Stage

**Fig 5.1k: Form A, Q.19: Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity by Q.10: Key Stage groups, 2005**

- Database: all teachers’ responses Q.19: Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity by Q.10: Key Stage groups, missing and mixed Key Stage groups excluded, 2005 (1325 KS2 and below, 196 KS3 and above)

Primary teachers value the enjoyment and inspiration to be gained in museums a great deal more highly than do secondary teachers.

---

11 Chi square analysis was not performed on this cross-tab because of the very low number of responses in the ‘not important’ and ‘neither’ categories.
Primary teachers also value the Knowledge and Understanding their pupils may gain more highly than secondary teachers.

---

12 Chi square analysis was not performed on this cross-tab because of the very low number of responses in the ‘not important’ and ‘neither’ categories.
Fig 5.1m: Form A, Q.19: Attitudes and Values by Q.10: Key Stage groups, 2005

Base: all teachers’ responses Q.19 Attitudes and Values and Q.10 Key Stage groups, missing and mixed Key Stage groups excluded, 2005 (1316 KS2 and below, 195 KS3 and above)

Primary teachers value the potential change or development in Attitudes and Values more highly than secondary teachers.

Chi square analysis was not performed on this cross-tab because of the very low number of responses in the ‘not important’ and ‘neither’ categories.
While primary teachers appear to value the activities that their pupils may engage in and the progression that may result slightly more highly than secondary teachers this difference is not statistically significant.14

---

14 There is no significant difference between KS2 and below and KS3 and above teachers’ rating of the importance of Action, Behaviour, Progression (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=1355) = 3.993, p 0.26 (>0.05).
The attitudes of primary and secondary teachers show a significant difference when it comes to considering a development in Skills following a museum visit. This difference is mainly accounted for by more KS2 and below teachers rating Skills as ‘very important’ and less KS2 and below teachers rating Skills as ‘unimportant’ or neither ‘important’ or ‘unimportant’.

Considering the different ways in which teachers working at different Key Stages value the outcomes of museum-based learning, it is very clear that primary teachers consistently regard the five potential types of outcome more important than the secondary teachers, and this is particularly so in the case of Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity and Knowledge and Understanding. If there were a larger proportion of secondary teachers completing Form A in

---

15 There is a significant difference between KS2 and below and KS3 and above teachers' rating of the importance of Skills ('missing' and 'don't know' categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=1506) = 10.11, p 0.018 (<0.05).
2005 than in 2003, this might have accounted for the apparent drop in importance of the GLOs. However, there are less secondary teachers than in 2003, so if anything, the importance accorded to the GLOs should have risen in 2005, and this has not happened.

◆ Q. 19: cross-tabbed by first visit

**Fig 5.1p: Form A, Q.19: Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity by Q.20: ‘Is this your first visit (as a teacher) to a museum with this class?’**, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers’ responses Q.19: Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity and Q.20: ‘Is this your first visit (as a teacher) to a museum with this class?’, missing excluded, 2005, (yes 684, no 844)

While teachers on their first visit to the museum were very likely to think Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity was ‘very important’, those that were not on their first visit were even more likely to think Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity was ‘very important’. However, these differences are too small to be considered statistically significant.  

16 There is not a significant difference when teachers rating the importance of Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity is compared by teachers on their first visit and
Fig 5.1q: Form A, Q.19: Knowledge and Understanding by Q.20: ‘Is this your first visit (as a teacher) to a museum with this class?’, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers’ responses Q.19: Knowledge and Understanding and Q.20: ‘Is this your first visit (as a teacher) to a museum with this class?’, missing excluded, 2005, (yes 690, no 848)

Those teachers who were not on their first visit value Knowledge and Understanding more highly than those who were on their first visit, again though these differences are too small to be considered statistically significant.  

17 There is not a significant difference when teachers rating the importance of Knowledge and Understanding is compared by teachers on their first visit and teachers not on their first visit (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=1524)= 3.95, p 0.267 (>0.05).
**Fig 5.1r: Form A, Q.19: Attitudes and Values by Q.20: ‘Is this your first visit (as a teacher) to a museum with this class?’, 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers’ responses Q.19: Attitudes and Values and Q.20: ‘Is this your first visit (as a teacher) to a museum with this class?’, missing excluded, 2005, (yes 685, no 837)

There is no significant difference here.\(^\text{18}\)

---

\(^{18}\) There is not a significant difference when teachers rating the importance of Attitudes and Values is compared by teachers on their first visit and teachers not on their first visit (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=1516)= 3.095, p 0.377 (>0.05).
Base: all teachers’ responses Q.19: Skills and Q.20: ‘Is this your first visit (as a teacher) to a museum with this class?’, missing excluded, 2005, (683 yes, 837 no)

These very small differences are not significant.¹⁹

¹⁹ There is not a significant difference when teachers rating the importance of Skills is compared by teachers on their first visit and teachers not on their first visit (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=1515)= 0.811, p 0.847 (>0.05).
There is a small difference between teachers here, with those who have been before more convinced that pupils will benefit from what they do at the museum. However, these differences are too minor to be regarded as statistically significant.  

Forty-three percent of teachers were on their first visit to the museum, compared with 45% in 2003. While it is interesting to see that teachers do increase the level of importance accorded to the GLOs once they have used a museum, it is not the teachers on their first visit that are responsible for the apparent drop in importance of the GLOs in 2005.

---

20 There is not a significant difference when teachers rating the importance of Action, Behaviour, Progression is compared by teachers' on their first visit and teachers not on their first visit (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=1363)= 3.683, p 0.298 (>0.05).
Q.19: cross-tabbed by the link of the work at the museum to the curriculum (Q.22)

Fig 5.1u: Form A, Q.19: Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity and Q.22: ‘Is today’s work linked to the curriculum?’, 2005

While the vast majority of teachers who are using the museum for both curriculum-related and non curriculum-related work think Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity is ‘very important’, those working on the curriculum rate this more highly. However, this difference in rating of ‘very important’ is too small to be statistically significant.²¹

²¹ There is not a significant difference when teachers rating the importance of Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity is compared by teachers working on the curriculum and teachers not working on the curriculum (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=1521)= 1.732, p 0.63 (>0.05).
Fig 5.1v: Form A, Q.19: Knowledge and Understanding and Q.22: ‘Is today’s work linked to the curriculum?’, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers responses Q.19: Knowledge and Understanding and Q.22: ‘Is today’s work linked to the curriculum?’, 2005, missing excluded (yes 1422, no 115)

There is a huge difference between those teachers whose work is curriculum-linked and those whose work is not curriculum-linked in relation to the importance accorded to Knowledge and Understanding.\(^{22}\)

\(^{22}\) Chi square analysis was not performed on this cross-tab because of the very low number of responses in the ‘not important’ and ‘neither’ categories.
There is a substantial difference in the importance accorded to Attitudes and Values between those teachers linked to the curriculum and those who are not.  

---

23 Chi square analysis was not performed on this cross-tab because of the very low number of responses in the ‘not important’ and ‘neither’ categories.
Fig 5.1x: Form A, Q.19: Action, Behaviour, Progression and Q.22: ‘Is today’s work linked to the curriculum?’, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very important</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Here again there is a considerable difference between the teachers according to their focus. ²⁴

²⁴ Chi square analysis was not performed on this cross-tab because of the very low number of responses in the ‘not important’ category.
The teachers show a significant difference in the importance they attach to this GLO according to the relationship of their work to the curriculum. With teachers working on the curriculum more likely to rate Skills ‘very important’ rather than ‘important’, when compared with those not working on curriculum-related activities.

The percentage of teachers using museums for curriculum-related work has decreased from 94% in 2003 to 90% in 2005. In the charts above, there are some very large percentage differences between teachers in their view of the importance of each of the GLOs according to whether or not their work was curriculum-related. These are shown below.

---

25 There is a significant difference when teachers rating the importance of Skills is compared by teachers working on the curriculum and teachers not working on the curriculum (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=1514)=14.057, p 0.003 (<0.05).
### Table 5.1z: Form A, Q.19: Percentage of teachers rating each GLO ‘very important’, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLO</th>
<th>Curriculum-related</th>
<th>Not curriculum-related</th>
<th>Percentage difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and Values</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action, Behaviour, Progression</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: teachers responding ‘very important’ Q.19 and Q.22, 2005 (EIC 1525, KU 1537, AV 1520, S1518 and ABP 1374)

It is likely that the drop in teachers using the museum for curriculum-related work has affected the level of importance accorded to each GLO.
5.2 The importance of museums in teaching

Q.26: ‘How important are museums to your teaching?’

The extremely high levels of appreciation of museums and their contribution to learning are linked to how important teachers think museums are to their teaching. The chart below shows that broadly equal numbers of teachers think that museums are ‘very important’ (46%) or ‘important’ (49%) for their teaching.

Fig 5.2a: Form A, Q.26: ‘How important are museums to your teaching?’, 2005

Base: all teachers’ responses Q.26: ‘How important are museums to your teaching?’, 2005 (1632)

The total percentage of teachers feeling positive about museums and finding them either ‘very important’ or ‘important’ for teaching is 95%. Perhaps this is not very surprising, as this is a survey of those teachers who were indeed using museums for teaching. The results are virtually identical in both the Phase 1 and the Phase 2 museums.

Compared with the first study, there has been a significant change in how teachers rate the importance of museums to their teaching.26 While the overall positive value is much the same (95% in 2005, 95% in 2003), the balance has shifted considerably, so that fewer teachers in 2005 stated that museums were ‘very important’ (46% compared with 58%) than in 2003, and more stated ‘important’ (48% compared with 37%).

26 There is a significant difference in teachers rating the importance of museums to their teaching between 2003 and 2005 (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=2515)=36.735, p <0.001.
Table 5.2b: Form A: Percentages of teachers stating that museums were ‘very important’ and ‘important’ to their teaching, 2003 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers’ responses Q.22: ‘How important are museums to your teaching?’ 2003 (936) and Q.26: ‘How important are museums to your teaching?’ 2005 (1632)

Given the range of views expressed by different teachers discussed in relation to the way they valued the GLOs, their attitudes to the importance of museums was reviewed in relation to whether they were teachers of primary or secondary pupils, and whether or not their work at the museum was linked to the curriculum. Figures 5.2c and 5.2d below show the results.

Fig 5.2c: Form A, Q.26: ‘How important are museums to your teaching?’, by Key Stage, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KS2 and below</th>
<th>KS3 and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all important</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers’ responses Q.26: ‘How important are museums to your teaching?’ and Q.10 Key Stage groups, missing and mixed Key Stage groups excluded, 2005 (KS2 and below 1366, KS3 and above 201)
While there is very little difference in the responses of teachers working with different Key Stage groups, there is a considerable difference between those whose work is linked to the curriculum and those whose is not. Ninety-seven percent (97%) of teachers who are using the museum for curriculum-related work find museums either ‘very important’ or ‘important.’ However, 89% of those who are not using the museum for curriculum-related work also express positive attitudes. But there is a difference of 15% between the ‘very important’ ratings; 15% more of those teachers using the museum for curriculum-related work rate museums as ‘very important’ to their teaching than those using the museums for work which is not focused on the curriculum. Ninety percent (90%) of teachers responding to the survey stated that their work was linked to the curriculum. The apparent drop in the ratings of importance of museums to teachers would appear to be because this percentage has dropped from 94% in 2003.

Chi square analysis was not performed on this cross-tab because of the very low number of responses in the ‘not important’ and ‘neither’ categories.

---

27 Chi square analysis was not performed on this cross-tab because of the very low number of responses in the ‘not important’ and ‘neither’ categories.
5.2.1 Evidence of the importance of museums from the focus groups and case-studies

The qualitative research provides a further dimension to how teachers value museums. Two elements seem to be key to this - the significance of doing something different to what can be done in schools, and an utterly dependable high quality. As one museum educator put it:

‘I think that it isn’t just another chapter in a textbook, it’s got to be something else… to justify bringing out 200 or 300 students from a very, very tight important stage of their schooling, it’s got to be top notch quality and we’ve got to add something that they cannot do at school’.

5.2.2 Importance of the local

Many teachers talked in an interesting way about how a local museum can provide pupils with information about their local context. Teachers thought this was important for a number of reasons. A museum visit provided pupils with exposure to parts of their local area which they may not have visited before:

‘The majority of children have never been to a museum, few even come into the city centre’.

‘They go to their local shopping centre but not into the city’.

‘Some children haven’t even been to Woolworth’s’.

Teachers also mentioned that local museums can provide pupils with an understanding of the way in which their local environment had changed over time:

‘We go to the Police Museum as part of our topic looking at how the locality has changed’.

‘We’re aware the city’s changing ... [we did] a four day workshop..., looking at parts of the city other than the shopping areas where they all go, the girls were amazed and had no idea. And ... we had a Kurdish girl who pointed out a tree of remembrance from the atrocities that happened, we showed them things like the Buddhist Centre and the Chinese Art Gallery there in the art quarter, some other shops, the arts and craft shop’.

‘They looked at ... work, he photographed the city from high vantage points, making it look very glamorous and clean. And then they looked from when they were walking round. There’s the down-and-outs and the graffiti and they thought about how
the city presented itself and how they felt about it and what they would want for the future for their culture and generation’.

Most of the teachers we spoke to commented on the value of the museum for presenting a local perspective on subjects taught within the National Curriculum, and how powerful it was to use local examples like Blakesley Hall which helped pupils to understand the Tudors in the context of their local area.

‘The curriculum is national and decided by the Government, and textbooks seldom give local examples. Museums can give a more local perspective’.

‘[It gives access to] objects ... related to the local context. Real connections exist and this triggers an emotional response’.

Loren aged 15 was also able to think differently about her local area after a visit to the Museum of London:

Fig 5.2.2a: Form B KS3 and above completed by 15 year old pupil after a visit to the Museum of London

The most interesting thing about today was...

getting to know about the regeneration and of the history of the docklands where I live. I also like the fact that you get a break and while you're not discover thing i didn't now and know how the people that lived in docklands feel makes me realise what life used to be like. I also liked the information given.
It is not only attitudes to urban contexts that can change. Will aged 13 became more aware of and sympathetic to his environment after a visit to Roots of Norfolk at Gressenhall:

**Fig 5.2.2b: Form B KS3 and above completed by 13 year old pupil after a visit to Roots of Norfolk at Gressenhall**

The most interesting thing about today was...

Seeing the countryside and realising how easy it would be to lose it. Also how many rare animals Norfolk has, and we must preserve what we have and not lose something that is precious and fragile to mankind.
5.3 Teachers' confidence in using museums

♦ Q.28: ‘To what extent has the experience of this visit increased your own confidence to use museums as part of your teaching?’

The importance of museums in teaching is strongly related to how confident teachers feel about using museums. The Teachers' Questionnaire (Form A) suggests that 90% of teachers thought it ‘likely’ or ‘very likely’ that the visit they had just completed would have increased their confidence to use museums as part of their teaching. Sixty percent (60%) of teachers thought this was ‘very likely’. The percentage of teachers saying ‘very likely’ was slightly higher in the Phase 1 museums at 63% than in the Phase 2 museums (58%), however this difference cannot be considered statistically significant.28 This 5% difference might be attributable to greater maturity and development in the Phase 1 museums because of Renaissance funding; this increased level of development may lead teachers to feel more confident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All museums</th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers’ responses Q.28: ‘To what extent has the experience of this visit increased your own confidence to use museums as part of your teaching?’ ‘very likely’ only 2005 (1632)

Teachers’ confidence in using museums as part of their teaching shows no significant29 change between 2003 and 2005, although slightly more teachers thought it ‘very likely’ or ‘quite likely’ in 2005 (90% in 2005, 89% in 2003) that their visit had increased their confidence in using museums as part of their teaching.

---

28 There is not a significant difference in teachers’ confidence to use museums as part of their teaching between Phase 1 and Phase 2 museums in 2005 (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=1582)= 3.39, p >0.05.

29 There is not a significant difference in teachers’ confidence to use museums as part of their teaching between 2003 and 2005 (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=2494)= 4.46, p >0.05.
**Fig 5.3b: Form A, Q.28: 'To what extent has the experience of this visit increased your own confidence to use museums as part of your teaching?', 2005**

Base: all teachers' responses to Q.28: ‘To what extent has the experience of this visit increased your own confidence to use museums as part of your teaching?’, 2005 (1632)

**Fig 5.3c: Form A, Q.24: 'To what extent has the experience of this visit increased your own confidence to use museums as part of your teaching?', 2003**

Base: all teachers' responses to Q.24: ‘To what extent has the experience of this visit increased your own confidence to use museums as part of your teaching?’, 2003 (936)
5.4 Value of the museum to teachers’ professional development

A number of teachers mentioned the importance of engagement with a museum to their own professional development. Some mentioned developing their own subject-specific knowledge and learning as a result of museum provision, such as a mediated session.

Fig 5.4a: A teacher becomes a participant in a museum workshop

Other teachers mentioned that it was useful for them to see how other people managed, worked and interacted with their classes, and discussed how being exposed to different teaching styles was important. One teacher talked about how an involvement with a museum had re-introduced her to some skills:

‘For me it’s reminded me at a very basic level that just simple things like tearing bits out of magazines and sticking them on and sticking photographs on and just cutting and sticking and going back to the basics can teach them a lot, doesn’t cost a lot and it’s something we can do very easily and adapt. I’d forgotten, you know, I’d just forgotten how easy it is really to think of six different activities that don’t cost much and the children love it and they’re learning a lot’.
5.5 Levels of satisfaction with the museum provision

♦ Q.27: ‘How satisfied are you with the museum’s provision today?’

Seventy-four percent (74%) of teachers in all 54 museums responded that they were ‘very satisfied’ and a further 22% were ‘satisfied’. Together, this is 96% of teachers stating that they were either ‘satisfied’ or ‘very satisfied’. This compares well with the first study, where 72% were ‘very satisfied’ and 24% were ‘satisfied’, with the same overall positive rating of 96%.

Fig 5.5a: Form A, Q.27: ‘How satisfied are you with the museum’s provision today?’, 2005

Looking at the breakdown by Phase, 78% of teachers in the Phase 1 museums stated that they were ‘very satisfied’, compared with the Phase 2 museums, where 74% of teachers were ‘very satisfied’.

These small percentage differences, whilst not statistically significant, may suggest that the museum education services that have received Renaissance funding for the longest period of time are producing a greater percentage of teachers who are ‘very satisfied’.

---

30 There is not a significant difference in teachers’ satisfaction with museum provision between Phase 1 and Phase 2 museums in 2005 (‘missing’ and ‘don’t know’ categories excluded). Chi square (degrees of freedom 3, n=1596)=4.515, p=0.21 (p >0.05).
Fig 5.5b: Form A, Q.27: ‘How satisfied are you with the museum’s provision today?’ by museum Phase, 2005

Base: all teachers’ responses to Q.27 ‘How satisfied are you with the museum’s provision today?’ by museum Phase (Phase 1 museums 761, Phase 2 museums 835)
5.6 Evidence from the focus groups and case-studies of satisfaction and dissatisfaction with museum provision

During discussions, teachers were probed to identify the problems teachers experienced using museums and the aspects of museum provision which they found most useful. Many of these issues are very similar to those that were raised during the earlier study in 2003. Research with teachers, pupils, LEAs and other service providers undertaken by all nine of the regional Hubs and MLA’s Regional Agencies confirms the key areas in which the teachers we spoke to expressed dissatisfaction.31

MLA’s research identified two main sets of barriers to the development of the national museum education offer. These were:

1. ‘Barriers to school participating in a national museum education offer:
   - schools not recognising the relevance of museums education
   - logistical issues
   - skills in schools
   - awareness in schools of what museums offer

2. Barriers to museums developing a national education offer:
   - capacity in museums
   - skills in museums
   - environment and facilities
   - education activities which are not relevant to schools or learners’.32

Relevance:
As many of the teachers we spoke to were already engaged in museum education and were making good use of the museum as an educational tool we did not interview any teachers who questioned the relevance of the museum to pupils. MLA’s research identified that themes focusing on the cultural, social and educational relevance of the museum ran through all the of the Hub’s Education Programme Delivery Plans (EPDP).33 However, MLA also found that ‘without the relevance of this “offer” being acknowledged conceptually by LEAs and schools in the first instance, a greater awareness of what museums can bring to learning will not be achieved’.34 We found that it was precisely the broader cultural, social and educational relevance of the museum that teachers identified with. However, the teachers who identified this broader relevance of the museum were more likely to be experienced museum users. Teachers who were less experienced museum users were likely to comment on the utility of the museum in direct proportion to its relevance to the curriculum. This seemed a matter of the teachers’ confidence in using the museum and in teaching the subject. Where teachers were more confident of their subject area and museum use they were able to talk confidently about using the museum, providing educational tools and

32 MLA, 2005, 17.
33 MLA, 2005, 18.
34 MLA, 2005, 18.
designing their own museum visit. In addition, we identified that in some cases this was a lack of understanding and in some cases awareness of what museums offer.

Training:
We identified training issues for teachers in relation to the utility of the museum as an educational tool especially in relation to confidence, lack of awareness and the range of opportunities for museum use. Teachers were also in agreement about the importance of the quality of the facilitation provided by the museum. This finding is in accordance with MLA’s research which found that the ‘value of a museum visit was seen by teachers as depending on the quality of delivery by museum facilitators’.  

Logistics, environment and facilities:
Below are listed items of dissatisfaction which teachers we spoke to identified as a barrier to their use of museums. In common with MLA’s research we found that many of the barriers to utilising museums identified by teachers were logistical or had to do with the museum environment and its facilities. Our research supports MLA’s conclusion that this ‘suggests that practical developments around information-sharing and promotion (e.g. support on risk assessment; on-line and print directories of provision) could provide relatively straightforward improvements to links between museums and schools’.  

Following is a list of items of dissatisfaction and satisfaction taken from interviews and focus groups with teachers as part of the qualitative research.

Dissatisfaction with museum provision:
Problems with museums:

- Pupil to staff ratio established by museums is too high and unrealistic.
- Lack of appropriate food/food too expensive.
- Disengaged or unenthusiastic museum staff.
- Museum staff that are rude to pupils.
- Museums not able to cater for very large groups (e.g. whole year groups-230 pupils).
- Disorganised museum administration e.g. bookings of lunch rooms not being honoured, pre-arranged programmes being changed without informing the school.
- Limited view of the value of museum learning; museums advertise content or subject specific programmes but they could also advertise the diverse learning experiences provided by a museum visit regardless of the subject.
- Timing of ‘pre-visit’ sessions for teachers; these sessions must take better account of the teacher’s working day, e.g. some teachers cannot attend 3.30pm sessions as some schools finish at that time. A number of teachers commented on the disappearance of ‘pre-visit twilight sessions’ which they had found useful.
- Issues with space for classes to have lunch.

36 MLA, 2005, 18.
Problems with factors beyond museums’ control:

- High cost of transport to get to the museum (a number of teachers suggested museums should help with this cost), asking parents for money is not encouraged, and many teachers talked about only asking for a voluntary contribution from parents.
- Difficulty of taking classes of children on public transport e.g. public ‘less than courteous’.
- Museum visits cut into other lessons - pupils miss classes in other curriculum subjects.
- Requirement of a high pupil to staff ratio.
- School institutional requirement to justify visit in terms of particular institutionally set targets; some teachers find this difficult, and possibly museums could provide material which teachers could use for these purposes thus providing leverage for permission.
- Large amounts of paperwork and administration associated with a museum visit e.g. letters and phone calls to and from the museum, letters to parents, reply slips, risk assessments, organising free school meals, organising transport, and so forth.
- Risk assessments - one teacher stated that the risk assessment forms she had to complete for a museum visit were 10 pages long; another teacher described a museum which helps with risk assessments (see below in section on satisfaction).
- Some teachers who had a limited or a narrow understanding of how the museum was useful to their teaching complained about unstructured museum experiences where either the mediated session was not highly structured or the material provided for self-led sessions did not provide a highly structured experience. Teachers who were more confident and flexible in their use of the museum talked about enjoying unstructured visits as well as structured visits.
- One teacher talked about encountering racism from a member of the public on a museum visit.
- Some teachers are worried pupils will misbehave and this would be highly visible in public places.
- One secondary school teacher talked about the impact of the new Teaching and Learning Responsibilities (TLR). This new government directive had been interpreted by his school in such a way that it will create more barriers to taking groups out to museums as cover for other classes will problematic. As part of the TLR high school teachers are not allowed to cover colleagues for illness or school trips. Teachers are given 3-4 free periods a week for marking and preparation but they are not allowed to do anything else in this time. In the past, this time could be used to cover colleagues (who may have been on a school trip) but this is no longer allowed. This means that there must be a significant investment in training teaching assistants who are qualified enough to provide cover. There had been some suggestion that the cost of providing cover for a school trip could be passed on to pupils.
Satisfaction:
Aspects of museum provision that teachers find useful:

- Museum staff who are networked with teachers and are proactive about inviting teachers to the museum to build partnerships.
- Museums which ask for schools to state what subjects are covered and help to plan a tailored visit to the museum.
- Good quality museum guides or packs for teachers.
- Good quality museum packs targeted at a curriculum subject.
- Museum packs and guides which include materials for the pupils and give them lots of things to do/ questions to answer.
- Some teachers talked about appreciating most those museums which provide highly structured visits either through packs which teachers can use for a self-led session or through facilitation; other teachers used unstructured visits and many of these talked about the importance of pre-visit sessions for teachers.
- Pre-visit sessions for teachers.
- Good quality mediated sessions.
- Museums that are flexible in the options and material they can provide for teachers.
- Actors in role as facilitators of a museum visit.
- Good quality websites which can be used to add to the pre-visit information (not as a replacement for) and provide information the teachers can use to prepare the pupils for their visit.
- A number of teachers talked about the importance of artefacts which pupils could touch or see museum staff handle.
- Children involved in role playing or dressing up.
- Workshops.
- Media resources produced by museums which can be used as an aid to teaching e.g. CD ROMs, websites.
- Two of the special school teachers commented that museums which enabled the pupil to have some kind of physical involvement were particularly useful.
- Enthusiastic and knowledgeable museum staff.
- Museums which send a completed risk assessment form to the teacher prior to the visit.
- Museum programmes involving a process with an outcome (assignment, painting, piece of writing etc.) - although sometimes the process is more important than the outcome.
- Regular sessions/ programmes.
- Working with specialists- artists/ scientists etc.
5.7 Conclusion

This section considers how teachers value museums. Overall, the great enthusiasm for museums is very clear, and it is also clear that many teachers can discuss their use of museums critically and analytically. Indeed, teachers in the research undertaken for this study in 2005 appeared more reflective about the types of learning their pupils experienced during a museum visit, and were able to analyse and examine this more effectively than during the 2003 study, where teachers frequently merely described the activities that took place during the museum visit. Teachers were also more focused on the impact of the museum on their pupils in relation to issues around ethnicity, socio-economic deprivation, cultural entitlement, aspiration, class mobility and inclusion. It may be that the policies and strategies outlined in Section 1, and especially Every Child Matters, may have influenced teachers' concerns and attitudes.

Much of this section considered issues to do with the value to teaching and learning that teachers place on museums and the learning that may result. It has begun to become clear that teachers value museum-based learning outcomes differently according to the reasons for which they are using museums. It seems logical that purpose and outcome should be strongly related.

Overall, teachers are extremely positive about the value of museums to their teaching. The percentages of teachers saying that the learning outcomes that could result from using museums were 'important' or 'very important' to them are very much the same (with one exception) as in 2003 (2003 figures in brackets):

- Increase or change in Knowledge and Understanding 95% (96%)
- Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity 94% (96%)
- Change or development in Attitudes and Values 92% (93%)
- Increase in Skills 89% (88%)
- Action, Behaviour, Progression 81% (92%)

Looking only at the 'very important' and 'important' values appeared to raise questions about whether there had in fact been a change in the ways teachers valued museums and this has been further reviewed. Analysing the difference between teachers' views in 2005 and 2003 as accurately as possible by doing a chi-square test (looking at actual numbers of teachers rather than percentages) after having omitted 'don't know' and 'missing' values, it would appear that teachers find Attitudes and Values slightly more important (by 4%) than in 2003, and Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity slightly less important (by 3%).

An analysis of attitudes to the GLOs in relation to teachers' purposes in using museums shows that these differences in purpose have a considerable impact on how teachers value the potential learning outcomes. More of those teachers using museums for curriculum-related work think that the five GLOs are 'very important' than those who are not linking the museum work to
the curriculum, and primary teachers as a whole are much more likely to find the museum-based learning outcomes 'very important' than secondary teachers.

Table 5.7a: Teachers using museums for curriculum-related and non-curriculum-related purposes stating 'very important' (all teachers in all museums), 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Curriculum-related</th>
<th>Non curriculum-related</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and Values</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action, Behaviour, Progression</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: teachers completing Q.19 and Q.22 (1525 EIC, 1537 KU, 1520 AV, 1518 S and 1374 ABP)

Table 5.7b: Form A, Q.19: Primary and secondary teachers stating ‘very important’, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teachers of KS2 and below</th>
<th>Teachers of KS3 and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyment, Inspiration, Creativity</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and Values</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action, Behaviour, Progression</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: all teachers completing Q.19 (1527 EIC, 1535 KU, 1518 AV, 1372 ABP, 1517 S)

There are some large differences in the importance accorded to museum-based learning outcomes in the tables above. In considering how teachers value museums and the learning that may result from their use, it is vital to differentiate between primary and secondary teachers, and between the purposes for which those teachers are using museums.

Q. 26 asked teachers how important museums were to their teaching. While 95% stated that museums were ‘important’ or ‘very important’ for their teaching, which was much the same as in 2003, the percentage stating ‘very important’ has fallen from 58% to 46%. Probing for possible reasons for this, it was found that while Key Stage had no bearing on teachers’ views, whether or not the work at the museum was linked to the curriculum was a major factor. As the percentage of teachers using museums for curriculum-related work has dropped since 2003, this may account for an apparent drop in the importance of museums in teachers’ eyes.
Very large percentages of teachers (74%) across all museums are ‘very satisfied’ with their museum experiences (although some important issues were raised about the difficulties teachers face in visiting museums with their classes). Ninety percent (90%) of teachers left the museum feeling ‘confident’ or ‘very confident’ about using museums in the future. This is an enormously positive endorsement for museum education staff as a whole, especially considering the very large proportion of schools where children may face challenges in learning.