



<http://www.diva-portal.org>

This is the published version of a paper presented at *Oldham University Campus Research Symposium, Key note speech.*

Citation for the original published paper:

Bottomley, J. (2018)

Talking movies: Using film as part of language study and academic development

In: *Spark: The Journal of Research and Scholarly Activity at University Campus Oldham, Issue 1, March, ISSN 2516-4295*

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published paper.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:kth:diva-334409>

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327060348>

# Talking movies: Using film as part of language study and academic development

Conference Paper · March 2018

---

CITATIONS

0

READS

4,012

1 author:



Jane Bottomley

KTH Royal Institute of Technology

3 PUBLICATIONS 3 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

# Talking movies: using film as part of language study and academic development

**Jane Bottomley**

Published in:

Spark: The Journal of Research and Scholarly Activity at University Campus Oldham, Issue 1, March 2018, ISSN 2516-4295

## Introduction

After many years as an English language tutor, I have come to believe that film is one of the most powerful tools in the classroom. In my more recent capacity teaching English for Academic Purposes, I have also come to appreciate the role film analysis can play in helping students develop transferrable academic skills, many of which form part of the ‘graduate attributes’ promoted in UK universities (Barrie, 2004; Hounsell, 2011). In this paper, I will discuss the potential of film for developing language, cultural understanding, and academic skills, with reference to an undergraduate course developed at the University of Manchester. I will also present the results of a small survey conducted on student perceptions regarding the role the course played in the development of their language and academic skills.

## Why film?

In terms of language, film contextualises usage in an interesting and accessible way. Moreover, the dialogue in many films, e.g. *Kes*, *East is East*, *This is England*, *Trainspotting*, often approaches authentic language use. Lastly, in my experience, film has the potential to lift language off the page and bring it to (technicolour!) life in the classroom.

Language study necessarily includes the study of culture, and many films explore key cultural and social themes in an interesting way. These may be central to the narrative, and even, on occasion, be tied in with the idea of film as social critique. The films of Ken Loach, for example, can be viewed within the context of Loach’s belief in the political nature and transformative power of film – with *Kes* representing for him the ‘waste of human spirit’ engendered by the education system and wider society (Pulleine, 1972: 56), and *Cathy Come Home* acting as a catalyst for the launch of *Shelter* in the UK. However, even with the most activist of directors, films can rarely be reduced to a political point. Nor can cultural exploration be limited to ‘difficult’ issues such as social deprivation; it must also encompass

everyday topics such as family life, relationships and personal aspirations. From this broader perspective, Loach's films are not only interesting for their overtly political stance, they also resonate as individual tales, often featuring 'a single protagonist with a simple goal' (Robins, 2003). Where social themes and issues are backgrounded in a film, as with, for example, the 1984 miners' strike in *Billy Elliot*, they are still often integral to the narrative, enriching and authenticating it on a number of levels.

### **How should we study films?**

The study of films to explore language and culture is distinct from academic studies in cinema or screen studies, with the overt technical content of the latter. However, with film, as with comparable media such as literature, it is impossible, or at least unwise, to separate *content* and *form*. As Dix explains: '[t]he formal strategies of a film are not neutral or background facts but meaning-generating processes' (2008: 9-10). It follows, from this perspective, that to truly understand a film, we need to engage with its formal elements. Dix goes further, asserting that 'any attempt to place a given film in larger cultural or ideological contexts is [...] inadequate if it does not include some reckoning with the work's distinctive form' (Dix, 2008: 9-10). This reckoning entails a consideration of how things are revealed not only through narrative, but through cinematic technique and style. This may involve analysis of composition and mise-en-scene, of camera work such as the use of close-ups and tracking shots, or of the application of editing tools such as montage and crosscutting. Effective film analysis requires an understanding of how these aspects of form interplay with content, and with each other. Take for example a key scene in *Billy Elliot*, where crosscutting between the picket line and the dance class is used to establish a stark contrast between the tough, masculine world of the miners with their gruff chanting and seemingly brutish physicality, and the genteel world of dance, with its classical music, French phraseology and elegant movement. The alternating shots also echo the tension between individuality and solidarity which could be said to underpin the film as a whole. However, the crosscutting here is perhaps not solely contrastive; it could also be seen to link the two scenes in some way, showing the miners engaged in their own dance, moving and chanting together in mass resistance. The scenes, viewed in this way, are perhaps as much to do with solidarity as difference.

## **It's all academic!**

Technical analysis not only reveals meaning, it can also help students to hone critical skills which transfer to a wider study context. Students develop analytical skills as they pull apart a film or a scene to see how it constructs what the audience sees, hears and feels, and how dialogue, sound and visual language function as part of this. They develop evaluative skills as they judge the success of directorial choices or assess an actor's interpretation of a role. They develop reflective skills as they make distinctions between subjective opinion and objective analysis. They develop academic rigour as they distinguish between description and analysis of film, and make choices about appropriate content and tone in academic writing and speaking assignments. They develop their academic discourse skills as they strive to organise, sustain and support ideas until they are fully formed, and to fine-tune those ideas through revision of the language used to convey them (Corrigan, 2007). In short, film can be a vehicle for the development of a whole host of transferrable academic skills, and the data collected and reported on later in this paper goes some way to providing an understanding of how aware students are of this.

## **Creating a film module**

The three aspects of study outlined above – content, form and academic skills – have formed the foundation of the *Language and Culture through Film* course at the University of Manchester. The course aims for students to:

- acquire knowledge and understanding of UK language and culture;
- engage with the formal elements of film, employing basic analytical tools;
- develop transferable academic skills.

It is ultimately the interplay between these three aspects of the course which promotes deeper understanding of the films, the culture they are part of, the language which permeates them, and the academic skills required to critically analyse and evaluate them.

The 10-credit course is aimed at international undergraduates with English as a second language. There is an advanced group with entry set at IELTS 7 or equivalent, and a lower-level group with entry set at IELTS 6.5 or equivalent. The basic content of the course is the same for both groups, but they are differentiated in terms of support and assessment. Course

work activities include mini-lectures, reflective activities, analysis of scenes and dialogue, and small group seminars.

### **Selecting films**

Films studied on the course include:

- *Kes*
- *Billy Elliot*
- *Brassed off*
- *Pride*
- *The Queen*
- *Dirty Pretty Things*
- *East is East*
- *This is England*
- *Trainspotting*
- *24 Hour Party People*
- *Sense and Sensibility*

I approached film choice with the belief that any number of films could form the basis of such a course, and that different teachers would inevitably choose different films.

Nonetheless, I was also conscious of the fact that not any film would do, so I developed criteria to govern my own selection. Firstly, I decided to choose films which had generated a significant degree of critical acclaim. Given the remit of the course, it was also important to include films which offered a window onto interesting periods, places and people in the UK. There is an emphasis on films which reflect the emergence of contemporary society, but even historical costume dramas can feed into current issues, for example, *Sense and Sensibility*, with its interesting treatment of class and gender. I required the films as a whole to represent a range of language use in the UK in terms of social and regional varieties. I also chose films which explore register and ‘interesting’ language use such as idiom and metaphor. Finally, and perhaps more controversially, I decided to choose films with which I have some personal connection. It is of course important to retain objectivity in the context of academic study, but films are deeply connected to our identity, and, if this connection is openly discussed, I believe it can weave an interesting thread through such a course. In class discussions, I allude

to personal connections when they seem relevant and if I believe that they can perhaps add to students' understanding of what makes a people and a culture: perhaps, in *Billy Elliot*, how the outside toilet reminds me of houses from my own northern, working class background, how heated exchanges on the 1984 miners' strike take me back to rows on the topic with my own dad when I was a student, and how a magical clip from Fred Astaire in *Top Hat* evokes my black and white film education in my grandparents' front room. If students understand that these things are open to discussion, they will often take the lead, asking, for example, about how it felt to witness a particular event, like the miners' strike or the death of Diana, and perhaps linking it to something they have experienced themselves in their own lives. This link to the personal can make it easier for students to discuss their emotional as well as their intellectual responses to the films, and to perhaps find connections to their own life stories. Of course, on an academic course, it is also imperative to differentiate between personal reactions and objective analysis, and to relate this to assessment requirements, but this differentiation process can only enhance critical development.

### **Language in film**

There is undoubtedly a Northern bias in the choice of films. The resulting focus on northern English reflects the students' current reality, based as they are in Manchester. It also, along with the range of social classes represented in the films, perhaps provides a necessary corrective to what some see as a certain prejudice against regional and social varieties of English in UK universities, notwithstanding the outward commitment of these institutions to diversity and inclusion (Loukopoulou, 2017).

#### Lexis, grammar and accent

Films such as *Kes*, *Billy Elliot*, *East is East* and *Trainspotting* are a rich source of northern lexis: *mam*, *hiya*, *tara*, *mither*, *nesh*, *mardy*, *skrike*, *anyroad*, *nowt*, *owt*. This includes words related to specific dialects: *thou* (Yorkshire); *howay*, *maybes* (Geordie); *wee*, *bairn*, *ken*, *aye* (Scottish). Many of these expressions are contained in the word bank collected by the *British Library* as evidence that dialects continue to flourish in the UK (Duncan and Holder, 2017), and, in film, such language is fully contextualised.

Similarly, these films also provide an opportunity to examine phonological variation in the UK in action, including:

- the northern /ʊ/ (rather than /ʌ/) in words such as ‘bus’ and ‘love’;
- the northern short /æ/ in ‘bath’ and ‘class’;
- t-glottalisation in the north east;
- the Scottish rhotic ‘r’;
- the hard Liverpoolian /k/;
- Yorkshire definite article reduction (‘in t’field’).

There are also similarly contextualised examples of grammatical variation, for example:

“Jesus Christ, Billy Elliot, you’re a disgrace to them [those] gloves, your father and the traditions of this boxing hall.” (*Billy Elliot*)

“Can’t we go for us [our] dinners, Sir?” (*Kes*)

“I were [was] terrified.” (*Kes*)

In contrast, in the film *The Queen*, we encounter (unsurprisingly) what is sometimes referred to as ‘the Queen’s English’, notably, the use of the ‘royal *we*’, but also language specifically associated with the upper classes, such as the use of the impersonal ‘one’. As far as accent is concerned, *The Queen* in fact provides a good opportunity for students to explore the rather narrow definition of standard UK pronunciation, or Received Pronunciation (RP), as it is known. As Crystal points out (2002), RP is only used by approximately 3% of the UK population, although a much greater number use something which he calls ‘modified RP’, which might include a small number of regional or social variations. RP is associated with the south east and with the middle classes, and is in fact represented more faithfully in the film by Tony Blair, rather than the Queen, with her occasional non-standard phoneme use such as the long vowel in ‘off’ (although, a brief look at recordings from the 1950s until the present day reveal a shift in the Queen’s accent).

### Lexical fields

Some of the films on the courses are rich in imagery and symbolism, often illustrated through discernible lexical fields, which lend themselves to a contextualised approach to vocabulary study. In the Queen for example, the following emerge:

- **Royalty:** the crown; the throne; sovereign; monarch; your majesty; predecessors; curtsy
- **Subservience:** flunky; go to someone cap in hand
- **Death:** grief; mourn; funeral; cortege; hearse; coffin; undertaker; bury; flag at half mast; kick the bucket
- **Hunting:** stag; stalking; stick to your guns; bay for blood; “Diana was hounded by the press”
- **Emotion:** “Queen of hearts”; wear your heart on your sleeve; have a change of heart
- **Media:** the press; tabloid; spin

### Humour

The films on this course all deal with serious topics, but they all contain elements of light and shade, and humour is an important element of all, even the darkest, of them. It is therefore interesting to analyse language as a source of humour in the films. For example, in *The Queen*, Tony Blair is given oddly precise instructions on pronunciation as part of his protocol induction which add to the general comedy of the scene:

“And it’s ma’am as in ham, not ma’am as in farm”.

(Interestingly, as my students watch *The Queen* after *Billy Elliot* and *Kes* on the course, they are often amused that *ma’am* and the northern colloquialism for mother (*mam*) are therefore homophones.)

In *Trainspotting*, one source of humour is the juxtaposition of formal and informal registers or situations:

“Would sir care for a starter of some garlic bread perhaps?” – “No thank you. I will proceed directly to the intravenous injection of hard drugs please.”

“Swanney taught us to adore and respect the health service. For it was the source of much of our gear.”

“Can’t even find a decent culture to be colonised by. We’re ruled by effete assholes.”

### Reading between the lines

In order to understand the culture presented in films, it is often necessary to ‘read between the lines’ of a dialogue. The following dialogue in *The Queen* is as interesting for the things which are unsaid or implied as much as for the things which are explicitly stated:

Robin: The Prime Minister’s on his way ma’am.

The Queen: To be Robin. Prime Minister to be. I haven’t asked him yet. He’s a hard one to read, isn’t he?

Robin: Yes. On the one hand his background is quite establishment: father a Conservative, educated at Fettes, where he was tutored by the same man as the Prince of Wales.

The Queen: Well, we’ll try not to hold that against him.

Robin: On the other, his manifesto promises the most radical modernisation and shake-up of the constitution in three hundred years.

The Queen: Oh, do you think he’s going to try and modernise us?

Robin: Well, I wouldn’t put it past him. He’s married to a woman with known anti-monarchist sympathies. You may remember her – curtsy, the first time you met. It could best be described as – shallow.

The Queen: I don’t measure the depth of a curtsy Robin. I leave that to my sister.

Robin: The atmosphere at Downing Street is expected to be very informal. Everyone on first name terms, at the Prime Minister’s insistence.

The Queen: What, as in “call me Tony”?

Robin: Yes ma’am.

The Queen: Oh I don’t like that. Have we sent him a protocol sheet?

The dialogue very much plays on shared public perceptions of certain public figures formed by the media – precisely the kind of thing which international students may struggle to decode. In this case, the difficulty is compounded by quite subtle idiomatic usage (*We’ll try*

*not to hold that against him; I wouldn't put it past him*). However, it is possible to work with students to tease out hidden, implied or opaque meaning, in this case: the meaning and importance of the term 'establishment'; the Queen's problematic relationship with her son and heir; the apparent distrust of Tony Blair among the establishment; the perception of Princess Margaret as rather snobby or entitled. In my experience, 'cracking the code' in this way can give language students a huge sense of satisfaction. This can be taken further by asking the students to act out the dialogue, using word stress and intonation to convey the sense and tone of the dialogue as they have come to understand it.

### **Culture and society in film**

A film is not only a story, but what Berger calls 'a way of seeing' (1977). As Corrigan asserts: 'Analyzing our reactions to themes, characters, or images [...] can be a way not only of understanding a movie better but also of understanding better how we view the world and the cultures we live in.' (2007: 4). The films on the course provide a window onto culture on many different levels. There is a historical perspective both at the level of daily life (houses with pantries and outside loos) and of politics (Margaret Thatcher, the 1984 miners' strike, the Falklands, Tony Blair, Enoch Powell's 'Rivers of Blood' speech). In *Trainspotting*, direct reference to one of Thatcher's iconic political speeches passes almost unnoticed:

"I quite enjoyed the sound of it all. Profit, loss, margins, takeovers, letting, subletting, subdividing, cheating, scamming, fragmenting, breaking away. **There was no such thing as society** and even if there was, I most certainly had nothing to do with it. For the first time in my adult life I was almost content."

Political themes sometimes straddle the films on the course. Thatcher drew parallels between the Falklands conflict, central to *This is England*, and domestic 'subversive activities' – labour actions and other activities that did not 'match the spirit' of the reborn Britain (Gilroy 1987: 51) – presented in *Billy Elliot*. In fact, in one scene in *Billy Elliot*, we clearly hear the prime minister on the radio referring to the striking miners of 1984 as 'the enemy within'.

The films are of course only *representations* of British culture and society, products of a writer or director's perspective and imagination, rendered through the interpretive performances of the actors. It is therefore important to hold these representations up to scrutiny. Alderson (2011) discusses the problematic treatment of history in *Billy Elliot*,

which, as he sees it, ‘suppresses any consciousness of the solidarities with miners that were formed, or attempted, by working class women, feminists, and lesbian and gay activists’. This can lead to an interesting discussion of alternative representations of women and gay activists in films such as *Brassed off* (1996) and *Pride* (2014).

Similar issues of representation emerge in *East is East*. Shohat and Stam (1994: 183) note the danger that negative behaviour in a minority community can be ‘generalised as typical’, whereas dominant groups are seen as ‘naturally diverse’. Thus, for them, the character of George becomes a representation of all Muslim fathers. However, it is interesting to note that this is directly contradicted by the writer himself: ‘I’m portraying my father, he’s not a Pakistani everyman.’ (Khan-Din in Olden, 1999)

### **Researching practice**

Like many university teachers, in particular those working in languages and academic skills, I am on a teaching contract, and am not expected to do research. However, as Harwood argues (2017: 1), practitioners are, in a sense, natural researchers, in that they have a ‘vivid sense of research priorities and pressing problems and questions that need addressing, as manifested in their day-to-day routines and conversations with students, colleagues and content lecturers’. I would go so far as to say that not only are we in a good position to do research, we *should* do it in order to become better practitioners. In simple terms, I believe practitioner research should involve:

- working to understand what is going on in the classroom, then sharing this understanding with others;
- the scholarship of teaching, i.e. telling others about how pedagogical innovations and developments impact on teaching and learning (Schulman, 2000).

My research focus on this course was the seminars that followed the lecture/workshop, where the students split into smaller groups of 8-12 to discuss the film, with a different student leading the seminar each week (with questions, activities, games etc.). The aim of the seminars is to provide a low stakes, non-threatening space to develop and test ideas and language for written and oral assignments, as well as initiation into a common mode of course delivery in HE that is believed to facilitate learning. Seminars provide a potential opportunity to support language students in the move from ‘sociolinguistic’ groups, where

the focus is on ‘communicative needs of the group, such as socialisation or group solidarity’ to ‘sociorhetorical’ groups ‘who link up in order to pursue objectives that are prior to those of socialisation and solidarity, even if these latter should consequently occur’ (Swales, 1990: 24). One of the primary objectives of the seminars is for students to develop transferable academic skills, including:

- seminar skills themselves (turn-taking, negotiation of meaning, co-construction of knowledge etc.);
- intellectual skills (criticality, creativity etc.);
- communication skills;
- language skills;
- collaborative skills;
- social skills;
- intercultural skills.

However, as Alexander et al. note (2011): ‘For skills to be genuinely transferable, students must be aware of the generic nature of what they learn and identify for themselves opportunities for effective transfer of learning.’ With this in mind, I wanted to investigate whether students were in fact conscious of developing certain academic skills in seminars, and if they recognised their transferability to other contexts. I surveyed 60 students with some open questions:

1) Has your experience taught you anything about the ‘conventions’, or ‘rules’, governing the way seminars are conducted at university? Have you been able to apply these conventions/rules in other seminars on your other courses?

2) Have the seminars improved your English **language** development? In what way?

3) Have the seminars played a role in your **academic** development? How?

4) Did you lead a seminar on this course? If yes, please comment on your experience.

I categorised the students’ responses thematically and the following threads emerged.

The students’ responses did in fact indicate an explicit awareness of the *transferability* of the academic skills they were developing:

- “The skills I have developed in film analysis have been very useful in other classes.”
- “This seminar became good practice for other tutorials.”
- “It made me think about how to develop certain assessments.”
- “Seminars helped me to use more proper language and helped me to develop my writing.”
- “[Leading the seminar] required me to make a good structure and organisation which is a skill equally useful for presentations and writings.”
- “It made me think about how I can focus my classes on my future career.”

The responses also revealed an awareness of seminar conventions, which, interestingly, one student referred to as ‘table manners’ – a misuse of course, but notable for its connotations of ‘correct behaviour’. The importance of participation was highlighted:

- “I’ve learned participate in discussion is important since it would motivate not only myself but also the other course mates.”
- “I should have a bit more participated in the seminar (my problem!)”
- “It was quite nice seeing a teacher participate in the discussion.”

Many students commented on how they had developed their communication skills.

- “It helps a lot to develop my speech skills.”
- “I can reinforce my communicative skills.”
- “It can make me speak more and [...] in front of some people [than if] I haven’t attended seminars.”
- “It taught me much of how to speak more logically and clearly.”

A number of students particularly mentioned growing proficiency and confidence in this area:

- “I have confidence in speaking up in public.”
- “More confident and less afraid of using English.”
- “I lose the fraid to speak in loud voice.”
- “At first it was very difficult [...] became much easier.”
- “At the beginning it was quite complicated but then we got to know each other and it becomes easier.”

- “It was quite hard to come up with activities. But I felt positively because everyone was eager to attend the activities.”

Some of the comments displayed a keen awareness of one of the key elements of academic writing and speaking: *audience* (Swales, 1990).

- “Expressing yourself in discussion is sometimes difficult because you have to get others to understand your point – the seminar was good practice.”
- “I needed to use clear and understandable language that others can understand.”
- “In the seminars, we had to make our ideas and arguments clear, which is one really important point.”

Some also noted how they had been pushed to express complex notions academically, objectively and with precision:

- “Having to find the right words to express myself.”
- “Push yourself to try to express the complex concepts.”
- “It helped me see how a film comment could be done in an academic way.”
- “By being objective while analysing a scene we got use to criticise in an appropriate way. In other words right now we know what kind of language we should use.”
- “It helped me to moderate my way of speaking and use expressions expressing my way of thinking without forcing people to think the way I do.”

Another theme to emerge was that of finding a ‘voice’ and supporting ideas with evidence.

- “We were given all the necessary instruments to develop skills and produce successful analysis, without having our own ideas influenced by the tutor to the point of them being not our own anymore.”
- “It helped me realise the importance of supporting arguments with evidence.”
- “It forces me to speak and give arguments in English in front of other persons and also to be able to justify all my opinions and choices.”
- “Don’t be afraid of showing your opinion, because as long as you can explain it, you will always be right.”

Many also commented on their growing intellectual skills, including critical thinking.

- “I learned the method to analyse something.”
- “This seminars has helped me to analyze the subject better and developed my ideas.”
- “Think of films in a diverse way not just [...] subjective point of view.”
- “It helped me to develop [...] critical skills and to consider different points of view and different ways of perceiving [...].”
- “The seminars taught me [...] to question myself.”
- “Organise in a better way the ideas I want to develop.”
- “Structuring my thoughts in a simple, logical and clear way.”
- “[Leading the seminar] makes me more autonomous about my academic skills.”
- “I [...] learned to work independently [preparing the seminar].”

Some also commented on the development of their leadership skills:

- “Very useful to develop organisation and leadership skills.”
- “My experience as a seminar leader [...] pushed me out of my comfort zone.”
- “I realised I was able to lead a seminar in English.”
- “I’m not a person who is good at leading something like a discussion [...] I could manage to do that and I got confidence.”

There were also some comments which were more negative:

- seminars could be stressful;
- participation was sometimes difficult;
- a lot of preparation was required;
- student-led seminars could be chaotic;
- more guidelines were needed.

The data can reasonably be interpreted as evidence that many of the students have established some connection between what they do in the film seminars and the requirements of wider university study. They identify the development of particular academic skills, and indicate an understanding of both the importance and the transferability of these skills. This outcome has supported the continuation of seminar provision on the course. It has also motivated me to explore seminar use in other areas of my teaching. Regarding the course itself, the direct outcome was clearer guidelines for seminar participation, including advice on leading a

seminar. Future research could involve recording the seminars in order to explore students' use of critical language and their development with respect to this over time.

## **Conclusion**

Film offers a rich source of material for language teachers. It provides contextualised study of grammar, lexis and pronunciation, as well as ample exemplification of the variety of the English language. It illustrates the subtleties of discourse and humour, and reveals a complex cultural landscape. What's more, the analytical study of film offers a natural context within which students are potentially able to develop a range of transferrable academic skills.

## **References**

Anderson, D. (2011) Making electricity: Narrating gender, sexuality, and the neoliberal tradition in *Billy Elliot*. *Camera Obscura*, 25, 3, 75, pp 1-27

Barrie, S. (2004) A Research-based approach to generic graduate attributes policy. *Higher Education Research and Development*, 23, p 3

Berger, J. (1972) *Ways of Seeing*. London: Penguin

Crystal, D. (2002) *The English Language*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. London: Penguin

Corrigan, T. (2007) *A short guide to writing about film*. 6<sup>th</sup> Edition. Pearson Longman

Dix, A. (2008) *Beginning film studies*. Manchester: Manchester University Press

Duncan, P. and Holder, J. (2017) The death of dialect? Don't believe a word of it. *The Guardian*, 13<sup>th</sup> March. Available at:

<https://www.theguardian.com/science/2017/mar/13/death-of-dialect-dont-believe-a-word-british-library> [Accessed 4<sup>th</sup> December, 2017]

Friedman, L. (2006) *Fires were started: British cinema and Thatcherism*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. London: Wallflower

Gilroy, P. (1987) *"There ain't no black in the Union Jack": The cultural politics of race and nation*. London: Hutchinson

Harwood, N. (2017) The EAP practitioner as researcher and disseminators of knowledge. BALEAP ResTES, Knowledge and the EAP practitioner: A symposium, 28<sup>th</sup> January, 2017, University of Leeds. Available at: <https://teachingeap.wordpress.com/2017/01/20/knowledge-and-the-eap-practitioner/> [Accessed 19<sup>th</sup> February, 2017]

Hounsell, D. (2011) Graduates for the 21<sup>st</sup> century: Integrating the enhancement themes. *The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education*

Loukopoulou, K. (2017) It's not what you say, but how you say it. *Times Higher Education*, 4<sup>th</sup> October, p 17

Olden, M. (1999) A quick chat with Ayub Khan Din. *Kamera*

Pulleine, T. (1972) Review of *Kes*, *Film Quarterly*. Available at: [http://www.jstor.org/stable/1211331?seq=1#page\\_scan\\_tab\\_contents](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1211331?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents) [Accessed 4<sup>th</sup> December, 2017]

Milne, S. (2004) *The enemy within: The secret war against the miners*. 4<sup>th</sup> Edition. London: Verso

Robins, M. (2003) *Ken Loach, Senses of cinema*. Available at: <http://sensesofcinema.com/2003/great-directors/loach/> [Accessed 4<sup>th</sup> December, 2017]

Schulman, L. (2000) From Minsk to Pinsk: Why a scholarship of teaching and learning? *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 1, 1, pp 48-53

Shohat, E. and Stam, R. (1994) *Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the media*. London: Routledge

Swales, J. (1990) *Genre analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press