

The case for Team-Based Learning in Higher Education Scriptwriting Programs: a narrative literature review

Dee Hughes, Bournemouth University

Abstract

Team-Based Learning (TBL) is a collaborative learning method that has been successfully adopted across a number of disciplines since its inception in the early 1970s. This article provides an exploration as to how it has been implemented and why it has not been adopted by arts-based disciplines on quite the same scale as those of scientific, medical, engineering and business-related subjects. The findings indicate that the time required to design a TBL course is a major hindrance to adoption. Other factors such as students' reluctance to engage with the unfamiliar, unsuitable working spaces, the lack of guidance as to how to design the integral problem-solving exercises; an institutional culture not open to adopting new working practises and limited empirical evidence of the impact of TBL in arts and creative disciplines such as scriptwriting. are all reasons given as to why TBL has not crossed wholesale into the study of arts-based subjects. Students are changing and it is therefore imperative that as educators we investigate and discover new ways to teach scriptwriting and arts-based subjects that meet the needs of the requirements of future generations.

Key words

Challenges; Impact; Peer-Evaluation; Real-World Exercises; Teams; Stages.

Date submitted XXX; date accepted XXX.

Introduction

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) continuously face new challenges (Shin, Harman, & New, 2009), not least the need to prepare students for the world of work. The expectation from employers is on HEIs to foster a wide range of skills in students such as team working, problem-solving, critical thinking and communication skills (Henard and Roseveare, 2012). A competitive employment market combined with growing numbers of students attending university; larger class sizes; and increased diversity and ranges of learning styles amongst student cohorts have led to a need to rethink the traditional mass lecture as the choice of content delivery. Diseth (2007) asserts that instructors who focus most of their energies on a lecture intensive approach have received criticism as being linked with students adopting a surface approach to learning. Didactic approaches to teaching promote a surface approach rather than the deep learning and skill development needed to meet the demands of students and employers. This presents a challenge when working with large student groups and where resources are limited.

As an educator of Scriptwriting at undergraduate and postgraduate levels, I have become increasingly aware of these demands and the need to adopt different teaching methods when working with students. My research in this area is focused on one particular teaching method Team-Based Learning and its application to the teaching of scriptwriting. I have recently designed a TBL scriptwriting unit and will be implementing it within my teaching. On completion of my teaching I will begin the process of examining the suitability of TBL for the teaching of scriptwriting. Peterson and Anand (2004), in their recent study into the cultural industries, concluded that the idea that one person's vision is responsible for creative work alone is not true. Their research finds that collaboration is responsible for the 'production of

culture'. This collaboration has not always been evident in European television production. My own experience of writing for the BBC is echoed by American screenwriter Frank Spotnitz, who discovered that when he was tasked with developing a series for the BBC, British writers were not familiar with the concept of the 'writers' room'. Redvall (2013) identifies the limited tradition of the 'writers' room' experience in the European television industry and explains the structural difference that exists due to the large amount of material that is required as a result of the pilot season within the American television industry.

Culturally then, European writers have worked in a system in which as Redvall (2013) reveals, the title and role of the 'showrunner' is still very much a foreign concept. The scepticism towards the 'showrunner' and 'writers' room' approach, as adopted by organisations such as the BBC, is changing in parts of the European television industry. Redvall's exploration of the changing culture within the Danish television industry highlights the adoption of 'production hotels' that promotes communication between the many departments tasked with producing a television series. For the writers involved the rewards of such a device involve the ability to immediately discuss any production questions they may have. This practice of collaboration and discussion are born out of the teaching methods prospective Danish scriptwriters encounter during their studies. Teaching is based around the practice of discussion and the promotion of collaboration, and this is best demonstrated during the study period in which students are required to devise a television series idea. The rejection of the lecture approach at the school is promoted by Detlefsen (Redvall, 2013) who believes lectures nurse students too much and doesn't allow for them to make mistakes.

Discussion and collaboration are just two of the three components of TBL that writers looking to work in the television industry today will require. The third is the ability to problem-solve,

and Redvall (2009) suggests writing a script is a learning process whereby the writer is involved in a continual process of problem-finding and problem-solving. This ability to problem-solve is discussed further in the chapter ‘Teaching Scriptwriting Through Script Development: Looking Beyond the Screenplay’ (Batty, Taylor 2019). When exploring how script development should be best practised, one of the writers interviewed in this chapter suggests that the writer must recognise and accept that their role is to identify a problem and then set about solving it. The exploration of teaching through script development as opposed to just writing a script, highlights the traits of communication, problem-solving and discussion, the very same traits that TBL is designed to promote. Batty (2016) and Bordino (2017) comment that many screenwriting manuals play to the individual whereas evidence suggests this is a moribund state of affairs. Macdonald (2004a) goes on to stress that the university lectures that promote ‘craft theory’ do not provide future writers with the rigorous practice they require to understand the actual practice of working as a scriptwriter.

Research shows (Dana, 2007) that benefits of small group learning include: higher achievement, greater use of higher-level reasoning, enhanced critical thinking skills, more positive attitudes toward the subject matter, satisfaction with the class and better interpersonal relationships among students and between students and educators. A pedagogic approach designed to incorporate small group learning with large cohorts is Team Based Learning (TBL). When promoting TBL as a valuable teaching tool for the teaching of scriptwriting, the question arises as to its value over Problem Based Learning (PBL) and Cooperative Learning (CL) or other modes of small group teaching that are available. Each approach has its advocates and a growing body of evidence to support their chosen method. Small group teaching is not a new phenomenon and so the advantages of TBL specifically need to be considered. The objective of motivating students to engage in conversation, promote critical thinking skills and

problem solve can be claimed by TBL, CL and PBL. Where TBL differs is in the delivery of these goals as it provides a more concrete and structured approach. A more in-depth investigation of TBL's advantages over CL and PBL is beyond the scope of this paper.

However, when contrasting and comparing these different methods two differences that were apparent focused on the creation of self-managed teams not being central to the success of either CL or PBL. Also, peer assessment and feedback were considered far less important to CL and PBL. Michaelsen, Davidson and Major (2014) suggest that TBL has clearly defined practices and principles, whereas CL and PBL's less structured formats allow them to be much more open to a wider range of practices for using small group work. The attraction for myself of TBL over the others is the concrete and structural approach TBL provides. Burgess, Bleasel, Hickson et al. (2020) concluded that after switching to TBL from PBL it allowed them to provide a standardised approach to small group teaching but on a large scale. Additionally, it also provided resource efficiencies.

As an educator in Scriptwriting, however, I have found no examples of TBL being used in the field. *Team-Based Learning in the Social Sciences and Humanities* (Sweet and Michaelsen 2012) is the only text to offer an exploration of the application of TBL subjects not in either science, technology, business or law. Of the eighteen chapters in the book, only three are devoted to subjects of a similar nature. The significant amount of research into TBL since its inception in the 1970s has been confined to its involvement with subjects such as Business, Pharmacy, Engineering and Nursing. This article provides a review of research literature that centres on the implementation of TBL in a number of subjects utilised in Higher Education with a view to identifying its transferability to other disciplines such as scriptwriting.

Narrative Literature Review

In undertaking a narrative literature review, a number of primary research studies and literature reviews were selected. Inclusion criteria were set to TBL conducted in Higher Education settings; peer reviewed papers; published since 2000 and written in English. After analysis, a number of themes were identified for further discussion. These were: the stages of TBL; application to different subject disciplines; educator time; students embracing new approaches to learning; learning outcomes and impact and suitable workspaces.

Origin of Team-Based Learning

Team-Based Learning is a flipped classroom student centred approach to learning. The development of TBL originated in the 1970's at the University of Oklahoma. Its founder, Larry Michaelsen, wanted to support classroom learning by applying small group learning to his larger classes (Michaelsen, Knight, & Fink, 2004). The intention was to combat the pressure on teachers due to ever-increasing class sizes by replacing traditional lectures with a small group approach. Small groups were created within the large class whilst retaining a single teacher (Fink, 2002). There are several key principles that continue to underpin Team-Based Learning (Michaelsen et al. 2004, Haidet et al. 2012). These are designed to enable small groups to become cohesive teams capable of outperforming their best member. Teams of around five to seven students (Michaelsen et al. 2002) are formed by the Educator with diversity being the guiding factor (Hernandez 2002). Once chosen, teams remain set for the duration of the course. The majority of the work carried out by each team is within class. Prescribed in-class problem-solving exercises are undertaken and should be based on rigorous and real-world problems. Feedback provided must be immediate and provided by educators and peers. Both individual and team performance is assessed. Peer review must form part of a student's performance assessment.

The Four Stages

It is largely accepted in the literature that there are four distinct stages to the TBL model. Stage one: the formation of teams. Stage two: readiness assurance process; Stage three: creating a challenging problem to solve and Stage four: peer evaluation. Each stage is briefly summarised here before discussing some of the challenges and adaptations identified within the literature and the transferability of the approach to creative and arts-based disciplines such as scriptwriting. Much of the literature suggests that implementation of TBL involves the application of a rigid process that must be followed with no deviation (Michaelson 2002, Farland et al. 2013). Increasingly however, educators are adapting the process and a number of studies reviewed evaluated the impact of each stage on the learning outcomes for students.

Step One - Teams

The first step is the formation of the teams, which is carried out by the educator. Michaelson (2004) suggests a balance of diversity, skills, knowledge and experience for teams to function at their best. He argues that this is the instructor's responsibility as students 'do not possess the relevant level of awareness to produce diverse teams' (Michaelson et al. 2004 p.17). A number of authors however have since questioned this. Gillies & Boyle (2010) for example, agree with the principle but question whether educators possess this knowledge when working with large groups. They argue that students' language skills and background knowledge of the field are essential pieces of information required for an instructor to produce well rounded teams but that acquiring such knowledge is a time-consuming process. Pociask, Gross and Shih (2017) explored what impact the formation of teams had on learning outcomes. They evaluated this in relation to Teams chosen by the instructor, by the students themselves and by a computer programme. Their findings revealed that similar results were achieved by the instructor chosen

teams and the student chosen teams on three of the measures of performance being considered: individual performance, team performance and effort. They concluded the time-consuming task of forming teams can be delegated to the students with little noticeable impact on performance.

Step Two – RAT's

Once teams are in place the second stage of the process is the Readiness Assurance Process (Robinson, Robinson and McGaskill, 2013, Swanson et al. 2017, Macke et al. 2019). Michaelsen and Sweet (2008) position the Readiness Assurance Test (RAT) phase as the backbone of TBL. To ensure that class time can be used for interactive discussion and debate rather than the didactic delivery of information, students are assigned pre-class reading. It is this structure, pre-course reading followed by RAT's that Burgess et al. (2014) insist must be in place. The importance of the iRAT is such that Parmelee et al. (2012) highlight the importance of the iRAT scores being a part of the overall TBL grade. This opinion is further reinforced by Haidet et al. (2012) who also believe that marking or grading the individual RAT sessions is important as 'assessment drives learning' (Epstein 2007, p.393).

An Individual Readiness Assessment Test (iRAT) is then taken at the start of class where students answer a number of multiple-choice questions based on their pre-class reading. Once completed the same test is undertaken by each team, a Team Readiness Assurance Test (tRAT) with the results made instantly available. If students wish to challenge the answers given they are able to do this by appealing. They have the opportunity to question poorly worded questions or provide a rationale for wrong answers with a view to scoring points for their team. Clark et al. (2008) reported that students prepared more for their TBL classes as a way of making sure they did well in the Readiness Assurance Tests.

This stage of TBL presents a challenge to creative and arts-based disciplines such as scriptwriting which rely less on the testing of concrete knowledge. Subjects such as law are well suited to TBL as Dana (2007) explains legal rules and the law lend themselves well to RATs. It is possible that the subjectivity that an arts-based subject, such as scriptwriting embraces, makes it difficult for RATs to be satisfactorily created. This is an area that requires further investigation.

Step Three – Application Exercise

Creating a challenging real-world problem that each team is tasked with solving is the centrepiece of the Team-Based Learning method (Timmerman and Morris, 2015). Pre-class reading is built upon through its application to an expertly designed problem or challenge. Teams work on the same problem and after debating their answer within their team reveal their answer at the same time to the class, usually by holding up a card that signifies their chosen answer. Once each team's choice has been revealed a class discussion can take place (Hopper, 2018). This stage of TBL lends itself well to creative and arts-based disciplines as numerous outcomes and possibilities can be explored and evaluated by students. As already mentioned there is a subjectivity to arts-based subjects that may not be suitable for the readiness assurance tests. Where I believe it will work well is when this subjectivity is drawn upon when solving the real-world problem exercises. How to fix a script is an essential skill of any scriptwriter but how to do it is not a question that possesses a single answer. Therefore, the debate and discussion such an exercise would create would be a highly beneficial way of consolidating the learning taking place.

It is evident from the literature that when designing a TBL course, one area that may require the greatest amount of attention is the design of the central problem-solving exercises. Currey et al. (2018) explain that by using the knowledge acquired through the iRAT and tRAT each team will attempt to solve the same complex problem through discussion and debate. This process aids students by helping them develop their critical thinking skills resulting in deeper learning. These exercise questions are therefore integral to the success of the strategy. Although Michaelson et al. (2004) offer guidance on how to use the exercises, Timmerman & Morris (2019) point out that there is little available instruction as to how to design them and no prepared examples ready for use or adaptation. This gap, Timmerman and Morris conclude, offers a huge and possibly overwhelming challenge to instructors.

Step Four – Peer Evaluation

The final major component of Team-Based Learning is the peer evaluation process that is designed to instigate a level of individual accountability (Cestone et al., 2008; Doyle and Meeker, 2008). This has benefits when working with large groups as it creates conditions for every student to contribute. Research has suggested that the peer review process, if delivered and structured as outlined, will lead to a number of outcomes including improved communication and teamwork skills (Thompson et al., 2007); deeper student engagement (Haidet et al., 2012); improved problem-solving skills (Kelly et al., 2005) and improved learning outcomes (Koles, Stolfi, Borges, Nelson, & Parmelee, 2010).

Social Loafing

The issue of ‘social loafing’, however, has been identified within the literature as a potential problem. Buckenhymer (2000) suggests that in undergraduate education social loafing is an issue when TBL is adopted. Research and studies into social loafing have a long history with

the unpublished work of Ringlemann being the most seminal. Frash Jr, Kline and Stahura (2003) point out that social loafing, is not confined to TBL, and has been found to occur in a large variety of different activities ranging from perceptual tasks to swimming. Evaluation-potential as described by Frash Jr, Kilne and Stahura (2003 p62.) is ‘the idea that the extent one is prone to socially loaf, is directly in proportion to how easily identified her or his contribution to the group is’. The elements of individual and peer evaluation in TBL seek to minimise this issue.

Disciplines and Geography

Over half of the papers reviewed for this literature study originated from the U.S.A., with the remaining papers from Norway, Turkey, Thailand, Lebanon, South Africa and Australia, which suggests TBL possesses a wide global reach and appeal. The variety of subject disciplines employing TBL however remains largely limited. Research papers considered for this review discussed the use of TBL in nursing, oceanography, social work, medicine, biochemistry, accountancy, business, agriculture, industrial education, pharmacy and management and hospitality. Litchfield (2010) suggests that employer bodies of business, law, I.T., science, engineering, nursing, midwifery and health and science all recognise team work as one of the six graduate attributes they require. These are likely to be skills however that are sought after in all professions. Dana (2007) concludes that TBL is a good fit for an introduction to a law course because the course can be easily divided up into clear and concise units. This clinical or technical approach may not therefore be as effective in subjects like scriptwriting. Only one paper discussed the adoption of TBL in a Humanities based subject. Harde (2015) in her paper Team-Based Learning in the Humanities Classroom: “Women’s Environmental Writing” as a Case Study, discusses her application of TBL to a writing-based subject. One consideration Harde discusses early in her paper is whether she should be attempting TBL within this

discipline. Michaelson (2002) accepts that there are subjects where the adoption of TBL may be more difficult but he is unequivocal that TBL is an appropriate teaching method for the Humanities. Harde (2015) concluded that TBL is a highly effective teaching approach and should be used to teach a part of a unit or to teach the whole unit, but it should be adopted.

Challenges

There are several challenges identified in the literature regarding the adoption of TBL by educators and the transferability to other disciplines. These include educator time, the need to embrace a new approach to learning; and limited empirical evidence of the impact of TBL in arts and creative disciplines such as scriptwriting. These three issues are explored here together with sundry issues that the papers have also identified such as course design. There are a number of areas of course design that can be considered as possible reasons as to why TBL has not been adopted across a wider array of disciplines. The first of these relates to time. Freeman (2006); Carmichael (2009) and Eksteen (2019) all acknowledge the upfront time commitment required of a Lecturer to design a TBL course. It may be the case that instructors in arts-based disciplines are reluctant to invest the extra time required to design a course as presently there is little or no research to confirm to them that TBL will work in their subject. Harde (2015) acknowledges in her Women's Environmental Writing class that the extra time required is indeed predominantly front loaded. However, once this work has been carried out the rest of the teaching is not in excess of her normal workload. This though is just one study in an arts-based subject and many more will be required before a conclusion can be arrived at.

As the TBL model evolves, there are methods emerging that will help reduce the burden of time in some areas of the process. New software is being developed that helps the instructor have immediate access to individual and team scores. It also eradicates the use of old-fashioned

scratch cards and fits well with the new type of student and their expectations. Skiba and Barton (2006) discuss how the learning preferences of students are changing. A new generation of digital learners are now arriving at Higher Education Institutions with very different learning expectations than those of their instructors. Back in 2006, Skiba and Barton argued that Faculties need to adapt and change to the demands these digital learners will be placing upon them. This requires educators to adopt a new approach to technology which they may be unfamiliar with if it is not in wide use within their discipline. Eksteen (2019) also suggests the problem of adoption may also be in part due to the instructor's lack of familiarity with the strategy and promotes the need for educators only to adopt a TBL approach once they have fully educated themselves.

The evidence in the literature provides strong support for the adaptation of the mass lecture, where students attend but some do not engage. For me as an educator, TBL presents a model by which I can transform my role from that of Lecturer to Facilitator as I look to implement a social constructivist teaching approach as propagated by Vygotsky. Powell and Kalina (2009) describe a social constructivist teaching approach to be one where learning is constructed through interaction with a teacher and fellow students. My aim of adopting TBL is to dispense with what was for some students a surface learning approach to one where all students embrace deep learning. From the papers identified this does not seem to be so clear cut. Robinson, Robinson and McCaskill (2013) discovered only 31 out of the 40 social work students involved embraced the new learning approach. The remaining students expressed a preference for mass lectures believing they learnt better when the teacher teaches. Zgheib et al. (2016) found that even though medical students in their study were supportive of TBL they recommended it was used as an addition to lectures and not as the sole approach.

This suggests that there will be students who will not embrace TBL or not embrace TBL fully. It was not clear from either study if these views persisted in the long term once students were more familiar with the methods and the potential benefits i.e. that it was due to a resistance to change or if it was due to a difference in learning styles and preferences. It could be that the more TBL and other strategic and focused teaching methods are engaged with eventually the old-style lecture will become moribund, if it is not already. It may be that a toolkit of approaches is needed to address the learning styles and preferences of students.

It is clear from the research that instructors unanimously accept the benefits of TBL and recommend its use in their teaching (Clark et al. 2008, Thomas, 2014, Jenou et al. 2017). Furthermore, they recommend its adoption and implementation by other educators. Where there is not universal acceptance of TBL being the panacea some believe it to be is when students are asked to express their opinion. Robinson, Robinson and McGaskill (2013) report that a quarter of the students they surveyed expressed a preference for a lecture style approach over a TBL approach.

Additionally, Currey et al. (2018) reported that not all their students liked TBL as they disliked both the group learning element and the passive teaching style. It may well be the lack of familiarity with TBL resulted in a negative view of the teaching method. There is also a suggestion that some students simply do not like working in teams and as this underpins TBL their reluctance to embrace it is understandable. A possible solution to this is offered by Bengu (2019) who recommends that institutions provide pre-training workshops for instructors. These workshops would provide an overview of course requirements and student expectations and how best to meet those requirements. It is my view that I will look to educate myself about TBL and how to introduce it whereby any pitfalls have been identified and accounted for.

Environment

The following reason, classroom environment, was commented upon in two papers, as a factor that the authors of those papers felt warranted a mention as issues, that if not considered may have a detrimental impact on TBL being adopted. This issue is the classroom environment and the investigation Yuretich and Kanner (2015) undertook. The investigation in their paper *Examining the Effectiveness of Team-Based Learning (TBL) in Different Classroom Settings* concluded that they believe their results were mixed when implementing TBL due in part to the classroom environment. It is their assertion that TBL will be more successfully adopted by students if it is taught in a TBL friendly environment. This ideal classroom, they also suggest, should have good technological support. The use of clickers that allows students to replace scratch cards is something that students were happy to embrace. Bengu (2019) asked his TBL students during a focus group as to what they would like changed and was met with an almost unanimous response that it was the classroom they wanted changed. They did not feel the space they used was conducive to learning through teamwork. At the institution where I teach, a programme of new buildings is being undertaken with new and modern workspaces being built to not only meet the increased numbers of students, but also meet their needs. These new facilities offer a mixture of old-style lecture theatres and new style smaller workspaces, with the larger share of the space being given over to smaller workspaces with excellent technological facilities. When examining these new facilities, it is clear that they would be excellent spaces in which to teach TBL.

The majority of papers considered for this review explore the implementation of TBL within a single discipline. The many claims attributed to TBL by Michaelsen (2004, 2008) range from it resulting in higher class attendance and better student accountability to it being suitable for

teaching where there is a high student-to-staff ratio. The growing popularity of TBL is emphasised by Freeman (2012) who highlights that TBL now has an annual conference; an active listserv; a thriving website and points to the considerable and growing amount of published research. It is clear from the research that instructors unanimously accept the benefits of TBL and recommend its use in their teaching (Clark et al. 2008, Thomas, 2014, Jenó et al. 2017). Furthermore, they recommend its adoption and implementation by other educators. However, at the institution I teach at presently there is only one course that is taught using TBL and unsurprisingly it is a medical based discipline. With virtually no research in evidence as to the use of TBL in the teaching of arts-based subjects and none for the subject of scriptwriting there is a clear gap in the literature which I hope my research will begin to fill.

Conclusion

The purpose of this article has been to investigate the use of TBL in higher education with a view to understanding why its use has been limited to specific disciplines. With the growing list of pressures on Higher Education Institutions such as increasing student numbers and the claimed benefits of adopting TBL it could correctly be assumed its use should be more widespread. The instructors who have written papers have all concluded unanimously that TBL should be adopted. In disciplines where it has been adopted the feedback on the whole is positive. TBL does indeed support and nurture team and collaborative learning while at the same time producing final exam results that show a marked improvement when compared against the old-style lecture delivery system (Zgheib et al. 2016p15). All of these attributes join together to respond positively to employers' requirements and produce graduates with the skills that employers require.

Yet in the Humanities it is not in wide use. It may be that TBL is being used to teach Humanities subjects but little or no research is being undertaken. If it is being undertaken, this is not evident in the online TBL community or network. Why Humanities related subjects have not engaged with TBL in direct contradiction of the evidence of its positive impact on learning outcomes remains a question in need of further exploration. The most prominent reason volunteered for not adopting TBL is that there is an increased time commitment in the requirement of redesigning a course but this is also the case for the disciplines who have adopted it. This time factor is mentioned a number of times but is quickly offset by an understanding that once designed there is no extra work to be done. Where this extra time appears to be concentrated is on one aspect of the course design, the problem-solving exercises. The research reveals there is little or no guidance as to how to do this and so possibly with a clearer set of instructions those contemplating adopting TBL may feel encouraged to take the leap.

Many other smaller factors are also mentioned that when added up together may also deter any future adopters. These range from working at an institution that is broadly supportive of TBL, being able to access the correct facilities such as suitable classroom spaces and technology and being in a position to educate students in preparation for the move to TBL. Each of these factors may play a role in the decision as to whether an instructor will choose to adopt TBL within their discipline. None of the papers considered concluded that any of the potential factors listed was in itself a deterrent and all recommended TBL should be adopted. One final suggestion as to why TBL has not been embraced by the Humanities disciplines is that many of these subjects do not have exams. The increased exam success that results from the adoption of TBL is often used as evidence of the success of TBL. Yet without being able to draw on solid data such as exam results in humanities-based subjects lecturers choose not to take the plunge feeling not

quite convinced of its validity. This has resulted in the present situation that right now there is no empirical evidence that TBL works with humanities subjects.

My research aims to address the clear evidence gap that exists as over the next academic year I will be teaching a scriptwriting unit using TBL. On conclusion of the unit, I will interview a small number of students to record their responses. These responses, together with my own observation diary, will provide the first empirical evidence as to the outcome of teaching scriptwriting using TBL. It is my intention to design different scriptwriting units to be taught using TBL, and to continue to publish these findings with a view to starting the conversation as whether TBL is a viable method for teaching scriptwriting. The justification for this research is supported by the changing television industry and the increasing use of ‘writers rooms’ and ‘showrunners’. The need to prepare writers for the reality of working as writers within the television industry as opposed to just teaching them how to write a script requires the adoption of new teaching methods. Redvall’s research into the Danish television industry and the examination of teaching scriptwriting through script development suggests that the adoption of TBL could be an effective response for the adoption of TBL in response to the evidence provided.

References

Angu, P. E. (2019) 'Students' Experiences of Teamwork: Dealing with Conflicting Identities during a Team-based Academic Writing Project in a Clinical Medical Practice Programme', *International Journal of Diversity in Education*, 19(1), p. 11.

Batty, C. (2016) Screenwriting Studies, Screenwriting Practice and the Screenwriting Manual. *New Writing: The International Journal for the Practice and Theory of Creative Writing*, 13(1), 59–70.

Batty, C. and Taylor, S., (2019) Teaching screenwriting through script development: Looking beyond the screenplay. In *The Palgrave handbook of screen production* (pp. 459-472). Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.

Bengü, E. (2019) 'Application of Team-Based Learning at a Health Science Course: A Case Study', *Athens Journal of Education*, 6(1), pp. 77–91.

Bordino, A. W. (2017) Script Doctoring and Authorial Control in Hollywood and Independent American Cinema. *Journal of Screenwriting*, 8(3), 249–265.

Buckenmyer, J. A. (2000) Using teams for class activities: making courses/classroom teams work. *Journal of Education for Business*, 76(2), 98-107.

Burgess, A., Bleasel, J., Hickson, J. *et al.* Team-based learning replaces problem-based learning at a large medical school. *BMC Med Educ* **20**, 492 (2020)

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-020-02362-4>

Carmichael, J. (2009) 'Team-Based Learning Enhances Performance in Introductory Biology', *Journal of College Science Teaching*, 38(4), pp. 54–61.

Cestone, C.M., Levine, R.E., and Lane, D.R. (2008) Peer assessment and evaluation in team-based learning. *New Directions in Teaching and Learning* 116:69-78.

Christensen, J. *et al.* (2019) 'Implementing team-based learning (TBL) in accounting courses', *Accounting Education*, 28(2), pp. 195–219.

Clark, M. C. *et al.* (2008) 'Team-Based Learning in an Undergraduate Nursing Course', *Journal of Nursing Education*, 47(3), pp. 111–117.

Currey, J. *et al.* (2018) 'Students perceive Team-Based Learning facilitates development of graduate learning outcomes and professional skills', *Journal of Teaching and Learning for Graduate Employability*, 9(1), pp. 93–113.

Dana, S. W. (2007) 'Implementing Team-Based Learning in an Introduction to Law Course', *Journal of Legal Studies Education*, 24(1), pp. 59–108.

Dearnley, C. *et al.* (2018) 'Team based learning in nursing and midwifery higher education; a systematic review of the evidence for change', *Nurse Education Today*, 60, pp. 75–83.

Diseth, Á. (2007) Students' evaluation of teaching, approaches to learning, and academic achievement. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 51, 185–204.

doi:10.1080/00313830701191654

Doyle, J.K., and Meeker, R.D. (2008) Team projects and peer evaluations. *College Teaching Methods & Styles Journal* 4(5):21— 28.

Eksteen, M. J. (2019) 'Does Team-Based Learning Develop Essential Generic Skills in Pharmacy Students?', *South African Journal of Higher Education*, 33(1), pp. 59–73.

Epstein, R. M. (2007) Assessment in medical education. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 2007, 387–396.

Evans, H. G., Heyl, D. L. and Liggitt, P. (2016) 'Team-Based Learning, Faculty Research, and Grant Writing Bring Significant Learning Experiences to an Undergraduate Biochemistry Laboratory Course', *Journal of Chemical Education*, 93(6), pp. 1027–1033.

Figland, W. (2020) 'Using Team-Based Learning (TBL) in an Agricultural Mechanics Laboratory: Examining its Use in Secondary and Post-Secondary Education', *Agricultural Education Magazine*, 92(6), pp. 7–8.

Fink, D. L. (2002) Beyond small groups: Harnessing the extraordinary power of learning teams. In L .K Michaelsen, A.B Knight, & L. Dee Fink (Eds), *Team-based learning : A transformative use of small groups* (pp. 3–27). Westport Connecticut, London: Praeger.

Frash Jr., R. E., Kline, S. and Stahura, J. M. (2003) 'Mitigating Social Loafing in Team-Based Learning', *Journal of Teaching in Travel & Tourism*, 3(4), pp. 57–78.

Freeman, M. (2012) 'To adopt or not to adopt innovation: A case study of team-based learning', *International Journal of Management Education (Oxford Brookes University)*, 10(3), pp. 155–168.

Gillies, R. M., & Boyle, M. (2010) Teachers' reflections on cooperative learning: Issues of implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 933-940.

Haidet, P., Levine, R. E., Parmelee, D. X., Crow, S., Kennedy, F., Kelly, P. A., et al. (2012) Perspective: Guidelines for reporting team-based learning activities in the medical and health sciences education literature. *Academic Medicine*, 87, 292–299.

Harde, H. (2015) 'Team-based Learning in the Humanities Classroom: "Women's Environmental Writing" as a Case Study', *Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 6(3), pp. 1–17.

Hénard, F. and Roseveare, D. (2012) Fostering quality teaching in higher education: Policies and practices. *An IMHE Guide for Higher Education Institutions*, 1(1), pp.7-11.

Hernandez, S. A. (2002) 'Team-Based Learning in a Marketing Principles Course: Cooperative Structures that Facilitate Active Learning and Higher Level Thinking'. *Journal of Marketing Education* 24 (1): 45–75. Johnson, D., R. Johnson, and K. Smith.

Hopper, M. K. (2018) 'Alphabet Soup of Active Learning: Comparison of PBL, CBL, and TBL', *HAPS Educator*, 22(2), pp. 144–149.

Hunn, V. (2014) 'African American Students, Retention, and Team-Based Learning: A Review of the Literature and Recommendations for Retention at Predominately White Institutions', *Journal of Black Studies*, 45(4), pp. 301–314.

Jeno, L. M. *et al.* (2017) 'The Relative Effect of Team-Based Learning on Motivation and Learning: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective', *CBE - Life Sciences Education*, 16(4).

Koh, Y. Y. J. *et al.* (2019) 'Effects of graded versus ungraded individual readiness assurance scores in team-based learning: a quasi-experimental study', *Advances in Health Sciences Education*, 24(3), pp. 477–488.

Koles, P.G., Stolfi, A., Borges, N.J., Nelson, S. & Parmelee, D.X. (2010) The impact of team-based learning on medical students' academic performance. *Acad. Med.*, **85**, 1739-1745.

Litchfield, A., J. Frawley, and S. Nettleton. (2010) "Contextualising and Integrating into the Curriculum the Learning and Teaching of Work-Ready Professional Graduate Attributes." *Higher Education Research & Development* 29 (5): 519–534.

Lohmann, G. *et al.* (2019) 'Online business simulations: authentic teamwork, learning outcomes, and satisfaction', *Higher Education (00181560)*, 77(3), pp. 455–472.

Mac, K. (2011) 'Small Group Workshops in Large Creative Writing Classes: Because You Can't Be Everywhere at Once', *Wascana Review*, 43(1), p. 224.

Macdonald, I. W. (2004a) Manuals Are Not Enough: Relating Screenwriting Practice to Theories. *Journal of British Cinema and Television*, 1(2), 260–274.

Macke, C. *et al.* (2019) 'Outcomes for Black students in team-based learning courses', *Journal of Black Studies*, 50(1), pp. 66–86.

Michaelsen, L.K., Davidson, N. and Major, C.H., (2014) Team-Based Learning Practices and Principles in Comparison With Cooperative Learning and Problem-Based Learning. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 25.

Michaelsen, L.K., Knight, A.B., & Fink, L.D. (Eds.). (2004) Team-based learning: A transformative use of small groups in college teaching. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, LLC

Michaelsen, L. K., & Sweet, M. (2008) Fundamental principles and practices of team-based learning. In L. K. Michaelsen, D. X. Parmelee, K. K. McMahon, & R. E. Levine (Eds.), *Team-based learning for health professions education: A guide to using small groups for improving learning* (pp. 9–34). Sterling: Stylus Publishing LLC.

Parmelee, D. X., Michaelsen, L. K., Cook, S., & Hudes, P. D. (2012) Team-based learning: A practical guide: AMEE Guide No. 65. *Medical Teacher*, 34, e275–e287.

Persky, A. M. (2012) 'The Impact of Team-Based Learning on a Foundational Pharmacokinetics Course', *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 76(2), pp. 1–10.

Peterson, R.A. and Anand, N. (2004) The production of culture perspective. *Annual review of sociology*, pp.311-334.

Pociask, S., Gross, D. and Mei-Yau Shih. (2017) 'Does Team Formation Impact Student Performance, Effort and Attitudes in a College Course Employing Collaborative Learning?', *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching & Learning*, 17(3), pp. 19–33.

Powell, K. and Cody J. Kalina. "Cognitive and Social Constructivism: Developing Tools for an Effective Classroom." *Education 3-13* 130 (2009): 241-250.

Redvall, E.N. (2009) Scriptwriting as a creative, collaborative learning process of problem finding and problem solving. *MedieKultur: Journal of media and communication research*, 25(46), pp.22-p.

Redvall, E.N. (2013) Training Talent for Television: DR and the 'TV Term'. In: *Writing and Producing Television Drama in Denmark*. Palgrave Studies in Screenwriting. Palgrave Macmillan, London. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137288417_5

Redvall, E. N. (2013) Writing and Producing Television Drama in Denmark: From *The Kingdom* to *The Killing*. Palgrave Macmillan:UK

Robinson, M. A., Robinson, M. B. and McCaskill, G. M. (2013) 'Teaching Note--An Exploration of Team-Based Learning and Social Work Education: A Natural Fit', *Journal of Social Work Education*, 49(4), pp. 774–781.

Shin, J.C., Harman, G. New challenges for higher education: global and Asia-Pacific perspectives. *Asia Pacific Educ. Rev.* **10**, 1–13 (2009) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-009-9011-6>

Skiba, D., & Barton, A. (2006) Adapting your teaching to accommodate the net generation of learners. *The Online Journal of Issues in Nursing*, 11(2), 1–11. Swanson, E., McCulley, L. V., Osman, D. J., Scammacca Lewi

Sovajassatakul, T., Jitgarun, K. and Shinatrakool, R. (2011) 'Team-Based Learning: Perceptions of Instructors and Students in Thai Universities', *Journal of College Teaching & Learning*, 8(11), pp. 39–50.

Swanson, E. *et al.* (2019) 'The Effect of Team-Based Learning on Content Knowledge: A Meta-Analysis', *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 20(1), pp. 39–50.

Sweet, M. and Michaelsen, L.K. (2012) *Team-based learning in the social sciences and humanities: Group work that works to generate critical thinking and engagement*. Stylus Publishing, LLC..

Thomas, T. A. (2014) 'Developing team skills through a collaborative writing assignment', *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 39(4), pp. 479–495.

Thompson, B. M., Schneider, V. F., Haidet, P., Levine, R. E., McMahon, K. K., Perkowski, L. C., et al. (2007). Team-based learning at ten medical schools: two years later. *Medical Education*, 41(3), 250–257.

Timmerman, J. E. and Morris, R. F., Jr. (2015) ‘Creation of Exercises for Team-Based Learning in Business’, *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 27(2), pp. 280–291.

V. Rasiah, R. R. (2014) ‘Transformative Higher Education Teaching and Learning: Using Social Media in a Team-based Learning Environment’, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 123, pp. 369–379.

Yuretich, R. F. and Kanner, L. C. (2015) ‘Examining the Effectiveness of Team-Based Learning (TBL) in Different Classroom Settings’, *Journal of Geoscience Education*, 63(2), pp. 147–156.

Wiegant, F. *et al.* (2012) ‘Team-Based Learning in Honors Science Education: The Benefit of Complex Writing Assignments’, *Journal of the National Collegiate Honors Council*, 13(2), pp. 219–227.

Zgheib, N. K. *et al.* (2016) ‘The long-term impact of team-based learning on medical students’ team performance scores and on their peer evaluation scores’, *Medical Teacher*, 38(10), pp. 1017–1024.

Contributor details

Dee Hughes is a commissioned writer with professional screen credits, who now teaches screenwriting full-time at Bournemouth University. His research focuses on the implementation of new and innovative pedagogies to the teaching of scriptwriting, with a focus on Team-Based Learning and Passion-Driven Learning.

Contact details

Faculty of Media and Communication,
Room W213, Bournemouth University,
Poole,
Dorset,
BH12 5BB,
UK.

[e. dhughes@bournemouth.ac.uk](mailto:dhughes@bournemouth.ac.uk)

[t. +44 \(0\)1202 965645](tel:+441202965645)

ORCID: 0000-0002-1321-1179