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Chapter 8: Orchestration

The dimension we have called 'orchestration' brings together a group of teaching practices concerned with management of the learning environment in early years literacy classrooms. In developing these teaching practices of CLOS, we have drawn on a long-established literature on classroom management and organisation. The common quality of these teaching practices is that they are responses to the complexity of the social context of the classroom. As Doyle's classic formulation has it, classrooms are characterised by multidimensionality, simultaneity and unpredictability (1986, pp. 394-5). The challenge for people working in classrooms is to manage this complex social environment, ensuring it is sufficiently predictable that twenty or more children have extended opportunities for literacy learning without making management the dominant focus of their interactions with children. Outstanding early years literacy teachers, as Snow, Burns and Griffin have said, are 'masterful' in their management of activity, behaviour and resources (2001, p. 196). Brophy and Good make the link between teacher behaviour and student achievement and say that effective instruction involves selecting (from a larger repertoire) and orchestrating those teaching behaviors that are appropriate to the context and to the teacher's goals, rather than mastering and consistently applying a few generic teaching skills (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 360).

Five teaching practices constitute the orchestration dimension: 'awareness', 'structure', 'flexibility', 'pace' and 'transition' (see Table 8.1). Underpinning these teaching practices is the process-product literature of the 1970s and 1980s. Effective teachers, this literature suggests, have high levels of awareness of classroom activities and of children's levels of participation. As Kounin (1977, p. 85) said, an effective teacher has 'eyes in the back of her head'. The quality of structure concerns the maintenance of an orderly and predictable environment. Effective early years classrooms, as Brophy and Good noted, are characterised by 'a great deal of instruction in desired routines and procedures' (1986, p. 366). These routines, which become part of the tacit landscape of the classroom, provide taken-for-granted structures for the introduction, monitoring, maintenance, conclusion and follow-up of activities.

Table 8.1 CLOS Teaching Practices: Orchestration

| Awareness | The teacher has a high level of awareness of literacy activities and participation by children |
| Structure | The environment is predictable and orderly |
| Pace | The teacher provides strong forward momentum in literacy lessons |
| Transition | Minimum time is spent in transitions or there is productive use of transitions |
| Flexibility | The teacher responds to learning opportunities that arise in the flow of literacy lessons |

Effective teachers structure lessons so that children have many opportunities throughout the day to make connections to prior literacy learning. Rosenshine and Stevens describe effective instruction as, 'an exciting thing to watch... [as the] class or group move at a rapid pace... giving the correct response rapidly and confidently' (1986, p. 380). Pace concerns the quality of forward momentum in literacy classrooms. Briskness, smoothness and timing, it has been argued, all underpin effective teaching (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 346). Similarly, effective teachers are thought to spend little time on transition between activities and make productive educational uses of time spent on transition between activities (Arlin, cited in Doyle, 1986, p. 416). Flexibility, the final teaching practice associated with orchestration, concerns teachers' capacity to respond to the learning opportunities that arise within the flow of lessons, to 'adjust to the demands of immediately unfolding events and the multiple vectors of classroom settings' (Doyle, 1986, p. 360).
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1986, p. 361). The teaching practices in the orchestration dimension focus mostly on the teacher's behaviour, although structure is most often observed through the children's behaviour.

A simple descriptive analysis, by frequency, of each of the orchestration dimension teaching practices in the classrooms visited and videotaped provides a summary of the proportion of episodes that the researchers coded for awareness, structure, pace, transition and flexibility and shows the wide variation across the classrooms (see Figure 8.1). The less effective teachers were among those with the lowest number of episodes characterised by the orchestration dimension. In two of these teachers' classrooms – awareness, structure, flexibility and pace were not observed at all, although a few episodes demonstrated transition. In contrast, in the classrooms of the more effective and the effective teachers, awareness, structure, pace, transition and flexibility were generally observed in most episodes. The levels of orchestration in these and other classes are discussed below, and illustrated with selections from transcripts of the video cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hannah</td>
<td>+4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>+2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>+1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>+1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isobel/Abby</td>
<td>-1.05/-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia</td>
<td>-3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabby</td>
<td>-4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry</td>
<td>-4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ana</td>
<td>-4.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 8.1 Proportion of teaching practices present in episodes, by teacher, for the orchestration dimension of CLOS](image)

### Awareness

Awareness has long been regarded as essential to effective classroom management. Kounin for example, characterised good classrooms in terms of teachers' 'withitness' and capacity to attend to several issues simultaneously (1977, p. 74). In the present study

---

15 Figures in parentheses indicate the children's learning gain adjusted residual in standard deviation units for each teacher's classroom
the effective and the more effective teachers rarely attended just to one issue at a time. In Jane’s class, for example, even as she was hearing a child read, her eyes scanned the rest of the class to check their progress on the group activities that had been set while she listened to individual reading. Later, as she worked individually with a child on his writing, she directed a second child to a particular word on his spelling card, corrected the posture of a third child, and directed a fourth child to complete a follow-up task.

Similarly, during a spelling lesson, Hannah was able to give individual attention to a child who was having difficulty learning the letter-sound combination /qu/\(^6\). At the same time as she gave this individual help, she monitored the progress of the other children in the class and was aware of those who were attending and those who were at risk of getting off-task.

Awareness was not simply about handling misbehaviour and managing classroom routines. As the episode above shows, it’s also about the teacher’s ability to monitor children’s progress during activities so that she can make quick judgements about progressing an activity in response to the children’s understanding. In these examples, the teachers constantly evaluated individual children’s participation in an activity, monitored the pace of the lesson and adjusted it accordingly, ensuring that as many children as possible were engaged in a meaningful learning activity for most of the class time.

In the following episode, Jenny seems to have ‘eyes in the back of her head’ as she simultaneously attends to the behaviour of individuals whilst at the same time monitoring the children’s progress on a handwriting task.

Awareness was not simply about handling misbehaviour and managing classroom routines. As the episode above shows, it’s also about the teacher’s ability to monitor children’s progress during activities so that she can make quick judgements about progressing an activity in response to the children’s understanding. In these examples, the teachers constantly evaluated individual children’s participation in an activity, monitored the pace of the lesson and adjusted it accordingly, ensuring that as many children as possible were engaged in a meaningful learning activity for most of the class time.

In the following episode, Jenny seems to have ‘eyes in the back of her head’ as she simultaneously attends to the behaviour of individuals whilst at the same time monitoring the children’s progress on a handwriting task.

---

\(^6\) Here Hannah was teaching the spelling pattern /qu/ as representing one sound, which, whilst it represents the two phonemes /k/ and /w/, is often taught as a digraph that represents one sound only.
sound. Oh, just hold them there for a moment. Some people are still working.


Except for time when the class was engaged in a silent reading or silent writing activity, the more effective teachers’ voices were a constant presence as they orchestrated the progress of each child for each particular task. In the following examples, Sarah, an effective teacher, showed her awareness of the behaviour and understanding of individual children in a whole group discussion leading to a story writing activity.

T: When we write a story, there are three parts to the story, who can tell me what they are?

SN: End?

T: The end is one of them. Just a minute, Jack’s having a turn. The end, the middle. Mary?

SN: Middle?

SN: And the beginning.

T: And the beginning, but we do it the other way around, we don’t start with the end first, we start at the beginning. So I’d like to see beginning, the middle and the end. So how many sentences will you need?

SS: Three.

T: Three. Beginning, middle, end, and Mrs F has had a go at doing that, I don’t want you to copy Mrs F, I want you to have a go at doing it yourself. The people that are working on the sequencing activity today, you’re going to have a go down here in the book corner, and Karen this is you, so you need to be listening. That’s why I’ve put the book there because you’re in the book corner today. Okay?

By contrast, in the less effective teachers’ classes, greater proportions of the teachers’ talk time were spent in managing misbehaving children. There were also more incidents of children being off-task, and the teachers’ response time to attending to off-task behaviour was inconsistent. Sometimes there was no attempt made to get the recalcitrant child back on task and this caused further disruption for other children around the recalcitrant. There were occasions when a less effective teacher wasn’t aware that a child or group of children was off task either overtly or covertly. There were also incidents where, although the teacher was aware, she didn’t have the skills to deal with the situation effectively. As a result, long periods of lesson time were unproductive and did not provide significant literacy learning opportunities.

Structure

The teaching practice identified as structure refers to the orchestration of physical movement around the classroom and to the predictable and orderly structuring of learning tasks and activities. In this study, the more effective teachers demonstrated structure in every episode observed. Their expertise was observed in the way they managed the physicality of activities, ensuring that instructions were delivered clearly and children understood exactly what they were required to do. In the following example, for instance, Sarah was setting up the class group literacy rotation activities. There were normally two rotations during this session. Coloured stars designated the groups.

T: Red stars today, you get to do a special pop-up card about Jack and the Beanstalk, and I’ll leave the book up here so that you can have a look if you want to. On the front cover I’d like you to write the title of the story, Jack and the Beanstalk, Mrs J did a beautiful job with that, didn't she? When you open it
up, you can have a go at drawing any part of the book in there. Mrs J drew the cow, she must have liked the part with the cow, and she had a go at writing a sentence. The cow was sold for magic beans.

So I'd like you to choose your favourite part of the story. You can put one of the characters on the pop-up bit, and then you can write me one sentence to go with the picture.

Okay, so there's two parts you need to remember for this activity, the first one, make a character, the second one, make a sentence. Can you say that with me? Make a character, make a sentence.

T: Two things you need to remember... Pop your hands down and we'll have questions at the end.

Sarah gave clear and detailed instructions in small steps and checked children's understanding before allowing them to begin. At this stage, she did not allow questions to break the flow of the instruction-giving phase and efficiently dealt with raised hands, indicating to children when questions would be answered.

These more effective teachers broke down new and complex tasks into parts and gave many opportunities to practise new skills and concepts. In Hannah's class, for example, Sam and Brian were finding a phonological awareness task difficult, so she broke it down for them even further and provided an opportunity for guided practice to consolidate this concept.

T: You've got to watch my fingers, Sam. This one's really hard because it has more letters this time. It's got...

SS: Five!

T: Five. Do you think we can write a word that's got five letters?

SS: No! Yes!

T: Watch my fingers because here are my clues for you, Brian. Please don't do that. We've talked about that. Here we go. Are we ready? /qu/ /li/ /ck/.

SN: Quick.

SN: Quick.

SS: Quick.

The more effective teachers' expertise was also clearly evident in the careful and thoughtful way that the content of the literacy lessons was structured and delivered. This was a clear point of delineation among the more effective and most of the effective teachers, and the less effective teachers. Although all teachers taught a specified literacy block of activities first thing in the morning when interviewed, the more effective teachers explained that this delineation of specific literacy time was an artifice. For their classes, literacy-related activities continued throughout the day and were embedded in all activities. Even in a maths or science lesson, it was common to see a child make a connection in their learning to a literacy concept, and the child's excitement at making the connection was evident.

It was hard to find evidence of such excitement for learning in the less effective teachers' classes. Their episodes were characterised either by passive compliance with the teacher's directions or covert or overt misbehaviour by individuals or groups of children. Often instructions for tasks and activities in these classes were not given clearly. Either too many instructions were given at once, or the instructions were not
broken down into manageable steps. The sequence of activities did not flow logically from one to another, and children's lack of understanding of the purpose of a task led to off-task behaviour. In addition the purpose of the task was not often explicitly linked to previous learning or to subsequent activities. There was little time given to practising new skills and concepts adequately, so that children who were having difficulty floundered when required to apply the new task or concept to a subsequent activity.

Pace

According to the process-product literature, pace of teaching – and especially the maintenance of strong forward momentum – has consistently been associated with high student achievement (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 360). This quality has frequently been noted in the classroom management literature. Kounin (1977), for example, measured ‘movement management’ and distinguished between classes in terms of their 'smoothness,' ‘jerkiness,’ ‘dragginess,’ or whether they were ‘really moving’ (Kounin, 1977, p. 92).

Among the more effective teachers in this study, a common characteristic was the high energy levels modelled by the teachers and generated among children. The more effective teachers rarely stood still and were constantly encouraging, motivating, correcting, directing, monitoring and inspiring their children to master another skill, finish off something, or begin something new. In the following episode from Jane's class, the sense of strong forward momentum was evident in a brief exchange in the middle of a word study activity. The word for the day was *transport* and children were making up other words with these letters.

| T: We're doing /p/ /o/ /t/. Who can find some more? We've already got someone started. Lauren's found *rat*: /r/ /a/ /t/. How many more can you find? Go! Look for some words from the rest. |
| SN: *Not.* |
| T: Write it down. /n/ /o/ /t/. And what did you find? |
| SN: /p/ /a/ /t/. |
| T: Write some more! Use your brains! Right! Good boy! Tommy, you've got *rot* on there. Good boy. /r/ /o/ /t/. That's what happens when things go bad, isn't it? |
| SN: /s/ /a/ /t/. |
| T: /s/ /o/ /t/. Did you find *sat?* /s/ /a/ /t/. Go! |

There was a sense of urgency in these classes – as if every minute were a precious learning opportunity not to be wasted. The children, even those who had some difficulty with aspects of the literacy lessons, responded positively to this pace and were just as keen as others to show the teacher what they had accomplished in the time given to a task. Jenny, for example, constantly urged her children to learn as much as they could. During a handwriting lesson, she incorporated a vocabulary building activity. She encouraged children to think of words starting with the /g/ sound at the same time as they were working on their correct letter formation, holding the pen correctly and sitting properly.

| T: Harry, look at this one. This one's much better. Try one more, here. See if you can make it just perfect. When you've finished I need some words that start with a /g/ sound...Oh, just hold them there for a moment. Some people are still working. Beautiful...Kyle, your book, Ben, your book. |
| SN: Simone and Harry have to go to see Mrs K. |
| T: It doesn't matter. Who's that? |
| S: Mrs K. And Harry have to go to Mrs K. |
| T: Harry, you go to Mrs K...Wonderful work. Put your pencils down and your
Chapter 8: Orchestration

eyes this way. I need someone to give me a word that begins with my /g/ sound, Robby?
SN: Game.
T: Game. How am I going to write game, Robby?

Similarly, in the context of a guided practice session during a spelling and vocabulary activity, Hannah squeezed out every last learning opportunity. Children made rapid responses to questions, they responded enthusiastically to the activity, and the teacher kept urging them to contribute. At times she would nominate a child to respond, ensuring that all children remained attentive just in case they were called upon to answer.

T: Okay, before we go. What letter did I have to change, please... Sandy. What letter did I have to change?
SN: The W.
T: The W. What did I have to change it to? Sally-Ann?
SN: T.
SN: H.
T: Not H. I think you've just guessed, because sometimes you do that. What letter was it? Ah, Jack.
SN: N.
SN: N.
SN: In.
T: Did you all have that?
SN: /n/.
SS: Yes.
T: Don't! Stop! One last thing. Now we had wet, net. What do those words - two words do? Natalie?
SN: Rhyme.
T: They rhyme. Do you think you could write a word that rhymes with net and wet?

Typically, children in the more effective teachers' classes worked to a stricter time frame than children in less effective teachers' classes. If children finished earlier than expected or required more time to complete an activity the teacher would stop the class briefly and explain the time change. In contrast, the less effective teachers' lessons sometimes seemed tedious. In news telling, for example, long blocks of time were given to individual children to the exclusion of others. Teachers less often noticed when children's attention dropped off, especially if children were quietly inattentive. Sometimes, the less effective teachers took children too quickly through new material and appeared unaware that they were not keeping pace with their instruction. Some mat sessions continued for more than an hour and left children fidgeting, unable to sit still or concentrate. On these occasions, it seemed that the teacher was intent on covering the material she had prepared no matter how the children responded. During deskwork or individual activities, there was no sense of urgency to complete set work and children were easily distracted by others' off-task behaviour.

Transition
The teaching practice called transition concerns both the amount of time spent on movement from one activity to the next and the productive use of this time. In the process-product literature, strong positive correlations have been observed between low levels of time spent on transitions and higher levels of child achievement (Brophy & Good, 1986, p. 341). Skilled managers, it is argued, typically 'marked the onset of
transitions clearly, orchestrated transitions actively, and minimized the loss of momentum during these changes in activities’ (Doyle, 1986, p. 416).

In this study, all teachers were scored as managing transitions effectively in at least one of their videotaped teaching episodes. The more effective and effective teachers, however, used more complex transition strategies than did the less effective teachers. Generally, the less effective teachers completed an activity, managed the movement to the next activity with the whole class and then commenced it.

In the more effective and some of the effective teachers’ classrooms, transitions appeared seamless. At the simplest classroom management level, routines were so clearly understood by the children that the teacher’s movement to indicate a change of activity was sometimes almost imperceptible. For example, in Jane’s class, without any explicit instruction from the teacher, at the start of the day the children filed into the classroom, picked up their individual blackboards, sat on the floor, and began to copy the word of the day. In making transitions appear seamless, these teachers had prepared cross-over tasks and staggered the movement from one activity to the next so that individual needs could be met. For example, children completed an activity and knew that they had to proceed to the next sequenced activity. They knew what the activity was and where they had to go, so there was some ownership for children in regulating the use of their time, albeit under the teacher’s omniscient eye.

For the most part the more effective and effective teachers used specific cues or even props to signal the end of activities or to make the transition between parts of an activity. Hannah used a tambourine and several teachers used clapping, isometrics or variations on these strategies, which meant that the teacher’s voice was never raised to gain the children’s attention and minimal time was spent in gaining or regaining order. The language of the more effective teachers was peppered with a sense of urgency indicated by short, sharp directions and constant encouragement for children to ‘hurry up’, ‘quickly’, ‘come along’, or words to that effect.

T: Will, I'd love to see your eyes. Those girls up the back, why are you sitting there? Well then what are you going to do? Hurry up and move forward please. Georgia and Steve could you push the boxes against the wall, please? Hands up in the air, hands on your heads, hands on your shoulders. Hands up in the air, hands on your heads, hands on your shoulders. Could those people at the back move forward please? Hurry up, Skye. Now, in the Sad Little Monster and the Jelly Bean Queen I actually saw some sentences that were questions. Remember we've been talking about questions because that starts with /qui/.

In Sarah’s class, transitions within activities were even more overtly orchestrated as she donned angel wings to indicate that she was not to be interrupted while she worked exclusively with a small group. The rest of the class knew that this meant they were expected to work independently until the wings were removed.

T: Yes, you’re allowed to have a look at the book to have a look at the characters. Alright, have a look up there and see what you’re working on today. I’m going to put my wings on; you know what that means. Away we go.

Sarah also made time considerations explicit to the children. In this example, after explaining what was required, she simply counted to five whilst at the same time dealing with other children’s enquiries and maintaining the momentum of the transition.
T: OK, I'm going to count to five, and I will see you standing behind your tables. One. Two, Three...
SN: We don't have a table.
T: Where were you working?
S: I think [inaudible].
SN: I'll just put this in the bin.
T: Quickly then.
SN: Mrs C? Um, can I just finish off?
T: It doesn't matter if you're not finished it. Alright, I'm just about to tell you what we're going to do.
SN: Can I just write it?
T: You've already written it. I saw it. OK, eyes this way and listening. Put your hand up if you haven't had a turn at sharing this week. Put your hand up high. Alright, we're going to have Carol, Will, Jack, Shaun. Have you two had a go this week?
SN: Yes.
T: Have you had a go Karen?
SN: Yep.
T: Yes Karen, so just four for today. Alright, sharers can you bring your work to the floor please? Grab your hats, and we'll see how quickly we can get here.

Sue also made the use of time a conscious consideration for children and this gave them ownership of the way that they managed time as well. She made explicit the time that children had and what was expected of them in this time. She constantly reminded them to be conscious of using valuable time productively.

T: So you've got one minute to do two jobs - tell your news and say how you're going to write it. Alright. Sometimes they're different. Sometimes they're the same. Right. So I'm going to time you. One minute and then we'll stop and we will have a swap over so that both get a turn but I want the inside person to share first. Off you go.

The language of the more effective teachers when giving instructions was characterised by its explicitness and detail. This minimised confusion for children and assisted in providing strong forward momentum during transitions. Hannah's instructions at the start of an integrated language and science lesson demonstrated this use of explicit language well. She also checked back to ensure that the children had understood the instructions.

T: What do you mean? That they're the same word? Yes, that's right, they are. Let me see. Who's ready to go and do their fantastic piece of writing about what they learnt today? Let me see. We're going to use a lead pencil for this so if there isn't a lead pencil on your table could you get one out of the tin. There's something I haven't reminded you to do. What do I need to remind you to do, David?
SS: Put your name on.
T: Now, this spot here. I don't want you to touch that spot until I've seen your piece of writing. OK? So, David. Do we draw in that spot? No...
If you're waiting for me to see your piece of writing and you have finished everything, then you may come and read out of the quiet reading boxes. OK, let's see who's ready to go. No, you're sitting back at your own seats now.
Another point of distinction between the more effective and the less effective teachers was in the way they used small group rotations in their assigned literacy time. The more effective teachers managed complex rotations of several groups several times for up to an hour whereas the less effective teachers typically only rotated children once or twice. Where children were only rotated once or twice, the teacher typically divided them into ability groups and they worked on the one activity for over 20 minutes, regardless of the individual progress of each child. For more effective teachers, the children were rotated through three or four group activities so that all attempted all activities. The movement of the child in these transitions was well executed, very quick, precise and efficient.

**Flexibility**

Flexibility, the last of the teaching practices grouped under orchestration concerns the teachers’ capacity to respond to the improvisational character of classroom lessons (Erickson, cited in Doyle, 1986, p. 361), and deviate quickly and appropriately from their written plans in response to a child’s needs and interests.

In Sarah’s class an opportunity arose when she was reviewing children’s achievements in the day’s literacy session. Jack explained his progress with the writing activity he was completing. The teacher used this child’s summary to do a quick class review ‘in the moment’ on strategies for working out the spelling of unknown words, as well as reviewing the past tense of the verb ‘to sell’ for the whole class.

T: What did you do today?
SN: Today I did a story and I did some colouring in.
T: Good, is that the title page that you've got there? Let's have a look at the title that you wrote. *Jack and the Beanstalk* here.
S: *Jack and the Beanstalk.*
T: *Beanstalk.* And fancy that your name’s Jack too, isn’t it? And then who did you draw on the inside of the card today? Let’s stand around here so we can see.
S: Cow.
T: The cow. And what did you try and write up here about the cow?
S: Um, *sold* the cow.
T: *Sold* the cow.
S: *Sold* the…
T: Jack was trying really, really hard today to sound out that word *sold*. He said to me, Mrs F? He said, “Is that word *sold* on one of our cards?” And I said, “No, not on one of our cards. How can we try and make a word if it’s not on one of our cards?”
S: Sound it out.
T: Sound it out. And that’s exactly what he did, so let’s give Jack a big clap for sounding out. That was well done!

[H20015_1:00:17]

One of Hannah’s episodes provided a good example of flexibility where the teacher’s judgment was demonstrated in knowing when to let a class discussion take a tangent and when to keep it flowing along the planned line. The class was discussing their first impressions of a new text *The Sad Little Monster and the Jellybean Queen* (Lardner, 1996). She took on a child’s comment, but before following his discussion point, she took a moment to use Lourie’s incident of calling out his answer to reinforce classroom behaviour. Having made this point ‘in the moment’, she didn’t dwell on it to the extent of interrupting the lesson flow, and she carried on to explore the child’s idea with the class.

T: It is very sad. Far away, there lived a fair princess with golden hair. She ate jellybeans for breakfast, lunch and tea. On her island, the sky was always
bright and the wind was always warm.
SN: That looks like a...
T: Lourie, what's our rule?
S: Should always put your hand up.
T: Always put your hand up. So what are you going to do?
S: Put my hand up.
T: Well put your hand up. Are you going to put your hand up? Yes, Lourie?
S: It's a happy island there.
T: It's a happy island there. Have a look at the difference. What do you notice about the colours? Have a look at that island ... Have a look at that island. Ellen?
SN: Umm, the other picture's darker; the other picture's light.
T: Yes. That's right it's very dark, very sad colours. These are light and bright colours, aren't they?

Hannah provided another example of flexibility in her integrated literacy/science lesson on worms. In the following episode, she recalled a fact previously contributed by a child and then skillfully integrated it into the lesson. This not only valued children's individual contributions to the learning process at the appropriate time, but also modelled and reinforced concepts learned previously by making the link from past learning to the current lesson. The children had been sounding out the word, cold.

T: D. Fantastic! Well done, cold. So we've got, “worms feel ticklish, worms feel squishy, worms feel soft, and worms feel cold”. And I know that, Tamsyn - where are you? You had another word that went with cold.
SN: Cold-blooded.
T: Cold-blooded. Remember when we saw the snakes the other day? What were they?
SS: Cold-blooded.
T: They were cold-blooded as well. So will we add that in?
SS: Yes.
T: Cold-blooded. That's very good.

In the course of one of Jenny's shared book lessons, a child suggested the word humongous to describe a giant. Jenny picked up the child's suggestion and turned the discussion into an opportunity to model spelling strategies for unfamiliar words.

T: Giant. Who could give me some words? What popped into your mind immediately that I said that word giant? What popped into your mind? Shane?
SN: Humongous.
T: Uh oh. Pardon?
S: Humongous...[10].
SN: She can't spell it.
T: It's one of those words that's sort of, just sort of grown up, and I need some help. Humongous.
SN: /hu/.
T: Who can help me out? Humongous. What sounds can we hear?
T: Come on Shane. You said it. Help me out.
SN: [inaudible]
T: Oh thank you. Here's a boy who's helping. He's learning. Brilliant! Carl, have a go.
SN: H U M
T: H U M
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S:  
T:  Leo, what would you put?
SN:  WHO
T:  Sorry, Leo. Humungous.
SN:  WHO
T:  Have a listen. Have a listen. Humungous. Okay, go for me.
S:  H U
T:  /ool, /ool. We’ve crossed out the W. Now? /m/ /m/.
S:  M U N G E S
T:  Mm! Anyone else got any ideas? One more person?
SN:  O W
T:  Trent?
SN:  H U M U N
[C14015_0:06:02]

What was important to Jenny at this moment was that the children learned some strategies for exploring new words. She suggested that they use a ‘sounding out’ strategy. When this strategy became problematic she suggested the strategy of consulting a dictionary to see if the children could find the word *humungous* which, as she pointed out is ‘one of those words that sort of, just sort of, grown up’. She also suggested the possibility that the word *humungous*, which is current in colloquial speech, might not be found in the dictionary. They also learned some strategies for exploring new words. Interestingly, effective demonstration of flexibility was also characterised in some instances by its absence. It was sometimes not appropriate to spontaneously follow a potential diversion to a lesson plan no matter how tempting. The skill of effective and more effective teachers was demonstrated in making that judgement and not allowing a lesson to be sidetracked.

Summary

For the most part the more effective and effective teachers in this study, whilst they showed differences in teaching style, had in common highly developed capacities to manage the uncertain social environment of early years literacy classrooms. They were characterised by high levels of awareness, being able to manage interruptions and lapses of child attention without losing focus on their moment-by-moment instructional goals and being able to structure children’s movement around the classroom, learning tasks and activities in predictable and orderly ways. These teachers had the ability to maximise learning opportunities with a sense of urgency as if every minute were a precious learning opportunity not to be missed. Whilst their literacy sessions proceeded at a brisk pace, they managed to retain the attention of all children.

The more effective and effective teachers ensured that transitions between and within activities were seamless, as they established specific routines within their classrooms and made expectations explicit. Despite the establishment of routines these teachers were able to judge when to respond spontaneously to the ‘teachable moment’ and when to resist unnecessary diversions. These teachers were consistently able to manage and adjust complex movements within and around activities and groups of children, to ensure that maximum time was spent engaged in significant learning opportunities.

The classrooms of the less effective teachers, whilst they contained some of the features of the more effective and effective teachers’ classrooms, were characterised by far fewer demonstrations of these features than were evident in the more effective teachers’

---

17 *Humungous* did not appear in any printed dictionary consulted, but does appear in the MS Word dictionary, spelled *humongous* or *humungous* and defined as an ‘informal’ adjective meaning ‘extremely large in size or amount’.
classrooms and most of the effective teachers’ classrooms. Instances of the practices of pace, awareness and flexibility were observed in only one of the four less effective teachers’ classrooms, structure was observed to varying degrees in three of them and transition in all four, again to varying degrees. These classrooms were characterised by various instances of off-task behaviour, an absence of the fast-paced sense of urgency found in the classrooms of the more effective and effective teachers and a corresponding climate of tedium. The transitions between and within activities generally took longer in these classrooms, with less detailed and precise teacher instruction as to what routine was to be followed, and the teachers did not take advantage of learning opportunities that arose in the course of a lesson, such as building on children’s contributions to discussion.
Chapter 9: Support

The dimension that we have called ‘support’ refers to the ways in which effective teachers structure children’s literacy learning so that they are expertly assisted in their acquisition of appropriate knowledge and skills. This dimension is therefore closely related to the ‘knowledge’ dimension as the effectiveness of support depends in a large part upon teachers’ knowledge of literacy and literacy learning. The seven specific teaching practices of the support dimension: ‘assessment’, ‘scaffolding’, ‘feedback’, ‘responsiveness’, ‘explicitness word’, ‘explicitness text’, and ‘persistence’ are described in Table 9.1.

Table 9.1 CLOS Teaching Practices: Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>The teacher uses fine-grained knowledge of children’s literacy performance in planning and teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>The teacher extends children’s literacy learning through modelling, modifying, and correcting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>The teacher gives timely, focused and explicit literacy feedback to children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>The teacher shares and builds on children’s literacy contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitness</td>
<td>Word level – The teacher directs children’s attention to explicit word and sound strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitness</td>
<td>Text level - The teacher makes explicit specific attributes of a text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>The teacher provides many opportunities to practise and master new literacy learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the research literature much attention has been paid to support for learning in terms of these identified teaching practices. What effective teachers do in terms of support for literacy is to use detailed knowledge of the children’s learning, gained from formal and informal assessment and monitoring, in order to tailor planning and teaching to class and individual levels (Hill & Crevola, 1999; Wray et al., 2000). Since effective literacy teachers use detailed assessment information in planning and teaching they are able to expertly scaffold and extend children’s literacy learning as they model, modify, and correct responses (Bloom, 1982; Brophy & Good, 1986; Strickland, 2002). Intimately related to scaffolding is the timely, focused and explicit feedback provided by effective teachers, that indicates to children exactly where their learning is appropriate and where they need to re-think specific concepts and skills. Feedback has been included in this dimension as a practice in its own right as it has been identified in many studies as a most important teaching practice (Bloom, 1982; Hattie, 2003; Strickland, 2002).

In addition to the explicitness of feedback, effective early years literacy teachers provide highly explicit instruction in word and text level strategies and knowledge (Mazzoli & Gambrell, 2003; National Reading Panel, 2000; Snow, Burns & Griffin, 1998; Taylor et al., 1999). Their instruction takes into account children’s contributions as they share and build on these (Brophy & Good, 1986; Hattie, 2003) and they are persistent in their provision of many opportunities to practise and master new literacy learning (Brophy & Good, 1986; Snow et al., 1998).
Quantitative analyses undertaken on the CLOS data provided further strategies for understanding the support dimension in these classrooms. A simple descriptive analysis, by frequency, of each of the support dimension teaching practices in the classrooms videotaped provides a summary of the proportion of episodes that the researchers coded for assessment, scaffolding, feedback, responsiveness, explicitness word, explicitness text and persistence and shows the variation across the classrooms (see Figure 9.1). The less effective teachers were amongst those with the lowest number of episodes characterised by support. For example, in two of the less effective teachers’ classrooms none of the episodes were characterised by persistence or assessment and in another less effective teacher’s classroom, there were no observations of scaffolding or responsiveness. In contrast to this, in the classrooms of the more effective teachers all episodes were characterised by scaffolding, feedback, responsiveness, explicitness word, explicitness text and persistence.

In broad terms support was more in evidence in the classrooms of the effective and more effective teachers. On the whole the effective and more effective teachers appeared to incorporate all aspects of differentiation into their teaching repertoire, with successful outcomes. It is noted, however, that one less effective teacher demonstrated all the practices contained in the support dimension and one of the more effective teachers did not demonstrate assessment, nor did she demonstrate high levels of explicitness text. Nevertheless, overall the less effective teachers demonstrated fewer support teaching practices in their classrooms.

---

18 Figures in parentheses indicate the children’s learning gain adjusted residual in standard deviation units for each teacher’s classroom.
practices, and were associated with children whose growth in the LLANS literacy test scores was less than expected. The teachers’ use of support for literacy is discussed below and illustrated with selections from transcripts of the video cases.

Assessment

Diagnostic teaching, or teaching based on detailed analysis of what the student knows and needs to learn, is the basis of many intervention and remedial programs (Clay, 1985; Kibby, 1995; Lipson & Wixson 1997). However, teaching based on focused observations of children and systematic record keeping has also been shown to characterise effective classroom literacy teachers and this has been shown to contribute ‘markedly to their abilities to select appropriate literacy content for their children’s needs’ (Wray et al., 2000, p. 62). In explaining the purpose of early literacy assessment Johnston and Rogers (2001) examined the professional standards of various bodies, including the National Association for the Education of Young Children and the International Reading Association, and found that ‘each professional group that offers standards on assessment argues that the primary purpose of early literacy assessment is to optimise student learning’ (p. 381). Assessment for their purposes was used ‘to refer to the broad repertoire of behaviours involved in noticing, documenting, recording, and interpreting children’s behaviours and performances’ (pp. 377-378).

The importance of teaching based on detailed knowledge of children’s literacy needs, that is, practice based on informed decision making, has been seen as a principle of ‘best practice’ for literacy teaching (Mazzoli & Gambrell, 2003). In order for teachers to address effectively the diverse range of literacy needs within a classroom it is most important that they find out what children know and what they need to learn so that instruction can be targeted at individual points of need. In other words, fine-grained knowledge of children’s performance used by the teacher in planning and teaching has the potential to produce effective outcomes for children.

It was not easy to observe all instances when the teachers in our study were in fact using assessment as the basis for their teaching. Since we focused on observed teacher behaviour rather than on what the teachers said they did, it was at times not possible to ascertain if a teacher’s practice was related to her assessment and monitoring of the children in her class. Nevertheless, Hannah, who was identified as the most effective teacher in the study, was observed to use assessment in all episodes and Jane and Sarah, who were identified as effective teachers, were observed to use teaching based on assessment in 83% of episodes. In an apparent anomaly, Jenny a more effective teacher, was not observed to use teaching based on assessment of needs. A likely explanation for this is that, as Jenny had been promoted to the position of Deputy Principal of her school during the course of the study, her teaching was not concentrated within one class, which meant that she taught another teacher’s class for the observational phase of the study. As such she did not have access to the fine-grained knowledge of each child’s needs that is gained through day-to-day interaction with one class.

As expected, none of the less effective teachers appeared to display a high level of teaching based on assessment. It should be noted that most of the teachers we observed were working in States in which there was regular mandated standardised testing of literacy in the early years of school so that they could have, if they wished, based their teaching on analyses of all children’s performance on these tests.

Much of the assessment based teaching observed in the effective and more effective teachers’ classrooms involved teacher observation of groups and individuals and identification of points of error that led to the re-teaching of a concept or skill. In the following transcript Hannah had identified an error in some children’s writing of the letter Z at the end of the word quiz. She wrote the letter backwards on the board and
called on the individual children who had made this error to identify what was wrong. Once Sam had identified that the letter was ‘the wrong way’ she demonstrated the correct way to write the letter Z, verbalising the correct starting point ‘over on the left’ and the correct orientation, ‘we go across to the right, down the hill and back across’.

T: But three sounds, /kw/ /l/ /z/. Now I notice some people, when I was doing, marking your sound assessment, some people are doing this. What’s wrong with that?

SN: Um, it’s, it’s wrong.
T: Why’s it wrong?
S: Um...
T: Who can tell me what’s wrong with that /z/? What’s wrong with that /z/? David, what’s wrong with that /z/?

SN: Because it’s too long.
T: No, that’s not it.
SN: I know! //
T: //Natalie. I haven’t written it very well.
S?: [inaudible]
T: No. Some people have done this... I’ll write a better /z/. What have they done?
Steve?
SN: [inaudible] that way.
T: You’re getting there.
SN: It’s going [inaudible]
T: Hmm. //Sam?
SN: //It’s, it’s the wrong way!
T: It’s the wrong way.
SS: [laughter]
T: So just watch I know most people have done a /z/ but watch. Remember we start over on the left we go across to the right, down the hill and back across. So if your Z isn’t correct could you fix it up?

[126S1_0:13:35]

Teaching based on assessment was not confined to correction of errors, although this was where it was more readily identified. Jane used the word transport as the basis of a word study and writing lesson. The task for the children was to write as many smaller words as they could find within the word transport. Jane modelled the writing of the word pot for a small number of children whom she had noticed were experiencing some difficulty with the task. She also challenged Sinead and Tyler to write the more complex words they had suggested earlier in the lesson.

T: We have an N. Down here. Okay. Watch. Watch this. Look /p/ /ə/ /t/.
E: /p/ /ə/ /t/.
T: Do it again /p/.
E: /p/ /ə/ /t/, pot.
T: Write them down and make me a new word. Sinead, you can write that one you found. Tyler, /p/.

[126S1_0:11:17]

In this way Jane was using her on-the-run assessments of children’s performance on a group task to target her teaching to individual children who were in need of some corrective teaching and, at the same time, was able to use her assessment information to build on the contributions of two of the more able children in order to extend their learning.
Chapter 9: Support

On the few occasions where the less effective teachers were observed to use assessment in their teaching, it was usually directed more at a group or whole class level than at fine-grained knowledge of individual needs. An exception was the following excerpt from the classroom of one of the less effective teachers. She had noticed over-use of the word and in children’s writing and explained that they should limit the use of and to once in a sentence and use fullstops instead of a string of ands.

T: “On the weekend, I went camping and I went swimming and I went hiking and I had fun”. So, “On the weekend I went camping and I went swimming and I went hiking and I had fun.”

E: [children talk in pairs/groups] [20].

T: Can you tell me why there are too many ands? Otherwise you can’t take a breath, and it just runs all together [5]. One and per sentence, “and we went swimming”, fullstop. That’s one... because we’ve got this fullstop we can cross out the next and. "I went hiking and I had fun". [inaudible] One and per sentence.

Ss: Yes.

E: [inaudible] [5]

T: After the fullstop we have a look at the first letter of the first word. It always has to be a capital.

SN: [inaudible]

T: OK, that’s what I wanted to tell you because when I was looking through your writing you both used lots of ands and you need to learn how to use fullstops.

This instance of fairly clear instruction based on clearly identified individual needs was not a common occurrence in the classrooms of the less effective teachers. The only other observation of assessment-based teaching for this teacher involved her giving instructions to children, grouped according to her judgment of their ability, on how to play a word game.

**Scaffolding**

The practice of scaffolding, in which the teacher extends children’s learning through modelling, modifying and correcting, has received a great deal of prominence in theories of teaching and learning and is usually related to the work of Vygotsky (1978) and Bruner (1996). Vygotsky distinguished between two levels of a child’s development: the ‘actual’ level of development, which is the upper level of unaided performance and the ‘potential’ level of development, which is the upper level of performance with the assistance of a more competent other. The skill of the teacher, as the more competent other, is to present the skills and knowledge to be learnt between the actual and potential levels of development, or to use Vygotsky’s term, ‘within the zone of proximal development’.

In terms of literacy teaching, ‘scaffolding’, the term introduced by Bruner (1996), includes the ways in which teachers assist their students to reach their potential level of development. It involves demonstrations and modelling, such as when teachers say aloud what they are thinking while they are reading and writing in order to make clear the ‘cognitive processes used by skilled readers and writers’ (Strickland, 2002, p. 80). Scaffolding also involves the gradual removal of support as children master the skill or concept being taught (Alverman & Phelps, 2001). As Duffy (2003) has put it:

> The purpose of scaffolding is to move from teacher ownership to student ownership. At first students are dependent upon our assistance. As we gradually reduce the amount of assistance, students gain experience in responding and build their own understandings. That is, they personalize the task and make it their own (p. 11).
In Teachers’ Hands

For the scaffolding teaching practice there was a clear division between the more effective and effective teachers and the less effective teachers. All but one of the effective and more effective teachers displayed scaffolding in all episodes. On the other hand, no less effective teacher demonstrated scaffolding in more than 50% of episodes.

The effective and more effective teachers used scaffolding extensively to extend children’s literacy learning in ways that increased their confidence and led to successful experiences with print. It was a regular routine in these classrooms to prepare the children for successful reading of a shared book by predicting or pointing out features such as the storyline, pictures, vocabulary and word decoding strategies to be used. In the following episode Sarah, an effective teacher, prepared her guided reading group of first year children for reading the book Pass the Pasta, Please (Avery, 2001).

T: How about that? Can you find the title page for me, please? The title page. We need to turn the front cover Brian. There we go. Let's read the title page //Pass the Pasta, Please.

Ss: //Pass the Pasta, Please.

SN: No, but it says pasta pasta and please.

T: Nina, if you have a look at pass and pasta, they are very similar. They both have a /p/ sound at the start; this one here says pass, and this one here says pasta. Have a look /p/ /æ/. This one's got a /t/ sound in it, /pal /stæ/. Okay? Pass the Pasta, Please. So they're a little bit different.

SN: //Hey, that's the same sort we had!

T: [points to picture of pasta in the book] That's like the bits we had isn't it? The thin spaghetti.

S: //Yeah.

T: Now, let's have a look. Does this look a little bit like the pasta that we saw before?

Ss: Yeah.

T: Does a little bit, doesn't it? Jack, quickly please.

SN: But it's longer.

T: It is longer. Can you have a look? What was...? We saw some of this. This was the coloured pasta, wasn't it? What colours did we see in our pasta?

In this episode Sarah had oriented the class to the front cover and then directed their attention to the title page as she engaged them in reading the title Pass the Pasta, Please. When Nina indicated that she was reading the word pass as pasta, Sarah individualised instruction for her by modelling an exaggerated correct pronunciation of the two words and then, whilst she pointed to the words, broke them into sound segments (/p/ /æss/) and (/pal /stæ/). Having modified and corrected Nina’s misunderstanding she continued the book orientation for the whole class as she invited discussion of the types of pasta shown in the illustrations, to help both comprehension and decoding of the text to be read.

The next transcript is taken from the final part of the book reading episode when the children were reaching the last page. Sarah had set them up for success by pointing out, before they were asked to read the words on the page, that they were the same as those in the title. She also made sure that Nina had retained her learning of the difference between pass and pasta by asking her to point to the correct words and to explain in what way the two words differed, thus setting her up for success in further activities based on the book.

T: They put cheese on it ready to eat. Yes now have a look. What she's doing, Brian?

SN: She's eating it?

T: She's eating it. Yes, pasta is fun to eat isn't it? Beautiful!
SN: Yummy!
T: Yum, yum! Now, if you have a look at the last page, this is the same as the title. We'll read it all together. Let's touch the words as we go. //Pass the Pasta, Please.
Ss: //Pass the Pasta, Please.
T: Nina, find the word that says pasta, pasta. Good girl! How did you know that was pasta and not pass?
SN: Um, because it has an A at the end?
T: Yes, it's got an A at the end, and pass has a /s/ sound at the end. [H32S27_0:27:40]

This ability to scaffold both the whole class and individual learning in order to allow for successful literacy experiences was also shown in the following episode from the second year classroom of Sue, an effective teacher. Sue was preparing the children for a successful writing activity as they orally rehearsed with a partner what they were going to write. They were asked to concentrate on both the content of their news and on the sentence structures they would use in their writing.

T: Now I'm going to give you one minute for the inside person to share with the outside person two things: one their news; and two, what they're going to write. Because it's all very well to tell your news, but how are you going to put it on paper? So you need to not only tell your news, you need to tell the sentence that you're going to write, or the sentences that you're going to write. So you've got one minute to do two jobs - tell your news and say how you're going to write it. [J24S27_0:09:49]

As the children were rehearsing their news Sue circulated around the class, asking individual children about the content and structure of the news and modelling sentences and phrases. She paid particular attention to those children who could have experienced difficulty, indicating that she would help them where necessary. Once the children had begun to write Sue encouraged them all, and as she moved around the class, carefully scaffolded the writing of particular words for individual children.

T: It's nice to see you getting your thoughts on paper because they are your own thoughts. No-one else would have the same news as you... There's went... Yes. On Sunday Where are we going from here? On Sunday?
SN: I...
T: Good boy. Yes. I went.
S: To?
T: To? You know about to... Yes. Where?
S: [inaudible].
T: To where, darling?
S: Disneyland.
T: Disneyland? What does Disneyland start with?
S: /d/.
T: Is it a special place? Do you think it deserves a capital letter to start with?
S: Mm.
T: You do? Okay then. You start with a capital then. On Sunday I went to Disneyland. Look at me /dis/ /dis/... 
S: [mumbles]
T: /ney/ /ney/. Yes.
S: /ney/.
T: /lan/ /d/.
[J24S27_0:09:49]
Like Sarah, Sue demonstrated her ability to scaffold the learning of both the whole class and individuals throughout an extended lesson by extending, reinforcing and modifying their literacy learning. This was possible only through detailed observation of individual behaviours, the ability to recall these observations, make use of them as the lesson progressed and to provide cues that were distinctly and succinctly targeted at what the children needed to learn. This complex and sustained attention of the teacher and ability to provide appropriate cues as she supported the children was not shown in the classrooms of the less effective teachers. Where instances of scaffolding were observed they were usually isolated incidents directed at the whole group and involving cues that did not always set the children up for success. In the following example towards the end of a long small group word study lesson a less effective teacher tried to correct a child’s misconception of *sun* as a word that’s got a /pi/ sound.

T: Um, can you find me another word that’s got a /pi/ sound? ...[5]
SN: Sun.
T: Sun. Does *sun* have /pi/ sound? /si/, what letter makes /si/?
SN: [inaudible]
T: Okay. Maybe I can give you, yes, I can give you a clue. The animals that you have at home, the animals that you have at home, what do you call the animal at home?
If you have a rabbit or a dog or a cat, what do you call them?
SN: [inaudible]
T: No.
SN: Pet.
T: *Pet*. That’s right. Does it start with, does it start with /pi/? That’s right.
SN: [inaudible]
T: Okay.
[A13S27_1:17:18]

The cues that the teacher used in her attempt to help scaffold the child’s learning complicated what was already a difficult task for the child, identifying the sound /pi/ at the beginning of a word. The task was initially made more difficult by the non-specific instruction to find ‘a word that’s got a /pi/ sound’, without prompting that the child should focus on the first sound. The teacher took attention away from the original task and focused on word meaning in terms of an unsuccessful convoluted guessing exercise and then refocused attention on the beginning sound /pi/. Whilst the child’s inaudible response to the guessing game could well have been correct in terms of meaning, it was seen by the teacher as incorrect as she negated the response. Thus the child appeared to be confused and had not achieved success even by the end of the lesson.

Feedback

Hattie (2003) has found feedback to children that is timely, focused and explicit to be ‘the most powerful single moderator that enhances achievement’. He explains:

[Expert teachers] are better able to filter relevant from irrelevant information, and are able to monitor, understand, and interpret events in more detail and with more insight than experienced teachers. As a consequence they seek and provide more and better feedback in light of this monitoring (p. 7).

Feedback has a substantial history in the research literature on effective teaching. Bloom (1976) saw feedback (along with correctives) as being an integral element of quality of instruction, in which ‘the tutor quickly adapts the cues, amount of participation or practice and the use of reinforcement to the learner’s characteristics and needs’ (p. 124). He claimed that to be effective in whole class situations feedback needs to be individually adjusted for each child. Similarly Brophy and Good (1986) saw teacher feedback as effective reactions to student responses that included acceptance of correct
responses, follow-up of partially correct responses and use of student responses in making teaching points.

A feature of the early years classrooms in this study was the use of feedback. It was present in all teachers’ classrooms but varied in frequency, type and quality. The classrooms of the more effective and effective teachers were characterised by a positive happy climate in which there was much use of positive reinforcement throughout the literacy sessions. The children in the classroom of Hannah, a more effective teacher, joined in with her catch cry of ‘fantastic’ and those in Sarah’s class joined in with ‘sensational’ as their accomplishments were celebrated. However, Hannah, Sarah and the other more effective and effective teachers also provided children with feedback that explicitly indicated exactly what was being celebrated, modified or corrected. In a discussion of their worm project Hannah made clear to Jack and Lourie that she appreciated their observations and use of vocabulary.

SN: Worms are made of little...
T: You told me...
S: Segments.
T: Segments. Worms are made of little segments! I think Jack and Lourie saw that. They saw little parts that made up the whole worm. Fantastic! Next one.
S: They are tiny and they feel funny.
T: Fantastic! Let's give Lourie a big clap. That was wonderful! I really like that information, “worms are made of little segments”. Jack and Lourie, so you two can stand up first, and go quietly out to morning tea.

Similarly Sarah gave positive feedback to Aidan who correctly identified beginning, middle and end as being three elements of a story. She did this first with her accepting comment of ‘good boy’ and then proceeded to repeat and expand on Aidan’s response in order to reinforce the concept of distinct parts of a story, a concept essential for the activity she was about to present.

T: Who can remember what the parts of the story are? What are the three parts we need to remember? Aidan?
SN: Middle; ah, beginning, middle and end.
T: Yes, good boy. We have to have a beginning, where they tell us who the characters are, and maybe where the story is going to take place. Then we have a middle, and we find out what happens in the story, and then we have and ending to find out how it's going to finish. Miss W might help me to hold this one out. I've already made our big chart for us, and I've divided it into the three parts that we will need to be looking at today. We've got the beginning, the middle and the end.
Ss: Beginning, middle and the end.

Because they had created a positive classroom climate and gained the respect of their class, the effective and more effective teachers were able to provide not only affirming, but also in a positive manner, modifying and corrective feedback that challenged the children to achieve at higher levels. Jane, an effective teacher, gave highly explicit recognition for achievements. In the following episode she firstly praised Tom (who was experiencing some problems in fine motor co-ordination) for his neat writing, she referred to some difficulties he had experienced the previous day and how he had overcome them, and she concluded with reaffirmation of his attention to the task and his excellent letter formation.
In Teachers’ Hands

T: Good boy! Beautiful writing! Look at this one! Have a look at how neatly Tom has written his word today. Yesterday Tom decided he wasn’t writing words and then when it came time to remember it he did a great job. So today he’s written it very quickly. Good boy! Excellent formation of all your letters!

Jane used feedback constantly to challenge the children to achieve. As she moved around the classroom checking on all children’s writing as they made smaller words from the word transport, she affirmed, but also modified and connected where she saw the need and moved on to give feedback to the next child.

T: Another T? OK. Charlotte?
SN: A B.
T: Is there a B in transport?
S: No.
T: Don’t want that one today.

Much of the feedback given by the less effective teachers was not so explicit. Children were praised for their efforts but the teachers did not frequently point out the specific attribute being praised. They used words and phrases such as ‘beautiful’, ‘good’, ‘excellent’, ‘good boy’, but did not specify to the same degree as the effective and more effective teachers exactly what was beautiful, good or excellent. This was in contrast to the explicitness of the feedback in the above episodes where Jane, for example, praised Tom’s writing in terms of neatness, speed and excellent formation of all letters.

Responsiveness

A particular form of feedback is responsiveness where the teacher shares and builds on children’s contributions, thus making the child’s contribution a teaching point (Brophy & Good, 1986). Hattie (2003) has pointed out that expert teachers are more adept than other teachers at anticipating and then improvising. In this study there was a clear difference between the effective and more effective teachers and the less effective teachers for the responsiveness teaching practice. All but one of the more effective and effective teachers demonstrated responsiveness in all episodes, whereas two of the less effective teachers did not demonstrate responsiveness at all, one demonstrated it in 25% of episodes and the other demonstrated it in 50% of episodes.

Many of the teaching points that the effective and more effective teachers made, based on children’s contributions, were highly explicit and concise, as if they did not wish to deviate too far from their planned lessons and teaching points. In the following episode Jane was discussing a book she had made to illustrate old forms of transport.

T: We have lots and lots of trucks coming past here. These boys are riding their bicycles to school and they’re not wearing helmets. Do you know why?
Ss: Why?
T: Why? Cos it was a long, long time ago.
SN: They didn’t have helmets.
T: That’s right. And when your daddy was a little boy he didn’t have to wear a helmet. And when your mum was a little girl she didn’t have to wear a helmet.

She related the children’s own experiences of trucks to those shown in the book and then pointed to a picture of some children without helmets who were riding old-style bicycles to school. When one child commented, ‘They didn’t have helmets’, Jane briefly related
the concept of time past to when the children’s parents were children, thus building up their background knowledge of the topic.

Once this brief deviation initiated by the teacher was finished, the teacher refocused attention on the next picture in the book. In a similar way Hannah set up a shared writing session around the worms that had formed the basis for a language experience session. Whilst at first glance it might look as if the children were directing the course of the writing session, Hannah carefully elicited the adjectives little and long, which the children had already used to describe the worms.

T: I noticed their size next. Someone had this word. I think it was, Tamsyn.
SN: Cold-blooded?
T: No, about their size and their shape.
S: Long.
T: What did you say about their size, Tamsyn?
SN: Little.
T: Little. So, Maggie, I’m going to write, Worms are little. I’m also going to talk about their shape and Lourie gave a really good word for their shape. Down there, Lourie. What’s the word you said for their shape?
SN: Um... circle?
T: No, you told me another word, the word I want.
S: Long?
T: Long. So I’m going to write, The worms are little and long.

Having elicited the two words little and long that she wanted for the sentence to make sense, Hannah then wrote the sentence to include these words, with the children helping with spelling and Hannah pointing out various writing conventions. Once finished Hannah asked the children to help her read back the sentence. As in Jane’s previous episode the teacher elicited the responses that she wanted from the children and, having accepted them, used them to make a teaching point, before continuing with the planned lesson. This was the teaching format most common in examples of the responsiveness practice.

Nevertheless, there were a few instances in which a child’s contribution was allowed to dominate for at least a short time. In Sarah’s class a different child each day was chosen to take home Baby Fatso, a soft toy that was the class mascot. Each morning the chosen child was expected to discuss what Baby Fatso had done and to have completed some writing about the experience. In this episode the child who had taken home the soft toy the previous afternoon was explaining what she and Baby Fatso had done at home.

T: Would you like to tell us something else you did with Baby Fatso last night?
S: We went to bed and we...I felled out of bed.
T: You fell out? Did Baby Fatso fall out?
S: [nods]
T: Oh, goodness, let’s have a look. Did you have to put a bandage on him?
S: No [laughs].
NS: Did you put a bandage on you?
T: There, does he look hurt?
NS: No
T: No, I think he’s OK.
NS: Did you put a Bandaid on you?
T: Did you need a Bandaid?
NS: Nope.
T: No. Can we have a look at the beautiful writing that you did, because that is fantastic! Yes, give her a clap, Will. Well done! Good girl!

E: [claps]

T: Did you get mummy to write down with you first, the sentence, or did you do that just straightaway into the book?

S: Straightaway.

T: Straightaway. Didn't even have a practice first so that was fantastic! Good girl!

T: Would you like to see who's going to take him home tonight?

Again the routine experience was carefully structured by the teacher, but this time the child's responses were totally affirmed as there were no set answers in the teacher's head. Nevertheless, imminent closure of the discussion session was indicated by the teacher's instruction, 'Yes, give her a clap', and once the child's writing had been reviewed by the teacher, her contribution was ended as another child was allocated the toy to take home.

A rare instance of the responsiveness practice that developed along a course not pre-planned by the teacher and did not end with closure, occurred in Jenny's second year of school classroom as she was asking the children for words with which to describe a giant in a pre-reading activity for the book *The Giant of Ginger Hill* (Eggleton, 2000).

T: *Giant*. Who could give me some words? What popped into your mind immediately that I said that word giant? What popped into your mind? Shane?

S: *Humungous*.

SN: Uh-oh. Pardon?

T: *Humungous*...[10].

SN: She can't spell it.

T: It's one of those words that's sort of - just sort of grown up, and I need some help. *Humungous*.

T: /hu/  
SN: Who can help me out? *Humungous*. What sounds can we hear?

T: Come on, Shane. You said it. Help me out.

SN: [inaudible]

T: Oh thank you. Here's a boy who's helping. He's learning. Brilliant! Carl, have a go.

S: *H U M*  
T: *H U M*  
SN: *U G E S*  
T: Leo, what would you put?

SN: *W H O*  
T: Sorry Leo. *Humungous*.

S: *W H O*  
T: Have a listen. Have a listen. *Humungous* [slowly articulated]. Okay, go for me.

S: *H U*  
T: /ou/, /ou/. We've crossed out the W. Now? /m/ /m/.

SN: *M U N G E S*  
T: Mm? Anyone else got any ideas? One more person.

SN: *O W*  
[C4S26_0:06:02]
Jenny was surprised by the word *humongous* as can be seen by her exclamation of ‘Uh-oh. Pardon?’ Nevertheless, she accepted this word that is common in children’s oral language but not as yet widely accepted in conventional written language. When one of the children challenged her ability to spell *humongous* she suggested that she needed some help as the word had ‘just sort of grown up’ and accordingly engaged the children in the process of sounding it out. After various attempts by the children Jenny signalled the end of the activity by asking for ‘one more person’. Nevertheless, she saw the discussion as an opportunity to make an important teaching point and did not yet close down the discussion.

T: Tell you what. I’m going to have to check that one.
S: GAS.
T: It could be. I don’t know. It’s one of those words, oh Shane, go on. Last person.
SN: H U M U N G I S.
T: Could very well be. Can I put a question mark there?
Ss: Yes.
T: Can I put a question mark and can we all check that one out?
Ss: Yep.
T: Yep? Can you do that for me? We will check the dictionary. If it’s there.
SN: I will get the dictionary.
T: Oh, thank you, Roger. I will choose someone to check the dictionaries for me. We may have to ask someone else. Can I leave that word, Shane?
[C4S26_0:06:02]

Here Jenny allowed the discussion to include another ‘last person’ and added further spelling strategies to the strategy of sounding out: consulting dictionaries or asking ‘someone else’. Whilst she had closed down the discussion for the moment, the episode did not end with closure as she asked Shane’s permission to ‘leave that word’, with the implication that once the other strategies had been tried the discussion would continue. Thus, the teacher’s responsiveness in her acceptance of the contribution of the word *humongous* by one child had led to an unplanned exploration of highly significant literacy concepts, not only in terms of spelling but also in terms of the changing nature of the English language. The relatively extensive nature of this unplanned diversion from the task of providing words associated with *giant* was not typical of other episodes coded as containing the responsiveness teaching practice.

**Explicitness Word**

In order to be able to read efficiently, young children need to develop the knowledge and strategies necessary for breaking the code of texts at the word level. However, the ways in which this code breaking is taught and in particular the explicitness with which it is taught has caused huge divisions in the educational arena (Chall, 1967). The divisions are still persisting amongst some sections of the education community, as can be seen by the headline ‘Phonics at core of new literacy war’ (*The Australian*, April 21, 2004, p. 21). Nevertheless, there is a growing recognition within the education community that the explicit teaching of sound-letter relationships and how to use these in reading and writing are important parts of early literacy teaching. Snow, Burns and Griffin (1998) call for a first grade program that has a strong focus on ‘explicit instruction and practice with sound structures that lead to phonemic awareness…sight recognition of frequent words [and] instruction in spelling-sound correspondences and common spelling conventions, and their use in identifying printed words’ (p. 194).

---

19 *Humongous* did not appear in any printed dictionary consulted, but does appear in the MS Word dictionary spelled *humongous* or *humongous* and defined as an ‘informal’ adjective meaning ‘extremely large in size or amount’.
The need for this emphasis on the word level in early years literacy teaching was shown by the National Reading Panel (2000) in results of their meta-analyses of many controlled research studies. These results showed that phonemic awareness (awareness of the sound units of language) and letter knowledge measured at school entry were the two best predictors of reading success in the first two years of school and that systematic phonics instruction, in which the acquisition of sound-letter correspondences and their use in reading and spelling were explicitly taught, was highly effective in promoting early reading. Phonics instruction has been defined by Stahl (2001, p. 335) as ‘any approach in which the teacher does/says something to help children learn how to decode words (after Durkin, 1978-1979)’. Stahl defines the components of phonics as ‘teaching sound-symbol correspondences directly, having children manipulate sounds in written words through spelling tasks, pointing out patterns in similarly spelled words, or anything else which helps children learn about orthographic patterns in written language’ (p. 335).

It was expected in light of the research literature that, since the teachers in this study were working with children in the first two years of school, they would have a focus on the word level aspect of text. And this was the picture for the most part. In all teachers’ classrooms there were occasions where teachers directed children’s attention to explicit word and sound strategies. As expected, explicitness word was observed in all episodes of the two most effective teachers’ classrooms and one of the effective teachers’ classrooms. However, it was also observed in 50% or more of the episodes for all but one of the other teachers’ classrooms. Thus, frequency of use of this teaching practice did not discriminate between the more effective, the effective and the less effective teachers (see Chapter 5 for explanation in terms of Rasch analysis).

All teachers directed the children’s attention to whole words, the sounds and letters within them, the relationships between sounds and letters and how to read and write them through segmenting and blending. This was observed in the classrooms of most, but not all, of the less effective, as well as the effective teachers. In the following episode a less effective teacher, who was using the commercial phonics program THRASS (www.THRASS.com.au), reminded a child to consult the phonics chart in order to spell the /ea/ sound in leaf.

T: That's a terrific sentence! I love your capital and your fullstop at the end. I want you to go to your THRASS chart and see if you can find the phoneme you need in the middle of leaf. What's in the middle of leaf? You've got /l/ and /f/. What's in the middle of /l/ /eaf/? Which box do you need to look on your THRASS chart?
SN: On the E box.
T: Good. Can you go and do that?
S: Yeah I did that.
T: And which...? You made that choice out of the E box on the THRASS chart. OK. That was a good choice. It's actually the same /eaf/ as in beach.

Another less effective teacher directed the children’s attention to rhyming words in a Big Book.

T: OK. Now, everyone to look up here and we read it all again once more and then we're going to find out any rhyming words in the poem. OK?
SN: Mother - brother.
T: One already! Very good. OK. Can you close the book and put it on the floor?

Whilst all the teachers focused to some extent on word level features and strategies and the explicitness word teaching practice did not differentiate between the groups of teachers in terms of frequency of occurrence of the teaching practice, on the whole the effective and more effective teachers provided extremely clear explanations and directions that were of a higher order than those of the less effective teachers. In terms of writing words, children’s attention was directed towards various aspects of this process, including not only spelling, but also letter formation and other writing conventions such as capitalisation and spacing between words.

In the following episode Jacinta had identified the compound word roller-coaster as the word she wanted to use in her writing. Sue, her teacher, firstly reminded Jacinta of the writing conventions of line and word spacing, then directed her attention to the spoken word roller, thus segmenting at the word level. Sue continued to break it down for Jacinta into the smaller word/syllable roll and then into the segments of onset and rime /r/ /loll/. Once Jacinta had succeeded in writing roller, Sue directed the child’s attention to segmenting coaster, the second part of the compound word, and painstakingly guided Jacinta through its phonemic structure, thus explicitly teaching segmenting at different levels of the word and syllable as a spelling strategy.

T: What did you play on?
S: Roller-coaster.
T: Roller-coaster. Now roller’s a big word. Do you think we need a new line for that? OK. Here you are.
S: [inaudible]
T: All right. Well I’ll put the finger space and you can go. What does roller start with?
S: [inaudible]
T: Roll, /r/ /loll/, /r/ /loll/.
S: Roll.
T: Now coaster, roller-coaster. What does it start with?
S: C.
T: Yes. C, /coal/, C O, /coast/, COA, /coal/ C O A... What’s next? We’ve got /coal/...
S: [looks at the floor and mutters]
T: Look at me, Jacinta, /coast/.
S: /l/.

Sue was teaching a second year of school class. The more effective and effective teachers of the first year of school taught decoding strategies in terms of even more specific relationships between sounds and letters. Hannah explicitly taught the spelling pattern Q, U which she taught as representing one sound, but which, whilst strictly it represents the two phonemes /k/ and /w/, is often taught as a digraph that represents one sound.

T: Now we’re going to have a go at writing a word. Are we ready? When I say the sound /qu/, how many letters are we going to write for that one sound? Jack.
SN: Two.
T: Two letters because we write Q and U to make the sound /qu/.
SS: /qu/.
SN: /qu/.
T: Here’s the first word, are we ready?
SS: Yes.
T: Lourie, are you listening?... /qu/ /l/ /l/. Quit.
SN: Quit. /qu/ /l/ /l/.
In Teachers’ Hands

T: So you’re going to have, how many letters altogether?
SN: Four.
T: Four.
[B6S12_0:09:58]

Some teachers used multisensory clues for demonstrating the one-to-one and one-to-
more than-one relationships between phonemes and alphabet letters. In the above
episode Hannah used her fingers to illustrate the number of letters in /qui/ and then in the
word quit. Some teachers used a sound box technique (Clay, 1993; Elkonin, 1976) as a
visual illustration of these relationships, which was sometimes accompanied by
movement of discs or letters into the boxes in order to help children learn through multi-
sensory experiences.

Jane used a multi-sensory strategy when she explicitly taught handwriting at the same
time as spelling and word study. She had written the word transport on the blackboard at
the beginning of the day, read the word clearly and slowly to the children, and drew their
attention to the sounds and letters within the word. The children were then required to
write the word several times on their own small blackboards, paying attention to letter
formation. In this way they were given both a visual and auditory representation of the
word before being asked for the kinaesthetic representation as they wrote it on their
individual blackboards. They were also supported in their writing of the word transport
by reminders of strategies for letter formation, as Jane moved around the classroom.

T: Well done, Marijana. Good girl. Christy, a P has to have a hang down point; the P
has to have a hang down point. Here look, Christy. It's like a fishing rod that's in a
pond. Make it go down. Tim's doing a great job! He's got good control. Good girl.
Write me another P over there that hasn't got a join in it. Show me another P. Down, up, over, down, off. Excellent!
[I4S12_0:07:04]

In the second year of school classrooms the children had acquired more knowledge of
sound-letter relationships and there was in most cases a correspondingly more complex
teaching of these relationships. In the following episode Jenny was facilitating a
discussion of long and short vowels in the spelling lists she had written on the
blackboard. The task for the children was to identify long and short vowels in the words.

T: Sun. Does it have a short vowel? Remember the sound. You have to listen. It must
make the /a/ /e/ /i/ /o/ /u/ sound to be a short vowel or A E I O U to be a long vowel.
What is it, Erin?
SN: Short.
T: Which one is it?
SN: /a/
T: /a/. Good girl. There it is. That's the short vowel. What about bed? Does it have a
long or a short vowel in it?
[C8S12_0:52:43]

Following this explicit teaching of relationships Jenny, as an orientation activity to the
shared book The Giant of Ginger Hill (Eggleton, 2000), asked the children to read flash
cards of some of the key words in the book. In this activity, when the children
encountered the words giant and ginger, Jenny helped them recognise that the letter G in
these two words made the sound /j/ and she reinforced the connection to previous
discussions about short vowels when a child noticed that the letter G was followed by
the short vowel /i/.
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T: *Giant* and *ginger*. What did we have? Ah, Erin! I saw the little lights go on. What sound's it making?

SN: /g/.

T: /j/. What sound is there?

S: /j/.

T: The G, it's making that /j/ sound we had. The same as in *giraffe*. Be very careful about that one.

SN: It's got the /i/ in the word there. The /i/.

T: Ah! Oh! The short vowel?

SN: The short vowel it's in both of them.

[C9S12_0:15:04]

The emphasis by all teachers on the explicit teaching of strategies to decode or encode words had the potential to improve literacy outcomes for children, and an enormous amount of research has been conducted that shows teaching these skills does in fact lead to improved literacy outcomes. However, in our study frequency of use of this teaching practice was not in itself related to improved outcomes for children in all classrooms.

**Explicitness Text**

In addition to focusing on word level instruction it is also important that teachers make explicit specific attributes of a text, in particular through strategies with which to support text comprehension and creation. The National Reading Panel attributes positive outcomes for students to methods used by teachers in which they 'demonstrate, explain, model and implement interaction with students in teaching them how to comprehend a text' (p. 4). This comprehension of text includes strategies with which to bring background knowledge of a topic to the text being read, to comprehend texts literally as well as inferentially, to comprehend words and to use comprehension monitoring and ‘fix-up’ strategies (Snow, Burns & Griffin, 1998). Many methods of comprehension instruction involve careful scaffolding of students until they have learnt a particular strategy (for example, Duffy, 2003; Palincsar & Brown, 1983). Duke and Pearson (2002) describe a model of comprehension strategy instruction that includes explicit description of the strategy, modelling, collaborative use, guided practice and finally, independent use of the strategy.

Making specific attributes of a text explicit does not only mean formal comprehension strategy instruction. It may mean embedding the teaching of reading and writing into a wider context, using whole texts as the basis for instruction (Wray *et al*., 2002). In the early years classrooms in our study the teachers often used whole texts to make specific attributes explicit when teaching reading as well as writing. The fairly long extract below from Sue’s classroom illustrates clearly some text level strategies shown by the effective and more effective teachers.

Sue re-introduced the children to the previously read Big Book *Franklin in the Dark* (Bourgeois, 1986), by drawing attention to the title of the book and the pictures. She asked the children to discuss the story from these two aspects of the text, directing them to focus on the feelings of Franklin, the main character who is ‘scared’, and to relate their own feelings of fear to those of Franklin.

T: I'm going to read the title and it's *Franklin in the Dark*. And look, Franklin's looking a little sad here. What's unusual about this?

SN: Looks scared because he's scared of the dark.

T: Could be. Could be. Yes.

SN: Out of his shell.

T: He's out of his shell. Do turtles usually do that?
S: No.
T: He's just taken it off and put it down, on the side.
SN: Um, he's scared of the dark and he doesn't want to get in because he's scared.
T: Yes, you've read the story already. Right, well you need to sit down and listen because the focus today is not what's happening. I want you to think about how Franklin would feel. Right? Because sometimes we feel the same. Don't we Andrew?
SN: Yes.

Before re-reading the book Sue explained to the children that they would need to focus on Franklin’s feeling of fear, as the book would be a catalyst for their personal writing about fear.

T: Sometimes we could feel like this, and we need to think about when we feel like Franklin. Because at the end I'm going to ask you to write me a story, a short story, but not the story that we're reading here; I want to know about when you feel like this. And sometimes it's not a nice feeling, but we need to write and talk about these feelings that aren't always happy. OK? Quite often our sad feelings, our frightened feelings and our scared feelings end up OK. But to start with it's not very pleasant, is it?
Now you need to all see. Can you see, Joel? And listen. It's a listening turn. There he is, and there's our author and our illustrator, Paulette and Brenda. Two ladies wrote this and drew. Is there a dedication?

In this episode Sue provided a focus for the reading of the text and by providing this focus directed the children towards a particular response to the text that would inform their own writing. Presentation of a text in terms of prediction from the title and the pictures was a common pre-reading practice in the classrooms of the effective and more effective teachers. The use of a shared text and the guided discussion of particular features as the model for children's own writing was also a common practice in these teachers' classrooms, as was discussion of the author, illustrator and other 'blurb' on the cover pages. In the classrooms of the less effective teachers detailed discussion was often limited to the book title, author and illustrator.

Some of the effective and more effective teachers focused their discussion and explanations of text on specific discussions of text type, as in Jenny’s guided discussion of the purpose of narrative genre.

T: What type of book is this book?
SN: A narrative.
T: A narrative. That's right. A made up story. Why do we say it's narrative?
SN: [inaudible]
T: Why do we have narratives?
SN: To trick people and scare them.
T: Maybe to trick or scare. Erin why might we have a narrative? Why do people write narratives?
SN: [inaudible]
T: It could be. Yeah. Would you say they could entertain us? These books are fun to read.

[C12S13_0:35:23]
There was an overall emphasis on the narrative and recount genres in all classrooms. Some exceptions were reading and discussion of factual texts on the theme of transport in Jane’s classroom, experience, discussion and writing about features of worms in Hannah’s classroom and the following shared writing of a letter to a teacher who had been involved in a traffic accident, in the classroom of Isobel, an effective teacher.

T: Yes, we need to start off with who it’s to. What are some other things we need to put in our letter? Nick?
SN: To.
T: Yes, we might write to.
SN: Dear
T: //Or Dear. We know Mrs Howath so we might write Dear. Think about in the middle of the letter. What are some of the things we might put in? Mark?
SN: Questions?
T: Some questions. Why do we need to put in questions?
SN: Write back.
T: That’s right. So they can write back to us. If we don’t ask any questions in the letter then they won’t think of things that they could write back. It makes it easier for them to write back to us. Because we hope that Mrs Howath will write back, hopefully, cross our fingers that she will write back to us.
T: Sh. All right, where should we start our letter? Joel? What should we put at the start of our letter?
SN: Dear Mrs Howath.
T: Good idea.
 [F8S13_0:01:06]

In this extract the teacher made explicit a convention of letter writing, that is the salutation at the beginning, and then asked for ideas for the content. When Mark proposed asking questions in the letter Isobel probed for the purpose of these questions, which another child interpreted as to solicit a reply. Isobel then affirmed the response by stating that asking questions elicits a response and gave the recipient of the letter a purpose for replying. She then returned to the actual writing of the letter, reinforcing the salutation of Dear and continued in the remainder of the episode to explicitly model conventions and the content provided by the children.

Persistence

Persistence involves the teacher providing many opportunities for children to practise and master new learning. Snow, Burns and Griffin (1998) have pointed out that ‘outstanding’ teachers provide many opportunities for sustained reading and writing practice in a range of formats. At the word level this may mean ‘creating multiple opportunities for sustained reading practice in a variety of formats, such as choral, individual and partner reading’ (p. 196). Time spent in practising reading is important for word identification processes and skills to become automatic and free up working memory space for higher order processing (La BERGE & Samuels, 1974; Samuels, 2002). At the text level, persistence may involve the teacher allocating a large amount of time to reading in order to provide experience in using comprehension strategies (Duke & Pearson, 2002).

Persistence, as witnessed in the classrooms of the more effective and effective teachers in our study, could be seen as related to their ‘drive for improvement’ for both themselves and their students (DfEE, 2002) and was also a reflection of their ‘passion for teaching’ (Hattie, 2003). These teachers made the most of every window of opportunity to reinforce the knowledge, concepts and skills that were to be learnt. The persistence teaching practice was observed in at least 50% of episodes in the effective
and more effective teachers’ classrooms and in all episodes in two of them. On the other hand it was not observed in any episodes in two of the less effective teachers’ classrooms.

The persistence with which the effective and more effective teachers pursued the learning of their children pervaded the episodes already analysed in this chapter, as these teachers carefully planned what was to be taught and reinforced this at all opportunities. As we have already seen in two episodes, Hannah, who displayed the teaching practice of persistence in every episode, focused the children’s attention on the spelling-sound pattern QU many times during the two-hour coded observations. She began in the first episode by pointing out that in the reading of the book The Sad Little Monster and the Jelly Bean Queen (Lardner, 1996) the last word in the title began with /qu/, a pattern that had previously been taught.

T: Right, everyone turn their eyes and look at me. Let me see if I can see everyone's eyes so I know you're ready to listen. Lourie? That's it. Now, we've started doing the sound... what sound have we started doing?
SN: /qu/.
T: /qu/, Now I went to the library and when I went home I looked through all of Jessie and Allanah's reading shelves, and I could only find one book that had a /qu/ in the name of the title of the book.

As she made the transition from the reading of the shared text to a drama session, which would have a focus on questions, Hannah made the connection between sessions by pointing out that the word questions also started with /qu/.

T: Now, in The Sad Little Monster and the Jelly Bean Queen I actually saw some sentences that were questions. Remember we've been talking about questions because that starts with...?
SS: /qu/
T: /qu/, and I found one on this page. So let's just check if it's got one of those question words that we wrote down on our question word chart. Better find where it is now. Here's the first question.

Hannah returned to the /qu/ concept in a later episode when she modelled the writing of it as an introduction to a handwriting and spelling lesson based specifically on this sound/spelling pattern. She then very carefully supported the children in their writing of the words quit and quiz.

SN: Bravo!
SS: Bravo!
T: All right. Did everyone have Q and U for /qu/?
E: Yes.
T: Then /i/?
E: Yes.
T: Then /h/?
E: Yes. //
T: //Well done! We're going to write another word. Don't rub it out! We'll just write underneath. Are we ready for our next one? Here we go. Watch my fingers! /qu/ /i/ /u/, quiz.
Similarly Jane, who also displayed the persistence teaching practice in every episode, directed her children’s attention many times to the word transport in handwriting, spelling, word study, reading and creative writing sessions. As transport was her theme for the week it was used not only at the word level, but also at a whole text level. Jane had read the children books about transport, they had discussed various forms of transport and were also asked to make their own book about transport. In these teachers’ classrooms it appeared that no child could escape from learning what was being taught, through the teachers’ drive for improved outcomes and passion for their work. Despite the high level of redundancy inherent in these teachers’ practices, the children in their classrooms were completely engaged. Their teachers provided a variety of motivating activities and regularly announced their intention to ‘trick’ the children, thus turning learning into a game that the children were supported into winning.

In the classrooms of the less effective teachers there was little persistence: activities were introduced and even if they were related, the relationship was not explicitly explained. Where less effective teachers were identified as demonstrating the persistence practice, there was not the high level of specificity, connection and redundancy shown by the effective and more effective teachers.

One less effective teacher, who was coded as showing a high level of persistence with her first year of school class, had a focus on ‘sounding out’ words in reading. She began her literacy session with a discussion of letter names and sounds, which were printed on flash-cards, then extended this to specific discussion of vowel sounds and finally to ‘sounding’ two ‘letters’ put together. The theme of sounding out was then extended to a shared book entitled *I Spy* (Marzollo, 1992) in which the teacher asked the children to guess the last word in the sentence from its first sound. In a writing activity that followed, children were individually directed to ‘think about sounding out’, ‘have a go at sounding out’, and ‘say the word as it sounds’.

Whilst this teacher was persistent in her encouragement of the decoding strategy of ‘sounding out’, her teaching of first year of school children did not have the specificity and scaffolding shown by Hannah and Jane in their teaching of first year children. Where Hannah focused on the specific letter combination *QU* and Jane focused on the specific word *transport*, this teacher focused on a general strategy that was also introduced at a general level. Whilst some of the children in her class were apparently able to respond to this general strategy instruction, many children in their first year of school would most likely have needed the specific support that Hannah and Jane so persistently provided.

In this chapter there has been an emphasis on word level strategies in terms of the practice of persistence and it has been shown that word level instruction was a strong feature in the classrooms of all the teachers. Nevertheless, most of the more effective and effective teachers were also persistent at the text level in providing various opportunities for reading and writing connected text in a variety of formats, including modelled and shared reading and writing, and guided reading and writing.

**Summary**

On the whole the more effective and effective teachers differed in terms of the quantity and quality of their teaching practices in the support dimension. The more effective and effective teachers were better able for the most part to support children through the
literacy teaching practices of assessment-based teaching, scaffolding, feedback, responsiveness, explicitness at word and text levels and persistence in ensuring positive literacy outcomes for all class members.

The teaching practice of assessment-based literacy teaching was observed to a greater or lesser extent in all but one of the effective and more effective teachers’ classrooms. These teachers were able to use on-the-run assessments of children’s performance in a group task to target their teaching to individual children who were in need of either corrective teaching or extension of learning. These teachers were also able to scaffold children’s literacy learning to help them reach their potential level of development, the majority of them using this teaching practice in all episodes. They used scaffolding extensively at group and individual levels to extend children’s literacy learning in ways that increased their confidence and led to successful experiences with print.

Timely and focused feedback to children was observed in all the teachers’ classrooms, although it varied in frequency, type and quality. It was intensively used by the more effective and effective teachers, all of them displaying this teaching practice in most of their episodes. The classrooms of these teachers were characterised by a positive happy climate in which there was much use of positive reinforcement throughout the literacy sessions, that explicitly indicated exactly what was being celebrated. Further, because they had created a positive classroom climate and gained the respect of their class, the effective and more effective teachers were able to provide not only affirming, but also modifying and corrective feedback that challenged the children to achieve at higher levels. These teachers were also able to respond to children through feedback in order to share and build on their contributions, although the teaching points made in this way were often highly explicit and concise.

It was expected that all teachers would have a focus on the word level aspect of text, in light of much previous research showing that the systematic teaching of phonemic awareness and phonics in the early years of school is associated with higher reading outcomes. This was the picture for the most part. In all teachers’ classrooms there were occasions where children displayed or teachers reminded children of explicit word and sound strategies. Explicitness at the word level was observed in all episodes of the two most effective teachers’ classrooms and in one of the effective teachers’ classrooms. It was also observed in at least half of the episodes for all but one of all other teachers’ classrooms. The emphasis by teachers in this study on the explicit teaching of strategies to decode or encode words had the potential to improve literacy outcomes for children. However, in our study frequency of use of this teaching practice was not in itself related to improved outcomes for children in all classrooms. Nevertheless, there were important qualitative differences between the word level teaching strategies of the more effective and effective teachers and those of the less effective teachers. On the whole the effective and more effective teachers provided extremely clear explanations and directions that were of a higher order than those of the less effective teachers.

Explicitness at the text level was not as frequently observed as explicitness at the word level, but was more likely to be observed in the classrooms of the more effective and effective teachers. Whilst three of the four teachers identified as less effective demonstrated the practice of explicitness word in well over half of their episodes, none demonstrated explicitness text in more than half of their episodes, reflecting the fact that their instruction was concentrated at the word level. Our suggested explanation for these findings is that a balanced approach which includes a combination of word and text level explicit instruction has a positive effect on child literacy outcomes.

The teaching practice of persistence, defined in our study as providing ‘many opportunities to practise and master new literacy learning’ is related to teachers’ drive
for improvement for both themselves and their children and was also a reflection of their passion for teaching. The more effective and effective teachers made the most of every window of opportunity to reinforce the knowledge, concepts and skills that were to be learnt. The persistence teaching practice was observed in at least half the episodes of the effective and more effective teachers' and in all episodes for two of them. Most of the more effective and effective teachers were persistent at word and text levels as they provided many opportunities for reading and writing connected text in a variety of formats.
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From a socio-cultural perspective language and literacy are not simply about the understanding of symbolic meaning, but are also about the development of relational identity. Indeed, it has been said that language, as the critical relational skill in young children, forms the core of individual identity (Gee, 2002). Identity is mediated through the ways in which language and literacy are understood, valued and practised in different social, cultural and linguistic communities. Differentiation, therefore, is about the ways in which teachers tailor the curriculum and pedagogic practices to the unique cognitive and socio-cultural understandings and practices that each child brings to the classroom, while at the same time maintaining group cohesion. Providing a successful differentiated curriculum is a complex and demanding task, through which effective teachers assist children to make connections between the ‘known’ and the ‘new’.

The dimension we have called ‘differentiation’ is characterised by five teaching practices: ‘challenge’, ‘individualisation’, ‘inclusion’, ‘variation’ and ‘connection’ (see Table 10.1).

Table 10.1 CLOS Teaching Practices: Differentiation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>The teacher extends and promotes higher levels of thinking in literacy learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualisation</td>
<td>Differentiated literacy instruction recognises individual differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>The teacher facilitates inclusion of all children in literacy lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variation</td>
<td>Literacy teaching is structured around groups or individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>Connections are made between class and community literacy-related knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenge is perhaps one of the most demanding of all teaching practices, as it involves recognising possibilities within literacy tasks for extending and promoting higher order thinking (Taylor et al., 1999). Effective teachers often do this by helping children to move beyond literal interpretation and construction of text to more cognitively demanding interpretations, explanations and justifications. Such higher levels of thinking has been seen as not only interpreting and explaining text but also constructing and problematising knowledge through the deconstruction of text in order ‘to solve problems, gain understanding and discover new meanings.’ (Education Queensland, 2002, p. 1). Challenging children has been identified as one of the most critical factors in determining children’s literacy achievements. In a study of literacy learning in a ‘whole language’ classroom Stahl, Suttles, & Pugnucco (1996) concluded that student achievement at the end of the year was determined by the amount of challenge they were presented with in their reading materials. Mazzoli and Gambrell (2003) argued that one of the most difficult aspects of challenging children is creating a balance between ‘content and emphasis while making adjustments for the changing needs of individual children’ (p. 62). Thus, effective teachers are aware of the diversity of knowledge and understanding within their classrooms, building on and planning for individual knowledge and skills in ways that provide challenge for all children (DfEE, 2000).

The second teaching practice, individualisation, is characterised by the ways in which effective teachers not only provide differentiated instruction and tasks, which take account of individual needs, but also manage to facilitate the inclusion of all children within and across tasks (Snow, et al., 1998; Wray, et al., 2000). Mazzoli and Gambrell (2003) found that effective teachers made adjustments to match the changing needs of individual children as they scaffolded their literacy learning through the use of a variety of strategies and groupings. A study by Hattie (2003), found that ‘expert’ teachers not
only planned for individualisation, but also used an extensive range of teaching practices to respond to unpredictable individual and group needs through improvisation. Teaching plans were seen as a guide, which allowed teachers to be flexible and responsive to unexpected teaching moments.

Inclusion, the third teaching practice within the differentiation dimension is defined as the ways in which teachers provide different tasks within specific literacy areas, while also creating opportunities for children to engage at different levels within the same literacy task. Wittrock (1986) found that more effective teachers 'involved all of their children rather than concentrating on a sub-group, and they were more likely to ask open-ended questions and wait for them to be answered' (p. 351). It appears that effective inclusion is not only about planning differentiated tasks, but it is also about creating an inclusive curriculum through deep knowledge of, and rapport with children (DfEE, 2000; Scheerens & Bosker, 1997). Awareness of individual needs and inclusion of children are reflected in the ways in which effective teachers manage and organise this variation within their classroom.

Variation, the fourth teaching practice refers to the ways in which teachers use grouping as a means of responding to children's needs and abilities. Although group work has been identified as a significant factor in a number of studies of teacher effectiveness (Mazzoli & Gambrell, 2003; Snow et al., 1998), it is the ways in which the task is matched to the group needs, and instruction and support are adjusted according to individual needs, that determine the effectiveness of group work. Taylor, Pearson, Clark and Walpole (1999) found that the time teachers spent in small group instruction had a significant impact on learning outcomes. Research on literature-based instruction has found that small group interaction around texts appears to lead to higher levels of comprehension and critical thinking than whole class and one-to-one readings (McGee, 1992; Morrow & Smith, 1990). Effective small group work enables teachers to interact with children at an appropriate level, and also allows teachers to make connections with children's own constructions of the world.

The fifth teaching practice of the differentiation dimension is connection. Bruner described the essence of effective teaching and learning as 'how human beings achieve a meeting of minds' (Bruner, 1996, p. 45). It is this 'meeting of minds' that characterises connection. It refers to the ways in which teachers and children make connections between community knowledge and practice and class knowledge and practice, as a means of effective teaching and learning (McNaughton, 2002). The concept of connection has received some support as a characteristic of effective teaching. Mazzoli and Gambrell (2003) identified the process of incorporating class, community and social/cultural knowledge, as one of their ten researched-based best practices for literacy teaching. Hill et al. (1998) found that teacher knowledge and use of children's prior to school literacy practices, were central to effective literacy teaching. In the Productive Pedagogies framework connectedness is defined as: 'the extent to which the lesson has value and meaning beyond the instructional context, making a connection to the wider social context within which students live' (Education Queensland, 2002, p. 23). The significance of connection has been demonstrated in various studies, in which a 'mismatch' between school and family/community literacy practices appears to have contributed to low literacy achievement of particular children (Heath, 1983; Hill, et al., 1998; Jacob & Jordan, 1987; McNaughton, 2002).

Quantitative analyses undertaken on the CLOS data provided further strategies for understanding the differentiation dimension in these classrooms. A simple descriptive analysis, by frequency, of each of the differentiation dimension teaching practices in the classrooms videotaped provides a summary of the proportion of episodes that the
researchers coded for challenge, individualisation, inclusion, variation and connection and shows the wide variation across the classrooms (see Figure 10.1).

![Diagram showing the proportion of teaching practices present in episodes, by teacher, for the differentiation dimension of CLOS](image)

**Figure 10.1** Proportion of teaching practices present in episodes, by teacher, for the differentiation dimension of CLOS²⁰

The less effective teachers were amongst those with the lowest number of episodes characterised by differentiation. For example, in two of the less effective teachers’ classrooms none of the episodes was characterised by variation, inclusion or challenge and only a few demonstrations of individualisation were observed in one of the less effective teacher’s classrooms. In contrast to this, in the classrooms of the more effective and effective teachers many episodes were characterised by challenge, individualisation, inclusion, connection and, to a lesser extent, variation. An exception to this finding was that the classroom of Jenny, a more effective teacher, was not characterised by connection, variation or challenge. A possible explanation is that for the purposes of the observational phase of the study, Jenny taught another teacher’s class as at that time she had an administrative position within the school. Of particular note is that challenge was the least observed teaching practice overall and was not observed in any of the less effective teachers’ classrooms.

In broad terms differentiation was more evident in the classrooms of the effective and more effective teachers. For the most part these teachers appeared to incorporate most aspects of differentiation into their teaching repertoire. Less effective teachers demonstrated fewer differentiation teaching practices. The ways in which the teachers

---

²⁰ Figures in parentheses indicate the children’s learning gain adjusted residual in standard deviation units for each teacher’s classroom.
demonstrated differentiation are discussed below and illustrated with selections from transcripts of the video cases.

**Challenge**

Results of quantitative analyses (see Chapter 5) indicated that challenge was the least observed teaching practice, not only within the differentiation dimension, but also in the whole repertoire of CLOS teaching practices. Challenge was identified in under half of the classrooms observed and where it was observed, it was in the classrooms of the more effective or effective teachers. The literature suggests that the concept of challenge is multi-faceted and involves the quality of interaction, the nature and structure of the task and the level of teacher expectation. It is the complex interrelationship between these facets that creates a high level of challenge.

Effective teachers challenge children through the provision of demanding tasks and the interaction which occurs in and around those tasks. They plan demanding tasks based on their knowledge of children’s levels of attainment and they challenge children to use higher levels of thinking through the use of higher order questioning (Taylor et al., 1999; Wray et al., 2000). In a review of several studies Snow et al. (1998) found that cognitively challenging interactions and the use of a wide vocabulary were significant factors in early literacy development. Evidence suggests that effective questioning techniques, such as the use of higher order questioning, build children’s critical and creative thinking skills (Cotton, 1995).

It has been argued that, ‘while competent teachers may challenge some children some of the time, experts find ways to challenge all children to stretch their understanding of ideas’ (Hattie, 2003, p. 7). The more effective teachers seemed to move between different levels of questioning, confirming and extending thinking when appropriate. They appeared to be constantly urging children to move to a higher level of thinking as demonstrated in the following example. Using the text *Who Sank the Boat* (Allen, 1982) Hannah, a more effective teacher, built on the children’s scientific knowledge as she challenged them to think about why the boat was sinking. She extended their thinking by building on their responses, confirming their replies and leading them towards explanation through open-ended questions, some of which were directed to individuals.

T: Look at that boat. What can you notice? Someone who hasn’t put their hand up, Marty?
SN: Um. Pig.
T: What do you notice about the pig?
S: It’s pink.
T: It’s pink, yes, but what do you notice about the boat here? What’s started to happen? Jack?
SN: Started to sink.
T: Started to sink. It’s going right down into the water, isn’t it? Why do you think that is? Brian?
SN: Getting heavier.
T: Because it’s getting heavier. Was it the sheep who knew where to sit? To level the boat, so she could knit? Do you think it was her?

Challenge is not just about developing the higher order skills of more competent students, but it also includes providing sufficient challenge for both high and low achieving children (Scheerens & Bosker, 1997). It is the teacher’s judgement of the children’s level of understanding that determines what is challenging. In the following episode Isobel, an effective teacher, was introducing the concept of a written book response through shared writing. As this was a new concept the children were
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challenged at a number of different levels. Based on the children's responses, Isobel sequenced the activity, starting with the identification and justification of their favourite character. This was followed by the production of a jointly constructed text as the children decided what to write. Isobel challenged the children to think about the content, structure and surface features of the text. As the lesson progressed she encouraged them to combine their ideas and finally asked them to consider what they needed to check as they read the text to ensure it made sense. She addressed some questions to individual children and moved between different levels of text construction in response to their comments, adapting the material to meet their needs. The children began by identifying and justifying their choice of their favourite character.

T: Okay. Our favourite character in the book is the mum. Why do we like the mum? What is it about the mum that we like? Ashley?

SN: She's scared of mice.

T: She's scared of mice. What was that what you were going to say? What were you going to say?

SN: [inaudible]

T: Oh, she didn't, did she? Michael?

SN: [inaudible]

T: The mouse. It was only one mouse. Remember, if it's one, it's mouse. If it's more than one it's...

Ss: Mice.

T: Mice. Okay, there was a mouse under the bed. So what can we write then? Let's go back and reread from the start. // Our book is called Don't Look Under The Bed. Our favourite character in the book is the mum.

Ss: //Our book is called Don't Look Under The Bed. Our favourite character in the book is the mum.

T: Now instead of putting a fullstop there I might take it away because...because why? Because? Because she?

SN: Was scared of mice.

T: Because she was scared of the mouse. And where was the mouse?

Ss: Under the bed.

T: She was scared of the mouse under the bed.

Ss: From under the bed.

T: Do you think we need the word from?

Ss: No.

T: You're not sure? Okay. Well we can pop it there. Perhaps we can put a line under it and once we've finished we'll go back and reread it and see if we want it.

Although questioning was an integral part of all the teaching that was observed in this study, higher order questioning was not frequently observed. Questions from less effective teachers seemed to be directed at the whole class, rather than focusing on challenging individuals or groups when these teachers used modelled or shared reading. These questions tended to be of a lower order, closed in nature and often appeared to follow a pattern of 'getting the right answer', rather than encouraging exploration of ideas. It has been found that effective teachers use literature to provide children with opportunities to explore multiple interpretations of text and respond at higher levels of abstract and critical thinking (McGee, 1992). Such questioning emphasises the validity of individual perceptions and encourages deconstruction of text. Having used the Big Book to develop scientific concepts, Hannah was observed challenging children to make meaning by analysing the illustrations from The Sad Little Monster and The JellyBean Queen (Lardner, 1996), as she drew their attention to the changing colours of the illustrations.
In Teachers’ Hands

T:  *The next day the princess went back to her island for she missed the golden sand. But the little monster was not sad anymore, his island was now a bright and happy place.* What do you notice now? Robyn.

S:  It's the same as the, um, place.

T:  What's the same?

S:  Um. Wherever the monster lives.

T:  How is it the same, though? What's changed to make it the same?

S:  Umm...

T:  Look at it back there. Look now.

S:  They're laughing?

T:  Yes, they're laughing. What do you notice about...the colours on this page now?

S:  It's happy.

T:  It's a happy, those are happy colours, aren't they? It's not like those...dark colours right back at the beginning. It's now a happy place and you can see by the colours on the page.

In the analysis of episodes that were identified as challenge, literary tasks were not the only source of challenge. Effective teachers challenged children to build on and extend their literacy knowledge, asking children to synthesise, generalise or transfer concepts about the use of written frameworks and sentence and word structures to help them move to new understanding. In the following example Hannah was working on phoneme replacement and rhyming, based on an extension of earlier work. A child was asked to write a word on the board and children were challenged to replace a letter in order to create a new word. Hannah challenged the children to find the replacement letter, asked for the definition of words which ended with the same sound, and concluded by asking children to write their own rhyming word.

T:  Good boy. Now don't rub that off. This is where I'm going to try and trick you. At the moment, what does this word say everyone?

E:  *Wet.*

T:  I want you to change one letter, you have to change one letter and I want the word to say *net. /n/ /et/*.

SN:  /n/.

T:  You only have to change one letter. Which letter would you have to change to make it say */n/ /et/*?

SN:  *W?*

T:  Mhm?... *W? Michael, did I trick you? W. Oh! Quick, quick!*

Ss:  [inaudible]

T:  *W. Take away the W...net...W?*

Ss:  [inaudible]

T:  Okay, before we go. What letter did I have to change, please... Sandy. What letter did I have to change?

SN:  The *W*.

T:  The *W*. What did I have to change it to?

T:  Marty?

SN:  *H?*

T:  Not *H*. I think you've just guessed, because sometimes you do that. What letter was it? Ah, Jack.

SN:  *N?*

T:  *N.*

SN:  /n/.

T:  Did you all have that?

SN:  /n/.
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E: Yes.
T: Don't go! Stop! One last thing. Now we had wet, net. What do those words, two words do? Natalie?
SN: Rhyme?
T: They rhyme. Do you think you could write a word that rhymes with net and wet?

As illustrated in the above episode, some of the more effective and effective teachers in this study also used encouraging phrases which hinted at the challenging nature of the task, for example, ‘I’m going to trick you’, and, ‘Quick, quick!’ Other phrases effective teachers used to encourage thinking, such as, ‘Use your brains!’, ‘Go!’ and, ‘I don’t want to stop you thinking; I want you to think more’, were used when teachers encouraged children to concentrate on recording their ideas, rather than being concerned about correct spelling.

Challenge is not just about the level of interaction between teacher and children and the nature of the task. The literature suggests that it also involves structuring activities so that children can achieve the challenges that have been set. That is, ‘even for higher level, complex learning objectives, guidance through planned sequences of experience is likely to be more effective than unsystematic trial and error’ (Brophy & Good, 1986 p. 366). There was evidence that some of the more effective and effective teachers in this study repeatedly scaffolded children’s learning through careful sequencing and analysis of tasks to help them achieve deeper understanding.

A common characteristic of the more effective and effective teachers appeared to be their high expectations of children’s achievement, as evidenced in the way they presented challenge. Levine & Lezotte (1990) identified ‘high expectations as a crucial characteristic of virtually all unusually effective schools’ (p. 39). High expectations were identified as one of the characteristics of ‘social support’ in the Productive Pedagogies framework (Education Queensland, 2002). In addition, Hattie et al. (1995) suggested that effective (expert) teachers inspire children to become excited about their learning, by demonstrating their belief in successful outcomes for all learners and finding ways of helping children to overcome difficulties in learning.

For example, Hannah created a highly motivated classroom atmosphere. She engaged the children in a battle of wits, ‘This is where I’m going to try and trick you’, praising their responses, ‘I just heard some fantastic answers!’ and urging them on, ‘Don’t stop! One last thing! David, are you watching? Are you watching? Good boy. Quick! I’m going to stop in a moment’.

The literature suggests that high expectations are more likely to be realised if teachers encourage children to share construction of, and commitment to, challenging goals and provide timely and appropriate feedback. It is this feedback which leads children to higher levels of comprehension (Hattie et al., 1995). Luke (2003) has suggested that creating challenging tasks which encourage children to construct knowledge, leads to a degree of uncertainty in outcomes. However, effective teachers are able to build on unpredictable responses in ways which further challenge children’s thinking. Providing children with opportunities to take responsibility for their learning reinforces children’s belief in themselves as learners and enhances their sense of confidence. In the following example Isobel pointed to the effort made by individual children through the sharing of their work. However, this was more than just sharing, as Isobel praised, rewarded, checked and extended each child’s understanding through reference to their individual pieces of writing, thus acknowledging the individual challenges that the children had met.
SN: I went to the park and I went on the rides.
T: With Annabel’s writing she was able to write lots of words all by herself today, weren't you, Annabel? *Went.* Did you know how to spell that word or did you look somewhere? You knew how to spell it, fantastic! Now Annabel was sounding the sounds out for the word *ride,* weren't you? *Rides.* And she wrote *R I D* and then she listened to the word again and she heard the letter and popped it in.
T: OK Tina, a big loud voice.
SN: Once upon a time there was a Barbie named [inaudible] and she lived in a town... [10]
T: Peter’s. Tina. Tina, what were you looking at in your writing today?
S: Capital letters.
T: Capital letters. Good girl! Where do they go, Tina?
S: At the start of a sentence...
T: Yes, where else? Someone's name and a name of a...?
S: Place.
T: Good girl! Well done. Sharnie, loud voice.
SN: [inaudible] And I am nearly eight years old.
T: That's lovely. Now Sharnie, are you going to publish that or are you happy to just read it? Give her a clap. Excellent, did everyone hear that? And lucky last, the star of the writing today. Do you want me to hold your book and you point to the words while you...
SN: //Start again.
T: //Start again.
S: *I cleaned the house with my mum.*
T: Excellent! Did everyone hear that? *I cleaned the house with my mum.* And you can see here all the sounds he was able to hear and write by himself. Fabulous! And he got a sticker! Show everyone your sticker.

**Individualisation**

In the examples already discussed for the challenge teaching practice, some of the more effective and effective teachers seemed to be aware of differences between children and challenged individuals at an appropriate level. Individualisation is the second teaching practice in the differentiation dimension. In terms of classroom management this involves responding to the children as a fluid series of groups with differing needs and attending to specific individual needs. Snow *et al.* (1998) identified several attributes of effective classroom practice for early literacy learning, which included, ‘adjusting groupings and explicitness of instruction according to individual needs’ (p. 150).

In the following episode Jenny, although working with the whole class, challenged individual children by adjusting her responses to meet their level of understanding. She selected and invited individual children to read two sentences from a narrative text. She began by giving them a strategy to help them read fluently, then she responded to each individual by praising and focusing on a particular aspect of the text. In the following example she praised the child, encouraged him to ‘enact’ the giant’s actions, responded to his comment about the giant and challenged him to articulate his knowledge of sentence structure.

T: Have a scan down the page yourself before I ask you to read. Is there anyone who would like to read me the first two sentences? Please, Trent?
SN: The giants.
SN: *The giant lived on Ginger Hill. He loved to go stamping and tramping his- in his giant boots.*
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T: Excellent! Can you do some stamping and tramping in your giant boots on your way back to your spot? Watch out for hands.

SN: He's scary!

T: It would be rather scary. I need someone else and I'm glad you knew where the sentences were too. What gave you the clue, Trent?

SN: Um, because there was no fullstop after stamping.

T: I thought, I thought someone might stop there, but you didn't. Clever boy!

Here Jenny was working with the whole class and responding to individual needs, as the children attempted the same task. Effective teachers also presented opportunities for children to pursue tasks at their own level and provided individual feedback during whole class activities.

It appears that the more effective teachers also built on and consolidated individual children's learning by re-visiting a particular concept as part of follow-up activities. This gave the teacher an opportunity to assess understanding and present information in alternative ways in different contexts. For example, in one observed small group activity in the classroom of Sarah, an effective teacher, Nina had difficulty in differentiating between the words pass and pasta. Sarah gave an explanation and followed this up later as the child worked independently on the task.

T: Nina, find the word that says pasta, pasta. Good girl! How did you know that was pasta and not pass?

SN: Um, because it has an A at the end?

T: Yes, it's got an A at the end, and pass has an /s/ sound at the end.

There were a number of other strategies the more effective and effective teachers used to meet the needs of individuals within their classrooms. Sarah used a system of 'buddy' reading, whereby a more able child supported a less able child. This was structured in such a way that the less able child was individually tutored, and both children received positive reinforcement from their teacher and the class.

T: You can help Evie with the reading this morning. Evie, which is the one that you did?

T: Oh, it's beautiful, isn't it! Ready? /wh/ You whisper in her ear to help her read the, read the sentence. /wh/.

S: When.

T: Listening?

S: When the sun came up the animals had a party.

T: Oh, when the sun came up the animals had a party. Evie and her buddy are /sensational/!

E: Sensational!

T: Give them a clap! Well done!

E: [claps]

Direct input, scaffolding and explicit instruction were also strategies used by more effective and effective teachers with individuals in small groups, while the rest of the class worked on the same task independently. These teachers were observed directing attention to individual needs by challenging thinking at an appropriate level, helping less able children to consolidate their ideas and structuring their thinking in order to complete a task.
The more effective and effective teachers also monitored the children’s progress and assisted individual children by giving feedback. This often entailed working at text, sentence and word level according to individual needs. Jane, an effective teacher encouraged children to understand the individual literacy needs of their peers when she was discussing classroom rules.

T: Yes. Sarah, what’s another rule?
SN: When you’re reading them and you don’t, um, you don’t get the levels that you’re, um, that you’re not up to.
T: That’s right. You need to select the book that suits what you’re reading.
S: [inaudible]
SN: [inaudible]
T: It’s fine because remember, we have children in here who are just learning to read, who don’t read just as well as you do, so they have to have the right to choose a book that will suit them.

However, in addition to paying attention to the needs of weaker children, the effective teachers also addressed the range of ability within the classroom and focused on high achieving children as well as the individual needs of weaker children. Scheerens & Bosker (1997) argued that effective teachers set goals ‘in such a way that pupils are challenged, but not demotivated because the standards are too high or too low — not a preoccupation with achievement, regardless of ability levels but care is taken of individual differences between pupils’ (p. 101). In the following episode Jane made time to hear each child read and she challenged Tyler to articulate the strategies he was using to make meaning from the text. She prompted his understanding of sound-letter knowledge and of the relationship between text and illustrations.

T: Tyler, up here.
SN: Big Sea An - Big Sea ... Come.//
T: // Come...
S: And look at the fish.
T: The...
S: The fish is big.
T: Good boy. Come...
S: Come and look at the crocodile... alligator.
T: No.
S: Crocodile.
T: Yeah, because it starts with a...?
S: /c/
T: /c/ for crocodile. Right. The...
S: The //crocodile is big.
T: //Crocodile. Good. Come...
S: Come and look at the turtle.
T: How do you know it’s a turtle? How did you get the clue? What did you do? You looked at the...?
S: Word.
T: And what’s that? It’s a picture.
S: [inaudible]
T: Right. Okay. The.
S: //The turtle is big.
T: // /c/ Come...
S: //Come and look at the...
T: What do you think that is?
Some of the less effective teachers we observed did not appear to take individual differences into account in their planning or practices. Other less effective teachers responded to individual needs, but often as a result of a problem related to the understanding or misunderstanding of task requirements or as a result of children completing a task incorrectly. In addition, in some of these classrooms less able children were given individual ‘busy work’ that was often unrelated to the work required of the rest of the class, or, which may have emphasised their weakness or made them feel marginalised. Snow et al. (1998) argue that, ‘effective teachers are able to craft a special mix of instructional ingredients for every child they work with’ (pp. 2-3), thus ensuring all children are included.

Inclusion

Although effective teachers were aware of individual differences and needs they were also committed to inclusion, our third teaching practice in the differentiation dimension. Hattie et al. (1995) found that effective teachers provided challenging tasks, which differentiated between, but did not exclude children at different levels. In this study the effective teachers managed to include children in subtle ways while still providing for individual needs. Strategies included the ways in which teachers organised children and planned many open-ended tasks to ensure that all children could participate at their own level. In the following episode each child was given the opportunity to practise asking and responding to a question based on the book, *Who Sank the Boat* (Allen, 1982). In an attempt to engage the children’s imagination and support their thinking Hannah invited them to join her in an imaginary boat.

T: Hands on your heads. Jack, you’ve had your turn you need to let Sandy have her turn OK? Hands off heads. Sandy who are you inviting?
SN: Maggie.
T: Pardon? Could you ask her, please?
SN: Maggie, would you like to come in the boat?
SN: Yes.
T: Alright, everyone hold on. OK?
SN: No.
[B8D16_0:58:06]

Differentiating within tasks was another means through which all children were included. For example, Jenny a more effective teacher worked simultaneously with three levels of reading. She moved between groups, monitoring progress and either giving feedback or introducing a new concept as appropriate. Sarah used a variety of strategies, which included a ‘sharing’ time, based on a report about what had happened when the class mascot, a soft toy, went home for the night. The more effective and effective teachers appeared to be aware of children’s participation and continually encouraged them to stay on task and to join in through positive comments and feedback rather than by criticism or punishment. By acknowledging the children’s contributions these teachers demonstrated the practice of inclusion.

Inclusion was also about the teacher’s acknowledgment of difference. For example, Jane made reference both directly and indirectly to James, a child who was visually impaired. She referred to his need for large text when she introduced the Big Book she had made, and related James’s visual needs to her own failing eyesight and its effect on her reading of the children’s writing.
T: This is a Big Book called Big Machines. Do you know, James, isn't here today. He loves this one. This is the reading bag he takes home all the time. It's got a workman's helmet in it.
T: Well done, Sinead. They're all quick! Can you please write just a little bit bigger. You know I need glasses. I'm glad you're writing bigger today, Jill. Thank you.

More effective and effective teachers managed to include children by differentiating between the needs of the individuals in the class and responding appropriately to each child. Individualised responses were related to task demands, children's perceptions of themselves as learners and classroom management. For example, Sue often worked with children who needed the most support and then held a conferencing session with other children who had themselves identified the specific areas in which they needed help.

Inclusion was not often observed in the classrooms of the less effective teachers. When it was displayed by these teachers they seemed to focus on checking that all children were making progress, as they corrected mistakes or re-stated instructions. In these environments inclusion appeared to be characterised by passive compliance, rather than by active involvement in learning. At other times it seemed to take the form of reprimands to children who were off-task or who did not appear to be paying attention.

Variation

Individualisation and inclusion were maintained by the more effective and effective teachers through their use of variation, the fourth teaching practice within the differentiation dimension. All teachers in this study used some form of group work as part of their everyday classroom management strategies. Teachers used individual instruction, pair work, and small group work in order to structure literacy teaching for individuals and groups. The group allocations were made by individual choice, pre-designated groups and by seemingly random selection by the teacher. Some groups were static and others dynamic. However, it was not the act of grouping itself that made a difference to outcomes, but rather what actually happened in the groups and the ways in which the teacher responded. The effective and more effective teachers were observed using groups as a means of focusing on individual needs through scaffolding learning and giving effective and timely feedback. Some of the less effective teachers used groups as a static classroom management strategy which did not allow for differentiated learning experiences.

The literature suggests that effective teachers adapt and modify instruction during the flow of a lesson. Effective teachers draw on an extensive repertoire of patterns of action while teaching and incorporate them into instruction that is continually responsive to children. They meet needs as they arise and maintain a balance between content-centered and student-centered instruction (Brophy & Good, 1986; Snow et. al., 1998).

The more effective and effective teachers in this study were responsive to particular children and groups in their classrooms. In these teachers’ classrooms grouping was dynamic and responsive, demonstrated by the ways in which children were allocated to different groups for different tasks. Grouping was determined by the nature of the task and individual needs rather than by the need for management or control. In the following episode children were grouped in pairs to discuss worms. As Hannah worked with each pair of children, she reiterated the task and then asked specific questions to help them focus and structure their thinking. Not only did this method of grouping allow all children to articulate their thoughts to another, it also allowed the teacher to target her feedback to the specific needs of individuals and pairs of children.
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T: Stevie. While you're looking at them now I want you to look at their size, their colour, their covering. And the way they move, and talk to your partner about those things.

Ss: [children talk in pairs/groups] [5]
T: Is yours still alive? Is yours alive? Is he alive? He's not going very fast yours is he?
Ss: [inaudible] [3]
T: What do you notice about the covering of it?
SN: Ours is very long.
T: Very long is it?
S: Yeah.
T: What colour is it? What colour do you think it is?
SN: Brown.
S: Black.
T: Blacky brown. OK. And what do you think its covering looks like? What can you see?
SN: [inaudible]
T: Pardon?
S: Segments.
T: Oh, segments! You can see little segments there. Look at that! Can you see how they join together?

In the following example Sue asked the children to choose a partner with whom to share their news and plan how they would write it. She gave them a structure and timeframe and then worked with children who needed extra scaffolding, thus offering individual support. She adapted the lesson to ensure the inclusion of less able children.

T: Now I'm going to give you one minute for the inside person to share with the outside person two things: one their news; and two, what they're going to write. Because it's all very well to tell your news, but how are you going to put it on paper? So you need to not only tell your news, you need to tell the sentence that you're going to write, or the sentences that you're going to write. So you've got one minute to do two jobs. Tell your news and say how you're going to write it. Off you go!

Ss: [children talk in pairs]
T: When did you go to [inaudible], Jacinta?
SN: Monday.

Sarah also used variation effectively through group work. It was highly organised, particularly when she worked with an assistant to produce challenging and engaging materials for all groups. This enabled her to move around to ensure that the groups were working independently, were on task, engaged and challenged. She also had transition activities organised for children who finished early.

Connection

Connection the fifth teaching practice in the differentiation dimension has been identified as important to effective teaching and learning. Research has identified the importance of making connections between the different orientations to communication and literacy that children may practise in their families and communities and in ‘school’ based discourses (Cairney & Ruge, 1998; Hill et al., 1998; McNaughton, 2002). In order to plan for a differentiated curriculum that challenged children at different levels, the more effective and effective teachers drew on their understanding of children’s personal experiences and community knowledge. They recognised the significance of children’s
knowledge as a basis for learning, and in this way they were able to help children make connections between class and community knowledge. They were able to incorporate their understanding of the children’s experiences into their curriculum planning and to use this knowledge to scaffold learning within and across tasks. Although all teachers used connection to some degree, the more effective and effective teachers used connection as a ‘means of building on and extending current knowledge and skills and creating continuity by building on the familiar’ (McNaughton, 2002, p. 18). The more effective teachers appeared to use connection as a deliberate means of developing literacy as part of their program, rather than simply as an incidental strategy.

The following episode illustrates how Sue used her knowledge of the wider community and shared experiences to prompt and extend children’s news telling. Making connections enabled the learners to take on the role of expert, as they explained particular events in their family and community. In this episode Sue used the children’s personal experiences of fear to form the basis for writing a response to a shared book. As Kathryn recounted the events of a possum hunting expedition with her mother, she told the story from her perspective and demonstrated ownership of the narrative. Sue acted as scribe and asked for clarification and identification of the source of fear as the narrative progressed.

SN: I was scared when I was hunting and it was dark.
T: It was in the night?
S: Yeah.
T: And we were up the...?
S: The mountain.
T: Mountain? I was scared because it was...
S: Dark.
T: Dark. Were you scared because... Who were you with to start with?
S: Um, my mum.
T: Mum and you, possum hunting up the mountain.
S: Yeah because we lost a dog and [inaudible]/.
T: //Oh. So were you scared because of the night, or scared because your dog was lost?
S: Um...
T: Or scared because it was only mum and you?
S: I was scared of the dark.

The more effective and effective teachers also used their knowledge of children’s families and communities as a means of helping the children comprehend meaning within different texts. In the following episode, Hannah encouraged the children to use their local knowledge to extend the concepts in the shared book, thus helping the children to make connections between literature in the classroom and their experiences in the community.

T: Oars, that's exactly right. And they're like a paddle. There'd be probably a wider part down the bottom to help them get through the water. So there they are rowing... Whereabouts do you think they might be rowing? Tamsyn?
SN: In a boat.
T: In a boat. But where?
S: In the sea.
T: In the sea. They might be in the sea. Where else could they be?
SN: In a river?
T: They could be in a river? I've seen people rowing in rivers. Where else could they be? We've got one of these at [place name].
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SN: A lake?
T: Thank you Craig. A lake. It could be a lake. I don’t know. Now I heard someone shout out the name of this book, the title of this book. Does anyone want to tell me what it said? Cassie?

Connection is not only about helping to make links between family and community experiences, but is also about accessing and building on children’s literacy experiences outside the classroom. Although there was little explicit evidence of this type of connection in our study, some of the more effective and effective teachers appeared to have detailed knowledge of children’s family and community practices. For example in Sarah’s class, each night a different child took home a bag with Baby Fatso (the class soft toy mascot) and a note explaining that Baby Fatso would live with them overnight. Their experiences together were used as the basis for shared writing with the family, an activity which connected the classroom to home life. Although this activity was based on a ’school’ literacy practice, it enabled children to reveal and reflect on some of their routines and practices within their families.

The ways in which the more effective and effective teachers helped children make connections between community and school knowledge reflected the teachers’ views of teaching and learning literacy. They used connections in order to scaffold children’s learning, thus moving them from the ‘known’ to the ‘unknown’.

Summary

Overall, the ways in which the more effective and effective teachers differentiated their teaching practices for all children, whether in whole class, small group or individual settings, distinguished them from the less effective teachers. None of the less effective teachers demonstrated any of the teaching practices within the differentiation dimension for more than half of the observed episodes, although one of the more effective teachers, who was not working in her own classroom during our observations, also shared this profile.

Challenge, which was the least observed teaching practice overall, was observed in the classrooms of less than half of the teachers. This finding is in accord with that of Luke (2003) who talked of the ‘dumbing down’ of Australian classrooms. Where challenge was observed it was in the classrooms of the more effective and effective teachers, who worked at developing higher levels of thinking for all the children in their classes. Those teachers who used this teaching practice challenged children to build on and extend their literacy knowledge as they guided them in synthesising, generalising or transferring concepts about the use of written frameworks and sentence and word structures to help them move to new understandings. They had high expectations for children, they used questioning techniques effectively, although higher order questioning was not frequently observed, and they structured activities so that children were guided through planned sequences that helped them achieve deep understanding.

The more effective and effective teachers managed to individualise instruction for children to differing degrees. Most carefully monitored individual children’s learning in group and individual activities and built on and consolidated this learning through carefully designed follow-up activities. Most also used strategies to include all children, through the use of open-ended tasks and small group activities, such as guided reading, in which children could participate at their own level. By varying instruction in this way these teachers were able to provide a differentiated curriculum to meet the literacy learning needs of individuals. The more effective and effective teachers knew their children well and were able to contextualise children’s learning as they made some connections between class and community knowledge.
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The less effective teachers did not, as a group, differentiate instruction. None was observed to use any differentiation teaching practice in more than half of their episodes. Further, none of their episodes was characterised by challenge and in two of the less effective teachers’ classrooms there were no episodes characterised by the teaching practices of variation or inclusion. Only a few demonstrations of individualisation were observed in the less effective teachers’ classrooms. In effect, they taught the whole class as a group, they did not usually cater for individual differences and, in particular, they did not appear to provide effective levels of challenge for the children in their classes.
In the Classroom Literacy Observation Schedule (CLOS) the dimension called 'respect' encompasses a group of teaching practices concerned with the social context of the classroom. The teaching practices that make up the respect dimension centre on values, motivation, and interactions between teachers and children, and between children and their peers. Effective teachers are successful in managing the social context of the classroom so that a positive learning environment is established and maintained so as to support children's learning.

Five teaching practices are identified within the respect dimension: 'warmth', 'rapport', 'credibility', 'citizenship' and 'independence' (see Table 11.1). These teaching practices vary from classroom to classroom. Hill and Rowe (1998) provided evidence that most of the differences in student achievement between schools are made at the class level, and that it is the class teacher who has the most control over classroom variables. However, whilst it is the teacher who sets up the classroom environment, some of the teaching practices in the respect dimension, such as credibility and independence, can be observed through the children's, rather than the teacher's behaviour.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Warmth</th>
<th>Welcoming, positive and inviting classroom is focused on literacy learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>Relationships with the children support tactful literacy interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>Respect for the teacher enables her to overcome any challenges to order and lesson flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>Equality, tolerance, inclusivity and awareness of the needs of others are promoted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>Children take some responsibility for their own literacy learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective teaching is evidenced by classrooms that are characterised by the teaching practice called warmth. Effective teachers use a range of teaching practices to establish and maintain social contexts in early years classrooms that are welcoming, positive and inviting, and that focus consistently on literacy learning. Snow et al. (1998) characterised this capacity as 'artful teaching', and cited research studies that refer to outstanding teachers' creation of a 'literate environment' in their classrooms. This concern with environment is related to other teaching practices in CLOS, such as 'environment' in the knowledge dimension, but in the respect dimension it describes the social context and environment that fosters children's engagement in literacy learning. Research supports the importance of social relationships in literacy teaching. Mazzoli and Gambrell (2003) articulated eight principles of best practice for literacy teaching, including the principle that social collaboration enhances learning. Hattie (2003) has reported on a large-scale study of the expertise that underpinned effective teachers, and identified five major dimensions of excellent teachers. The review found that one of the dimensions of expert teachers was that they can guide learning through classroom interactions:

They build climates where error is welcomed, where student questioning is high, where engagement is the norm, and where students can gain reputations as effective learners (Hattie, 2003).

Teaching practices that fit the category of warmth support the development of these kinds of classroom climates.

The respect dimension also includes the teaching practice called rapport, which encompasses the development of relationships between the teacher and children that consistently support tactful literacy interventions. Darling-Hammond (2000), in reviewing research that showed a
substantial proportion of school effectiveness data could be attributed to teachers, claimed that
effective teachers are those who are able to use a range of teaching and interaction styles.
Where teachers know their children, and understand their individual learning needs, they build
a rapport that enables them to intervene in ways that develop and sustain children’s
confidence and self-esteem.

Credibility, the third teaching practice associated with the respect dimension describes the
ways in which the teacher earns the respect from children that enables her to maintain the
momentum of the lesson, and to manage behaviours that could interrupt the orderly conduct of
the classroom. Scheerens and Bosker (1997) undertook a large analysis of effectiveness,
which identified several features relating to classroom climate. Under the classification of
orderliness several factors related to teacher credibility in terms of clarity of rules and firm but
friendly control.

Citizenship involves the promotion of equality, tolerance, inclusivity and awareness of the
needs of others. These characteristics are concerned with values and patterns of behaviour that
influence the extent to which children can actively engage in learning. Snow et al. (1998)
cited research that identified effective teachers as ‘those who effectively and deliberately plan
their instruction to meet the diverse needs of children in a number of ways’ (p. 196). The
Productive Pedagogies Theoretical Framework (Education Queensland, 2002) emphasised
active citizenship as a dimension of classroom climate that leads to independence in learning.

![Proportion of teaching practices present in episodes, by teacher, for the respect dimension of CLOSG](image)

Figure 11.1 Proportion of teaching practices present in episodes, by teacher, for the
respect dimension of CLOSG

---

21 Figures in parentheses indicate the children’s learning gain adjusted residual in standard deviation units
for each teacher’s classroom.
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Independence, the fifth teaching practice associated with the respect dimension, fosters children's motivation to take some responsibility for their own learning.

A simple descriptive analysis, by frequency, of each of the respect dimension teaching practices in the classrooms videotaped provides a summary of the proportion of episodes that the researchers coded for warmth, rapport, credibility, citizenship and independence (see Figure 11.1). The respect dimension distinguished between the teaching practices of the more effective and effective teachers and the less effective teachers. Warmth and rapport were two of the more frequently observed teaching practices and were observed more consistently in the classrooms of the more effective and effective teachers. Credibility was observed in all classrooms apart from those of two less effective teachers, and in almost all episodes for the classrooms of the more effective teachers and all but one of the effective teachers. The least frequently observed teaching practices in the respect dimension, independence and citizenship, were not evident in some classrooms, and in particular, they were rarely observed in the less effective teachers' classrooms. The levels of respect in these classes are discussed below, and illustrated with selections from transcripts of the video cases.

Warmth

The teaching practices that have been described as warmth manifest themselves in different ways in different classrooms. The following extracts illustrate some of the ways in which teachers observed in this study created warm and welcoming contexts in their classrooms.

Jane, an effective teacher, had many years of teaching experience and her positive and inviting classroom was characterised by a strong focus on literacy learning. At the beginning of one school day the word transport was written on the board, and as the children arrived in the classroom they immediately settled to the task of writing the word on their own chalkboards. This activity provided extensive practice for the children in writing quickly and neatly. Jane moved around the classroom, observing all children and commenting positively on features of their handwriting. She addressed the children by name, complimented them on specific aspects of their work, and invited one child, Christian, to evaluate the relative quality of each word he had written. As she gave feedback to individual children she created a positive tone in the highly task-oriented classroom.

T: Good. Lovely writing, Tina! How are you going, Christian? What beautiful letters! The first ones are fantastic! Give yourself a tick for the ones that are the best. Which ones have you written really well? Yes!

Sue, another effective teacher, with many years' experience demonstrated positive interactions with the children as she modelled editing on the white board. She invited children to contribute to the process, built on their contributions and provided specific, positive feedback on the children's editing.

T: What do you think needs a capital in that? There's definitely capitals needed but you think what we think we could use. What did we say has capitals?
S: Is, Is, Saturday.
T: Saturday. Are there any other days of the week there?
S: Monday and Sunday.
T: Yeah, OK. Off you go. Make it nice and big. That's it... [4]
T: Good boy. And another one...Excellent! So Shaun's done our days of the week, he's corrected all of them. They look pretty OK to me. Adam, would you like a turn? What are you going to correct?

[165]
Jenny, highly experienced, successful, and one of the more effective teachers provided positive reinforcement of learning behaviours and achievement throughout the day in her classroom. In this spelling activity, she facilitated discussion about long and short vowels in words. Interspersed with the discussion about vowels, she offered encouraging feedback to the children on their behaviour, thus welcoming them into the discussion. This episode shows an expertly managed blending of teaching about appropriate behaviour ('listening with his whole body') and explicit teaching about complex literacy knowledge ('It must make the ... sound to be a short vowel').

**T:** I want you to listen to the words and tell me if they have a long vowel or a short vowel. I love those people! John, again, a perfect list...a perfect learner!... I know he's perfect! I can see him listening with his whole body. Beautiful, Danny. [inaudible] some people. /sun/. Does it have a short vowel? Remember the sound. You have to listen. It must make the /a/ sound to be a short vowel or A E I O U to be a long vowel. What is it, Erin?

In the following episode, Hannah, a highly effective teacher with twenty years experience in a variety of educational settings had been working with her class on the letter Q. The children had been writing words on the board, and Hannah indicated the letters and sounds in the words. She involved all children in the activity, and her positive feedback about their work contributed to the climate of warmth in the classroom. In this episode she whispered a correction to the child at the white-board, thus providing tactful encouragement and support. The successful outcome of this intervention was drawn to the attention of the whole class, who were invited to acknowledge the achievement of their fellow classmate.

**T:** Who would like to come and write this word on the board for me?
**SN:** Me!
**T:** I can see everyone has their hand up! You've become (fantastic) now! Um. James... Let's see if you've got the same letters as James... Quit... Oh! Look at that beautiful handwriting! [teacher whispers to boy]. What goes with our Q though?
**S:** U.
**T:** Perfect! Good boy! Give him a clap!
**SN:** Bravo!
**Ss:** Bravo.
**T:** Alright. Did everyone have Q and U for /qu/?
**E:** Yes!

Another episode, this time a shared book activity in Hannah’s classroom, illustrates how positive and warm feedback created an inviting atmosphere.

**T:** Yes, what again. So we've got what again. Harry, you. I don't think there were anymore in that one. Think that was all. Harry, you. Christopher that was fantastic! Now I found another book that has a question for its title. And you may have seen this book before.
**SN:** I have.
**T:** That's good. I'm glad you have. Have a look at the title - the front of this book.

Jane’s classroom was characterised by effective management strategies that ensured the children had a clear understanding of what was expected of them. In this episode she firstly responded to the child’s evident interest in motor bikes, and then dealt explicitly with a behaviour problem that had the potential to distract other children.
SN: I know how to ride a motorbike!
T: You do? Well you can do motorbike. Can you put that very loud voice that you have today away and have a quiet voice for now?

Sometimes children needed reassurance and support. In an episode in Hannah’s class that involved handling worms, one child showed signs of distress. The teacher clarified the problem, reassured her, and offered to help. The child was then able to continue her participation in the activity.

T: They're soft, aren't they... What's wrong, Beccy?... What's wrong? I didn't ask you to write anything what's wrong? I can't hear you (...!) Oh! You're not scared of it?

Ss: [3]
T: Wipe your eyes... You OK? Now look. There's nothing to be scared of. I'll help you. Come here, Marty, move your chair up so she can sit properly, please. Is your worm still alive? Just, I reckon.

By contrast, in the less effective teachers’ classrooms teaching practices demonstrating warmth were observed, but to a lesser extent than in the more effective teachers’ classrooms. For example, Gabby showed strategies linked to warmth as she offered targeted support (‘Help Matt because it’s a bit hard’) and encouraged the children to ask her for help with sentence writing. She provided specific advice (‘Say the word as it sounds. Say that aloud’).

T: So you need some paper so you can write. I'm going to help Matt because it's a bit hard. What do you need to write now? Can you write a sentence here? My Animal. Write My up here on this line. Yes, Peter? Are you? Already? You clever person you! Mum loves me. Fullstop. Now put the [inaudible] up there, OK? Off you go. Don't forget to draw [inaudible], OK? Have a go at sounding out. Say the word as it sounds. Say that aloud and then please try and keep [inaudible]. That's fantastic!

Rapport

An important teaching practice within the respect dimension was rapport, seen in the strategies of teachers who established such strong relationships with children that tactful interventions to correct, or redirect an activity in order to support the children's literacy learning were smoothly managed. Several examples given below illustrate rapport.

In a guided reading lesson, Jane encouraged the children to develop a more fluent pace in their reading. When she anticipated that they were going to read at their own pace she tactfully suggested that they read aloud together (‘Go with my finger’). The intervention was intended to quicken the pace of the reading, but she provided a supportive strategy to bring this about:

T: Now you're going to have to go with my finger because otherwise we won't be reading together. Try and read it all together.
E: I see the door. I see the window.
T: That's excellent reading!

While Sue was working on a modelled editing activity, the need to check for the use of capitals was discussed. The rapport between the teacher and the children was such that she was able to involve them in identifying where capitals were needed, and this led them to recognise where further corrections were required. The rapport was maintained by the praise she offered when the capitalisation of the days of the week was complete.
In Teachers’ Hands

T: What do you think needs a capital in that? There’s definitely capitals needed but you think what we think we could use. What did we say has capitals?
S: /s/, /s/, Saturday.
T: Saturday. Are there any other days of the week there?
S: Monday and Sunday.
T: Yes, OK. Off you go. Make it nice and big. That’s it. [4]

T: Good boy. And another one... Excellent. So Shaun’s done our days of the week, he’s corrected all of them. They look pretty OK to me. Adam, would you like a turn? What are you going to correct?
SN: Capital
T: You’re going to start with a capital? That’s a good idea. Did I finish with a fullstop?

Effective teachers provided the kind of interventions that helped children to overcome difficulties and to rectify errors, but they also intervened to ‘stretch’ individual children. Often it was appropriate in a discussion of a shared book for the teacher to press for elaboration and further detail in children’s responses, nudging them on to be better able to read relevant detail in written and visual texts. In the following episode involving whole class reading and discussion of a shared book, Hannah tactfully intervened with a series of prompting questions to encourage a child to provide detail in her answer. While Hannah’s prompts supported this child, they also provided a guiding framework for other children in the class, so that all children’s learning was extended.

T: What can you see?
S: Horse.
T: Mm-hm. What else?
S: Cow.
T: And a cow, what are they //doing?
SN: //Cow.
SN: They’re sailing in the boat.
T: They’re in a boat and they’re sailing. Do you think they’re sailing ‘cause they have a sail?
S: [inaudible]
T: What sort of boat do you think it is?
S: It’s just a boat, a rowboat?
T: A rowboat.
T: Harry, you. Right, everyone’s eyes this way. Shaun could you stand up and come and sit next to Mark, please? Quickly... Who’d like to tell me something about the front cover of this book. Something you can see in the picture. Frances?

In another episode in an integrated language and science activity, Hannah helped a child by pointing to the words as he read his sentence and she praised his efforts. One purpose of this task was to develop the range of descriptive words the children could use about the worms. She repeated the word, in context, several times, provided a definition (‘little parts’), and gave a special reward to the boys who had used it. This kind of positive intervention showed respect for what the children knew, and was made possible because of the rapport between the teacher and the children.

SN: Worms are made of little...
T: You told me.
S: Segments?
T: Segments. Worms are made of little segments! I think Christopher and Laurie saw
that. They saw little parts that made up the whole worm. Fantastic! Next one.

S: They are tiny and they feel funny.

T: Fantastic! Let’s give Laurie a big clap! That was wonderful! I really like that information that “worms are made of little segments”, Christopher and Laurie, so you two can stand up first, and go quietly out to morning tea.

The above examples are all taken from the classrooms of the effective and more effective teachers where rapport was observed in every episode. Rapport was observed in all case study classrooms, but to a considerably lesser extent in the less effective teachers’ classrooms.

Credibility

Research indicates that teachers make the biggest difference to learning in classrooms (Darling-Hammond, 2000). Effective teachers have the capacity to gain the respect of all children so that they can overcome any challenges to the ongoing work of the classroom. Credibility involves the children’s recognition of and active response to the teacher’s authority. Hattie (2003) found that ‘expert teachers anticipate and prevent disturbance from occurring whereas non-experts tend to correct existing disturbances’ (Hattie, 2003).

In one episode Jane had noticed that Nicholas was not really working, and she skillfully redirected the child in order to engage him in the word study activity. She managed this as she maintained a constant overview of what all the children were doing, offering praise and advice targeted to individual children. The beginning and end of this episode shows how she worked with Nicholas, initially by specifically encouraging him to write and draw words on his board. She very particularly used his name several times to ensure that she had his attention. She clarified the task (“quickly write the word”) and at the end of the episode, she gave positive feedback to Nicholas on the word he had written. She commented on the improvement in his engagement in the activity as compared with the previous day. She also commented on the literacy learning, ‘excellent formation of all your letters’.

T: Steve, you’re not working. Nick, Nicholas. Would you like to show Mrs P that today you could write some words on your board? Transport, and you can draw me a truck when you’ve done that. So quickly write the word so you can draw. Nicholas.

T: Nice writing! I’ve got somebody here who has written transport four times. Lovely writing, Tony. Do some more, Mandy, please. You’ve only done it once.

SN: I’ve written it ten times!

T: Oh beautiful! Make sure the /p/ hangs down. It’s a long one. The word transport, I’ve done that one in capital letters. I need you to write it this way with lower case letters. I don’t want upper case. That’s on the title of a book, Title, book titles often have upper case letters. Well done, Tina. Good boy! Beautiful writing! Look at this one! Have a look at how neatly Nicholas has written his word today. Yesterday, yesterday Nicholas decided he wasn’t writing words and then when it came time to remember it he did a great job. So today he’s written it very quickly. Good boy! Excellent formation of all your letters.

When Sue’s children were writing a response to a shared book, she prepared them for the task by writing instructions on the board and scaffolding ideas with the children before they began to write. She also made sure that the children were located in appropriate seating positions, so that their opportunity to do the task was maximised. This example of credibility shows how effective teachers strategically plan to avoid behavioural difficulties in their classrooms. Here, Sue reminded the children that they were to start with their own ideas, would be able to share later, and that they might need more ‘elbow room’ to be able to work on their writing.
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T: Do we write a little one like that? We're starting, ah, I would expect that this'll be... You'll get time to share with each other, but to start with they are your private fears. They're your private feelings so you need to get yours on paper so that then you'll be able to share with the others. Adam, you can come round into this seat. Who's away?

Ss: Sarah.

T: Sarah. You can come in Sarah's seat so there's more elbow room for you. Right, /at/, /at/. Yes. Good girl!

SN: I saw some...

T: That gives you more room, Adam. And Susie P, you can come round into the spare seat too, dear. Right, /at/. What does night start with?

[J14R8_1:27:14]

The effective management of an activity such as a pre-reading activity using flash cards of words in the book to be shared required all children to be attentive. The following episode shows how Jenny settled the children to be ‘ready for learning’, gave positive reinforcement to those who were ready, and briefly but directly managed the behaviour of one child who was not ready. Harry was reprimanded, and asked to move to a position close to her. By noting that Leanne was ‘sitting beautifully’, she was simultaneously providing a model for Harry, and also articulating the rationale for behaviour that enables children to be ‘good learners’.

T: Harry I'd like you to come and sit right here for me, please. Harry, you. Leanne, you're ready for learning. Have a look at her. Sitting beautifully. Still, eyes this way, not fussing. That's what I call a good learner. Harry could I have my green book there please? Here he is.

[C14R8_0:13:37]

In Hannah’s class, when the children were taking turns to share the words they had found to describe worms, it was essential that the children listened to each other. Hannah drew the attention of the whole class to the importance of listening, involving everyone by using individual children’s names. She drew on her credibility with these children to refer to the reason why they needed to listen, and to the negative impact of talking over other people. When she had established the class as an attentive listening audience, she invited each child in turn to share their words. The lesson could not have proceeded without this intervention, but once the children were attentive, the learning could proceed.

T: Now you hold it. Alright, everyone's eyes this way. I can see Gemma’s eyes, I can see Alicia’s eyes, I can see Laurie R’s eyes, I can see Kathryn’s eyes, I can see Louise’s. I can see Carmen and Susan’s. Now is the time when we close our mouths and be quiet and we... //listen.

Ss: //listen.

T: Remember it's not very polite to talk when someone’s talking; when another person is sharing their answer. I know I don't like it when people are talking over me, Mary. Alright, let me see: Alexis Harries and Beccy. What would you like to share with us? Which side? Worms look, or Worms feel?

[B14R8_1:42:43]

Hannah’s strategies for fostering the children’s capacity to listen was also evident in another episode. She used the concept of ‘whole body listening’ as a means of vividly reminding the children that good listening was important in her classroom. Her direct instructions to Laurie illustrated the way in which warmth was evident in Hannah’s classroom; they also provided clear evidence of this teacher’s credibility.
Chapter II: Respect

T: Can I see everyone’s eyes? I want to see beautiful whole body listening. I can see nearly everyone’s eyes. Nearly everyone’s eyes. Remember, when we’re full body listening do we need to move our bottoms and our feet?

SN: No.

T: Stand up Laurie, and go to the blue chair. There’s one. It’s probably gone missing. It’s alright. Now I’ve sent Laurie there because Laurie is doing the opposite to what I’m asking him to do. And it’s not because he doesn’t know what to do. He does know what to do. He just needs a little bit of time to think about it. Who can tell me what it says up here? Beccy.

[B15R8_1:58:40]

Citizenship

The kind of supportive social context that was apparent in the classrooms of the more effective teachers was dependent on qualities that can be described as citizenship. These qualities placed emphasis on a range of values, including awareness of the needs of others, tolerance, equality and inclusiveness. The qualities that are classified under citizenship were observed in all episodes in only three of the classrooms.

Sometimes, the effective teachers demonstrated the place of citizenship in their classrooms by naming appropriate behaviour for particular classroom activities, as in the following episode, where Jenny reminded the children that ‘you have to listen’. This emphasis on appropriate behaviour was essential for the activity. In this case, the task required careful listening to distinguish between long and short vowels:

T: I want you to listen to the words and tell me if they have a long vowel or a short vowel. I love those people! John, again, a perfect list...a perfect learner!...I know he’s perfect! I can see him listening with his whole body. Beautiful, Danny! /Sun/. Does it have a short vowel? Remember the sound. You have to listen. It must make the /al/ /eI/ /il/ /I0/ /uI/ sound to be a short vowel or A E I O U to be a long vowel. What is it, Erin?

[C16R5_0:52:29]

Another manifestation of citizenship took the form of encouraging the children to be aware of others’ achievements. In this episode, Hannah acknowledged the work of all children, but specifically referred to Laurie and reminded the class to congratulate those who had made a good effort. This episode also shows how the teacher negotiated classroom rules. Although the child who spoke thought that no one could use it, it was explained that the ‘special purple texta’ could be used if the teacher granted permission. Citizenship is modelled in this episode in a number of ways, including the reference to classroom patterns and rules of behaviour, and the acknowledgement of success.

T: Oh well I’ve got some very clev... I mean, I’ve got very clever people here, because that’s a tricky word. Laurie would you like to come write it on the board for us? Quick. You can use my special purple texta.

SN: I thought you said no-one could use it?

T: If I let them... Let’s see how he goes. Could you do it big so people can see? Not too big... That’s the boy...

T: Can’t trick you guys...

SN: I don’t want to do it too big.

T: David are you watching?... Oh! Let’s see if you’ve got all the right.... Good boy! Did everyone have Q?

E: //Yes.

T: U?

E: Yes.
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T: Is?
E: Yes.
T: C?
E: Yes.
T: K?
E: Yes.
T: Everyone give Laurie a big clap. Well done!

Where classroom rules had been agreed, these teachers applied them with rigour and consistency. The rule in Hannah’s classroom was that the children had to raise their hands before speaking in whole class activities. In this extract, we see how Laurie was allowed to make comment only after he had put his hand up.

T: It is very sad... Far away, there lived a fair princess with golden hair. She ate jellybeans for breakfast, lunch and tea. On her island, the sky was always bright and the wind was always warm.

SN: That looks like a [inaudible].
T: Laurie, what’s our rule?
S: Should always put your hand up.
T: Always put your hand up. So what are you going to do?
S: Put my hand up.
T: Well put your hand up. Are you going to put your hand up? Yes, Laurie.
S: It’s a happy island there.
T: It’s a happy island there. Have a look at the difference. What do you notice about the colours? Have a look at that island... Have a look at that island.

Situations where children need to interact with each other provide teachers with useful contexts in which to emphasise citizenship. Sarah, an effective teacher, maintained firm control with natural strategies, involving all children and their Grade 5 buddies in making a story to be displayed on the classroom wall. This activity required considerable teamwork. The episode illustrates how Sarah reinforced citizenship in the class by commenting directly on it and praising the children for the way they had managed the teamwork.

T: James, love the way you’re sitting, looking at me. That tells me that you’re ready. You can have a tick. Well done! Alright, I need a couple of helpers. Would you like to come and hold up that end for me? And Sarah, would you like to hold up this end? Have a look at the beautiful story we’ve made today. I was very impressed when I went around. Grade Fives, you did a sensational job this morning in helping the Preps with the sounding out. I really like the way you let them do the writing, and you just help them, helped them to sound it out. I saw some great teamwork this morning, so give yourselves a clap. Well done!

E: [claps]

The effective and more effective teachers created contexts in which it was appropriate for the children to practise citizenship. Isobel, a teacher with three years’ teaching experience, worked as a member of a teaching team. She organised a sharing time after the children had completed an individual writing task. Children read their own work aloud, in a context in which the children could become aware of the achievements of their classmates. In this episode, the teacher pointed out the efforts made by each child who shared their work, especially the last child, who had special needs. Firstly, the teacher read the child’s work and provided a commentary for the rest of the class on the strategies Annabel had used.
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T: Loud voice. Remember that the people at the back need to hear.
SN: I went to the park and I went on the rides.
T: With Annabel’s writing she was able to write lots of words all by herself today, weren’t you Annabel? Went. Did you know how to spell that word or did you look somewhere? You knew how to spell it, fantastic! Now Annabel was sounding the sounds out for the word ride, weren’t you? Rides. And she wrote R I D and then she listened to the word again and she heard the letter and popped it in.

When Annabel had had her turn, the focus of the teacher’s response was on Tina’s knowledge of the use of capital letters.

T: OK Tina, a big loud voice.
SN: Once upon a time there was a Barbie named [inaudible] and she lived in a town...
T: Tina. Tina, what were you looking at in your writing today?
S: Capital letters.
T: Capital letters. Good girl! Where do they go, Tina?
S: At the start of a sentence...
T: Yes, where else? Someone’s name and a name of a...?
S: Place.
T: Good girl! Well done.

The next child, Sharnie, read her work aloud, and was asked about a possible next step – publication - before being applauded by the whole class.

T: Sharnie, loud voice.
SN: [inaudible] And I am nearly eight years old.
T: That’s lovely. Now Sharnie, are you going to publish that or are you happy to just read it? Give her a clap.

The last child to participate in the activity had special needs and the teacher adopted strategies to enable him to participate.

T: And lucky last, the star of the writing today. Do you want me to hold your book and you point to the words while you...
SN: //Start again.
T: //Start again.
S: I cleaned the house with my mum.
T: Excellent! Did everyone hear that? I cleaned the house with my mum. And you can see here all the sounds he was able to hear and write by himself. Fabulous! And he got a sticker! Show everyone your sticker.

In these episodes it can be seen how the teacher demonstrated her acceptance of each child’s efforts and encouraged the class to celebrate their classmates’ achievements.

Independence

The teaching practice where children are given the opportunity to take responsibility for their own learning was one of the least frequently observed and was more likely to be evident in the classrooms of the more effective teachers. Research studies have identified techniques that effective teachers use, ‘including encouraging self-regulation through cognitive monitoring
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strategies’ (Snow et al., 1998). Independence was observed in the majority of episodes involving the more effective and effective teachers. Independence was not observed at all in two of the less effective teachers’ classrooms. Surprisingly, Jenny a more effective teacher, was not observed using the independence teaching practice in any of her episodes. This is at odds with what would be expected as she had a wide repertoire of teaching practices and was observed using the other four practices from the respect dimension consistently. This apparent anomaly may be because this teacher was not observed in a classroom that she taught on a regular basis, although she knew all the children well.

Examples from the classrooms where independence was observed in all episodes show how independence looks different in different classrooms. An activity in Hannah’s classroom required the children to choose their own partners and share their knowledge independently of the teacher. Hannah focused the activity on a particular question about the text and provided support for the children’s sharing with each other. Practical support for organising the pairs was also provided.

T: And there were no jellybeans. That’s right. I want you to again talk to your partner and I want you to tell me why the sad little monster wasn’t sad anymore? What made him happy? Can you tell the person next to you?

Ss: [inaudible]

S?: The Jellybean Queen.

T: So we’re going to turn, we’re going to turn, and we’re going to face Steve and Alicia cause they’re in your group.

Independence was evident in another episode in Hannah’s classroom, where the children were given some words to describe their worms, and then had to think of other words by themselves. Hannah provided a framework for the children’s observations suggesting that they look at size, colour and covering.

T: Stevie. While you’re looking at them now I want you to look at their size, their colour, their covering. And the way they move, and talk to your partner about those things.

Ss: [children talk in pairs/groups] [5]

T: Is yours still alive? Is yours alive? Is he alive? He’s not going very fast, yours, is he?

Ss: [inaudible] [3]

T: What do you notice about the covering of it?

SN: Ours is very long.

T: Very long is it?

S?: Yeah.

Sarah followed the shared reading of a Big Book with a writing activity. Working with their Grade 5 buddies the children were asked to write about what happened in one part of the book. These pieces of writing were to be displayed on the classroom wall when finished, meaning that the children were aware of the purpose and audience for their writing. The activity drew on the children’s understanding of the text and their emerging writing skills. The buddies provided support, but the children were primarily responsible for writing their own sentence and drawing their picture. This independent work created an opportunity for the children to use their reading and writing skills in a purposeful context.
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T: OK. Two things you're going to have to do this morning. You need to write me a sentence about what happened in your part of the story. So if you are working on the beginning, you would write me a sentence about the beginning of the story. And I'd like you to draw a picture of some of the characters in the story. So we have the zoo keeper. Who else did we have? Carol?

SN: Umm, had the animals.
T: The animals were there at the zoo. Yes?
SN: The other zoo keeper.
T: Yes, the other zoo keeper. Neil?
SN: Umm, elephant.
T: There were elephants, lots of different things. I'll leave the book up here so if you have forgotten something you can come back and have another look. You're going to need to make a sentence and you're going to need to make a picture about what happened. OK, two things say it with me: //A sentence and a picture.

SS: //A sentence and a picture.
T: Grade Fives, remember the preps need to have a go at doing the writing. You're going to be the helpers this morning.

[0:42:02]

When children are given opportunities to write about their own experience, or prior knowledge, they become more independent as writers. In the following episode, Jane encouraged children to draw on prior knowledge in order to make a book with stories about transport. The content of the writing was therefore individual for each child, although they were writing in a common context.

T: We have lots and lots of trucks coming past here. These boys are riding their bicycles to school and they're not wearing helmets. Do you know why?
Ss: Why?
T: Why? Cos it was a long long time ago.
SN: They didn't have helmets!
T: That's right. And when your daddy was a little boy he didn't have to wear a helmet. And when your mum was a little girl she didn't have to wear a helmet.

[0:31:59]

The whole class activity of writing the word transport as many times as possible also encouraged the children to work independently. In this episode we see how Jane fostered the children's independent evaluative skills. When Jane asked Christian about the letters he had written 'really well' she was nudging him towards developing the capacity of being able to evaluate the quality of his own work.

T: Good. Lovely writing, Tina! How are you going Chris? Christian, what beautiful letters! The first one's are fantastic! Give yourself a tick for the ones that are the best. Which one's have you written really well? Yes.
SN: That one.
T: Yah, What about this one and this one? They look fantastic!
SN: Finished.
T: Now which letters do you think you need to fix up? OK. Let's rub off, no the rest are OK. Try...
SN: And that one.

[0:04:40]
Summary

In the classrooms of the more effective and effective teachers the teaching practices in the respect dimension contributed to the development of relationships, behavioural patterns and values that supported children's literacy learning. The more effective and effective teachers created a social context in their classrooms that focused on literacy learning, welcomed children and provided them with positive support. These teachers also built confidence in children that made tactful interventions productive. Their credibility enabled them to deal effectively with possible disruptions to order and to maintain the momentum of the lesson. These teaching practices appeared to encourage strong values that included tolerance and awareness of the needs of others, alongside the development of an ethos that allowed scope for the development of children's responsibility for their own learning.

These teaching practices provided the context for activities that were common to the literacy classrooms of all the teachers: shared book reading, reading aloud, modelled writing, group work, word study, spelling and matching letters and sounds. The learning opportunities accessible to all children were enriched by the consistency and firmness with which the more effective and effective teachers shaped values and relationships in their literacy classrooms.

Whilst the less effective teachers used similar activities to the effective and more effective teachers the classroom climate in which they were undertaken was not characterised by the same levels of warmth, rapport, credibility, citizenship and independence. In general, the social context of their classrooms was not characterised by an explicitly clear focus on literacy learning, they did not have the strong rapport with children that ensured tactful literacy interventions and, in some cases, the teacher did not command the complete respect of children necessary to overcome challenges to order and lesson flow. Additionally, these teachers did not appear to place a strong emphasis on a range of values that included awareness of the needs of others, tolerance, equality and inclusiveness nor did they encourage children to take responsibility for their own learning.
In this study, we set out to identify teaching practices that lead to improved literacy outcomes for children in the early years of school. We used a combination of quantitative and qualitative research methods to build an evidential link between children’s growth in English literacy in the early years of school and their teachers’ classroom practice. Our review of previous research led us to believe that we would find that effective teachers of early literacy would display a wide range of attributes and behaviours which we termed literacy teaching practices. These 33 research-based practices formed the basis of the Classroom Literacy Observation Schedule (CLOS), a tool that we developed in order to observe early literacy teachers at work in their classrooms. We grouped the practices into six dimensions:

**Participation:** Ways in which the teacher organises for and motivates children’s participation in classroom literacy tasks

**Knowledge:** Ways in which the teacher uses her knowledge of literacy to effectively teach significant literacy concepts and skills

**Orchestration:** Ways in which the teacher manages or orchestrates the demands of the literacy classroom

**Support:** Ways in which the teacher supports children’s literacy learning

**Differentiation:** Ways in which the teacher differentiates tasks and instruction for individual learners, providing individual levels of challenge

**Respect:** Ways in which the teacher gains the respect of the children and in which the children demonstrate respect for her.

In addition to these dimensions of literacy teaching practice we added another axis to the observation schedule in order to help us observe the literacy teaching activities used by the teachers. Our reasoning was that, in view of the large amount of literature directed at teachers on how to carry out particular activities, which assumes that these activities are important elements of teachers’ ‘tool boxes,’ we should investigate whether the use of these activities varied according to teacher effectiveness.

The basis of the evidential link between student outcomes and teaching practices was a set of literacy assessments completed by a nationally representative sample of children in their first and second years of formal schooling. An analysis of growth in scores on the literacy assessment tasks from ACER’s Longitudinal Literacy and Numeracy Study (LLANS) from the beginning of each school year to the end of each school year enabled us to make quantitative distinctions between classes where growth was more than statistically expected, as expected, or less than expected. Building on previous research that demonstrated the relative importance of teacher influences on student outcomes (compared with the influence of family home circumstances or school settings), we characterised the teachers of each of these three groups of classes as more effective, effective or less effective.

Once these groups of teachers had been identified, we invited sub-samples of each group to participate in the classroom observation phase of the study. This involved a site visit to each teacher’s classroom by two of the research team to make videotaped records of literacy teaching and to interview the teacher. A representative sample of classroom literacy activities in each observed classroom were coded using the Classroom Literacy Observation Schedule rating protocol. We analysed the coded video records in two ways. Quantitative analysis of the data involved the frequency of each literacy teaching practice in the observed classrooms, confirmatory factor analysis of the dimensions, and Rasch analysis to estimate teacher effectiveness in terms of a teacher’s repertoire of
literacy teaching practices. Qualitative analysis of the data included cross-case analysis of the video cases in terms of each of the literacy teaching practices by the more effective, effective and less effective teachers in order to find out how teachers from these groups enacted each literacy teaching practice in the classroom.

Summary of the findings

The Classroom Literacy Observation Schedule that we devised for the study was shown empirically to be appropriate for classroom observation of teachers’ pedagogical practices.

Literacy teaching activities varied only slightly according to teacher effectiveness. Generally, the same few activities were widely used by all teachers regardless of the teachers’ effectiveness. The more effective, effective and less effective teachers all extensively used familiar early years literacy activities such as shared book reading, modelled writing and phonics teaching. There were, however, distinct qualitative differences in the ways in which these activities were carried out by the more effective, effective and less effective teachers. Some literacy teaching activities that we had expected to find, such as the use of phonics-based commercial literacy programs and computer-based literacy activities were seldom seen in the classrooms of teachers in our observation sample.

The type of literacy teaching practice varied according to teacher effectiveness. The more effective and effective teachers demonstrated a wide variety of literacy teaching practices from all six dimensions of the observation schedule. The less effective teachers demonstrated a limited number of literacy teaching practices that were also spread across the six dimensions of the observation schedule. In addition to these quantitative differences, there were also distinct qualitative differences between the more effective and effective teachers and the less effective teachers.

The literacy teaching repertoires of the more effective and effective teachers included teaching practices that were most frequently observed such as attention or engagement, those that were frequently observed such as pace and metalanguage, and those such as challenge that were rarely incorporated into a repertoire of teaching practice. On the other hand, the literacy teaching repertoires of the less effective teachers tended to be dominated by those teaching practices that were most frequently observed.

There was no quantitative difference between teacher groups for the teaching practice we called ‘explicitness-word’, which concerned whether or not the teachers directed children’s attention to explicit word and sound strategies. The more effective, effective, and less effective teachers all paid explicit attention to phonics. There were, however, distinct qualitative differences between the ways in which these groups of teachers taught phonics. Whilst the more effective and effective teachers generally used a highly structured approach to phonics teaching, they were usually observed teaching word level skills and knowledge within a wider context, such as a theme or topic being studied, a shared book, a writing lesson or a spelling lesson, so that the purpose of learning phonics was made clear and relevant. These teachers provided extremely clear explanations of word level structures through the use of appropriate metalanguage, and their explanations in general were of a higher order than those of the less effective teachers. They also provided careful scaffolding, including guided practice in a variety of contexts, to ensure that important phonic concepts were learnt. The more effective and effective teachers also kept a focus on broader text level features, with a particular emphasis on comprehension of texts.
Chapter 12: Findings

How do effective teachers implement a literacy teaching activity?

Although the literacy teaching activities used by the teachers did not differentiate between the more effective, effective and less effective practitioners in terms of the quantitative data, there were distinct qualitative differences in the ways in which they were implemented by teachers of differing levels of effectiveness. In order to illustrate these qualitative differences we provide examples of a more effective and a less effective teacher using the strategy of shared book as the catalyst for a writing activity. All teachers observed in our study made extensive use of the shared book teaching activity and generally adhered to the following routine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of book to share</th>
<th>Physical arrangements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher chose the big book, usually a narrative or recount genre that was related in some way to a class theme or topic.</td>
<td>Children sat in a group on the floor ('the mat area') near the teacher who sat in a chair close to an easel on which the book was displayed. She used a pointer to indicate text features, that included both text and pictures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book introduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The book was usually introduced through a discussion of the cover, pictures, text, author, illustrator and other features that often included some prediction of what the text would be about.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading the book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first reading of the text was usually by the teacher, with children often joining in at some stage and discussing selected pages of the text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discussion of the whole text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After reading the teacher introduced some discussion of the book content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Related activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher often based further literacy activities on the book, frequently using the text as a catalyst for children’s writing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the vignettes that follow both teachers have chosen a big book that provides a recount of how the author overcame a fear of diving into deep water at the swimming pool and both use the book as a precursor to the children’s own writing.

Jenny, a more effective teacher, has chosen the shared text primarily to provide a model of the recount genre, which is the literacy focus for the week. She has also chosen it because the theme is topical as the class has just begun daily swimming lessons, and it is related to the ongoing class theme of challenging children to take risks in their learning. However, her main purpose is to make explicit to the children text features of a recount that they will need in the later writing activity.

Jenny’s introduction to the book begins with the children sitting in the ‘mat area’. She captures their attention and ensures their engagement as she motivates their interest by turning the discussion about the text features and cover into a game. She challenges them to find key features of the text which include not only the author and illustrator, but also more sophisticated features such as copyright, reference to the publisher’s website and the recount genre. Jenny structures the activity so that all children make some contribution to the introductory discussion and receive individual feedback that is targeted to their individual needs.

As she reads the text aloud Jenny models fluent reading using an animated voice, making eye contact with the children as she is extremely familiar with the text and rarely needs to look at the words. As she turns every page there is discussion of the development of the plot and characterisation, she encourages the children to reflect on their own experiences of fear and, on the basis of these reflections, predict what might
happen next. After Jenny has read each page, she invites the children to join in a re-reading. She draws particular attention to compound words that they have been studying and words she knows will be important in the writing of their own recounts. These discussions are extended but move at a brisk pace, as does the reading of the text. Jenny builds up suspense artfully and the children hang on to her every word as she reaches the climax when the author jumps from the diving board into the water below.

Once the reading of the whole text is complete Jenny discusses the main points in terms of the story theme (that of overcoming fear of diving), and allows the children to reflect on their own past experiences. She then makes the connection to the writing activity by re-introducing the children explicitly to the recount genre: ‘I was telling you about a type of writing that authors use, called a recount.’ She gives a recount of her own experiences that she links to ‘the little boy on the diving board’ in the big book. Her recount is of a time when she was ‘scared’ to dive from a diving board. This story mirrors the plot of the text and includes some of the linguistic structures and features of the recount, such as past tense, that she wants the children to use in their own writing. She then explicitly models the writing of her recount, with help from the children, making explicit that the genre requires the first person voice and the past tense. It is only after this large amount of scaffolding by the teacher, that the children begin the independent writing of their own recounts. During this writing Jenny works individually with children, challenging them at their own levels of literacy competence.

Patricia, a less effective teacher follows a similar routine to that of Jenny, and a casual observer walking down the corridor and looking through window would see few differences between their shared book activities. Certainly, the children are sitting in the mat area around the easel that holds the big book and have their attention focused on the text. However, careful analysis of the activity in each classroom shows distinct qualitative differences between the ways in which these teachers implement these seemingly similar activities.

Whilst Patricia has chosen the big book on the basis of the class involvement in daily swimming lessons and whilst it is possible that there is a connection to the subsequent diary writing activity, she does not articulate this connection either to the researchers or to the children. Her introduction to the text is cursory and limited to a very brief discussion of the book cover, author and illustrator. She launches into her reading of the text, occasionally asking the children to predict ‘what might happen next’. When the text has been read there is a brief discussion of the text that involves a few children. Whilst the children are attentive they do not appear to be particularly engaged in the text as is evident from their lack of contribution to the discussion. Patricia instructs the class to write their own experiences of the swimming lessons in their ‘diaries’ and provides a limited amount of feedback to groups and individuals.

In these two examples of superficially similar teaching activities it can be seen that the more effective teacher employs a much more sophisticated, thoughtful and purposeful approach. She ensures children’s participation in the activity, uses her literacy knowledge to teach significant literacy concepts and skills, manages the classroom, supports literacy learning, differentiates instruction including providing various levels of challenge, and gains the respect of the children. In other words it is the teaching practices employed in the implementation of the activity, rather than the activity itself, that distinguishes between the more effective and the less effective teacher.
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What are the literacy teaching practices of effective teachers?

Participation
The more effective and effective teachers gained strong child participation in learning activities, established significant relationships with their children, and actively sought to use language to encourage participation. They used a diverse range of practices that were well orchestrated to engender interest in and commitment to learning, founded on close personal relationships with children and knowledge of their ongoing needs as learners.

In specific terms, the classrooms of the more effective and effective teachers were characterised by the ways in which these teachers used their voices and body language to gain and maintain attention as they controlled behaviour, shaped activities, defined tasks and explained what was important for learning to occur. These teachers used language to ensure that children were not only attentive but also deeply absorbed in literacy tasks. They also used a variety of linguistic strategies to stimulate and motivate the children, such as positive feedback and encouragement to share success with others, to continue with learning and to strive for high standards.

The more effective and effective teachers created energetic and exciting classrooms, in which pleasure in literacy learning was evident, as they expressed their own personal pleasure in learning tasks, stimulated suspense and anticipation of joyful learning, and generally communicated their pleasure in children’s work. This creation of pleasure in their classrooms encouraged children to participate, sustain their efforts and remain on task. The more effective and effective teachers were also highly consistent in that they set clear routines that were understood and adhered to by the children and that resulted in appropriate classroom behaviour.

Knowledge
The more effective and effective teachers showed an understanding of the literacy concepts and skills taught in early years classrooms that underpinned their classroom practice. They provided a literate environment for the children in their classes and made substantial use of this environment in their teaching. Their classrooms contained many information charts such as the weather and days of the week that were used as part of daily routines. There were also dictionaries, word charts and a range of texts and other resources around the room to guide children’s personal writing. These teachers prepared the environment so that everything they needed for a particular session was either at hand or in a well-known place for immediate accessibility.

These teachers made explicit the purposes of set tasks, which were often of a higher order than those of the less effective teachers, and they sometimes conveyed to the children, often implicitly, purposes beyond the tasks at hand that had to do with overarching purposes such as school learning and future success. Closely related to purpose were the ways in which the more effective and effective teachers created tasks that allowed for substantial learning to take place as teachers and children engaged in dialogue that led to deep understanding of concepts and skills. The more effective and effective teachers also provided their children with clear and appropriate explanations of literacy concepts, both at the word and text levels.

All teachers made some use of modelling in their literacy teaching as they presented shared book experiences and modelled writing. What was noticeable about the more effective and effective teachers was the clarity and level of their metacognitive explanations. These often included the use of metalinguistic terms that provided the children with the vocabulary and linguistic structures that helped them make connections between what they already knew and the concepts being learnt. The metalanguage taught
included literary terms as well as those associated with the features of letters, sounds and words.

Orchestration
Although there were differences in teaching style, the more effective and effective teachers in this study had highly developed capacities to manage the uncertain social environment of early years literacy classrooms. They were characterised by high levels of awareness, being able to manage interruptions and lapses of child attention without losing focus on their moment-by-moment instructional goals and being able to structure children’s movement around the classroom, learning tasks and activities in predictable and orderly ways. These teachers had the ability to maximise learning opportunities with a sense of urgency, as if every minute were a precious learning opportunity not to be missed. Whilst their literacy sessions proceeded at a brisk pace, they managed to retain the attention of all children.

The more effective and effective teachers ensured that transitions between and within activities were seamlessly smooth, as they established specific routines within their classrooms and made expectations explicit. Despite the establishment of routines, these teachers were able to judge when to respond spontaneously to the ‘teachable moment’ and when to resist unnecessary diversions. These teachers were consistently able to manage and adjust complex movements within and around activities and groups of children thereby ensuring that maximum time was spent engaged in significant learning.

Support
The more effective and effective teachers differed in terms of the quantity and quality of their teaching practices in the support dimension. The more effective and effective teachers were better able, for the most part, to support children through the literacy teaching practices of assessment-based teaching, scaffolding, feedback, responsiveness, explicitness at word and text levels and persistence in ensuring positive literacy outcomes for all class members.

These teachers were able to use on-the-run assessments of children’s performance on a group task to target their teaching to individual children who were in need of either corrective teaching or extension of learning. They were also able to scaffold children’s literacy learning to help them reach their potential level of development with increased confidence as they provided for successful experiences with print. They gave timely and focused feedback to children with much positive reinforcement that explicitly indicated exactly what was being celebrated. Further, because they had created a positive classroom climate and gained the respect of their class, the effective and more effective teachers were able to provide not only affirming, but also modifying and corrective feedback that challenged the children to achieve at higher levels.

The effective and more effective teachers provided clear explanations of word level concepts and skills, as well as working explicitly at the text level. They made the most of every window of opportunity to reinforce the knowledge, concepts and skills that were to be learnt at both word and text levels, and they provided many opportunities for reading and writing connected text in a variety of formats.

Differentiation
The more effective and effective teachers generally managed to individualise instruction for children. Most carefully monitored individual children’s learning in group and individual activities and built on and consolidated this learning through carefully designed follow-up activities. Most also used strategies to include all children, through the use of open-ended tasks and small group activities, such as guided oral reading, in which children could participate at their own level. By varying instruction in this way these teachers were able to provide a differentiated curriculum to meet the literacy
learning needs of individuals. The more effective and effective teachers knew their children well and were able to contextualise children's learning as they made some connections between class and community knowledge.

Challenge was observed in most of these teachers' classrooms as they worked at developing higher levels of thinking for all the children in their classes, building on and extending their literacy knowledge. They had high expectations for children, they used questioning techniques effectively, and they structured activities so that children were guided through planned sequences that helped them achieve deep understanding.

Respect
The more effective and effective teachers created a social context in their classrooms that focused on literacy learning, welcomed children and provided them with positive support. These teachers also built confidence in children that made tactful interventions productive. Their credibility enabled them to deal effectively with possible disruptions to order and to maintain the momentum of the literacy lesson. These teaching practices appeared to encourage strong values that included tolerance and awareness of the needs of others, alongside the development of an ethos that allowed scope for the development of children's responsibility for their own learning. The learning opportunities accessible to all children were enriched by the consistency and firmness with which the more effective and effective teachers shaped values and relationships in their literacy classrooms.

Conclusions
Considered together the findings of this study have led us to conclude that contemporary Australian early years literacy teachers draw on a similar set of literacy teaching activities, but do so in quantitatively and qualitatively different ways. Differences in student learning outcomes can more reasonably be attributed to the ways teachers manage the literacy teaching dimensions identified in the study – participation, knowledge, orchestration, support, differentiation and respect – than to teaching activities such as shared book reading, modelled writing or stand-alone phonics lessons. Growth in children's literacy scores was associated with teachers who demonstrated more of the literacy teaching practices in these dimensions, and demonstrated them more often. There were also qualitative differences in the skill and subtlety with which the literacy teaching practices were implemented. In the case of word level decoding skills, all of the teachers we observed paid some explicit attention to phonics, but the more effective teachers provided clearer explanations of letter-sound correspondences and more careful scaffolding of learning, particularly in terms of guided practice of skills. These teachers also kept a focus on broader text level features, with a particular focus on comprehension of texts. Effective early literacy teaching, we believe, requires teachers who can ensure high levels of children's participation, are deeply knowledgeable about literacy learning, can simultaneously orchestrate a variety of classroom activities, can support and scaffold learners at word and text levels, can target and differentiate their instruction, and can do all of this in classrooms characterised by mutual respect.
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Appendix 1: Estimated Tetrachoric Correlation Matrices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>J1</th>
<th>J2</th>
<th>J3</th>
<th>J4</th>
<th>J5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J2</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J3</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J4</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>0.916</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J5</td>
<td>0.935</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.937</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>J6</th>
<th>J7</th>
<th>J8</th>
<th>J9</th>
<th>J10</th>
<th>J11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J6</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J7</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J8</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J9</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.995</td>
<td>0.957</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J10</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J11</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>0.830</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orchestration</th>
<th>J12</th>
<th>J13</th>
<th>J14</th>
<th>J15</th>
<th>J16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J12</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J13</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J14</td>
<td>0.907</td>
<td>0.988</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J15</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J16</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>0.745</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J17</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J18</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J19</td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J20</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J21</td>
<td>0.720</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J22</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.430</td>
<td>0.364</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J23</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.528</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Differentiation</th>
<th>J24</th>
<th>J25</th>
<th>J26</th>
<th>J27</th>
<th>J28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J24</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J25</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J26</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J27</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J28</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.885</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respect</th>
<th>J29</th>
<th>J30</th>
<th>J31</th>
<th>J32</th>
<th>J33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J29</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J30</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J31</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>0.863</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J32</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J33</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Explanation of model-fit

An extended explanation of each of the six separate models generated to represent the dimensions is presented below. To convey the reliability of each dimension, both composite scale reliability measures (r) and traditional reliability estimates (a) were reported. Squared multiple correlations were investigated to explain the reliability of each item in regards to its relative dimension. The fit indices applied were the root mean square residual (RMR, \( p<0.05 \)), the adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI >0.95) and the chi-square statistic (\( X^2, p>0.05 \)).

**Participation**

The participation dimension was estimated to capture all the variance in the five observed variables: attention, engagement, stimulation, pleasure and consistency. Despite the high correlation between all five of the variables (see Appendix I), the items were considered to be discrete behaviours. All the AGFI indicated a good fit between the model and the data. The difference between the proportionally weighted scaled scores for the five items was negligible hence all items were considered to contribute relatively equally to participation (see Table 5.2). All five items have acceptable reliability with \( R^2 \) values around 0.5. The composite scale reliability was 0.820, which is highly satisfactory.

**Knowledge**

The knowledge dimension was estimated to capture all the variance in the six observed variables: environment, purpose, substance, explanations, modelling and metalanguage. Despite high correlations between some of the items (see Appendix I) they were all considered to be discrete behaviours. All the AGFI indicated a good fit between the model and the data (see Table 5.2). The environment item had a noticeably lower item weight (0.076) and a marginal reliability value of 0.159. Environment was thus seen to be influenced the least by the dimension. The remaining items contributed evenly to the model and had acceptable reliability with \( R^2 \) values around 0.3 - 0.5. The composite scale reliability was 0.800, which is highly satisfactory.

**Orchestration**

The Orchestration dimension was estimated to capture all the variance in the five observed variables: awareness, structure, flexibility, pace and transition. Despite high correlations between some of the items (see Appendix I) they were all considered to be discrete behaviours. All the AGFI indicated a good fit between the model and the data (see Table 5.2). The transition item had a slightly item weight (0.109) and a marginal reliability value of 0.251. Transition was thus seen to be influenced the least by the dimension. The remaining items contributed evenly to the model and had acceptable reliability with \( R^2 \) values around 0.5. The composite scale reliability was 0.804 which is highly satisfactory.

**Support**

The support dimension was estimated to capture all the variance in the seven observed variables: responsiveness, explicitness word, explicitness text, persistence, assessment, feedback and scaffolding. The RMR indicated marginal fit (\( p=0.084 \)). The remaining AGFI indicated a good fit between the model and the data (see Table 5.2). The explicitness word and explicitness text items contributed least to the model and had marginal reliability values of 0.056 and 0.153 respectively. The remaining items contributed evenly to the model and had acceptable reliability with \( R^2 \) values around 0.4. The composite scale reliability was 0.787 which is satisfactory. An alternative model for support was tested after the removal of explicitness word. The model reported good fit, however, the content of this item was considered necessary to the dimension and it did not make theoretical sense to remove it.
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Differentiation
The differentiation dimension was estimated to capture all the variance in the five observed variables: connection, groupings, inclusion, individualisation and challenge. The RMR indicated acceptable fit (p=0.072). The remaining AGFI indicated a good fit between the model and the data (see Table 5.2). The connection and grouping items had slightly lower item weights and were thus seen to contribute least to the model. These items also had poor reliability with $R^2$ values of 0.248 and 0.239 respectively. The remaining items had acceptable reliability with $R^2$ values around 0.4. The composite scale reliability was 0.736 which is satisfactory.

Respect
The respect dimension was estimated to capture all the variance in the five observed variables: warmth, rapport, credibility, citizenship and independence. The RMR indicated acceptable fit (p=0.069). The remaining goodness-of-fit tests indicated a good fit between the model and the data (see Table 5.2). The independence item had a slightly lower item weight and was thus seen to be influenced the least by respect. This item also had poor reliability with a $R^2$ value of 0.282. The remaining items had acceptable reliability with $R^2$ values around 0.5. The composite scale reliability was 0.767, which is satisfactory.
## Appendix 3: Item fit, 33 items chi square probability order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>FitResid</th>
<th>ChiSq</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.93276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>-1.565</td>
<td>-0.458</td>
<td>0.412</td>
<td>0.813656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>0.763</td>
<td>-0.321</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.787974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>-1.381</td>
<td>-0.402</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.718545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>0.529</td>
<td>-1.674</td>
<td>0.948</td>
<td>0.622558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>-0.403</td>
<td>0.993</td>
<td>0.608537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>-0.668</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>1.145</td>
<td>0.564062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-1.315</td>
<td>1.261</td>
<td>0.532448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>1.186</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>0.334838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.766</td>
<td>2.283</td>
<td>0.319346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualisation</td>
<td>0.803</td>
<td>-0.623</td>
<td>2.365</td>
<td>0.30646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelling</td>
<td>-0.747</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>2.368</td>
<td>0.306016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>-0.741</td>
<td>-0.936</td>
<td>2.441</td>
<td>0.295023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>-0.231</td>
<td>-2.319</td>
<td>2.515</td>
<td>0.284405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
<td>-1.976</td>
<td>2.517</td>
<td>0.28408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>-0.402</td>
<td>-0.473</td>
<td>3.074</td>
<td>0.215064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1.112</td>
<td>-1.669</td>
<td>3.455</td>
<td>0.177759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>2.601</td>
<td>-0.724</td>
<td>3.457</td>
<td>0.177574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>4.131</td>
<td>0.126733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>-2.319</td>
<td>4.134</td>
<td>0.126541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>0.416</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>4.165</td>
<td>0.124629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-2.527</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.12006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.12004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitness Text</td>
<td>-0.195</td>
<td>1.652</td>
<td>4.387</td>
<td>0.111512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalanguage</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.163</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>0.109176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>-2.057</td>
<td>-0.844</td>
<td>4.584</td>
<td>0.101054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-1.775</td>
<td>4.812</td>
<td>0.090166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-1.924</td>
<td>6.812</td>
<td>0.03317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grouping</td>
<td>1.572</td>
<td>1.329</td>
<td>6.881</td>
<td>0.032044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>1.501</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
<td>6.896</td>
<td>0.031816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>1.215</td>
<td>8.603</td>
<td>0.013548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>2.068</td>
<td>10.333</td>
<td>0.005705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitness Word</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>2.135</td>
<td>30.31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 4: Item fit, 32 items chi square probability order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>FitResid</th>
<th>ChiSq</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>-0.278</td>
<td>0.158</td>
<td>0.923967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.82917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>-1.435</td>
<td>-0.294</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td>0.750874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>-0.782</td>
<td>-0.725</td>
<td>0.872</td>
<td>0.646516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmth</td>
<td>-0.703</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>0.645201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>-1.642</td>
<td>-0.418</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.640806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>1.066</td>
<td>0.586894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualisation</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>-0.364</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>0.584429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>-1.103</td>
<td>-0.345</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>0.553898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>-1.466</td>
<td>1.761</td>
<td>0.414613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasure</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>-1.521</td>
<td>2.162</td>
<td>0.339289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenge</td>
<td>2.652</td>
<td>-0.647</td>
<td>2.563</td>
<td>0.277684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persistence</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-1.161</td>
<td>2.691</td>
<td>0.260428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>1.193</td>
<td>-0.571</td>
<td>3.222</td>
<td>0.19965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metalanguage</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>3.406</td>
<td>0.182106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance</td>
<td>0.153</td>
<td>-2.442</td>
<td>3.575</td>
<td>0.167377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>-2.217</td>
<td>3.715</td>
<td>0.156041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicitness Text</td>
<td>-0.212</td>
<td>1.756</td>
<td>3.722</td>
<td>0.155517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credibility</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>-2.212</td>
<td>3.724</td>
<td>0.155387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td>-0.253</td>
<td>-2.308</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td>0.152031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulation</td>
<td>-0.195</td>
<td>-1.928</td>
<td>3.825</td>
<td>0.147743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>4.017</td>
<td>0.134159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>-2.189</td>
<td>-0.839</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.089796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>1.514</td>
<td>-0.237</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>0.088055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelling</td>
<td>-0.781</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>5.336</td>
<td>0.069385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaffolding</td>
<td>-0.432</td>
<td>-0.217</td>
<td>5.342</td>
<td>0.069178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition</td>
<td>-0.853</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>5.837</td>
<td>0.054005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>-0.859</td>
<td>-1.767</td>
<td>6.046</td>
<td>0.048653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>-1.211</td>
<td>-1.968</td>
<td>7.924</td>
<td>0.019021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>1.585</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>9.408</td>
<td>0.009057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>0.979</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>12.905</td>
<td>0.001578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connection</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>2.079</td>
<td>13.38</td>
<td>0.001244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Item characteristic curves for misfitting items

1. For Item 1:
   - Location (Locn) = 0.379
   - Fit Residual (FitRes) = 1.337
   - Chi-Square (ChiSq) = 0.002
   - Slope = 1.0

2. For Item 2:
   - Location (Locn) = 0.346
   - Fit Residual (FitRes) = 2.073
   - Chi-Square (ChiSq) = 0.001
   - Slope = 1.0
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**Appendix A:**

- **Structure**
  - Locn = -1.211
  - FitRes = -1.968
  - ChiSq(Pr) = 0.019
  - Slope = 1.0

---

**Appendix B:**

- **Groupings**
  - Locn = 1.585
  - FitRes = 1.421
  - ChiSq(Pr) = 0.009
  - Slope = 1.0

---

22 ‘Groupings’ was renamed as ‘variation’