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Direct Instruction (Intentional Teaching) v.

discovery learning

language experience

developmentally appropriate practice

open education

Children in these latter programs often performed worse than the control group in spite of tens of thousands of additional $s
Hattie (2003)

Synthesis of over 500k studies:

It is what students bring to the table that predicts successful school achievement more than any other variable (50%).

Home: 5 – 10%
Schools: 5 – 10%
Peer effects: 5 – 10%
Teachers: 30%
Hattie (2003) contd….

Effect sizes: (exceeding .41)

- Questioning: 0.41
- Direct instruction: 0.82
- Instructional quality: 1.00
- Students’ prior cog ability: 1.04
- Teacher Feedback*: 1.13

(*greatest impact on student achievement)
Hattie, J. (2009)

Direct Instruction: “Intentional Teaching”

Learning intentions

Success criteria

Build commitment & engagement

Guided practice with feedback

Closure

Independent practice & transfer - mastery
Feedback
Hattie, 1992 Australian Journal of Education

1. Among the most powerful influences on achievement

2. Two way process; listening to children elicits their zone (actual, proximal & potential)

3. Feedback is a consequence of performance – not where teaching starts
The Power of Feedback

FT - Feedback on Task:

1. whether correct or incorrect
2. direction to acquiring more or rather different kinds of information
3. Most powerful – responding to interpretations, not lack of understanding
4. Commonly mixed with FS which dilutes the power of FT
FP – Feedback about Process

1. Focus on processes underlying the task
2. Relates to strategies for error detection, therefore providing oneself with feedback
3. FP more effective than FT, however there is a powerful interaction between the two.
4. Most beneficial when rejecting erroneous hypotheses
FR – Feedback about self-Regulation

1. Addresses the ways learners monitor, direct and self-regulate actions towards success – how did/do I do it?

2. Creates internal feedback & cognitive routines for checking success

3. Learners know how & when to receive feedback from others
FS – Feedback about Self as a person

1. Contains little task related information
2. Does not increase engagement with task or greater understanding
3. Well done - Ineffectual in enhancing learning
4. Praise accompanied by information about the process or performance – more effective but still limited in impact.
Feedback in support of Learning & Development

For learners:

1. Gaining more information about how & what is understood or misunderstood
2. Finding directions & strategies to be successful
Feedback in support of Learning & Development

For educators:

1. Devising activities & questions that provide feedback to children about their own effectiveness
2. Finding out what to do next – informing program planning.
How does Feedback work in the Learning Process?

1. One of the most powerful influences on learning
2. Occurs too rarely in practice
3. Rarely operates at a single level
4. Needs further research, both qualitative and quantitative
Social Constructivism

1. Sits well with the work of Vygotsky:
2. Identifying zone of actual development
3. Achieving zone of proximal development
4. Scaffolding
5. Moving towards zone of potential development
6. Through interaction (conversation) with a more knowledgeable other.
EPPE UK research

‘Sustained shared thinking’:
Tuning-in
Listening
Working it out together
Talking together
Opportunities to challenge
Young Learners’ Project: 2007-2012

350 preschool children followed through into their first year in school (3 cohorts)

Early literacy focus

HLE explored

Video recordings in preschool = plus surveys and interviews

Outcome measures on school entry.

www.edfac.unimelb.edu.au/younglearners
Video data of storybook reading

Educators asked to read a story book to a small group of children
All agreed to video recording N = 21
A wide variety of activities captured for the same task across different settings
Tapes transcribed and checked
Educator – talk coded and checked for reliability.
YLP data (from Video transcripts)

Every teacher engaged in SSTs

There were differences:

a) no of turns teachers and children took
b) impact of SSTs on children’s language
c) impact of SSTs on teachers’ language.
YLP data (from Video transcripts)

No of turns:

1. Lots of short turns
2. Some did longer turns
3. Very few did really long turns
YLP data (from Video transcripts)

**Impact of SSTs on children’s language:**

1. MLU higher for children during their experience of SST
2. Ratio of children’s turns increased
YLP data (from Video transcripts)

*Impact of SST on Teacher language:*

- T. used simpler language (more explicit)
- T. was more eliciting (engaging)
- T. talks more (elaborates)
- T. talks more at the start of the exchange – establishing context.
YLP data (from Video transcripts)

The least facilitating teachers were those who did not vary their language at all.

They paid little or no regard to:

- Audience
- Context, nor
- Purpose.
Coding – Educator Feedback

FT – Feedback on Task  n = 4
1. Asking open questions, for opinion (oo) and clarification (oc)
2. Checking on prior experience (ri) and building links with previous knowledge
3. Acknowledging what the child has done (ap) – by far the most frequent form of feedback found in these data.
Coding – Educator Feedback

FP – Feedback on Process      n = 5

Open questions asking for:
  expansion (oe)
  prediction (op)
  inference (oi)
  world knowledge (ow)

Acknowledges thinking strategies (as)
Coding – Educator Feedback

FR – Feedback on Self-Regulation n=2
Acknowledging child’s behaviour (av)
Acknowledges effort (ae)

FS – Feedback about Self as a person
Gives praise (at) n = 1
Variety within Feedback Categories

12 different varieties of Ed responses;

FT – 4, FP – 5, FR – 2, FS – 1 = 12

Total of 12 different response types
Contributing to 4 different forms of feedback.
Time Taped for Storybook Reading

Average of 10.54 minutes
Range 5 – 27 minutes
Therefore;
all calculations proportioned to 5 minutes
Frequency & amount of Feedback

Frequency of responses:

Different no of responses to categories –

2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Teachers - 2 5 4 1 5 2 2
Variation in Feedback

Number of respondents

Number of response categories used

Respondents: N=21
## ASG Early Intervention Research Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>No of Instances x Educators %</th>
<th>Feedback types</th>
<th>TOTALS = 290.75 instances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oo</td>
<td>3 - 14.3%</td>
<td>FT – 72.23%</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oc</td>
<td>9 - 42.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ri</td>
<td>12 - 57.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ap</td>
<td>21 - 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oe</td>
<td>8 - 38.1%</td>
<td>FP – 26.05%</td>
<td>75.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>op</td>
<td>6 - 28.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oi</td>
<td>13 - 61.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ow</td>
<td>12 - 57.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as</td>
<td>7 - 33.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>av</td>
<td>2 - 9.5%</td>
<td>FR – 0.93%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ae</td>
<td>5 - 14.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at</td>
<td>4 - 19.1%</td>
<td>FS – 0.75%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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