

What do effective teachers of literacy know, believe and do?

David Wray and Jane Medwell

Institute of Education, University of Warwick, United Kingdom

Wray, D. & Medwell, J. (2002) 'What do effective teachers of literacy know, believe and do?', in Fisher, R., Brooks, G. & Lewis, M. (eds) *Raising Standards in Literacy* London: Routledge/Falmer, pp. 55-65

Introduction

This article reports the results of research, commissioned by the Teacher Training Agency in the United Kingdom, into the characteristics of teachers who could be shown to be effective in teaching literacy to primary school pupils. The findings are based on a close study of a sample of teachers whose pupils make effective learning gains in literacy and of a sample of teachers who were less effective in literacy teaching. The aims of this research were to:

- identify the key factors in what effective teachers knew, understood and did which enabled them teach literacy effectively;
- identify strategies which would enable those factors to be more widely applied;
- specify aspects of continuing professional development which appeared to contribute to the development of effective teachers of literacy.

Effective teaching and effective teachers

The literature on effective teaching has a number of dominant themes including school effect issues as well as issues related to the characteristics of effective teachers. The project reported here focused on the contribution made by the teacher to what children learnt in literacy. Research on school effectiveness suggests that variations in children's literacy performance may be related to three types of effect: whole school, teacher, and methods/materials. Of these three, the consensus is that the effect of the teacher is the most significant (Barr, 1984, Adams 1990). Of the range of models put

forward to explain the various components of school/teacher/pupil interactions, one we found particularly useful was the concept of 'curricular expertise', as advanced by Alexander, Rose and Woodhead (1992). By this they meant "the subject knowledge, the understanding of how children learn and the skills needed to teach subjects successfully." Effective teaching, they argued, depends on the successful combination of this knowledge, understanding and skill.

Most of the research into effective teaching is generic rather than specific to literacy teaching. In the 1970s a number of large scale studies in the USA attempted to look at the effects of the teacher by searching for links between teacher classroom behaviour and pupil achievement. (See Brophy and Good (1986) for a review). More recent studies have taken a more complex view of the classroom and used multi-faceted methods of research. Studies such as that of Bennett et al (1984) looked at the classes of teachers deemed to be effective and Mortimer et al (1988) studied teaching in junior schools.

Whilst the research offers little literacy-specific information it does give a range of findings concerning:

- teacher classroom behaviour, such as classroom management, task setting, task content and pedagogic skills
- teacher subject knowledge and beliefs, including content knowledge in a subject, an understanding of how children learn in that subject and the belief systems which interact with and enable such knowledge to be put into operation in the classroom

Effective teaching and effective teachers of literacy

There have been numerous attempts to establish the nature of effective teaching in literacy. Most of these have begun by analysing the processes involved in being literate and from this put forward a model to guide instruction in literacy (for example, Chall, 1967; Flesch, 1955; Goodman and Goodman, 1979). The argument has been that effective teaching in literacy is that which produces effective literate behaviour in learners. This sounds like an eminently sensible position but its main problem has been the difficulty researchers and teachers have found in agreeing on what exactly

should count as effective literate behaviour, especially in reading. The major disagreement has centred around the relative importance given in views of literacy to technical skills such as word recognition, decoding and spelling or to higher order skills such as making meaning. Such lack of agreement has led to proponents of radically different approaches to teaching literacy claiming superiority for their suggested programmes, but using very different criteria against which to judge the success of these programmes.

An example of this can be found in recent debates about literacy teaching. The whole language approach, for example, emphasises language processes and the creation of learning environments in which children experience authentic reading and writing (Weaver, 1990). Whole language theorists and teachers stress that skills instruction should occur within the context of natural reading and writing rather than through decontextualised exercises. The development of literacy tends to be seen as a natural by-product of immersion in high quality literacy environments.

In contrast, other researchers and teachers argue that learning the code is a critical part of early reading and that children are most likely to become skilled in this when they are provided with systematic teaching in decoding (e.g., Chall, 1967). There is growing evidence that such teaching increases reading ability (Adams, 1990), especially for children who experience difficulties in learning to read (Mather, 1992; Pressley and Rankin, 1994).

There have been several studies comparing the effectiveness of teaching programmes using a whole language approach and programmes emphasising traditional decoding. The evidence suggests that teaching based on whole language principles (i.e. the use of whole texts, good literature and fully contextualised instruction) does stimulate children to engage in a greater range of literate activities, develop more positive attitudes toward reading and writing, and increase their understanding about the nature and purposes of reading and writing (e.g. Morrow, 1990, 1991, 1992; Neuman and Roskos, 1990, 1992). Evidence also indicates, however, that whole language teaching programmes have less of an effect upon early reading achievement as measured by standardised tests of decoding, vocabulary, comprehension, and writing (Graham and

Harris, 1994; Stahl, McKenna, and Pagnucco, 1994; Stahl and Miller, 1989).

Teaching which explicitly focuses on phonemic awareness and letter-sound correspondences does result in improved performance on such standardised tests (Adams, 1990). The picture emerging from research is, therefore, not a simple one and it appears that the nature of effective teaching of literacy changes according to the outcome measures used to evaluate it.

An issue which has potential bearing on our understanding of the nature of effective literacy teaching and which may offer a focal point around which conflicting research findings can be synthesised is the near impossibility of finding, and thus testing, 'pure' teaching approaches in literacy. Close examination of many recent studies which appear to support the explicit teaching of decoding and comprehension strategies suggests that embedded in these programmes there are often many elements of what could be described as whole language teaching, including, for example, the reading of high quality children's literature and daily original writing by children (Pressley et al., 1991, 1992). Similarly, when the programmes described by whole language advocates are examined closely, it is quite apparent that they do contain a good deal of systematic teaching of letter-sound correspondences, for example (cf. Holdaway, 1979). These teaching approaches, in fact, are tending to become more and more alike and commentators such as Adams (1991) have suggested that there is no need for a division between teaching approaches styled as 'whole language' or 'explicit code teaching' in orientation. What has emerged in recent years is a realisation that explicit decoding and comprehension instruction are most effectively carried out in the context of other components.

Such rapprochement between previously contrasting positions suggests that effective literacy teaching is multifaceted (e.g., Adams, 1990; Cazden, 1992; Duffy, 1991; Stahl et al., 1994). That is to say that it integrates letter- and word-level teaching with explicit instruction in comprehension processes and sets all of these within a context meaningful to children in which they read and write high quality whole texts. Such an approach might be labelled eclectic in that it involves the use of a range of methods. Importantly, though, this implies an informed selection by the teacher from a range of teaching techniques and approaches on the basis of a detailed understanding of the

multifaceted nature of literacy and of the needs of a particular group of children. It does not, as Rose (1996) points out, mean the naive use of a range of teaching methods in the hope that, like shotgun pellets, at least some of them will hit the target.

The likely characteristics and manifestations of effective teaching of literacy, therefore, can be described, to some extent. The focus of our research was to consider what it was that effective teachers knew and believed about this teaching, and how this contributed to their effectiveness.

Designing the study

Our first step was to identify two main sample groups, one a group of primary teachers identified as effective in the teaching of literacy, and the second a control group of primary teachers randomly selected (the validation group).

A number of steps were taken to identify the effective literacy teachers. We firstly asked for recommendations from education personnel in a number of areas of the country. Having achieved a list of over 600 teachers recommended as effective in the teaching of literacy, we then checked such external data sources as we could locate about these teachers and their schools. National test data from each school and external inspection reports were combed for any indications that the literacy teaching of these teachers might not be as effective as we had been led to believe. A number of teachers were deleted from the list as a result. The headteachers of the remainder were contacted and asked, a) did they agree that the teacher in question was effective in teaching literacy, and b) did they have objective evidence to indicate this was the case. The key criterion here was whether headteachers could supply us with evidence, in the form of standardised reading test scores, of above-average learning gains in reading for the children in the classes of these teachers. Satisfactory responses to both these questions led to the inclusion of that teacher in the final sample of effective teachers of literacy, which initially numbered 301 teachers.

Teachers in the validation group were selected to represent a range of effectiveness in teaching literacy. Primary schools in similar areas of the country and similar

catchment areas to those of the effective teachers were chosen and the Mathematics co-ordinators of 140 of these schools initially selected to be part of the validation sample. We thus had no reason to believe that these validation teachers were either effective or ineffective at teaching literacy. They were included as a control group.

Teachers in both groups were asked to complete a questionnaire designed to enquire into their beliefs about literacy and literacy teaching approaches, their feelings about children's needs in literacy development, their reported use of a range of teaching techniques and their professional development experience in literacy. Completed questionnaires were returned from 228 of the effective teachers (a response rate of 75.7%) and 71 of the validation teachers (50.7%).

We then identified sub-samples of the two main groups, that is a sub-sample of 26 teachers from the group of teachers identified as effective in the teaching of literacy and a sub-sample of 10 of the teachers from the validation group. These teachers were principally chosen on a volunteer basis but also to represent a range of school types and geographical areas. The teachers in both sub-samples were twice observed teaching and then interviewed about each of these teaching episodes. The first observation/interview focused on teaching strategies and classroom organisation, and the genesis of these in terms of the teachers' experiences of professional development. The focus in the second observation/interview was on lesson content and teachers' subject knowledge. During the second interview, teachers completed a 'quiz' designed to test their knowledge about aspects of literacy.

Main findings of the research

In the space available here all we can do is summarise the major findings of the research. Much greater detail about these findings can be found in Wray & Medwell (2001).

Teachers' subject knowledge in literacy

Both the effective teachers and the validation teachers knew the requirements of the United Kingdom National Curriculum for English well and could describe what they were doing in terms of these. The effective teachers, however, placed a greater emphasis on children's knowledge of the purposes and functions of reading and writing and of the structures used to enable these processes. They taught language structures and were concerned to contextualise this teaching and to present such structures functionally and meaningfully to children.

Even the effective teachers, however, had limited success at recognising some types of words (e.g. adverb, preposition) in a sentence and some sub-word units (e.g. phoneme) out of context. Units such as phonemes, onsets and rimes and morphemes were problematic for them and even using more everyday terminology for these units still did not guarantee success for the teachers in recognising them out of the lesson context. Despite this apparent lack of explicit, abstract knowledge of linguistic concepts, the effective teachers used such knowledge implicitly in their teaching, particularly that connected with phonics. It seems that these teachers knew the material they were teaching in a particular way. They appeared to know and understand it in the form in which they taught it to the children, rather than abstracted from the teaching context. This is an important finding, which we feel has implications for the content of teachers' continuing professional development.

Teachers were also asked to examine and judge samples of children's reading and writing. All the teachers were able to analyse the children's mistakes in these samples, but the way in which the two groups carried out this task was different. The effective teachers were more diagnostic in the ways they approached the task and were more

able to generate explanations as to why children read or wrote as they did. In examining pieces of writing, the two groups eventually mentioned similar features, but the effective teachers were quicker to focus on possible underlying causes of a child's writing behaviour. Although both groups reached broadly similar conclusions about children's reading and writing, the effective teachers were able to offer many more reasons for their conclusions and to make these detailed judgements more quickly. This suggests a firmer command of subject knowledge relating to literacy processes.

Teachers' beliefs about literacy

The effective teachers of literacy tended to place a high value upon communication and composition in their views about the teaching of reading and writing. They were more coherent in their belief systems about the teaching of literacy and tended to favour teaching activities which explicitly emphasised the understanding of what was read and written.

The effective teachers translated their beliefs about purpose and meaning into practice by paying systematic attention to both the goals they had identified for reading and writing (the understanding and production of meaningful text) and to technical processes such as phonic knowledge, spelling, grammatical knowledge and punctuation. They tended to approach these technical skills in distinctive ways by using an embedded approach; that is, they gave explicit attention to word and sentence level aspects of reading and writing within whole text activities which were both meaningful and explained clearly to pupils. Teachers in the validation sample with less coherent approaches were less likely to show how technical features of reading and writing fitted within a broader range of skills. They did not necessarily ensure that pupils understood the connections between the aims and the processes of reading and writing.

Coherence and consistency emerged as being an important and distinctive characteristic of the effective teachers in several senses:

- their beliefs were internally consistent;

- their practice lived up to their aspirations;
- their beliefs included a belief in making connections between the goals of literacy teaching and learning activities and the activities themselves.

Teaching practices: connections and contexts

The effective teachers were generally much more likely to embed their teaching of literacy into a wider context and to understand and show how specific aspects of reading and writing contributed to communication. They tended to make such connections implicit and explicit. For example, when teaching skills such as vocabulary, word recognition and the use of text features, they made heavy use of whole texts or big books as the context in which to teach literacy. They were also very clear about their purposes for using such texts. They also used modelling extensively. They regularly demonstrated reading and writing to their classes in a variety of ways, often accompanying these demonstrations by verbal explanations of what they were doing.

Because of this concern to contextualise their teaching of language features by working together on texts, these teachers made explicit connections for their pupils between the text, sentence and word levels of language study.

The lessons of the effective teachers were all conducted at a brisk pace. They regularly re-focused children's attention on the task at hand and used clear time frames to keep children on task. They also tended to conclude their lessons by reviewing, with the whole class, what the children had done during the lesson.

Links with recent developments in literacy teaching

Developments in literacy teaching in the United Kingdom have recently been dominated by the design and implementation of a National Literacy Strategy aimed at ensuring higher literacy standards in children leaving our primary schools. This Strategy includes strong recommendations regarding the content and organisation of literacy teaching. In terms of the organisation of literacy teaching, its major innovation

is the 'literacy hour' - a daily hour devoted to the teaching of literacy and sub-divided into whole class teaching sessions followed by independent and group work sessions.

Although our research was begun before the National Literacy Strategy was devised, it was clear that there were several specific points of connection between the model of literacy teaching implicit in the Strategy and our research findings. We found that the effective teachers of literacy tended to teach literacy in lessons which were clearly focused on this subject (literacy hours). Within these lessons they used a mixture of whole class interactive teaching and small group guided work, with occasional individual teaching usually undertaken by a classroom assistant or volunteer helper. A good deal of their teaching involved the use of shared texts such as big books, duplicated passages and multiple copies of books, through which the attention of a whole class or group was drawn to text, sentence and word level features.

Implications of the research

There are several implications emerging from the research in terms of future policy and practice in continuing professional development.

Access to in-service courses

There has been a long standing tendency in the United Kingdom for literacy curriculum specialists to be targeted for in-service opportunities in literacy. Such specialists usually have positions of responsibility in their schools for co-ordinating literacy teaching and the expectation was that enhancements in their knowledge and expertise in teaching literacy would cascade down to their colleagues through in-school professional development work. There is evidence in our findings that this policy has had a positive effect on teachers who were literacy specialists. Most of the teachers in our sample of effective teachers of literacy currently held, or had held in the past, positions of responsibility for co-ordinating the literacy teaching in their schools. However, those teachers who had not been designated as school literacy co-ordinators had been somewhat restricted in the in-service opportunities available to them in literacy. We feel strongly that all teachers need professional development in

this crucial area and recommend that literacy in-service work be targeted more specifically at non-experts.

The nature of professional development experience

Our findings suggest that a particularly valuable form of professional development was teachers' involvement in longer-term projects where they had to work out practical philosophies and policies regarding literacy and its teaching, for example, through doing and using research. This contrasts with the predominantly 'short burst' nature of much current professional development experience. There are many professional development bonuses to be gained from a more active involvement of teachers in research and inquiry. Simple top-down training of teachers is less likely to result in significant development of teaching expertise.

The content of in-service courses

The most effective in-service content seemed from our findings not to be that which focused on knowledge at the teachers' own level, but rather that which dealt with subject knowledge in terms of how this was taught to children. This implies a more practical approach and the teachers in this study confirmed that one of the most successful forms of in-service was that which gave them guided opportunities to try out new ideas in the classroom.

While we found little evidence that the effective teachers of literacy had an extensive command of a range of linguistic terminology, it seems likely that having a greater command might help them further improve their teaching of literacy. Such terminology could be introduced (or reintroduced) to teachers not as a set of definitions for them to learn but as the embodiments of linguistic functions with a strong emphasis upon the ways these functions might be taught.

The evidence from this project also suggests that the experience of being a literacy co-ordinator itself makes a significant contribution to teachers' development as literacy

teachers. Schools need to consider how appropriate elements of this experience can be replicated for other teachers.

Conclusion

The research project described in this article is unique in the United Kingdom in focusing not on features of the teaching of literacy but on the characteristics of the teachers who perform this teaching well. There have also been very few comparable studies elsewhere in the world, the nearest equivalent being the research of Pressley, Rankin and Yokoi (1996) in the US. In the US study, however, effective teachers were chosen by nomination alone. Our research is distinctive in that we also used objective measures of teachers' effectiveness by looking at the learning outcomes they produced in their pupils.

We feel that we have made a significant contribution to understandings in this area and, we hope, have initiated a debate about teacher preparation, knowledge and development which has the potential to lead to major improvements in the quality of literacy teaching.

References

- Adams, M. J. (1991) Why not phonics and whole language. In Ellis, W. (ed.) *All Language and the Creation of Literacy*. Baltimore, MA: The Orton Dyslexia Society
- Adams, M. J. (1990) *Beginning to Read: Thinking and Learning About Print*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
- Alexander, R., Rose, J. and Woodhead, C. (1992) *Curriculum Organisation and Classroom Practice in Primary Schools*. London :HMSO
- Allington, R. (1984) Content coverage and contextual reading in reading groups. *Journal of Reading Behaviour*.16.
- Barr, R. (1984) Beginning reading instruction: from debate to reformation. In David Pearson (ed) *Handbook of Reading Research*. New York: Longman.
- Bennett, S.N., Desforges, C., Cockburn, A. and Wilkinson, B., (1984) *The Quality of Pupil Learning Experiences*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum

Brophy, J and Good, T. (1986) Teacher behaviour and student achievement. Wittrock, M. C.(ed.) *Handbook of Research In Teaching*. London: Collier Macmillan

Cazden, C, (1992) *Whole Language Plus: Essays on Literacy In The United States and New Zealand*. New York: Teachers' College Press

Chall, J. (1967) *Learning to Read: the Great Debate*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Duffy, G. (1991) What counts in teacher education? Dilemmas in educating empowered teachers. In, J. Zutell and McCormack, S. (eds.) *Learner Factors / Teacher Factors: Issues In Literacy Research and Instruction: Fortieth Yearbook of The National Reading Conference*. Chicago: NRC

Flesch, R. (1955) *Why Johnny Can't Read*. New York: Harper Row.

Goodman, K. and Goodman, Y. (1979) Learning to read is natural. In Resnik, L. B. and Weaver, P. A. (eds.) *Theory and Practice of Early Reading*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Graham, S. and Harris, K. R. (1994) The effects of whole language on children's writing: a review of the literature. *Educational Psychologist*. 29, 187-192.

Harrison, C. (1996) *Teaching Reading: What Teachers Need to Know*. Cambridge: United Kingdom Reading Association.

Holdaway, D. (1979) *The Foundations of Literacy*. Auckland: Ashton Scholastic.

Mather, N. (1992) Whole language reading instruction for students with learning abilities; caught in the crossfire. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*. 7, 87-95

Morrow, L. M. (1990) Preparing the classroom environment to promote literacy during play. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*. 5, 537-554

Morrow, L. M. (1991) Relationships among physical design of play centres, teachers' emphasis on literacy play, and children's behaviours during play. In Zutell, J. and McCormack, S. (eds.) *Learner Factors/Teacher Factors: Issues In Literacy Research and Instruction: Fortieth Yearbook of The National Reading Conference*. Chicago: NRC

Morrow, L. M. (1992) The impact of literature based programmes on literacy achievement, use of literature and attitudes of children from ethnic minority backgrounds. *Reading Research Quarterly*. 27, 251-275.

Mortimore, P., Sammons, P., Stoll, L., Lewis, D. and Ecob, R. (1988) *School Matters*. Wells, Somerset: Open Books

Neuman, S. B. and Roskos, K., (1990) The influence of literacy enriched play settings on pre-schoolers engagement with written language. In J. Zutell and McCormack, S.

(eds.) *Literacy Theory and Research: Analyses From Multiple Paradigms*. Chicago: NRC

Neuman, S. B. and Roskos, K., (1992) Literacy objects as cultural tools: effects on children's literacy behaviours at play. *Reading Research Quarterly*. 27, 203-225

Pressley, M. and Rankin, J. (1994) More about whole language methods of reading instruction for students at risk for early reading failure. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*. 9, 156-167.

Pressley, M., Gaskins, I., Cunicelli, E. A., Burdick, N. J., Schaub-Matt, M., Lee, D. S. and Powell, N. (1991) Strategy instruction at Benchmark School: a faculty interview study. *Learning Disability Quarterly*. 14, 19-48.

Pressley, M., El-Dinary, P. B., Gaskins, I., Schuder, T., Bergman, J., Almasai, L. and Brown, R. (1992) Beyond direct explanation: transactional instruction of reading comprehension strategies. *Elementary School Journal*. 92, 511-554.

Pressley, M., Rankin, J. and Yokoi, L. (1996) A survey of instructional practices of primary teachers nominated as effective in promoting literacy. *Elementary School Journal*, 96, 4, 363-384.

Rose, J. (1996) What our schools must teach. In *The Times*, 8th May, 1996

Stahl, S. A. and Miller, P.D. (1989) Whole language and language experience approaches for beginning reading: a quantitative research synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*. 59, 87-116.

Stahl, S. A., McKenna, M.C. and Pagnucco, J. R. (1994) The effects of whole language instruction: an update and reappraisal. *Educational Psychologist*. 29, 175-186

Weaver, C. (1990) *Understanding Whole language: From Principles To Practice*. Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.

Wray, D. and Medwell, J. (2001) *Teaching Literacy Effectively* London: Routledge Falmer