Informing practice in English

A review of recent research in literacy and the teaching of English

Professor Debra Myhill University of Exeter

Dr Ros Fisher University of Exeter

This literature review was commissioned by Ofsted to provide an overview of recent national and international research in the field of literacy (including other languages than English) and English teaching.

Age group	Published	Reference no.
Alll	October 2005	HMI 2565

© Crown copyright 2005

Document reference number: HMI 2565

Website: www.ofsted.gov.uk

This document may be reproduced in whole or in part for non-commercial educational purposes, provided that the information quoted is reproduced without adaptation and the source and date of publication are stated.

Contents

New international conceptualisations of literacy 1
Talking, thinking and learning in English: 2
Underachievement in English – the question of boys: 4
Understanding Writers and Writing: 5
Cognitive perspectives on literacy: 7
Wider personal reading: 8
ICT and multimodality 10
Bibliography 12

New international conceptualisations of literacy

One of the strongest trends in contemporary research and scholarship in English is the reframing of the subject as literacy. Underpinning this changed emphasis is a perspective which conceptualises literacy as being about far more than reading, writing and talking. Literacy is understood *as social practice*; a socially, culturally, and historically situated tool used for particular purposes in particular contexts. However, in school the child's task is to master a complex abstract system and failure is the inability to cope with such a system. However, Kress (2000) argues that children are actors in a social world and develop their own ways of communicating with those around them. One strand of international research in this area addresses how children make sense of school literacy experiences in the context of their own home literacy encounters (New London Group 2000). Haas Dyson (2000) shows how young children draw on shared experience of popular culture in their conversations and story making. In similar vein, Dutro and Kazemi (2004) explain how children in US classrooms negotiate social and intellectual identities through their writing practices. The state assessments construct an identity of being a failing or a successful writer, but children's own subjective identities are often more complex, and influenced by home and cultural experiences. Moll, Saez and Dworin (2001) argue that narrow views of literacy espoused by school do not help bilingual or children with EAL to flourish. Their study in the US shows how two bilingual kindergarten children use social processes and cultural resources at hand to develop their literacy competences, resources which their teachers had not acknowledged as valuable.

A further strand of the altering conceptualisation of literacy is the *Critical Literacies* perspective which adopts a view that literacy is not only socially and culturally situated but also ideologically shaped, often by dominant, hegemonic forces (Lankshear [1997]; Gee [2000]; Street [2003]; Lankshear and Knobel [2003]). These writers are less concerned with literacy as a cognitive skill or process and more interested in literacy as a social, cultural act of meaning-making (e.g. Street [2003]). They argue that literacies are not a set of de-contextualised skills but are rooted in social contexts, indicative of power relations between groups. As such, the prevailing view of literacy privileges the white middle class and marginalizes others. For example, Janks' work with high school students on the relationship between language and power in the late apartheid years in South Africa (Janks [2000]) and O'Brien's work with younger children on mothers' day catalogues (O'Brien [2001]).

This changing conceptualisation of literacy is a strong theme in research, and one espoused by a large numbers of respected researchers from around the world. However, there are voices which sound a more dissonant note. Stephens (2000) challenges Street's argument that literacy skills cannot be isolated from their context: rather she argues that written texts are recontextualised in the English classroom. Whilst accepting the significance of the social setting she also asserts that there is a role for cognitive development, including appropriate error correction and guidance on using Standard English rather than dialect.

Talking, thinking and learning in English

The inter-relationship between talking, thinking and learning is an important strand in literacy pedagogy. The Primary Literacy Strategy’s advocacy of more interactive whole class teaching (DfEE1998) has refocused research attention on these inter-relationships. Studies of classroom interaction at home and abroad show that in literacy teaching the recitation script of initiation, response and feedback (IRF) is still prevalent (Myhill, [2002] in UK and Marshall, Smagorinsky and Smith [1995]; Nystrand [1997 in USA]) with teachers seeking predetermined answers to their questions, particularly about the interpretation of texts. The TALK project investigated interaction with children aged 4–11 and found there was little constructive meaning-making and limited opportunities for pupil participation (Burns and Myhill [2004]). Similarly, Mroz et al. (2000), who studied 10 teachers’ interactions in the literacy hour argue that, despite the NLS’ endorsement of interactive whole class teaching, there are still few opportunities for pupils to question or explore ideas. The requirement for pre-determined outcomes and a fast pace seem to militate against reflection and exploration of ideas. The SPRINT project (Moyles et al. [2000]) showed that task-focused interactions and ‘rapid-fire’ closed questions had increased in line with the NLS aims to promote well-paced whole class teaching. However, an increase in higher order interactions involving reasoning with 7–11 year olds was matched by a heavy emphasis on factual recall with the younger children.

Many (2002) describes US classroom environments that are socio-constructivist in nature and deviate from traditional classroom interaction patterns. She argues that scaffolded instruction underscores both the role of the teacher and the role of the child as ‘co-participants in negotiating meaning and in informing the nature of the instructional conversations’. In Australia, close analysis of teachers who use talk to help children think more effectively about specific aspects of literacy show how, even in brief interactions, both teacher and child have their best opportunities to engage in genuine negotiations of meaning (Geekie et al. [1999]).

Alexander’s (2002) survey of educational practices in Europe and his recent work on dialogic thinking are both central to a consideration of effective talk in English. As quoted in Alexander (2004) ‘if an answer does not give rise to a new question from itself, it falls out of the dialogue’. Skidmore (2003) compared styles of teacher-pupil discourse: ‘pedagogical dialogue’ in which someone who possesses the truth instructs someone who is ignorant of it, as opposed to ‘internally persuasive discourse’. In internally persuasive discourse, the dialogue is all-important and no word can ever be final. Skidmore argues that, where children are encouraged to take on a wider range of speaking roles, classroom dialogue between pupils and teacher can enable the development of individual reflective capacity about texts as opposed to 'the ability to reproduce a canonical interpretation of the text'.

Recent studies have disclosed how groups of pupils use collaborative talk to make meaning (Lyle [1996]) including through using technology (Oshima et al. [1996]; Woodruff & Brett [1993]). Pupil-pupil collaboration can be an inherently motivating context for action and learning. In contrast to adult-child relations, peer interaction is more horizontally organised and power is more likely to be evenly shared (Blatchford, Kutnik, Baines & Galton [2003]). However, the development of collaborative talk can be difficult and children may need training. Haworth (1999) analysed the language of groups of children in primary classrooms as they talked about texts. She found that children tended to mirror the discourse of the teacher in which there is a tendency for an authoritarian speaker to close up the dialogue. She argues that those children who were able to adopt a more dialogic form of discourse were better able to enter into exploratory talk around text. Malloch (2002) describes the process and accompanying difficulties of moving from a teacher-led to a student-led discussion format in elementary school literature lessons and notes that pupils need help in developing these new discursive skills.

Woodruff and Brett (1999) found that in collaborative talk, groups worked to build knowledge through talk and that year 5/6 pupils learned to understand the concept of task as inquiry. They learned to discuss and argue ideas explicitly and were able to help each other advance their understanding. However, others argue that even these task-focused pupil interactions mainly involved exchanging information rather than discussing ideas (Galton et al. [1999a]; [1999b]). Wegerif, Mercer and Dawes (1999) found that 8- and 9-year-old children could be taught to use 'exploratory talk', a type of talk in which joint reasoning is made explicit. They claim that use of exploratory talk can improve group reasoning, and can be taught. In the US, Guthrie and Wigfield (2000) propose that collaborative talk around reading is motivational and that reading engagement is strongly related to both comprehension and achievement. Beard, Shorrocks-Taylor and Pell (2003) have shown how direct intervention using structured group work to raise attainment in literacy can be successful.

The SPRinG (Social Pedagogic Research into Grouping) project designed with teachers a programme of quality group work in classrooms. Blatchford et al. (2003) argue that the social context of learning is often left unplanned with no attention paid to the educational potential of the group. Teachers typically plan for their interactions with pupils, but not for interactions between pupils (Kutnick et al. [2002]). Also, Matthews and Kesner (2003) found that whereas collaborative group work in literacy teaching can be effective with 6 year olds, teachers need to take account of individual learning styles and pupils' status among peers. They encourage teachers to be sensitive to children's social skills and status when creating groups. Likewise, in a study of the influences of peer collaboration and social context on children's use of literate language, Jones (2002) found that friend pairs showed more evidence of constructive learning.

Latham (2002) argues that '*spoken language forms a constraint, a ceiling not only on the ability to comprehend, but also on the ability to write, beyond which literacy cannot progress';* speech supports and propels writing ability forward. Corden's (2000) findings support the view that children need to acquire an oral metalanguage to allow reflection on written text. Johnson (2000) argues that for young writers to expand their vocabulary and to be able to select the right word in their writing, rich oral language activities are essential.

Underachievement in English – the question of boys

The national concern with the underachievement of boys in English is a concern broadly paralleled throughout the English-speaking world. The relationship between gender identity and male achievement has been one route of research into the issue. Many researchers have considered how boys negotiate their masculine identity and adopt macho values which reject the values of school. In the post-16 setting, Bracey and Burns (2001) found that boys do not always see the value of academic attainment or literacy on their life chances as the association between the subject English and female identity does not help boys gain credibility for success. Indeed, Collins, Kenway and Macleod (2000) found that being good at English can make boys a subject for homophobic targeting. Investigating boys' writing in the primary classroom, Maynard and Lowe (1999) demonstrate that teachers articulate stereotypical perceptions of boys' and girls' literacy practices. Likewise, in a cross-phases study of fifteen schools, Jones and Myhill (2004) found that English teachers tended to promote stereotyped views of boys as troublesome, and girls as compliant; and that teachers held stereotyped views of children's preferences in English which the children's own responses did not support (Myhill [2001]).

There is a growing body of classroom-based research which addresses the effectiveness of strategies to narrow the differential (Sukhnandan, Lee and Kelleher [2000]; Warrington and Younger [2002]). Mulholland et al's (2004) Australian study analysed the impact of single sex teaching in Year 9 English and Maths classes. They found that single sex teaching made no difference in Maths, but in English both boys' and girls' scores improved when in single sex classes. However, the improvement was much stronger for girls. Through classroom observations of gender differences in literacy lessons from Years 1 to 10, Myhill (2002) revealed differential participation rates in whole class interactions with the teacher in literacy lessons, with boys and underachieving girls less participatory than high achieving girls. Younger, Warrington and Williams (1999) observed classroom participation, where boys dominated interactions, but did not get more learning support. In a later study, they found that girls tended to be involved in more supportive learning interactions with the teacher (Younger, Warrington and McLellan [2002]). They call for a focus on teaching strategies which foster more discussion and collaboration. However, Whitelaw, Milosevic and Daniels (2000) note that girls regard their positive achievement with some cynicism, interpreting the good marks achieved for writing as being more a consequence of good behaviour than good work. Focusing on boys' self-confidence in English, McGuinn (2000) highlights the benefits of computers in motivating underachieving boys and encouraging them to communicate.

Frater (1997, 2000) in a review of secondary and primary schools where boys do well in literacy claims that in these schools girls also do well. Warrington, Younger, and McLellan (2003) researched four schools with successful strategies for narrowing gaps in attainment. The strategy of encouraging boys and girls to work in pairs to revise each other's writing was successful and made both boys and girls more aware of gender stereotypical writing. Common to all four schools was a challenging of gender stereotypes about reading and writing and boosting self-esteem and self-worth through buddying and circle time. They also found that effective and focused target setting (Younger et al. [2002]) helped boys to become more autonomous and in control of their own learning, particularly when helped by mentors. Literacy initiatives which supported boys in handwriting and paired reading through, for example, year 12 mentors, were also significant factors in narrowing the boy-girl gap.

However, many researchers note that underachievement is a much more complex issue than can simply be described by gender. Smith (2003) contests the 'moral panic' surrounding the debate and illustrates through statistical analysis of results in English that the gap between boys and girls has remained pretty stable since the early 70s and is currently at its lowest (Smith [2003b]). Gorard et al. (1999) demonstrate that, as boys' and girls' results nationally have improved, the gap between them has declined. In Australia, Collins, Kenway and Macleod (2000) argue that the debate focuses too much on boys in general and should be looking at *which* boys and, of course, *which* girls are underachieving. They illustrate how gender is a less significant factor in predicting underachievement than socio-economic status.

Understanding Writers and Writing

Current pedagogic initiatives in the UK which focus on writing arise out of a concern for standards in writing and failure to meet national targets. Similarly, in the USA a national report (National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges [2003]) claimed that 75% of twelfth graders were not achieving the required standard and that half of all college freshmen had difficulties in writing.

The study of the psychological processes involved in writing dates from the Hayes and Flower (1980) model. This considered the act of writing in terms of the Task Environment (purpose and audience); Long Term Memory (including knowledge of the topic and genre) and three distinct phases in the writing process: planning; translating thoughts into written form; and revision. Recent research (Alamargot and Chanquoy [2001]) suggests that four kinds of knowledge are required: good knowledge of the topic; linguistic knowledge;

pragmatic knowledge of how to adapt texts for different purposes and audiences; and procedural knowledge which allows the writer to orchestrate the other three sets of knowledge. The planning process is a complex multi-layered one involving planning the content and ideas, the structure and organisation, and how to achieve the goal of the piece of writing. Sharples (1999) conceptualises writing as creative design: as a cognitive and a social activity within a community; and designing text, in which meaning is created not just in terms of words, sentences and texts, but also in terms of visual layout.

Evan's research (2001) in a primary context indicates that young writers see writing less as a process of meaning-making, more as production, focussing on the secretarial and presentational aspects of writing. Flutter (2000) also found that KS1 children especially were more concerned with making their story-writing neat and attractive and they were often unclear about the purposes of story-writing activities. Van den Bergh and Rijlaarsdam (2001) researched the writing of 15 year olds as they wrote an argument. They found that children who produced different quality of writing had different writing processes. The best writers had the highest scores for understanding what the task meant and high scores for generating ideas. They suggest that time spent interpreting and understanding the writing task is crucial.

All recent models of the writing process signal the importance of working memory: working memory has limited capacity and writing is a highly demanding activity. Therefore writers who, for example, have to think about how to spell words, or what ideas to use have less working memory available to shape the writing (Kellogg [1999]). Bannert (2002) suggested that the use of writing frames may minimise cognitive load by freeing the mind to concentrate on other areas. Fones (2001) noted the value of writing frames in easing the transition between GCSE and A level work, whilst in contrast, Grainger, Goouch and Lambirth (2003) are concerned that their actual effect might be to impose limitations on the child's writing. Likewise, revision is a '*cognitively complex and costly process'* (Chanquoy [2001]). Hayes and Flower's saw revision, or reviewing, as a recursive process, occurring throughout writing and interrupting the other activities. Chanquoy's study found that children revised better when there was a gap between writing and revising.

The value of peer discussion of writing is underlined by several studies. Nixon and Topping (2001) found writing in the reception class improved significantly when year 6 children, selected as having themselves been slow to develop literacy skills, were used as 'tutors'. Corden (2000) argues that quality peer-to-peer and teacher–pupil interaction can help pupils transfer understanding of reading texts into their writing and develop a metalanguage to apply to their own writing. A series of research projects into the benefits of peer observation of writing (Couzijn [1999]; Rijlaarsdam and Braaksma [2004]) shows that giving children opportunities to shift roles from writer to reader improved writing. In one classroom project focussing on argument letters, one group became the audience and discussed which letters were best, whilst another group observed the discussion and noted the quality criteria used. The group, who had observed rather than participated, improved their writing more significantly than their peers. 'Audience concern' or understanding the reader-writer relationship is cited by Lavelle and Guarino (2003) as a deep writing characteristic, a sign of more advanced writing and it may be that peer discussion and peer observation develops understanding of the needs of the audience.

Cognitive perspectives on literacy

Whilst the Vygotskian basis for the NLS and the Framework for English is perhaps now well understood, the pedagogical implications of other branches of cognitive psychology have been overlooked. Hibbing and Rankin-Erickson (2003) found that if pupils can create images in their minds as they read, their potential for understanding the text is increased. Consequently pupils who struggle to decode may need help by strategic use of external images to support their comprehension. They recommend simple teacher-drawn illustrations, pupil drawings, use of picture books and film as possible support for struggling readers and those who may find using visual imagery to support comprehension difficult. Barrs and Cork (2001) found that working with year 5 children on challenging literature, particularly through the use of drama and role play, resulted in greater reflection on the task of writing. It not only helped improve their writing but also encouraged the reading of more challenging texts.

Talk can extend the capacity of working memory for writing (Latham [2002]). For children concentrating on the secretarial aspects of writing, the demands on working memory may significantly hamper their ability to compose continuous prose. Talk and collaborative work can link composition to the long-term memory store (i.e. linking to meaningful experience) rendering the working memory more efficient. Green and Sutton (2003) investigated the effects of giving year 6 children prompts to support their writing. They found that giving more ideas for content could be problematic as then content took precedence over organisation; instead, focusing on purpose and audience was more effective in supporting writing.

Researchers continue to refine our understanding of the cognitive processes involved in using phonics in the teaching of early literacy. Recent work on the development of literacy in speakers of other languages is providing strong evidence of the transfer of cognitive strategies in reading in a first language to processing in a second. D'Anguilli et al. (2002) studied the development of reading in English and Italian bilingual children. They found that Italian, which is very phonologically regular, helped children learn to read English. They speculate that exposure to a language with regular phoneme-grapheme correspondences might enhance phonological understanding in English. However, Mumtaz and Humphreys (2002) studied children in Birmingham who were literate in Urdu (also phonologically regular). This study showed a beneficial impact on phonological reading skills in Urdu-literate children but a negative impact on the visual skills needed for decoding irregular words in reading. They argue the need for teachers to be aware of the differences when teaching children with EAL to read. Durgunoglu (2002) studied cross-linguistic transfer: phonological awareness, syntactic knowledge, genre and meaning-making knowledge was found to transfer from L1 to L2. The author suggests that assessment of learners with EAL could look at competence in these areas in their L1 to distinguish between those with inherent reading difficulties/special needs and those children who need more practice in the new language. Hutchinson (2003) recommends early assessment of comprehension and vocabulary.

Metacognition is the consciousness of your own cognitive, or thinking, processes and research in metacognitive thinking about both reading and writing has implications for current interest in thinking skills in English. Whitehead (2002) used thinking skills, based around social, physical and imagery strategies, to extend pupil understanding during guided reading sessions with a view to raising standards in English. Fisher (2001) argues that incorporating philosophical discussion about stories with children helps develop the thinking skills necessary for higher order reading. Peverly et al. (2002) investigated the relative importance of comprehension skills and metacognitive control of study strategies in 12- and 16-year-olds. They found that metacognitive control helped with the recall of information at both ages, but that metacognition was more important to older pupils where the information studied was more difficult. Guterman (2002) tested the effect of using written metacognitive awareness guidance to engage pupils with their prior knowledge before undertaking reading comprehension assessment and found that this improved performance on the tests, particularly those with higher cognitive demand. Hall and Myers (1999) argue that thinking aloud while modelling is important. Just modelling task completion is insufficient as then 'the strategic activity will be largely unobservable'. However, Fisher (2002) found that instances of metacognitive modelling were very rare in the literacy hour. Corden (2001) advocates 'developing pupils' strategic repertoires so they can make conscious choices and take control over their own writing'.

Wider personal reading

The most significant large-scale research into children's reading achievement and wider reading habits is the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) conducted in 2001, involving large samples of 9 year olds in 37 countries. English children achieved the highest scores in reading for literacy purposes (along with Sweden), and the second highest scores in reading for informational purposes. However, compared with other readers internationally, the study indicates that England's children are significantly less likely to be reading for pleasure outside of school.

There have been surprisingly few major studies into children's leisure reading habits: Hall and Coles (2002) conducted the first major survey of children's reading habits since Whitehead's in 1977, with a sample of almost 8000 children, aged 10, 12 and 14. They found that book-reading had increased, compared with Whitehead's survey, for all 10 year olds and for 12 year old girls; the only decline in reading was in 14 year old boys. Comics and magazines also enjoyed considerable popularity. The fiction preferences of boys and girls showed marked differences: girls read more adventure, horror/ghost stories, animal stories, school-related stories and romance and relationship stories than boys; boys chose to read more science fiction and fantasy, sports related books, war and spy stories, more comics and joke books and humorous fiction and annuals. Non-fiction reading is not as widespread as may have been thought with less than 3% of the sample choosing it; however, of these the vast majority were boys. Responding to this survey, Linda Hall (2000) regrets that little attention was paid to children's reading of the classics and she critiques Hall and Coles' claim that there was diversity in children's reading choices when one fifth chose Roald Dahl as a favourite which she attributes to teachers' use of Dahl in class.

Other smaller studies have considered reading choices and particularly the dissonances between school reading and home reading choices and experiences. Teese (2003) foregrounds the relationship between reading habits, gender and socio-economic status showing how the negative impact of gender on reluctance or difficulties in reading decreases as socio-economic advantage increases. An Australian study (Love and Hamston [2003]) considered the habits and views of adolescent boys who had both the ability and home support to be enthusiastic readers, but were reluctant to read by choice. Both the boys and their parents tended to conceptualise reading as print-based and the boys negatively associated this with school. The boys showed strong preferences for multimodal texts and reading which is pragmatic, geared to their tastes and needs. The authors suggest that the preference for multi-modal and semiotically complex texts needs to be incorporated more effectively into conceptualisations of reading or boys' leisure reading activities will continue to be alienated from school reading. Alvermann et al. (1999) report the success of an adolescent book club, held in a public library. She observes that there are limited opportunities for those who like reading to talk about it and they risk being ridiculed by peers in school. The book club became a social outlet: a non-institutionalised setting where their reading was not policed and they could discuss their different reading tastes and choices with each other.

In an in-depth case study of four pre-school children and their parents, Wilkinson (2003) explores reading choices made by pre-school children and their parents. Parents' reasons for choosing books drew on knowledge of what would interest, or connect with their child and their experiences: the 'quality' of the book was less important. Children's own favourite books often disregarded conventional notions of quality. Wilkinson argues that quality reading is less about the intrinsic quality of a book, and more about the nature of the reading experience and the meaning constructed through that experience. Millard and Marsh (2001) investigated years 1 and 3 children's reading of comics in school. Children felt that teachers didn't approve of comics but they themselves liked the interactive aspects such as puzzles and word-searches. Moreover, the use of comics seemed to encourage shared literacy experiences at home far more, including fathers responding positively. Millard and Marsh conclude that comics may be a way to diminish the increasing gap between home and school literacies.

ICT and multimodality

The impact, or otherwise, of new technologies on learning in English is a salient issue: information and communication technology (ICT) is altering the nature of English (Kress 2003) and fostering multi-modal versions of literate practices which has implications for children's experiences of English. Two strands are relevant here. The first is the extent to which the English curriculum can and/or should reflect the changing nature of literacy. Second, there is a need to consider the impact of the use of ICT for learning.

Carrington (2004) argues that electronic communication and computer games require a new form of literacy which is multi-modal and multi-dimensional, unlike traditional literacy which is more linear and one-dimensional. She proposes that adults are uncomfortable about this new form of literacy and about young people's superiority in its use. She argues for the 'necessity of rethinking and extending traditional notions of text and literacy' (p215). Hunt (2000) considers how electronic texts are less valued than printed texts in the education system, because they do not have the linearity that traditional printed texts have. He proposes that electronic texts share with oral texts the quality of a matrix and observes that experimentation with different ways of narrating fictional events would give children meta-narrative knowledge. However, Bearne (2003) argues that, until assessment of literacy allows multi-modal 'writing', the impact of this change will have little effect on classrooms, effectively excluding some children's literacy knowledge from school contexts.

Despite increasing use of ICT and multi-modality, not all children have equal access to computers at home, creating a 'digital divide' (Sutherland-Smith et al. [2003]). Even where pupils do have access to computers at home, low expectations based on teachers' perceptions of disadvantage may result in those children not having their expertise acknowledged (Snyder et al. [2002]). Moreover, Kerawalla (2002) reports that children's use of computers at home is very different from school use. In the homes she studied children were more likely to be playing games than doing homework, despite the fact that most parents valued computers and had bought educational software for their children.

Labbo and Reinking (2003) propose five ways in which computers can be used to support early literacy: to support writing; to contribute to the development of phonological abilities; to enable more independent reading; to foster social interaction; and transform instruction through the use of the internet and email. However, research shows that its use is still limited in all phases of schooling.

Makin (2003) argues that few examples of new technology are in evidence in early childhood classrooms, and skill and drill games predominate over replicating authentic literacy experiences. Mumtaz and Hammond (2002) found that teachers focused mainly on presentation and intervened only rarely when pupils were using a word processor. They argue that this is because teachers see the computer as a way of improving ICT skills rather than writing skills and as an individual rather than collaborative activity.

However, the value of computers for collaboration in literacy has been illustrated by Mercer et al's (2003) research into computer-focused textual discussion, which allowed children to think together, described by Mercer et al. as 'interthinking'. Merchant (2003) shows how email can be used to encourage children to write in new ways for new audiences. This research shows how digital communication can be used to enrich print-based literacy. Similarly, Yost (2000) used email with 5 year olds and found children did more writing as a result. Reid (2003) shows how short films can be used to scaffold writing and that pupils can learn from moving between print and film based forms.

A number of important studies have indicated the limited impact of ICT on student learning (BECTa, 1998, 1998-9, 2001a, 2001b; Torgerson and Elbourne [2002]; Pritchard and Cartwright [2004]; Paterson et al. [2003]). However, some small-scale studies offer more encouraging results. Dunsmuir and Clifford (2003) claim that computers have proved motivating for young writers at risk of failure. ICT provides opportunities for collaboration and better revision, allowing children to produce more accurate and better-presented text. Recent evidence shows that children who have experience using revising tools on the word processor have a better understanding of editing (Labbo and Kuhn [1998]; Fletcher [2001]). Other studies (Trushell et al. [2003]; Lewin [2002]) record the beneficial impact of ICT on children's reading.

Bibliography

Akselsen, S. et al. (2002) MICTS: Municipal ICT Schools – a Means for Bridging the Digital Divide Between Rural and Urban Communities. *Education and Information Technologies* vol.7, no.2, pp 93.

Alamargot, D. and Chanquoy, L. (2001) *Through the Models of Writing.* Dordrecht: Kluwer

Alexander, R. (2002) *Culture and Pedagogy.* London: Blackwell

Alexander, R. (2004) *Towards Dialogic Teaching: rethinking classroom talk.* Cambridge: Dialogos.

Alvermann, D. et al. (1999) Adolescents' Perceptions and Negotiations of Literacy Practices in After-School Read and Talk Clubs. *American Educational Research Journal* vol.36, no.2, pp 221-264.

Angus, L. et al. (2004) ICT and Educational (dis)Advantage: Families, Computers and Contemporary Social and Educational Inequalities. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* vol.25, no.1, pp 5-18.

Angus, L, Sutherland-Smith, W and Snyder, I. (2002) Building equitable literate futures: home and school computer-mediated literacy practices and disadvantage *Cambridge Journal of Education* vol.32, no.3, pp 367-383.

Applebee, A. N. (2002) Engaging Students in the Disciplines of English: What Are Effective Schools Doing? *English Journal* vol.91, no.6, pp 30-36.

Bannert, M. (2002) Managing cognitive load – recent trends in cognitive load theory. *Learning and Instruction* vol.12, no.1, pp 139-146.

Barrs, M. (2000) The Reader in the Writer. *Reading* vol.34, no.2, pp 54.

Barrs, M. and Cork, V. (2001) The reader in the writer: Links between the study of literature and writing development at kS2. London: CLPE

Beard, R. Shorrocks-Taylor, D and Pell, G. (2003) Evaluating Further Literacy Support *Literacy Today.*

Bearne, E. (2003) Rethinking literacy: communication, representation and text. *Reading, Literacy and Language* vol.37, no.2, pp 98-103.

Blatchford, P., Kutnick, P., Baines, E. & Galton, M. (2003) Toward a social pedagogy of classroom group work *International Journal of Educational Research* vol 39 no 1 pp153-172

Bracey, P. and Burns, J. (2001) Boys Underachievement: Issues, Challenges and Possible Ways Forward. *Westminster Studies in Education* vol.24, no.2, pp 155.

Brett, C. and Woodruff E. (1999) Collaborative knowledge building: preservice teachers and elementary students talking to learn. *Language and Education* vol.13, no.4, pp 280-302.

British Educational Communications and Technology Agency (BECTa) (1998) *The UK Evaluations Final Report*. Coventry: BECTa

British Educational Communications and Technology Agency (BECTa) (1998-9) *A Preliminary Report for the DfEE on the relationship between ICT and Primary School Standards.* Coventry: BECTa

British Educational Communications and Technology Agency (BECTa) (2001a) *Primary Schools of the Future – achieving today.* Coventry: BECTa

British Educational Communications and Technology Agency (BECTa) (2001b) *The Secondary School of the Future.* Coventry: BECTa

Brobst, K.E, Morris, K.S, and Peverly S.T. (2002) The contribution of reading comprehension ability and meta-cognitive control to the development of studying in adolescenc*e. Journal of Research in Reading* vol..25, no.2, pp 203-216.

Bullon, K. and Selwyn, N. (2000) Primary School Children's Use of ICT. *British Journal of Educational Technology* vol.31, no.4, pp 321.

Burns, C. and Myhill, D. (2004). Interactive or Inactive? A consideration of the nature of interaction in whole class teaching. *Cambridge Journal of Education Studies* vol.34, no.1, pp 35-49.

Carbonaro, W. and Gamoran, A. (2002) The Production of Achievement Inequality in High School English. *American Educational Research Journal* vol.39, no.4, pp 801-827.

Carrington, V. (2004) Texts and Literacies of the Shi Jinrui. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* vol.25, no.2, pp 215-228.

Chanquoy, L. (2001) How to make it easier for children to revise their writing: A study of text revision from 3rd to 5th grades. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* vol.71, no.1, pp 15-41.

Chiappe, P. and Siegel, L.S. (1999) Phonological awareness and reading acquisition in English and Punjabi speaking Canadian Children. *Journal of Educational Psychology* vol.9, no.1, pp 20-28.

Coles, M. and Hall, C. (2002) Gendered Readings: Learning from Children's Reading Choices. *Journal of Research in Reading* vol.25, issue 1, pp 96-108.

Collins, C, Kenway, J, and MaCleod, J. (2000) *Factors Influencing the Educational Performance of Males and Females in School and their Initial*

Destinations after Leaving School. Deakin: Deakin Centre for Education and Change.

Coltman, P, Petyaeva, D. and Anghileri, J. (2002) Scaffolding Learning through meaningful tasks and adult interactions. *Early Years* vol.22, no.1, pp 39-49.

Corden, R. (2000) Reading-Writing Connections: the Importance of Interactive Discourse. *English in Education* vol.34, no2, pp 35-44.

Corden, R. (2001) Teaching Reading-Writing Links (TRAWL Project). *Reading* vol.35, no.1, pp 37.

Corden, R. (2003) *Developing narrative writing 7-13*. Royston: UKRA.

Couzijn, M. (1999). Learning to write by observation of writing and reading processes: Effects on learning and transfer. *Learning and Instruction* vol.*2*, pp 109-142.

D'Anguilli, A, Siegel, L.S and Serra, E. (2002) The development of reading in English and Italian bilingual children. *Applied Psycholinguistics* vol.22, pp 479-507.

Dawes, L, Mercer, N. and Wegerif, R. (2000) *Thinking Together*. Birmingham: The Questions Publishing Company.

Demack, S, Drew D, and Grimsley, M. (2000). Minding the gap: ethnic, gender and social class differences in attainment at 16, 1988–95. *Race, Ethnicity and Education* vol.3, no.2, pp 117–143.

Department for Education and Employment (1998). *The National Literacy Strategy: A framework for teaching.* London: DfEE.

Dias, K. and Juniper, L. (2002) Phono-graphix – who needs additional literacy support? An outline of research in Bristol schools. *Support for Learning* vol.17, no.1, pp 34-38.

Dunsmuir, S. and Clifford, V. (2003) Children's Writing and the Use of Information and Communications Technology. *Educational Psychology in Practice* vol.19, no.3, pp 171-187.

Durgunoglu, A.Y. (2002) Cross-linguistic transfer in literacy development and implications for language learners. *Annals of Dyslexia* vol.52, pp 189-204.

Dutro, E. and Kazemi, E. (2004) *Children Writing for Themselves, the Teacher, and the State in an Urban Elementary Classroom.* Paper presented at American Educational Research Association annual conference, San Diego (CA).

Dyson, A.H. (2000) Writing and the Sea of Voices: Oral Language in, Around, and About Writing in Writing in Idrisano, R and Squire, J.R. (Eds) *Perspectives* *on Writing: Research, Theory and Practice.* Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Dyson, A.H. (2001) An introduction and a warning. *The Elementary School Journal* vol.101, no.4, pp 379-384.

Dyson, A.H. (2001). Donkey Kong in Little Bear country: A first grader's composing development in the media spotlight. *The Elementary School Journal* vol.101, no.4, pp 417-433.

English, E, Hargreaves, L. and Hislam, J. (2002) Pedagogical dilemmas in the National Literacy Strategy: primary teachers' perceptions, reflections and classroom behaviour. *Cambridge Journal of Education* vol.32, no.1, pp 9–26.

Evans, C.J. (2003) Approaches to learning, need for cognition, and strategic flexibility among university students. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* vol.73, no.4, pp 507-528.

Evans, J. (2001) *The Writing Classroom: Aspects of Writing and the Primary Child 3-11*. London: Fulton.

Feiler, A. (2003) A home visiting project for Reception children predicted to experience literacy difficulties. *British Journal of Special Education* vol.30, no.3, pp 156-162.

Fisher, R. (2001) Philosophy in primary schools: fostering thinking skills and literacy. *Reading* vol.35, no.2, pp 67-73.

Fisher, R. (2002) Shared Thinking: metacognitive modelling in the literacy hour. *Reading, literacy and language* vol.36, no.2, pp 64-68.

Flecknoe, M. (2002) How Can ICT Help us to Improve Education? *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* vol.39, no.4, pp 271-279.

Fletcher, D.C. (2001) Second graders decide when to use electronic editing tools. *Information Technology in Childhood Education Annual* pp 155-74.

Flutter, J. (2000) Words Matter: thinking and talking about Writing in the Classroom. *NFER TopicOnline*

Issue 23.

Fones, D. (2001) Blocking them in to free them to act: using writing frames to shape boys' responses to literature in the secondary school. *English in Education* vol.35, no.3, pp 21-31.

Francis, B. (1999) Lads, Lasses and (New) Labour: 14-16-Year Old Students' Responses to the 'Laddish Behaviour and Boys' Underachievement 'Debate'. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* vol.20, no.3, pp 355-371.

Galton, M, Hargreaves L, Comber, C, Wall, D. and Pell, T. (1999a) *Inside the Primary Classroom - 20 years on.* London: Routledge

Galton, M, Hargreaves, L, Comber, C, Wall, D. and Pell, T. (1999b) Changes in patterns of teacher interaction in primary classrooms: 1976-96. *British Educational Research Journal* vol.25, no.1, pp23-37.

Gee, J. P. (2000) The new literacy studies: From 'socially situated' to the work of the social in Barton,D, Hamilton, M. and Ivanic, R. (Eds.) *Situated literacies: reading and writing in context*. London: Routledge

Geekie, P, Cambourne, B. and Fitzsimmons, P. (1999) *Understanding Literacy Development.* Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Gillborn, D. and Youdell, D. (1999) Rationing education, policy, practice, reform and equity. Buckingham : Open University Press

Gorard, S. et al. (1999) Reappraising the Apparent Underachievement of Boys at School. *Gender and Education* vol.11, no.4, pp 441.

Grainger,T, Goouch, K, and Lambirth, A. (2003) Playing the Game called writing: Children’s Views and Voices. *English in Education* vol.37, no.2, pp 4-15.

Green, S and Sutton, P. (2003) What do children think as they plan their writing? *Reading* vol.37, no.1, pp 32-38.

Guterman, E. (2002) Toward dynamic assessment of reading: applying metacognitive awareness guidance to reading assessment tasks. *Journal of Research in Reading* vol.25, no.3, pp 283-298.

Guthrie, J. and Wigfield, A. (2000) Engagement and Motivation in the Classroom in Kamil, M, Mosenthal, P.B, Pearson, P.D. and Barr, R. (Eds.) *Handbook of Reading Research.* Mahwah, N. J: Ablex. vol.3, pp 403-422.

Guthrie, J. T. and Davis, M. H. (2003) Motivating Struggling Readers in Middle School through an Engagement Model of Classroom Practice. *Reading and Writing Quarterly: Overcoming Learning Difficulties* vol.19, no.1, pp 59-85.

Hall, C. and Coles, M. (1999) *Children’s Reading Choices.* London: Routledge.

Hall, K. and Myers, J. (1998) That's just the way I am: metacognition, personal intelligence and reading. *Reading* vol.32, no.2, pp 8-13.

Hall, L. (2000) Children’s Reading Choices. *Use of English* vol.51, no.2, pp 141.

Hall, K, Myers, J. and Bowman, H. (1999) Tasks, texts and contexts: a study of reading and metacognition in English and Irish primary classrooms. Educational Studies vol.25, no.3, pp311-325.

Haworth, A. (1999) Bakhtin in the Classroom: What constitutes a dialogic text? Some lessons from small group interaction. *Language and Education vol.13, no.*2, pp 99-117.

Hayes, J. R. and Flower, L.S. (1980) Identifying the Organisation of Writing Processes in Gregg, L. W. and Steinberg, E. R. *Cognitive Processes in Writing.* Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hibbing, A. N., and Rankin-Erickson, J. L. (2003) A picture is worth a thousand words: Using visual images to improve comprehension for middle school struggling readers. *The Reading Teacher* vol.56, no.8, pp 758-770.

Hoskyn, M. and Swanson, H. L. (2003) The relationship between working memory and writing in younger and older adults. *Reading and Writing* vol.16, no.8, pp 759-784.

Hunt, P (2000) Futures for Children’s Literature: Evolution or Radical Break? *Cambridge Journal of Education* vol.30, no.1, pp 111-119.

Hunter-Carsch, M, and Cortazzi, M. (2000) Multilingualism and literacy difficulties: bridging home and school. *Reading* vol.34, no.1, pp 39-45.

Hutchinson, J. M. (2003) The developmental progression of comprehension-related skills in children learning EAL. *Journal of Research in Reading* vol.26, no.1, pp 19-32.

Hutchinson, D. (2004) A Critical Evaluation of ‘Raising Boys’ Attainment’. *Educational Psychology in Practice* vol.20, no.1, pp 3-15.

Jackson, C. (1999) Underachieving’ Boys? Some Points for Consideration. *Curriculum* vol.20, no.2, pp 80-85.

Johnson, D.D. (2000) Just the Right Word: Vocabulary and Writing in Idrisano, R. and Squire, J. R. (Eds) *Perspectives on Writing: Research, Theory and Practice.* Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Jones, I. (2002) Social relationships, peer collaboration and children’s oral language. *Educational Psychology* vol.22, no.1, pp 63-73.

Jones, S. and Myhill, D. (2004) Troublesome Boys and Compliant Girls. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* vol.25, no.5, pp 557-571.

Juniper, L. and Dias, K. (2002) Phono-Graphix - who needs additional literacy support? An outline of research in Bristol schools. *Support For Learning* vol.17, no.1, pp 34-38.

Kellogg, R.T. (1999) Components of Working Memory in text production in Torrance, M. and Jeffery, G. *Studies in Writing*: *The Cognitive demands of writing: processing capacity and working memory effects in text production*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. vol.3, pp 43-61.

Kerawalla, L. and Crook, C. (2002) Children's Computer Use at Home and at School: Context and Continuity. *British Educational Research Journal* vol.28, no.6, pp 751-771.

Kirschner, P.A. (2002) Cognitive Load Theory: implications of cognitive load theory on the design of learning. *Learning and Instruction* vol.12, no.1, pp 1-10.

Kramer-Dahl, A. (2001) Importing critical literacy pedagogy: does it have to fail? *Language and Education* vol.15, no.1, pp 14-32.

Kress, G. (1994) *Learning to Write.* London: Routledge.

Kress, G. (2000) A curriculum for the future. *Cambridge Journal of Education* vol.30, no.1, pp 133-145.

Kress, G. and Kenner C. (2003) The multisemiotic resources of biliterate children. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* vol.3, no.2, pp 179-202.

Kutnick, P, Blatchford, P. and Baines, E. (2002) Pupil groupings in primary school classrooms: sites for learning and social pedagogy. *British Educational Research Journal* vol.28, no.2, pp 187-206.

Labbo, L. D. and Reinking, D. (2003) Computers and Early Literacy Education in Hall, N, Larson, J. and Marsh, J. (Eds) *Handbook of Early Childhood Literacy.* London: Sage. pp 338-354.

Labbo, L.D. and Kuhn, M.R. (1998) Electronic symbol making: young children's computer related emerging concepts of literacy in Reinking, D, McKenna, M.C, Labbo, L.D. and Kieffer, R.D. (Eds) *Handbook of Literacy and Technology: Transformations in a post-typographical world.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. pp 79-92.

Lacasa, P, Martin del Campo, B. and Reina, A. (2001) Talking and writing: how do children develop shared meanings in the school setting? in Tolchinsky Landsmann, L. *Developmental aspects in learning to write*. (Studies in writing vol. 8) Dordrecht [Netherlands]; Boston : Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lankshear, C. (1997) *Changing Literacies.* Buckingham: Open University Press

Lankshear, C. and Knobel, M. (2003) *New literacies: changing knowledge and classroom learning*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Latham, D. (2002) *How Children Learn to Write: Supporting and developing children's writing in schools.* London: Paul Chapman

Lavelle, E. and Guarino, A.J. (2003). A Multidimensional Approach to Understanding College Writing Processes. *Educational Psychology* vol.23, no.3, pp 295-305.

Lewin, C. (2000) Exploring the effects of talking book software in UK primary classrooms. *Journal of Research in Reading* vol.23, no.2, pp 149-157.

Lloyd, C. M. and Watts, M. (2004) The use of innovative ICT in the active pursuit of literacy. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* vol.20, no1, pp 50-58.

Love, K. and Hamston, J. (2003) Teenage Boys' Leisure Reading Dispositions: Juggling Male Youth Culture and Family Cultural Capital. *Educational Review* vol.55, no.2, pp 163-177.

Lyle, S. (1996) Making meaning: the voices of children talking about a dramatised story. *Educational Studies* vol.22, no.1, pp 83-97.

Makin,L. (2003) Creating positive literacy learning environments in early childhood in Hall, N, Larson, J. and Marsh, J (Eds) *Handbook of Early Childhood Literacy.* London: Sage

Malloch, B. (2002) Scaffolding student talk: One teacher's role in literature discussion groups. *Reading Research Quarterly* vol.37, no.1, pp 94-111.

Many, J. E. (2002) An exhibition and analysis of verbal tapestries: Understanding how scaffolding is woven into the fabric of instructional conversations. *Reading Research Quarterly* vol.37, no.4, pp 376-407.

Marsh, J. (2003) One Way Traffic? Connections Between Literacy Practices at Home and in the Nursery. *British Educational Research Journal* vol.29, no.3, pp 370-382.

Marshall, J. D, Smagorinsky, P. and Smith, M. W. (1995). *The language of Interpretation: Patterns of discourse in discussions of literature.* (NCTE Research Rep. no.27). Urbana,IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Martino, W. (1999) 'Cool Boys', 'Party Animals', 'Squids' and 'Poofters': interrogating the dynamics and politics of adolescent masculinities in school. *British Journal of the Sociology of Education* vol.20, no.2, pp 239-264.

Matters, G. et al. (1999) Can we Tell the Difference and Does it Matter? Differences in Achievement Between Girls and Boys in Australian Senior Secondary Education. *Curriculum Journal* vol.10, no.2, pp 283-302.

Matthews, M. and Kesner, J. (2003) Children learning with peers: the confluence of peer status and literacy competence within small group literacy events. *Reading Research Quarterly* vol.38, no.2, pp 208-235.

Maynard, T. and Lowe, K. (1999) Boys and Writing in the Primary school: whose problem is it anyway? *Education 3-13* vol.27, no.2, pp 4-9.

McGuinn, N. (2000) Electronic Communication and Under-achieving Boys: Some Issues. *English in Education* vol.34, no.1, pp 50.

Menchik, D. (2004) Placing Cybereducation in the UK Classroom. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* vol.25, no.2, pp 193-213.

Mercer, N. (2003) Talk about Texts at the Computer: Using ICT to Develop Children's Oral and Literate Abilities. *Reading*, vol.37, no.2, pp 81.

Mercer, N, Fernandez, M, Dawes, L, Wegerif, R. and Sams, C. (2003) Talk about Texts at the Computer: Using ICT to Develop Children's Oral and Literate Abilities. *Reading*, vol.37, no.2, pp 81-89.

Mercer, N, Dawes, L, and Wegerif, R. (1999) From social interaction to individual reasoning: an empirical investigation of a possible socio-cultural model of cognitive development. *Learning and Instruction* vol.9, no.6, pp 493-516.

Merchant, G. (2003) Email me your thoughts: digital communication and narrative writing. *Reading, Literacy and Language* vol.38, no.3, pp 104-110.

Millard, E. and Marsh, J. (2001) Sending Minnie the Minx Home: Comics and Reading Choices. *Cambridge Journal of Education* vol.31, no.1, pp 25-38.

Moll, L, Saez, R, and Dworin, J. (2001) Exploring biliteracy: Two case examples of writing as a social practice. *The Elementary School Journal* vol.101, no.4, pp 435-449.

Moss, G. and Erben, M. (2000). Introduction to Linguistics and Education: Special issue on knowledge, identity, and pedagogy – themes from the work of Basil Bernstein. *Linguistics and Education* vol.11, no.1, pp 1-5.

Moyles, J, Hargreaves, L. and Merry, R. (2001) *The Development of Primary Teachers' Understanding and Use of Interactive Teaching. End of award report (ROOO 238200). Swindon:* Economic and Social Research Council.

Mroz, M, Hardman, F. and Smith, F. (2000) The Discourse of the Literacy Hour. *Cambridge Journal of Education* vol.30, no.3, pp 379-390.

Mulholland, T. et al. (2004) Do Single-gender Classrooms in Coeducational Settings Address Boys' Underachievement? An Australian Study *Educational Studies* vol.30, no.1, pp 19.

Mullis, I.V.S, Martin, M.O, Gonzalez, E.J, and Kennedy, A.M. (2003), *PIRLS 2001 International Report: IEA's Study of Reading Literacy Achievement in Primary Schools*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College.

Mumtaz, M. and Hammond, M. (2002) The word-processor revisited: observations on the use of the word processor to develop literacy at KS2. *British Journal of Educational Technology* vol.33, no.3, pp 345-347.

Mumtaz,S. and Humphreys, G.W. (2002) The effect of Urdu vocabulary size on the acquisition of single word reading in English. *Educational Psychology* vol.22, no.2, pp 165-190.

Murphy, P. and Ivinson, G. (2003) Boys don't write romance: the construction of knowledge and social gender identities in English classrooms. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society* vol.11, no.1, pp 89-111.

Myhill, D.A. (2002) Bad boys and good girls? Patterns of interaction and response in whole class teaching. *British Educational Research Journal* vol.*28*, no.3, pp 339-352.

Myhill, D.A . (2001) *Writing; Crafting and Creating* English in Education. 35 (3) 13-20

National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges. (2003) *The neglected "R": The need for a writing revolution* (no. 997548). New York: College Board.

New London Group (1996) A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review* vol.*66,* no.1, pp 60-92.

New London Group (2000) A pedagogy of multiliteracies in Cope, B. and Kalantzis, M. (Eds.) *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures.* London: Routledge. pp. 9-37

Nichols, S. (2002) Parents' construction of their children as gendered, literate subjects: a critical discourse analysis. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* vol.2, no.2, pp 123-144.

Nixon, J. and Topping, K. (2001) Emergent Writing: the Impact of Structured Peer Interaction. *Educational Psychology* vol.21, no.1, pp 41-58.

Nystrand, M. (1997) *Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English classroom.* New York:Teachers College Press.

Oshima, J, Scardamalia, M. and Bereiter, C. (1996) Collaborative learning processes associated with high and low conceptual progress. *Instructional Science* vol.24, no.2, pp 125-155.

Pajares, F. and Valiante, G. (1999). Grade level and gender differences in the writing self-beliefs of middle school students._*Contemporary Psychology* vol.24, pp 390-405.

Paterson, W.A, Henry, J.J, O'Quin, K, Ceprano, M.A. and Blue, E.V. (2003) Investigating the effectiveness of an integrated learning system on early emergent readers. *Reading Research Quarterly* vol.38, no.2, pp 172-207.

Peverly S. T, Brobst, K. E. and Morris, K. S. (2002) The contribution of reading comprehension ability and meta-cognitive control to the development of studying in adolescence. *Journal of Research in Reading* vol.25, no.2, pp 203-216.

Phakiti, A. (2003) A closer look at the relationship of cognitive and metacognitive strategy use to EFL reading achievement test performance. *Language Testing* vol.20, no.1, pp 26-56.

Platten, J. (1999) Raising Boy's Achievement. *Curriculum* vol.20, no.1, pp 2.

Pressley, M. (1998) *Reading Instruction that Works: the case for balanced teaching.* New York: Gulliford Press.

Pritchard, A. and Cartwright, V. (2004) Transforming what they read: helping eleven-year-olds engage with Internet information. *Literacy* vol.38, no.1, pp. 26-31.

Quicke, J. and Winter, C. (1994) Teaching the Language of Learning: towards a metacognitive approach to pupil empowerment. *British Educational Research Journal* vol.20, no.4, pp 429-445.

Reid, M. (2003) Writing film: Making inferences when viewing and reading *Reading, Literacy and Language* vol.38, no.3, pp 111-115.

Rijlaarsdam, G. and Braaksma, M. (2004) *Students as researchers: defining text quality criteria*. Paper presented at the European Association for Learning and Instruction Writing conference, Geneva.

Saada-Robert, M. (1999) Effective means for learning to manage cognitive load in second grade school writing: a case study. *Learning and Instruction* vol.9, no.2, pp 189-208.

Savage, R. (2001) A re-evaluation of the evidence for orthographic analogies: a reply to Goswami (1999). *Journal of Research in Reading* vol.24, no.1, pp 1-18.

Savage, R, Carless, S. and Stuart,M. (2004) The effects of rime- and phoneme-based teaching delivered by Learning Support Assistants. *Journal of Research in Reading* vol.26, no.3, pp 211-233.

Scheerens, J. (1992) *Effective Schooling: Research, Theory and Practice.* London: Cassell.

Selwyn, N. (1999) Differences in Educational Computer Use: the Influence of Subject Cultures. *The Curriculum Journal* vol.10, no.1, pp 29-48.

Selwyn, N. (2002) Learning to Love the Micro: the Discursive Construction of 'Educational' Computing in the UK, 1979-1989. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* vol.23, no.3, pp 427-443.

Sharples, M. (1999) *How We Write: Writing as Creative Design.* London: Routledge

Skidmore, D. (2003). From Pedagogical Dialogue to Dialogic Pedagogy*. Language and Education* vol.14, no.4, pp 283-296.

Smagorinsky, P. (2001) If meaning is constructed, what is it made from? Toward a cultural theory of reading. *Review of Educational Research* vol.71, pp 133-169.

Smith, C. (2001) Click and turn the page: an exploration of multiple storybook literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly* vol.36, no.2, pp 153-83.

Smith, E. (2003a) Failing Boys and Moral Panics: Perspectives of the Underachievement Debate. *British Journal of Educational Studies* vol.51, no.3, pp 282-295.

Smith, E. (2003b) Understanding Underachievement: an Investigation into the Differential Attainment of Secondary School Pupils. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* vol.24, no.5, pp 575-586.

Snyder, I, Angus, L. and Sutherland-Smith, W. (2002) Building equitable literate futures: home and school computer mediated literacy practices and disadvantage. *Cambridge Journal of Education* vol.32, no.3, pp 367-383.

Spenser, L.H. and Hanley, J.R. (2004) Learning a transparent orthography at five years old: reading development of children during their first year of formal reading instruction in Wales. *Journal of Research in reading* vol.27, no.1, pp 1-14.

Stephens, . (2000) A critical discussion of the "new literacy studies" *British Journal of Educational Studies* vol.48, no.1, pp 10-23.

Street, B. (1984) *Literacy in Theory and Practice.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Street, B. V. (2003) What's 'new' in New Literacy Studies? Critical approaches to literacy in theory and practice. *Current Issues in Comparative Education* vol.*5, no.*2, pp 1-14.

Suffolk County Council (2002) *Literacy for Minority Ethnic and Traveller pupils: LEA advice and guidance.* (Suffolk: Suffolk County Council)

Sukhnandan L, Lee, B. and Kelleher, S. (2000) *An Investigation into Gender Differences in Achievement:* Phase 2: school and classroom strategies. NFER: Slough

Sutherland-Smith, W, Snyder, I. and Angus, L. (2003) The Digital Divide: differences in computer use between home and school in low socio-economic households. *L1-Educational Studies in Language and Literature* vol.3, no.1, pp 5-19.

Teese, R. (2002) Academic Success and Social Power. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press

Thomas, K, Horne, J. and Singleton, C. (2000) Computer-based cognitive assessment and the development of reading. *Journal of Research in Reading* vol.23, no.2, pp 158-180.

Torgerson, C.J. and Elbourne, D. (2002) A systematic review and meta-analysis of the effectiveness of information and communication technology (ICT) on the teaching of spelling. *Journal of Research in Reading* vol.25, no.2, pp 234-255.

Trushell, J, Maitland, A. and Burrell, C. (2003) Pupils' recall of an interactive storybook on CD-ROM. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* vol.19, no.1, pp 80-89.

Underwood, J. (2000) A comparison of two types of computer support for reading development. *Journal of Research in Reading* vol.23, no.2, pp 136–148.

Valcke, M. (2002) Cognitive Load: updating the theory? *Learning and Instruction* vol.12, no.1, pp 147-154.

Van den Bergh, H. and Rijlaarsdam, G. (2001) Changes in Cognitive Activities during the Writing Process and Relationships with Text Quality. *Educational Psychology* vol.21, no.4, pp373-385.

Ward, S (2000) Why do Boys Under-achieve? *New Era in Education* vol.81, no.2, pp 38.

Warrington, M, Younger, M. and McLellan, R. (2003) Under-achieving Boys in English Primary Schools? *The Curriculum Journal* vol.14, no.2, pp 139-156.

Watts, M. and Lloyd, C. M. (2004) The use of innovative ICT in the active pursuit of literacy. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning* vol.20, no.1, pp 50-58.

Wegerif, R, Mercer, N. and Dawes, L. (1999) From social interaction to individual reasoning: an empirical investigation of a possible socio-cultural model of cognitive development. *Learning and Instruction* vol.9, no.6, pp 493-516.

Wells, G. (1987) *The Meaning Makers.* Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton.

Whitehead, D. (2002) "The story means more to me now": teaching thinking through Guided Reading. *Reading* vol.36, no.1, pp 33-37.

Whitelaw, S. Milosevic, L. and Daniels, S. (2000). Gender, Behaviour and Achievement: a preliminary study of pupil perception and attitudes. *Gender and Education* vol.12, no.1, pp 87-113.

Wilkinson, K. (2003) Children's Favourite Books. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy* vol.3, issue 3, pp 275.

Williams, M. (2000) The part that metacognition can play in raising standards in English at key stage 2. *Reading* vol.34, no.1, pp 3-8.

Williams, C, Wright, B, Callaghan, G. and Coughlan, B. (2002) Do children with autism learn to read more readily by computer assisted instruction or traditional book methods? A pilot study. *Autism* vol.6, no.1, pp 71-93.

Wood, E. (2001) The Roots and Routes of Underachievement. *Primary English Magazine* vol.*6,* no.3, pp 7-10.

Woodruff, E. and Brett, C. (1999) Collaborative Knowledge Building: Preservice Teachers and Elementary Students Talking to Learn. *Language and Education* vol.13, no.4, pp 280-302.

Wyse, D. (2000) Phonics - the whole story? A critical review of empirical evidence. *Educational Studies* vol.26, no.3, pp 355-364.

Yost, N. (2000) Electronic expressions: using email to support emergent writers. *Computers in the schools* vol.16, no.1, pp 17-28.

Younger, M. and Warrington, M. (2002) Single-sex Teaching in a Co-Educational Comprehensive School in England: an evaluation based upon students' performance and classroom interactions. *British Educational Research Journal* vol.28, no.3, pp353-373.

Younger, M, Warrington, M. and McLellan, R. (2002) The 'Problem' of 'Under-achieving Boys': Some Responses from English Secondary Schools. *School Leadership and Management* vol.22, no.4, pp 389-405.

Younger, M, Warrington, M. and Williams, J. (1999) The gender gap and classroom interactions: reality and rhetoric? *British Journal of Sociology of Education* vol.20, no. 3, pp 325-341.

A research-into-practice series produced by a partnership between The Literacy and Numeracy Secretariat and the Ontario Association of Deans of Education. How can teachers promote strong literacy development among English language learners? Research Tells Us. â€¢ Active engagement with literacy is fundamental to student success in school. â€¢ The key to literacy engagement for English language learners is connecting what they know in their first language to English. â€¢ English language learners require at least five years to catch up to English-speaking students in the acquisition of academic langu A literature review is a survey of scholarly knowledge on a topic. It is used to identify trends, debates, and gaps in the research.Â Writing a literature review involves finding relevant publications (such as books and journal articles), critically analyzing them, and explaining what you found. There are five key stepsÂ For example, in scientific research, you would normally focus on recent literature; in the humanities, you're more likely to include important older works. But in general, if a source is still considered accurate and contains relevant knowledge about your topic, you can include it in your literature review as long as you have a clear reason for doing so. Recent research has shown that when school and early childhood educational leaders develop their specific knowledge about literacy teaching and learning, their educators and teachers feel supported and engaged in raising achievement in literacy. The role of professional learning in literacy has taken â€˜centre stageâ€™ in leadersâ€™ planning across the whole school setting.Â â€¢ understand the manageable steps that teachers can take in the teaching of language and literacy in each domain of practice. â€¢ understand the learning continuum for literacy as it relates to the Victorian Curriculum, to locate a studentâ€™s progress and a teacherâ€™s next steps. It is designed to provide access to evidence-informed understandings about effective language and literacy teaching and learning through Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elemen- tary Grades: A Practice Guide, published in 2007, was the very first IES practice guide developed.1 This earlier guide focused solely on research conducted up to 2005. As many readers will recall, the major emphasis in education at that time was teaching beginning reading according to evidence-based prac-tice, using a variety of interventions to help students who were likely to struggle.Â The guide emphasized types of screening tools that could be used with English learners and the principles that underlie effective liter-acy interventions for this population, especially in the primary grades. View Literacy Practices Research Papers on Academia.edu for free.Â Recent papers in Literacy Practices. Papers. People. An Investigation into How Parental Literacy Experiences are Reflected in Literacy Tendencies and Experiences of Preservice Teachers. This study was undertaken to examine how parental literacy experiences were reflected in the literacy tendencies and experiences of preservice teachers. It is known that in order to offer an effective teacher education, it is necessary to more. This study was undertaken to examine how parental literacy experiences were reflected in the literacy tendencies and experiences of preservice teachers.