2018 Sam Power Oration:
Looking back and moving forward: Building on Sam (Sandra) Power's legacy

Robyn Henderson | University of Southern Queensland

Abstract
This article is the transcript of the 2018 Sam Power Oration, presented by Robyn Henderson in Toowoomba, Queensland, on 18 October, 2018. This biennial event is organised by the Australian College of Educators (ACE) in memory of Sandra (Sam) Power, who was a teacher and researcher, as well as an active member of ACE, the Australian Literacy Educators' Association (ALEA) and the English Teachers Association of Queensland (ETAQ). Selected research experiences are used to illustrate the importance of learning in teaching and research, thus demonstrating Sam's legacy. References have been included in this written version.

Looking back

It is with great honour that I present the Sam Power Oration for 2018. I met Sam in the 1990s through our common interests in literacies and English teaching. Townsville, where Sam lived, was the hub for professional learning sessions, conferences and the like in North Queensland. Sam lived there, but I used to visit there quite often. I did eventually relocate to Townsville at the beginning of 2000, but by then Sam had moved here to Toowoomba. However, we continued to connect on a regular basis. We were both doing postgraduate study. I was a full-time PhD student, while Sam was enrolled in a research masters degree, which she then articulated into PhD study. Her situation was a bit different from mine, as she was a part-time student, juggling the many demands of, among other things, being a teacher, a mother and an active participant in several teacher professional associations – ACE, who has organised this event, ETAQ and ALEA.

At that time, Sam and I were the only two research students of the remarkable Pam Gilbert, a professor of education at James Cook University. I imagine that many of you in the audience would have known or know of Pam, especially those of you from ETAQ. When I think back to those days, I am reminded of not only the privilege to learn with such a master, but the power – no pun intended – of engaging in deep and critical thinking, challenging ourselves to think outside the square, and learning to use theory for making sense of the world of literacies. Pam demanded excellence and Sam and I experienced her quick and witty challenges to our thinking.

Sam's life and mine crossed paths many times: at the university coffee shop when she was visiting Townsville, at AATE/ALEA conferences, including the one in Hobart in 2001, and in late 2002 at Pam Gilbert's funeral. From then on, study seemed a tough road. Pam's passing left a hole in our study lives, plus Sam by then had her own medical problems to contend with. While such memories bring tears to my eyes, I think it is important that we focus on Sam's legacy.

Sam had a passion for critical literacy and literacy learning for boys. She taught for seven years at Ignatius Park College in Townsville, so literacy for boys was part of her daily work as well as her study. Sam's focus on what we would now probably put under a diversity

umbrella allows me to segue from Sam's story of teaching and research to my own. I hope that doesn't sound too self-indulgent, but I want to move forward from the days when I knew Sam and I am going to use some of my research as a way of talking about part of my learning about student diversity and teaching. I will, at the end, return to Sam's legacy.

Moving forward

Since Sam's passing in 2004, there have been huge changes in literacy education, as you know. Of course, we now have an Australian Curriculum that promotes literacy learning in English as well as a general capability across all learning areas. And then there's the obsession with standards, accountability and productivity that seems to permeate many, if not all, things educational. I will return to these later.

In talking about my research, I am focusing only on research about student mobility and what this means for teaching literacies. The story starts with my doctoral research, which seems appropriate in light of knowing Sam at that time, but it has been a topic I keep coming back to. My story will probably sound coherent, but that is because I have pulled out some particular events from what could have sounded like a very messy story. I have conceptualised this story as having five steps.

A first step: Beginning a research journey

As a school teacher, I had taught for a long time in a rural high school in North Queensland, where itinerant farm workers' children enrolled in about May or June each year. Their parents came to town for the annual winter harvesting season and all of the local schools bulged with increased enrolments when these families arrived. When I moved into an advisory job and worked with all Years 1 to 3 teachers in more than 30 primary schools, I started to see the extent of student mobility across a much larger geographical area.

Student mobility is probably more prevalent now, but at that time it was an issue for schools in particular locations. Several of the rural schools I visited as part of my role were inundated with the enrolment of farm workers' children during winter. In contrast, the schools in the Whitsundays welcomed the children of sea-changers, entrepreneurs and hospitality workers – and they often said goodbye to them when families moved on to somewhere else. Another school was located near a women's shelter, where women and children were accommodated temporarily. As a result, that school's enrolments changed on an almost daily basis. And, as part of my role, I used to visit Townsville, which has a large army presence, another example of an occupationally-mobile population.

Many of these schools were concerned about the negative effects of student mobility, particularly within the staffing and resource management rules that were predicated on a stable, non-mobile student population. The eighth day of the school year census, for example, was a point of contention for schools that saw an increase in enrolment numbers in the middle of the year. Issues of student mobility were part of everyday life for some schools, but there was considerable concern about the low literacies of students who travelled and how schools might best cater for those students.

The literacy learning of mobile students provided a focus for my doctoral research (Henderson, 2005). I decided to investigate the explanations that were given – the stories that were told – to explain the literacy underachievement of itinerant farm workers' children. I

knew that schools struggled with finding ways to cater well for mobile students, but I was surprised at the tenacity of the explanations or stories that were told. Stories of blame were dominant amongst teachers in the school where I collected data and there was much to learn about student diversity. In brief, my research (Henderson, 2005) found that:

- Being itinerant was not the same for all itinerant families.
- The families were diverse in many ways. Many families were of Turkish, Tongan, Samoan or Maori heritage and they spoke languages other than English at home. Cultural and linguistic diversity was evident.
- The teachers' stories about the literacy learning of itinerant children were diverse.
- However, there were dominant stories. In particular, many teachers talked about how understandable it was that itinerant farm workers' children did not do well in literacy learning, because of the detrimental nature of that lifestyle. Often parents were blamed for making their children move from school to school.
- Some of these stories linked to stories circulating in the community about how itinerant farm workers were untrustworthy, bad citizens and inadequate parents.
- However, teachers' talk about students who were 'regulars' – that is, the students who returned to the school year after year – was generally more positive. As the principal pointed out, 'we look forward to seeing them and they look forward to seeing us' (Henderson, 2005, p. 218). Nevertheless, literacy underachievement was still explained by reference to the families' itinerant lifestyles.

Overall, it was the diversity in many forms that intrigued me. The families were diverse; the students were diverse; their life experiences were diverse; and there were diverse explanations, especially when teachers' explanations of literacy underachievement – and the reasons for that – contrasted with the families' versions of the same events. This highlighted the challenges for teachers in understanding the lives of itinerant families and their children who arrive in class, stay for a while, then leave again.

Sometimes there were contrasting stories amongst teachers. Some stories were all about negatives. For example, when asked about a particular student's literacy learning, a teacher said:

> Well he mightn't be exposed to much written material at home, might spend a bit of time in front of the box instead of reading. His parents mightn't supply him with any reading books. His only reading might be at school, so that would slow him down. It might mean that his parents aren't helping him choose books in English. If they're not shooting down to the library to get books themselves, because there's probably not many Turkish books in the library here. …

> Because they're itinerant, I imagine what they bring is what they can fit in the car. So you don't bring your library ... perhaps there's limited books at home, maybe two or three books period, the Turkish bible or whatever, so that could be it. … And then, you know, like so many kids, I think he's into computer games and TV and stuff like that, not reading. (Henderson, 2007, p. 45)

But there were also some positive stories about itinerant children. This is a teacher talking about a student who had been in her class, but the season had finished and the family had left

town:

> [He] was a delightful boy. I really miss him. He was top of the Grade 4s. His English was very good. A couple of little idiomatic things that he said incorrectly, but his reading, oral reading was excellent; comprehension was excellent. He took a sort of outstanding part in the class to answer questions. …
>
> Written work – I sent one of his books up to the office so he could get a sticker for it, because it was so beautifully done. … And often he used to say on the weekend, can I do some extra work and is it all right if, instead of writing four stanzas from the poem, can I write the whole lot? And he'd bring it in on Monday with everything done and a special printed heading as well. I didn't see any problems with him at all. (Henderson, 2007, p. 46)

Perhaps you have guessed, or perhaps you will be surprised, but both teachers were talking about the same student. Following enrolment at the school, Mustafa was placed into one Year 4 class. However, as student numbers increased and the school was given additional teaching staff, the classes were reorganised and Mustafa ended up in another teacher's class. This is why two teachers were able to talk about his literacy learning.

Such contrasting stories made me wonder: How could teachers have such different views? I was convinced that this was not a case of one teacher being right and one teacher being wrong; that is, a case of good versus bad teacher. Rather, there seemed to be something about teachers' take-up of particular stories or discourses. What was happening that made stories that regarded the families and children as deficit and deficient seem normal to some teachers? And why did some teachers focus on students' strengths? These questions warranted further investigation

It was through looking historically at approaches to literacy teaching that helped me make sense of the teachers' stories. I want to talk briefly about that. In the 1990s, a number of researchers tried to map approaches to Australian literacy education over time (e.g., Freebody & Gilbert, 1999; Freebody, Ludwig, & Gunn, 1995; Luke & Freebody, 1997) and, as you would probably imagine, there were some variations in what they thought. However, the work of Luke and Freebody (1997) was useful for my purposes.

Basically, if we look at approaches to teaching literacy since the 1950s and 1960s, we can conceptualise three clusters of approaches. You will notice that I have said that these are clusters, as each cluster comprises a range of approaches.

1. If we start with the 1950s and 1960s, the time when I was at school, literacy was pretty much understood as a set of skills that needed to be learnt in order to become literate. Traditional skills-based approaches informed the way we were taught at school. We learnt a lot about the parts of language and literacy, such as spelling and grammar. Some of you might remember doing parsing and analysis and the other drills and skills that were associated with knowing English. I certainly do.

2. However, views about literacy started to change and there was a growing trend which identified the importance of making meaning, of understanding the whole of language rather than just the parts. This resulted in a second cluster that is often referred to as a

progressivist child-centred cluster of approaches. These approaches were evident in the work of, among others, Graves (1981), Smith (1983) and Goodman (1986).

However, these approaches did not replace traditional skills-based approaches. Rather, both groups of approaches co-existed.

3. Then, more recently – around the 1990s – we saw a shift away from the previous psychological approaches towards more sociological understandings which identified literacy as a social practice. These cultural-critical approaches were evident in the work of Gee (1996), Luke (1991) and Barton and Hamilton (1998), to name a few. This shift in thinking about literacy and how to teach it recognises that there are multiple literacies and that different literacies operate in different contexts.

But, again, this new family of approaches did not replace the previous two. All three co-exist. Indeed, teachers tend to be eclectic in their approaches to literacy teaching, often drawing on all three clusters (Henderson, 2002: Luke & Freebody, 1997).

So what does this have to do with the research I was describing? I think that the prevalence of deficit stories was highlighting a traditional approach to dealing with low literacy performances. Historically, literacy remediation has invoked a traditional skills-based approach (Alloway & Gilbert, 1998; Henderson, 2002). If students are thought to have individual deficits, then it makes sense to build the skills that the students do not have. It also becomes normal to talk about the children as individually deficient – an intellectual or cognitive deficit perhaps – or as having a social deficit, whereby 'family background is the root of failure' (Alloway & Gilbert, 1998, p. 254). When teachers talk about the individual literacy skills that students have or do not have, they tap into the traditional skills-based approach to literacy and deficit stories become 'normal'.

Yet my research showed that there were stories other than deficit stories, like the one I read about Mustafa. These were the stories that gave me hope that there were other ways of thinking about itinerant farm workers' children; that is, ways that moved beyond the deficit stories and made visible some of the strengths that itinerant children brought with them. These stories seemed to tap into a cultural-critical conceptualisation of literacy teaching and highlighted a much broader range of literacies, thereby recognising the complexities of literacy education.

A second step
A few years later, study leave offered me the opportunity to do some investigating in countries where particular groups of mobile (or itinerant) students were visible and recognised. In the Australian context, the itinerant farm workers' children were often invisible to the education system, although the schools that they enrolled in would say that they were a very visible group when they arrived to enrol. In the school where I conducted my research, around 60 students arrived as the harvesting season began, so it was a major event for the school.

I travelled to Scotland, Ireland and the state of Illinois in the United States. In these locations, dedicated programs and teachers catered for the children of Scottish Travellers, Irish Travellers and migrant (or migratory) agricultural workers, originally from countries like Mexico and El Salvador and working in the USA. In these three countries, particular mobile

groups were recognised and educational funding was allocated to cater for them. Sometimes that funding was large. At that time in the USA, for example, funding for the Migrant Education Program was over 300 million dollars per year.

However, I quickly learnt that the programs that had been put in place were compensatory. They were special programs, designed only for the specific children who were categorised as belonging to those particular mobile groups. Although I learnt a lot, I was bothered by the way that compensatory programs helped to separate, or keep separate, mobile students from other students. Even though there was evidence that these programs were working well for the specific groups of students they targeted, I was not learning a lot about how schools here in Australia might cater for mobile students in regular classrooms.

A third step
At this point, I decided that I needed to return to classrooms where teachers were working with itinerant or mobile students. I set up a research project in another North Queensland school, not the same one where I had conducted my earlier research. This was a much smaller school and I was fortunate that I could spend extended time there, interviewing most of the staff and observing in many classrooms.

What became evident was that this school focused on building relationships with families who were new to the community – and this included mobile students, as well as students who had just moved once and were now enrolled in a new school. The teachers at this school put a lot of time into helping families develop a sense of belonging to the new community they had just joined. This included the principal and deputy principal, who spent a lot of time with newly arrived parents and new students. They were always at the gate to welcome families each morning and they gave families tours of the school and introduced them to staff. In classrooms, the teachers used a buddy system to ensure that the children could find their way around the school and quickly fit into the school's routines (Henderson, 2015).

At this school, considerable time and energy went into ensuring that the students fitted in socially. In fact, the school had developed such a reputation for doing this that it had become a school of choice in the local district. What I found interesting was that deficit discourses seemed to be absent in this school. Student mobility and changing enrolments were regarded as part of normal school business.

As an observer in classrooms within the school, I saw a lot of good teaching. However, I was never really sure how teachers actually catered for the students who had just arrived. When I asked teachers about what they did to cater for the academic development of mobile or new students, especially in relation to literacy learning, it was as though I was asking a very strange question.

What I learnt was that the teachers did not talk about pedagogy – certainly they did not use that term – and they seemed to find it difficult to articulate exactly how they catered for mobile and new students beyond the social strategies that I have already talked about. I guess there could be many explanations for why that might be the case. Perhaps they did not do anything to cater for the mobile and new students, but I did not believe that. Perhaps their actions and practices were intuitive. Perhaps what they did had become so automatic that they were no longer aware of how they were catering for mobile students. Or perhaps I was simply asking the wrong questions!

My persistence with learning about mobile students came from the fact that my initial research had identified an array of deficit discourses, which implied that making a difference was outside of teachers' control. Yet I was still struggling to find out what teachers thought was good teaching practice for mobile and new students. That does not mean, of course, that teachers do not know what they're doing. Teaching is complex work and teachers are making multiple pedagogical decisions 'on the run' in their classrooms (Edwards & Protheroe, 2003; see also Henderson, 2015). I was convinced that there was a lot of pedagogical thinking going on in teachers' heads (see Henderson, 2015, p. 45), but researchers and classroom observers cannot necessarily see this and teachers cannot necessarily describe that either. So, where to from here?

A fourth step: Combining theory with knowledge of classroom practice
I decided, then, that it was time for me to do some thinking about what might be possible pedagogically. This was a theoretical exercise. I drew on my knowledge of pedagogies to think about how to create teaching units that considered the teaching of mobile students within a class. I focused on how teachers could ensure that mobile students could access the curriculum on offer in their new school. I had started to think that there were some critical things that needed to happen.

I was also cognisant that teachers tend to be very skilled at contextualising the curriculum for their students, thus showing how the learning of the classroom is relevant to the community around the school. However, for mobile students who do not know the context and the community, because they have just arrived, this well used teacher practice may not be useful. In a similar way, the background knowledges and strengths that new students bring to the classroom are often invisible to teachers when students first arrive. When students are in the same school and the same class all year round, teachers are able to build detailed knowledge of what their students can do, where they struggle, and so on. When mobile or new students arrive, teachers have to build their knowledge quickly.

This suggests that what is good teaching practice for residentially-stable students – that is, those who do not change schools – might not work as well for mobile students. It seems, therefore, that in classroom planning teachers need to ensure that opportunities are available for students new in the class to build background knowledge relevant to the current curriculum, and to revisit that learning as and when they need to. It also seems that opportunities are needed for the teacher to observe, talk with, and collect a range of data about newly arrived students, in order to build knowledge and understandings about their strengths and interests.

Drawing on The New London Group's (2000) work about the pedagogy of multiliteracies and the work by Kalantzis, Cope and others (e.g., Kalantzis, Cope, & the Learning by Design Project Group, 2005; Kalantzis, Cope, Chan, & Dalley-Trim, 2016) who have trialled pedagogical approaches with teachers, I wrote some teaching units. These incorporated:

- opportunities for students to experience the known and the new (situated practice);
- opportunities to explore diverse perspectives (critical framing); and
- targeted teaching (overt instruction). (Henderson, 2008)

Perhaps you are thinking, well there's nothing out of the ordinary there. For me, the exercise, albeit a theoretical one, made me revisit the way teachers adapt and adjust their classroom practice throughout the day. Even though I had observed in classrooms and interviewed

teachers, I had not been able to ascertain pedagogical moves that teachers thought were necessary for mobile students, beyond building a social environment that would help mobile students make friends, navigate the physical environment of the school, and become familiar with school and classroom routines (Henderson, 2015). I was still hopeful that I could find some evidence.

A fifth step

As a result, I decided to conduct another research project. Again, I went to a school where student mobility was high, but this time the school was located in the south-east of Queensland. It also had a reputation for catering for student diversity. What I planned was a fine-grained analysis of teaching and I wanted to try a process called video-stimulated recall, where segments of teaching are video-recorded and then discussed later with the teacher (Powell, 2005). I thought this would be a fabulous way of bringing some of the thinking behind particular teacher decisions into the foreground. For example, the teacher and I could watch the video and I could ask the teacher questions about specific actions. For example: Why did you do decide to do that? What were you thinking when that happened? And so on. The video-recording would stimulate that discussion and the teacher's recall.

However, the teachers weren't so keen on the idea of video-recording. In fact, one of the teachers kept reminding me about that. She used to say: 'You know I always feel nervous when you're in my classroom?' (Henderson, 2015, p. 47). This was not the type of researcher-teacher relationship I was hoping to foster. My response was usually something like: 'Would you prefer that I didn't observe today?', to which the teacher replied: 'No. I'm getting used to you being here, but I'm certainly not ready to be videoed' (Henderson, 2015, p. 47).

In conducting the research over many months, I had plenty of opportunities to talk with the teachers and their contributions to the research were incredibly rich and insightful. This was no longer about me doing research in teachers' classrooms, but the teachers had taken ownership of the research, reflecting on their classroom practices, discussing what they had found and identifying a list of strategies. Perhaps the fear of being video-recorded was a major motivator, but I don't actually think so! Although, we never did get to do any video-recording.

Over the months, I was lucky enough to observe the arrival of many new students and to see what the teachers did on those occasions. That had helped me to begin a tentative list of strategies around academic work. After sharing my list with the teachers and finding that they were able to contribute further strategies to the list, one of the teachers came up with a clever way of reflecting 'on action', to use Schön's (1991) term, in her classroom (Henderson, 2015). This was a turning point.

While I was observing in her classroom, the teacher started to provide a private voice-over, just for me. After talking and interacting with the students in her class, she would come past where I was sitting and she would whisper something like:

> You might have noticed that I asked Troy (pseudonym of a new student) the third question, not the first. That meant that he got to hear two answers from other students before he had to answer in front of the class. (Henderson, 2015, p. 47)

In this way, she began to talk to me about her reasons behind particular actions. The teacher

had found a way of verbalising her pedagogical decisions as they happened (Henderson, 2015). On another occasion, she said:

> The sentence task that I asked Emily (pseudonym of another new student) to create on the whiteboard was easier than the ones I asked of Dylan and Kaiah (pseudonyms of students who were not new). I don't know yet what level Emily is capable of working at, so I wanted an easier task where she could experience success. (Henderson, 2015, p. 47)

By the end of the project, the teachers collectively had identified more than 40 strategies (Butt, Foley, Nolan, Stuhmcke, & Henderson, 2016). These clustered into four main purposes. The first three – creating a welcoming environment, establishing initial social support, and checking where new students' learning is at – supported the findings of my earlier research. However, the fourth – engaging students in literacy learning – had started to identify some of the specific strategies that the teachers used to address academic issues for mobile students. Getting to these had not been easy and it had taken a long time.

Moving towards a conclusion
At this point, though, you may very well be wondering what the 'so what' is. I could have told you about those strategies right at the beginning. My purpose, though, has been to highlight some of the invisible work that teachers do and the challenges of understanding the details of how teachers cater for student diversity. And, as I promised at the beginning, I want to return to Sam Power's legacy.

As you are all aware, we are relentlessly bombarded by the media and politicians with messages about the poor state of education and the poor quality of teachers. We are also bombarded with suggestions that teaching is simply a matter of getting the right program in place and we so often hear that mistaken, ongoing argument about what approach to the teaching of literacy is best. I am pretty sure that teachers know that all learners are different and that one way of teaching or one program is not necessarily going to work for every child. It is pretty important to have a repertoire of approaches to ensure that the learning of literacies is possible for all students. Almost 20 years ago, Allan Luke (1999) highlighted the need for teachers to 'jiggle, adjust, remediate, shape and build … classroom pedagogies to get quality, educationally, intellectually and socially valuable outcomes' (pp. 9–10). And the teachers I have talked about have been doing just that.

As I said earlier, teachers are busy making decisions 'on the run' as they teach their students. This is complex and often invisible work that draws on professional knowledge, including learning from a whole range of resources and from practical experience. And that's where Sam's legacy comes in. Sam was a thinking practitioner. She asked some hard questions about her teaching of literacies and she set out to problem-solve some answers.

Sam's literacies focus was boys; mine has been mobile students. We were both interested in student diversity and what that means for the learning of literacies. We came to understand that, although these groups tended to perform differently from other groups – girls and residentially-stable students – that there was a huge diversity within each group. It was not simply a matter of asking why boys tended to underperform on literacy tests compared with girls, or why mobile students seemed to underachieve in comparison with residentially-stable students.

What worries me now is that the current focus on standards, accountability and productivity has shifted the focus away from diversity. In fact, you might say that a lot of talk about literacies these days takes a flat-earth view of education and forgets the diversity of students and the diversity of the places they come from. In saying this, I've appropriated the term flat-earth from the work of Susan Robertson (2018) at the University of Cambridge, although I am using it in a slightly different way.

From a literacies perspective, I think that the current preoccupation with standardised testing and standards has taken a flat-earth view. Assessments such as PISA – internationally – and NAPLAN here in Australia are based on a view that the earth is flat, and the consequence is that such a view has normalised a hierarchical view of literacy success and failure, across countries and across schools. However, through this approach, not every country or school can be a winner. For some to be at the top, others have to be lower on the hierarchy.

The focus has tended to move away from the social groups that Sam and I were interested in, and instead the focus has become countries or schools. Which country is doing best? Which country's practices should we follow? Which school is getting the best results? Which schools need to do more? A consequence of this view of the world is that it has mobilised specific deficit discourses. The gaze has turned to teachers – blaming them for their schools' poor performances on the tests – and also to teacher educators – with blame for not producing effective teachers.

Much earlier in this presentation, I talked about the way that deficit discourses seem to be related to narrow conceptualisations of literacy as the learning of traditional skills and how such a view often results in compensatory action. In education today, there is considerable pressure on schools to demonstrate that they are using test scores to inform teaching. This in itself is not a bad thing. However, when such an approach focuses only on skills and drills and narrows the curriculum for some students in some schools, then we are probably maintaining the status quo in terms of those who are successful in literacy learning and those who are not. So let's move on and consider what we might do. In other words, we are now at the conclusion.

Where to from here? Moving into the future
While many of the current educational conditions seem out of our control, there are things that we can do and I am only going to focus on three, as these link to Sam's legacy. I also recognise that many schools are already doing these. They are:
- making diversity and difference in schools visible and using that diversity to inform teaching;
- collaborating across the profession and related professions, such as teacher education;
- seeing teachers as learners who are able to use their professional understandings to inform their work as teachers.

In order to make diversity and difference in schools visible, it is helpful to use a camera lens analogy:

- use a wide lens: In other words, look beyond a narrow view to ensure that the full picture is available. In relation to NAPLAN results, for example, we need to see those as one item of assessment amongst many;
- use multiple lenses where possible: Teachers are a diverse group and collectively they

may be able to suggest many possible solutions to whatever literacy or educational problem we are trying to address. One of Sam's passions was critical literacy and that foregrounds multiple perspectives;

- avoid deficit discourses about children and families: These discourses tend to see 'the problem' for literacy underachievement as located 'in the background, outside the school setting and beyond the control of teachers' (Henderson, 2007, p. 47);
- identify students' strengths;
- avoid deficit discourses about teachers;
- question our assumptions, even when they seem to make sense: Some of those critical literacy questions will help here. For example: What am I thinking about this student? What evidence do I have for that? Am I stereotyping? Am I generalising from limited information? (Based on Henderson & Woods, 2018)

The second thing is collaboration. I have just suggested a list of ways to make diversity and difference visible, but it would be very difficult to do them alone. Collaboration offers a means for reflecting on practice, seeing different perspectives and thinking otherwise (Henderson & Noble, 2015), things that I know Sam was passionate about.

I use the term collaboration very broadly, which brings me to my third point. It is very important to let teachers do their professional work and to do the jiggling, adjusting, remediating, shaping and building that Luke (1999) referred to. As professionals, teachers have to 'know' teaching, but teaching has been described as 'forever an unfinished profession … never complete, never conquered, always being developed, always changing' (Grundy & Robison, 2004, p. 146). Teachers have to be good problem-solvers and good learners. They have to be open to change and to learning. Being a passive consumer of the latest cure-all literacy scheme or program is not teaching. Rather, teaching is about ongoing learning and continuing to research, reflect on, know, build, and shape teaching practice (Henderson, in press).

Conclusion

To me, Sam's legacy lies in her modelling of those attributes. She did the reflecting, knowing, building and shaping and she was doing research about some of the challenges that she had identified in relation to boys and literacy learning. Catering for student diversity and promoting teacher learning were part of what she did and she inspired many.

I will finish now with the words of Nea Stewart-Dore whose reputation in the literacy world is well known. She observed Sam and her friend and colleague Heather Fraser at a conference for English teachers. You probably remember Heather as she presented the Sam Power Oration in 2016. After the conference, Sam and Heather received a letter from Nea. Heather has kindly shared it. Nea said:

> Because you're learners, you're great teachers – and I hope you'll continue to enjoy your work as both learners and teachers. … Now enjoy your holiday – you've more than earned it after this wonderful sharing of you, your learning, your teaching practices. Thanks for inspiring me. (Stewart-Dore, n.d.)

References
Alloway, N., & Gilbert, P. (1998). Reading literacy test data: Benchmarking success?

Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, *21*(3), 249–261.

Barton, D., & Hamilton, M. (1998). *Local literacies: Reading and writing in one community*. London, UK: Routledge.

Butt, M., Foley, M., Nolan, L., Stuhmcke, K., & Henderson, R. (2016). Managing literacy teaching and learning for 'new' and mobile students. *Literacy Learning: the Middle Years*, *24*(1), i–viii.

Edwards, A., & Protheroe, I. (2003). Learning to see in classrooms: What are student teachers learning about teaching and learning while learning to teach in schools? *British Educational Research Journal, 29*(2), 227–242.

Freebody, P., & Gilbert, P. (1999). Research into language and literature. In J. Keeves & K. Majoribanks (Eds.), *Australian education: Review of research 1965–1998* (p. 145–169). Melbourne, Vic.: ACER Press.

Freebody, P., Ludwig, C., & Gunn, S. (1995). *Everyday literacy practices in and out of schools in low socio-economic communities*. Brisbane, Qld: Centre for Literacy Education Research.

Gee, J. P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in discourse* (2nd ed.). London, UK: Falmer Press.

Goodman, K. (1986). *What's whole in whole language.* Ontario, Canada: Scholastic.

Graves, D. H. (1981). Patterns of child control of the writing process. In R. D. Walshe (Ed.), *Donald Graves in Australia: Children want to write ...* (pp. 17–28). Rozelle, NSW: Primary English Teaching Association.

Grundy, S., & Robison, J. (2004). Teacher professional development: Themes and trends in the recent Australian experience. In C. Day & J. Sachs (Eds.), *International handbook on the continuing professional development of teachers* (pp. 146–166). Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Henderson, R. (2002). Queensland Year 2 Diagnostic Net and teachers' explanations of literacy failure. *Australian Journal of Education*, *46*(1), 50–64.

Henderson, R. (2005). *The social and discursive construction of itinerant farm workers' children as literacy learners*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, James Cook University, Townsville, Queensland.

Henderson, R. (2007). Looking at learners: Making sense of observations. *Literacy Learning: the Middle Years*, *15*(1), 43–48.

Henderson, R. (2008). Mobilising multiliteracies: Pedagogy for mobile students. In A. Healy (Ed.), *Multiliteracies and diversity in education: New pedagogies for expanding landscapes* (pp. 169–200). South Melbourne, Vic.: Oxford University Press.

Henderson, R. (2015). Two conversations at once: Making sense of classroom observations. *English in Australia*, *50*(1), 45–49.

Henderson, R. (2017). Building a sense of community belonging: Making mobile families welcome in a rural Australian school. *Australian and International Journal of Rural Education*, *27*(2), 18–30.

Henderson, R. (in press). Knowing teaching through researching and reflecting on practice. In A. Woods & B. Exley (Eds.), *Literacies in early childhood: Foundations for equity and quality*. Melbourne, Vic.: Oxford University Press.

Henderson, R., & Noble, K. (2015). *Professional learning, induction and critical reflection: Building workforce capacity in education*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Pivot.

Henderson, R., & Woods, A. (2018). (Re)Focusing the lens beyond deficit: Making diversity and difference in schools visible. In R. Henderson (Ed.), *Teaching literacies: Pedagogies and diversity* (2nd ed., pp. 231–248). Melbourne, Vic.: Oxford University Press.

Kalantzis, M., Cope, B., Chan, E., & Dalley-Trim, L. (2016). *Literacies* (Kindle ed., 2nd ed.).

Cambridge University Press.

Kalantzis, M., Cope, B., & the Learning by Design Project Group. (2005). *Learning by design*. Melbourne, Vic.: Victorian Schools Innovation Commission & Common Ground Publishing.

Luke, A. (1991). Literacies as social practices. *English Education*, *23*(3), 131–147.

Luke, A. (1999). Education 2010 and new times: Why equity and social justice still matter, but differently. Paper originally retrieved from Education Queensland's website.

Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1997). Shaping the social practices of reading. In S. Muspratt, A. Luke, & P. Freebody (Eds.), *Constructing critical literacies: Teaching and learning textual practice* (pp. 185–225). St Leonards, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Powell, E. (2005). Conceptualising and facilitating active learning: Teachers' video-stimulated reflective dialogues. *Reflective Practice*, *6*(3), 407–418.

Robertson, S. (2018). Researching global education policy: Angles in/on/out …. In A. Verger, M. Novelli, & H. K. Altinyelken (Eds.), *Global educational policy and international development: New agendas, issues and policies* (2nd ed., pp. 35– 51). London, UK: Bloomsbury.

Schön, D. (1991). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. London, UK: Arena.

Smith, F. (1983). *Essays into literacy*. Portsmouth, UK: Heinemann Educational Books.

Stewart-Dore, N. (n.d.). Personal communication [Letter]. Copy in possession of Heather Fraser.

The New London Group. (2000). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *Multiliteracies: Literacy learning and the design of social futures* (pp. 9–37). South Yarra, Vic.: Macmillan.

Robyn Henderson has been an educator for more than 40 years, having worked in recent years in the tertiary context and before that in secondary schooling and in early childhood. She currently holds an honorary appointment at the University of Southern Queensland. Even though she has retired, Robyn is still researching, writing and supervising doctoral students. She continues to work as the external examiner for a Doctor of Education program in an overseas university and she is a Principal Fellow and the Publications Director of the Australian Literacy Educators' Association.