Chapter 2

Thinking about Planning for Literacies Learning

Robyn Henderson and Beryl Exley

Effective planning is an important part of teaching literacies and meeting the learning needs of students. Yet, this task is inherently complex. It requires teachers to juggle the interconnected demands of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment, while considering short- and long-term goals and objectives, the diverse needs of students, and relevant contextual factors. This chapter lays the foundations by discussing some of the understandings about literacies that inform the process of planning for effective teaching, learning and assessment.

CHAPTER FOCI

- ✓ the teaching of literacies
- ✓ disciplinary literacies
- ✓ Cambourne's conditions for learning
- ✓ Bernstein's three message systems
- ✓ curriculum expectations
- ✓ pedagogical approaches
- ✓ a pedagogy of multiliteracies

Key terms

a pedagogy of multiliteracies
assessment
conditions for learning
curriculum
disciplinary literacies
four resources model
funds of knowledge
multimodality
pedagogy

Introduction

There is plenty of evidence that the learning of **literacies** (MN1) is vital to the success of students at school and in their lives beyond school. Teachers thus have an important role in ensuring that students are able to 'think, learn, and communicate with all kinds of texts' (Vacca, Vacca, & Mraz, 2014, p. 2), as well as produce texts. Students do not arrive at school as empty vessels waiting to be filled with the wisdom of their teachers. Rather, they have been learning literacies from 'living, growing and having experiences' in their everyday lives outside of school (Kalantzis, Cope, & the Learning by Design Project Group, 2005, p. 6). It makes sense that the formal learning that occurs in school should connect to students' lives and build their knowledges and skills so that they can be successful in their current and future

endeavours (Henderson, 2008; McMillon & McMillon, 2014).

MN1 **literacies**
The plural term *literacies*, introduced in Chapter 1, has been used deliberately to indicate multiple literacies rather than a single literacy.

As Darling-Hammond (2010) emphasised, 'high quality instruction … has been found to matter more for school outcomes than students' backgrounds' (p. 51; see also Darling-Hammond, 2015; Woods, Dooley, Luke, & Exley, 2014). Thus teachers need to ensure that all of their students are engaged in high quality learning experiences that allow them to make links to what they already know and to build on that knowledge. Teachers are responsible for helping students to develop literacies that will stand them in good stead in the school context and in the world outside school, for now and for the future (Darvin & Norton, 2017). To do this, teachers need multiple ways of engaging their students in learning. As Ryan's (2008) research revealed, students need to engage 'more often and for longer periods of time in sustained literacy tasks' (p. 200).

According to Wiggins and McTighe (2005, 2011), well designed curriculum, assessment and instruction provide vital starting points for effective teaching and learning. Along with Chapter 3, this chapter builds on the questions and thinking that Wiggins and McTighe have advocated:

> *How do we make it more likely—by our design—that more students really understand what they are asked to learn?* So often, by contrast, those who 'get it' are learners who come to us already able and articulate—understanding by good fortune. What must our planning entail to have an intellectual impact on everyone: the less experienced; the highly able, but unmotivated; the less able; those with varied interests and styles? (Wiggins & McTighe, 2005, p. 4)

We want the learning of literacies to be relevant and useful to students' lives within and outside school, and we also want to extend students' higher order thinking. Therefore, it is important that we consider:

- the complexities of literacies teaching;
- the importance of learning literacies across all areas of the curriculum;
- the theoretical framing of literacies learning;
- the interconnected elements of curriculum, assessment and **pedagogy**; (MN2)
- the current context/s within which teachers need to plan, including the particular curriculum that is being used and expectations for accountability.

MN2 pedagogy
Knowledge about how to teach. From the Greek work that means 'lead the child'.

In order to cater effectively for students' learning needs and to ensure that curriculum expectations are met, teachers must be knowledgeable about literacies, about how they are learnt and about the purposes of assessment. In this chapter, we discuss some of the understandings that we think are important. We recognise that planning for literacies learning is a complex process and that it is impossible for us to cover everything that teachers need to know. We have, however, included a range of planning frames that we think offer useful

insights into literacies, along with directions for planning for the learning of literacies and the assessment of students' learning. This chapter is, by necessity, linked to Chapter 3, where we show how we would apply these ideas to the planning of a teaching unit.

The teaching of literacies

Two decades ago, Luke (1999) highlighted the multifaceted nature and complexity of teachers' work. He acknowledged that:

> Working on all of these things simultaneously is difficult. … we need to commit to pedagogy—to understand that our job is to read these new communities, these new forms of poverty and disadvantage, and assess our students, their communities, their lifeworlds … to assess what kinds of curriculum goals, knowledges, skills, practices will be suited for them in these brave new and old worlds—and then to jiggle, adjust, remediate, shape and build our classroom pedagogies to get quality, educationally, intellectually and socially valuable outcomes. That's our business, that's our job, that's teachers' work. (p. 12)

Also, as discussed in Chapter 1, teachers have the additional challenge of working with young people who need to become literate across a range of learning areas and with a range of texts, including those that are multimodal, digital, traditional print, oral and visual. We know that learning areas have specialised and sometimes idiosyncratic literacy practices and conventions. As Wyatt-Smith and Cumming (2003) pointed out, each field of knowledge has its own sets of knowing (content knowledge) and ways of representing knowing (literacies). Chapter 1 referred to the terminology that is used to describe these literacies, including *disciplinary literacies* (Moje, 2008; Shanahan & Shanahan, 2012), *curriculum literacies* (Klenowski & Wyatt-Smith, 2014; Wyatt-Smith & Cumming, 2003) and *content area literacies* (Vacca, Vacca, & Mraz, 2014).

Shanahan and Shanahan (2012) highlighted that these terms are not synonymous. They argued that those who advocate for content area literacies generally 'treat content differences as the major distinction amongst the disciplines' (p. 8). In contrast, Shanahan and Shanahan emphasised the 'unique tools that the experts in a discipline use to engage in the work of that discipline' (p. 8). They recognised that disciplines are different in their 'fundamental purposes, specialized genres, symbolic artifacts, traditions of communication, evaluation standards of quality and precision, and use of language' (p. 9). Nevertheless, all of the terms that are in use reinforce the point that there is no single literacy that can be spread homogenously across all learning areas.

In addition, the literacies demands of different learning areas become more specific as students move through their schooling. This is particularly the case as students move towards upper primary school and into the secondary years. This increasing specialisation has been conceptualised by Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) as a model of literacy progression. As shown in Figure 2.1, they identified three layers of literacy progression: from basic literacy to intermediate literacy, to disciplinary literacy:

- Basic literacy: 'highly generalizable basic skills', including decoding and understanding literacy conventions (e.g., the purpose of text is to make meaning; responding to punctuation when reading; recognising basic text structures).
- Intermediate literacy: 'more sophisticated routines and responses … not as widely applicable to different texts ... but nor are they particularly linked to disciplinary

specializations', including more sophisticated decoding (e.g., multisyllabic words), responding automatically to non-high frequency words, using less common forms of punctuation (e.g., colon, semi-colon, a series of commas), working with extended texts and using a range of comprehension strategies.
- Disciplinary literacy: 'specialized reading routines and language uses', involving the 'increasing disciplinary and technical' nature of literacy tasks.
(Based on Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008, pp. 43–46)

INSERT FIGURE 2.1 APPROXIMATELY HERE

Figure 2.1 Literacy progression as increasing specialisation (based on Shanahan & Shanahan, 2008, p. 44)

The literacy progression identified by Shanahan and Shanahan (2008) refutes the notion that the teaching of literacies is the sole responsibility of teachers in the early years of primary schooling or English teachers. Instead, it highlights the important role that teachers across the full extent of schooling play in helping students move through the layers of increasing specialisation. All teachers, then, should be aware of the complexities and challenges of the literacies tasks they ask their students to do, and be skilled and expert at planning, coordinating and orchestrating learning activities. The professional capacities of teachers play a critical role in helping students to navigate the specific literacies demands of the learning areas they are studying (Kalantzis, Cope, & the Learning by Design Project Group, 2005).

In recent times, the political side of literacies has impacted noticeably on education systems, schools and teachers. In Australia, for example, the National Assessment Program – Literacy and Numeracy (NAPLAN) tests students in Years 3, 5, 7 and 9 (Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority [ACARA], 2016). NAPLAN is considered to be a high-stakes assessment and is thus highly controversial for a number of reasons:

1. The literacy component of NAPLAN is limited to Reading, Writing and Language Conventions (spelling, grammar and punctuation) and therefore it does not represent the full range of literacies discussed in Chapter 1;
2. Overall school results and the spread of individual student results within each year level are listed on the publically available My School website (ACARA, 2018e), thus allowing members of the public, including parents and the media, to compare the performances of 'like schools';
3. The media constructs NAPLAN as a 'race', pitting states and territories, schooling systems and categories of students against each other. (See Exley & Singh, 2011)

In addition, as Lingard, Thompson and Sellar (2016) explained, the data are used for a range of purposes, such as 'governing school systems, accountability purposes, managing staff within systems and schools, and making educational decisions' (p. 5). Evidence suggests that tests like these and the accountability that accompanies them have produced 'unintended consequences', including stress and frustration for teachers (Lingard et al., 2016, pp. 9–10; see also Cormack & Comber, 2013) and students (Howell, 2016). As Cormack and Comber (2013) highlighted, this focus on data—which prioritises students' scores on particular standardised tests over the data collected by teachers on a daily basis in classrooms—is 'underpinned by competitive logics' and the view that competition and comparison will result in better literacy results (pp. 79–80). Unfortunately, such views are often accompanied by searches for quick-fix or magic bullet solutions to literacy problems, rather than drawing on

the considered and professional views of teachers who have a whole range of data sources available to them.

In this current context, it is more important than ever that teachers are able to talk with confidence about what they do in relation to the teaching of literacies, explain why they do what they do, and be able to produce evidence of the success of what they do. Therefore, it is essential to understand how the teaching of literacies might be framed theoretically and conceptually. It is to this topic that we now turn.

Facilitating the learning of literacies at school

In this section, we consider the understandings that underpin our views about the teaching and learning of literacies. In particular, we consider some conditions for learning (based on the work of Cambourne, 1995), the three message systems of educational transmission identified by Bernstein (2003), and ways of framing the teaching of literacies, including curriculum expectations and pedagogical approaches.

Conditions for learning

Drawing on his long-term research experiences, Cambourne (1995) identified a set of conditions for learning in natural settings. He argued that this particular set of conditions enabled the learning of language in young children and that there was application to the teaching of literacies. In brief, his conditions for learning, with some advice for teachers, are:

- Immersion: Immerse students in a literate-rich environment with many different types of texts;
- Demonstration: Demonstrate and model how texts are written and read;
- Engagement: Provide opportunities for students to be actively involved in the learning of literacies;
- Expectations: Set realistic expectations for the learning of relevant literacies;
- Responsibility: Let students take responsibility for their learning and make choices;
- Approximations: Encourage students to have-a-go and accept mistakes as part of the process of learning;
- Employment: Provide opportunities for students to use literacies in meaningful ways;
- Response: Respond and give feedback to students on their learning, so that they can adjust their approximations. (Based on Cambourne, 1995, pp. 185–186)

Three message systems

Bernstein's (2003) theory of educational transmission identifies that schooling operates through three interrelated message systems:

- Curriculum: Defines what counts as valid knowledge to be taught;
- Pedagogy: Defines what counts as a valid way to transmit the content knowledge, whether it be via the teacher, text book or a computer program;
- Assessment: Defines what counts as valid for students' acquisition of content knowledge.

Bernstein (2003) explained that curriculum, pedagogy and assessment 'form a whole and should be treated as a whole' (p. 81). Any tweaking of curriculum should also entail a consideration of pedagogy and assessment, just as any tweaking of pedagogy or assessment will impact on the other two message systems. As shown in Figure 2.2, these three message

systems can be represented metaphorically as the wheels of a cog. As one wheel turns, the other wheels are set in motion.

INSERT FIGURE 2.2 APPROXIMATELY HERE

Figure 2.2 A metaphorical representation of the three message systems of education

Bernstein (2003) was especially interested in the way that particular orientations to curriculum, pedagogy and assessment either reproduced or interrupted educational dis/advantage for different groups of students. To give Bernstein's theory of educational transmission some context, let us return to the earlier discussion about NAPLAN. Much attention has been given to schools scoring below the national average. On the basis of their assessment results, these schools have been compelled to 'abandon rich curricula and innovative and deep learning experiences in favour of teaching to the test' (Exley & Singh, 2011, p. 246). With reference to the cogs in Figure 2.2, this means that certain outcomes in assessment (cog 3) have narrowed the curriculum (cog 1) and that the pedagogic practice of teachers (cog 2) has changed to individual skill and drill practice rather than focusing on a 'community of learners' ethos. In some schools, then, NAPLAN 'reduced opportunities for differentiated instruction and community contexts were overlooked' (Exley & Singh, 2011, p. 247).

It is of significant concern that disadvantaged schools are over-represented amongst those that have taken a narrow approach to curriculum and pedagogy. In other words, those students who are potentially the most disconnected to mainstream schooling seem to be the most likely to have their '**funds of knowledge**' (MN3) (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 2005) cast aside. When classroom pedagogy is reduced to a skill and drill approach, children are often seen as deficit and their strengths are rendered invisible to teachers. As a result, students from schools that do not achieve well on NAPLAN can be offered a schooling experience that seems impoverished, while students from schools that achieve well on NAPLAN are presented with engaging pedagogies and advanced work.

MN3 funds of knowledge
The term 'funds of knowledge' has been used by Moll, Amanti, Neff and Gonzalez (2005) to refer to the family and community resources that children bring to school.

For teachers in classrooms, the three interrelated message systems are important. Curriculum intent, pedagogy and assessment should align. As was indicated earlier, changes to one of the message systems will impact on the other two, so it is necessary to work to 'build coherence' across them (Hayes, 2003, p. 232) in order to support learning.

Reflection Activities

1. Keeping Cambourne's (1995) conditions for learning in mind, think about how you might ensure that the conditions for learning are evident in your classroom. How might each of the conditions be applied?
2. Cambourne has continued to write about the conditions for learning. His 2001 publication focused on five reasons why some students fail to become literate:
   (i) incorrect demonstrations;
   (ii) students not engaging with learning;
   (iii) students having low expectations of themselves as readers and/or writers;
   (iv) feedback providing a wrong message;

(v) students not taking responsibility for their own learning.

What actions might you take in your classroom to ensure that none of these occur?

Framing the teaching of literacies

All teachers bring theoretical and conceptual understandings to their planning, although not all teachers find it easy to articulate and explain the theories that underpin what they want to teach and how they plan for their teaching. In this section of the chapter, we describe several frames that are useful when planning for the teaching and learning of literacies. In explaining these, we lay the foundations for the planning that is presented in later chapters, including Chapter 3.

Curriculum expectations

When planning for the teaching and learning of literacies, teachers are guided by the relevant curriculum documents. Whilst we recognise that there are curriculum variations across the Australian states and territories, here we draw on the Australian Curriculum documents as indicative of curriculum intent. The *Australian Curriculum: English* (ACARA, 2018a) has literacy as one of its three strands, and each of the other learning areas have a statement about the specific literacy demands of that area. In addition, literacy is one of the general capabilities that are identified as 'equipping young Australians to live and work successfully in the twenty-first century' (ACARA, 2018b). The curriculum describes literacy as 'the knowledge and skills students need to access, understand, analyse and evaluate information, make meaning, express thoughts and emotions, present ideas and opinions, interact with others and participate in activities at school and in their lives beyond school' (ACARA, 2018c).

The Australian Curriculum provides an explicit framing of literacy, as shown in Figure 2.3. The comprehending and composing of texts are identified as the two overarching processes of being literate, with the former occurring through listening, reading and viewing and the latter through speaking, writing and creating. Four knowledges contribute to both comprehending and composing: text, grammar, word and visual, thus providing a total of six interrelated elements.

INSERT FIGURE 2.3 HERE

Figure 2.3 The six interrelated elements of the Australian Curriculum's framing of literacy as a general capability (From ACARA, 2018c)

The Australian Curriculum explains what students should be able to do as they move through schooling from Foundation to Year 10 (ACARA, 2018c). It takes a developmental approach, using a continuum of learning that identifies the comprehending, composing, text knowledge, grammar knowledge, word knowledge and visual knowledge that are relevant as students progress through the year levels of schooling. The inclusion of visual knowledge acknowledges the multimodality of texts, although it does not seem to cover the full range of multimodalities that could have been included. In this respect, the curriculum has taken a rather traditional and conservative view of what constitutes text. Linguistic, visual and, to some extent, spatial elements have a place, while little is said about the audio and gestural elements that are so important to many multimodal texts (Cope & Kalantzis, 2015; The New London Group, 1996).

As we have discussed, the increasing disciplinary specialisation of schooling, particularly in the secondary school years, requires teachers to consider the specific literacies of the particular learning areas they teach. These are recognised by the Australian Curriculum, which highlights that 'literacy is strengthened, made specific and extended in other learning areas [beyond the English curriculum] as students engage in a range of learning activities with significant literacy demands' (ACARA, 2018d). This means that all teachers have to be 'responsible for teaching the subject-specific literacy' of their learning area/s' (ACARA, 2018d). To do this, they 'need a clear understanding of the literacy demands and opportunities of their learning area/s' (ACARA, 2018d). The learning of literacies is clearly marked on the content descriptions and elaborations of each learning area.

The four resources model

One frame that we have found valuable in planning literacies learning is the **four resources model** (Freebody & Luke, 1990, 2003; Luke & Freebody, 1999). The model identifies code-breaking, text participation, text use and text analysis as four resources that students need in order to function and participate in a literate society. Each resource is regarded as necessary to promote effective literacies learning, but is insufficient by itself (Freebody & Luke, 2003). As Luke (1999) highlighted, 'effective teachers know this and monitor the progress of their students in order to make appropriate adaptations' to their teaching (p. 6).

four resources model A model of literacy learning that identifies code-breaking, text participation, text use and text analysis as four resources that students need in order to function and participate in a literate society.

The four resources model is helpful for reviewing classroom literacies practices. It does not provide teachers with a model of how to operationalise literacies teaching. Instead, it provides a way of understanding the types of literacies resources that should be included in a classroom program. This helps teachers to ascertain whether their program offers a range of experiences across all four resources or whether it is skewed in favour of particular resources. Table 2.1 provides a brief overview of the model.

Table 2.1 The four resources model

Code-breaking	This is about being able to crack the codes and symbols of particular **semiotic systems** used in texts, whether they be linguistic, auditory, visual, gestural or spatial. Being able to break the code of texts involves knowing how to recognise and use the codes of oral, print and multimodal texts. **semiotic systems** The codes and symbols that are used to make meaning. For example, the linguistic semiotic system includes the alphabet; the visual semiotic system includes colours, radiation, repetition, harmony. The skills used to crack these codes are usually those valued by a skills-based approach to the teaching of literacy.
Text participation	This refers to the resources that are required to make meaning of any text or to produce meaning in a text. We draw on prior experiences and knowledge about the content and type of text in order to make meaning of it. Meaning-making resources are emphasised in approaches to literacy teaching that use language experience models and **schema theories** to explain reading comprehension. **schema theories** The act of reading comprehension is often described as the connection between two bodies of

	knowledge: one unknown and external; the other known, familiar and internalised. Schema theories developed by cognitive psychologists offer an explanation of how we relate new knowledge to existing knowledge.
Text use	This requires an understanding of the social purpose of texts as well as the context in which a text occurs. To be a text user, it is important to know how to use and create texts for particular purposes and audiences. The genre-based approach to teaching writing emphasises text using resources as essential to understanding the **micro and macro structural features** of text types. **micro and macro structural features** Text types can be characterised by the organisation of the text (the macro structure) and the language and grammar used within that text (the micro features). See the Glossary for more information.
Text analysis	This enables a critical view of texts and emphasises that all texts are social and cultural constructs, produced by specific authors at specific points of time. This involves understanding that texts are not neutral and that they therefore represent particular **ideologies and world views**. Text analysing resources can be used to evaluate texts critically to detect bias or point of view. This knowledge can also be used when designing new texts. **ideologies and world views** Ideologies are sets of beliefs and practices that change the way we view the world—our world view. See the Glossary for more information. Critical literacy proponents claim that text analysis resources are paramount in the teaching of literacies (Honan, 2010).

(Based on Freebody & Luke, 1990, 2003; Luke & Freebody, 1999)

Approaches to pedagogy

A search of online sources and textbooks reveals a plethora of pedagogical models that can be used to frame teaching (e.g., Darder, 2017; Exley, Kervin, & Mantei, 2016; Queensland Department of Education and Training, n.d.; The University of Adelaide, 2015). For example, one education system has identified 11 effective age-appropriate pedagogies for early childhood (Queensland Department of Education and Training, n.d.). With so many pedagogical frameworks on offer, we cannot talk about the full range here. However, we wish to discuss one planning frame that we use. This is the multiliteracies pedagogical approach theorised by The New London Group (1996, 2000). One of the reasons we like **a pedagogy of multiliteracies** is because of its consideration of a wide range of different text types, including **multimodal** and hybrid texts (Cope & Kalantzis, 2015). It also considers a range of textual design elements: visual, audio, spatial and gestural, as well as the linguistic elements that have always been identified as part of literacy learning.

a pedagogy of multiliteracies A type of pedagogy that acknowledges the need for a broad view of literacies. The approach, based on the work of The New London Group (1996), comprises four practices: situated practice, overt instruction, critical framing and transformed practice.

multimodal The integrated use of semiotic modes (linguistic, visual, auditory, gestural, spatial).

A second reason we use a pedagogy of multiliteracies is because we recognise that 'literacy' has been, and still is, a contested field. Disagreement over what defines the most effective

teaching of literacies is widely evident in schools as well as in the broader community. The media, for example, continue to construct literacies pedagogy as a minefield of binaries and to argue that 'good' literacies teaching requires the take up of one view over another—whether that be whole language versus skills, genre versus process writing, or phonics versus word recognition. However, such simplistic views ignore the way that understandings about literacies have changed over time, and that newer approaches tend to co-exist with older ones rather than replacing them (Henderson, 2008). Although an historical account of literacies might highlight how particular clusters of pedagogical approaches—such as **traditional skills-based**, **progressivist student-centred**, and **cultural-critical approaches**—have been influential at particular times, Luke and Freebody (1997) observed that 'remnants from all of these models are sustained in most contemporary classrooms and lessons' (p. 191). The challenge is to create the right mix of these multiple approaches for each student at particular points in time.

traditional skills-based approaches In general, this cluster of approaches expects students to master a hierarchy of skills and includes drill and memorisation as learning strategies.

progressivist student-centred approaches This cluster of approaches includes whole language, experiential and discovery learning, and immersion of students in language and print resources.

cultural-critical approaches This cluster of approaches recognises that literacy can be understood in many ways. It emphasises the sociocultural contexts of literacy, and that different literacies are appropriate in different contexts.

To use a pedagogy of multiliteracies effectively, teachers need deep levels of **content knowledge** and **pedagogical knowledge** that will shape high quality learning experiences and produce successful learning outcomes for all students. While teaching from worksheets or using teacher-proof curriculum guides might be less taxing on teachers, there is evidence that these approaches have a ceiling effect on student learning outcomes (Exley & Luke, 2010; Exley & Singh, 2011), not to mention the detrimental effects on student motivation and engagement.

content knowledge Teachers' and students' knowledge of the subject matter of particular learning areas.

pedagogical knowledge Knowledge about effective teaching.

Instead of assuming that one pedagogical approach is better than any other, The New London Group (1996, 2000) conceptualised four integrated components of pedagogy: situated practice, overt instruction, critical framing and transformed practice. Cope and Kalantzis (2015) explained that this pedagogical approach 'provides a powerful foundation for synesthesia, or learning that emerges from mode switching, moving backwards and forwards between representations in text, image, sound, gesture, object, and space,' while also allowing a 'weaving' across different pedagogies. Weaving the four components together helps to overcome the weaknesses of each by providing students with different ways of learning and knowing.

The move away from a one-size-fits-all approach to literacies teaching gives teachers a more flexible range of options. As shown in Table 2.2, movement across and through the four components of a pedagogy of multiliteracies provides ample opportunities to develop and assess students' ways of knowing at multiple stages in a teaching unit. This is important, not just for initial planning, but also for the planning that will happen throughout the unit.

Table 2.2 The four components of a pedagogy of multiliteracies

Situated practice	Students have opportunities to demonstrate their existing knowledge and to experience new learning. For teachers, this means 'ground(ing) their plans in the interests, needs and knowledge of their students' (Ryan, Scott, & Walsh, 2010, p. 479), thereby assisting students to 'bring their (invariably diverse) experiences, interests and knowledge into the learning environment' and to become 'familiar with things that were previously unfamiliar' (Kalantzis & Cope, 2008, pp. 179 & 180). In this way, students are positioned as contributors of knowledge, rather than being understood solely as recipients of knowledge from the teacher. Chapters 3 and 7 provide some specific examples of activities that incorporate situated practice
Overt instruction	Based on observations and other forms of assessment, teachers identify students' specific learning needs for extended learning that will contribute to the overall project outcomes. By providing interventions and scaffolding learning, teachers assist students to conceptualise, theorise, develop explicit generalisations and learn appropriate technical points of language and **metalanguage**. **metalanguage** The language used to describe language. It can also refer to the jargon or particular language of a specific discipline. Just because the instruction is labelled as overt, it does not mean that the teacher is the only one able to deliver. Overt instruction can also be made available through online programs, guest speakers, group work activity centres, and so on. Chapters 3, 5, 7 and 12 provide examples of overt instruction.
Critical framing	Students understand different perspectives on knowledge and are able to infer and interpret relationships, interests and perspectives. By analysing functionally, learners 'systematically explore causes and effects and develop careful chains of reasoning' (Kalantzis & Cope, 2008, p. 184). By analysing critically, learners 'interrogate the interests behind an action, motives for expressing a meaning, or reasons for highlighting a particular fact in a particular way' (Kalantzis & Cope, 2008, p. 185). Teachers need to develop carefully crafted pedagogical practices for coping with this demanding component of multiliteracies tasks. Chapters 3 and 7 offer examples of how critical analysis or framing can be used in classrooms.
Transformed practice	Students demonstrate that they are able to apply knowledge appropriately in both typical and new situations or contexts. This can include applying theoretical knowledge to practical situations, as well as engaging learners in 'acts of imagination,' helping them move 'beyond their immediate comfort zones' and learning higher-order problem-solving (Kalantzis & Cope, 2008, p. 186). Transformed practice is the phase where students showcase what they have learnt, ideally for a real-life audience.

Transformed practice is discussed further in Chapter 7.

(Based on The New London Group, 1996; Kalantzis & Cope, 2008)

During the past 15 years, classroom research by Cope, Kalantzis and others (Cope & Kalantzis, 2015; Kalantzis, Cope, & the Learning by Design Project Group, 2005) has resulted in a reframing of the four components of a pedagogy of multiliteracies. This reframing focuses directly on learning (Cope & Kalantzis, 2015) and four **knowledge processes** through which learning occurs: experiencing, conceptualising, analysing and applying. According to Cope and Kalantzis (2015), these are the 'things you do to know.' In this approach, pedagogy is understood as 'the design of learning activity sequences' for students (Cope & Kalantzis, 2015). The shift in focus from teaching to learning reminds us that designing learning is core business for teachers.

MN
For further information about the knowledge processes, see Chapter 16.

Cope and Kalantzis (2015) emphasised that teachers must be reflexive and constantly vigilant, so that they can 'gauge which pedagogical move is appropriate at different moments of the learning process, for different students.' As has already been discussed—in this chapter as well as in Chapter 1—teachers need to have a wide repertoire of teaching practices and the ability to make those pedagogical moves (Cope & Kalantzis, 2015). Freebody (2005), for example, identified the need for teachers to develop a 'professional sophistication' (p. 177) that will enable them to manage the complexities of teaching: to deliver the curriculum, to manage, protect, engage and motivate students, and to cater for individual differences (see Chapter 1). Similarly, as stated at the beginning of this chapter, Luke (1999) argued that it is the responsibility of teachers 'to jiggle, adjust, remediate, shape and build our classroom pedagogies' to ensure 'quality, educationally, intellectually and socially valuable outcomes' (p. 12). The common message is that the work of teachers requires multiple knowledges, skills and capabilities about how to design learning and about how to make necessary adjustments and adaptions, on the run, in busy classrooms.

Reflection activities

1 Reflect on a lesson that you have taught or observed from any learning area. Since literacies are part of all learning areas, use Luke and Freebody's (1999) four resources model to identify the resources that were the focus of the lesson. If literacies were not a focus, identify the resources that the lesson could have developed.

2 What are the advantages and disadvantages of using a pedagogy of multiliteracies to frame literacies learning?

3 What other planning approaches or frames might you want to apply to your teaching? You might consider some of the suggestions for effective teaching and learning that have come from the education system you are connected with. For example, most state education departments identify relevant pedagogical frameworks or ask that each school develops a school-wide pedagogical framework. Many examples can be gleaned from the internet.

Tutorial exercises

1 A clear message from this chapter and from Chapter 1 is that teachers need to be highly knowledgeable and skilled, with the ability to adjust and adapt their practices to ensure student learning. Draw a two-column table. Add the four knowledge processes (experiencing, conceptualising, analysing and applying) to the cells in the left-hand column. In the right-hand column, identify teaching strategies that might be used to build each of those knowledge processes with school students. Discuss your lists with other members of your tutorial group.

2 Earlier in this chapter, it was stated that teachers need to have deep levels of content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge. Use a model of critical reflection (see Chapter 1) to think about your own content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge.
   - How is your learning of these knowledges progressing?
   - What areas do you see as needing attention?
   - What will you do about this?

Conclusion

In this chapter, we have considered understandings that are useful to inform the planning of literacies teaching and learning in classrooms. We think that it is really important that teachers know what they understand and assume about the learning and teaching of literacies and that they apply their theoretical understandings to practice. In Chapter 3, we move to the practical side of planning for literacies learning, putting ideas from this chapter into practice.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Eileen Honan for contributing some of the text about the four resources model.

Further reading

The following texts are useful for understanding some of the thinking that underpins planning for the learning of literacies. Friend (2017) focuses on the importance of teacher talk in mediating students' understanding of literacies in the learning and teaching of science. The Luke and Freebody (1999) article provides an overview of the four resources model. The New London Group (1996) article is a seminal text, having introduced the term *multiliteracies* and having set the foundations for current understandings about the teaching of literacies.

Friend, L. (2017). IRE and content area literacies: A critical analysis of classroom discourse. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 40*(2),124–134.

Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1999). A map of possible practices: Further notes on the four resources model. *Practically Primary, 4*(2), 5–8.

The New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 60–92.

References

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2016). NAP: National Assessment Program. Retrieved from https://www.nap.edu.au/

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2018a). Australian Curriculum: English. Retrieved from https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/english/

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2018b). Australian Curriculum: General capabilities. Retrieved from http://australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/general-capabilities/

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2018c). Australian Curriculum: General Capabilities: Literacy. Retrieved from https://www.australiancurriculum.edu.au/f-10-curriculum/general-capabilities/literacy/

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2018d). Literacy: In the learning areas. Retrieved from http://australian-curriculum.org/generalcapabilities/literacy/introduction/in-the-learning-areas

Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority. (2018e). My school [Website]. Retrieved from https://www.myschool.edu.au/

Bernstein, B. (2003). *Class, codes and control: Towards a theory of educational transmission.* London, UK: Routledge.

Cambourne, B. (1995). Toward an educationally relevant theory of literacy learning: Twenty years of inquiry. *The Reading Teacher, 49*(3), 182–190.

Cambourne, B. (2001). Conditions for literacy learning: Why do some students fail to learn to read? Ockham's razor and the conditions of learning. *The Reading Teacher, 54*(8), 784–786.

Cope, B., & Kalantzis, M. (2015). The things you do to know: An introduction to the pedagogy of multiliteracies. In B. Cope & M. Kalantzis (Eds.), *A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Learning by design* (Kindle ed.). Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cormack, P., & Comber, B. (2013). High-stakes literacy tests and local effects in a rural school. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 36*(2), 78–89.

Darder, A. (2017) *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A pedagogy of love*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). *The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2015). Want to close the achievement gap? Close the teaching gap. *American Educator, 38*(4), 14–18.

Darvin, R., & Norton, B. (2017). Investing in new literacies for a cosmopolitan future. In R. Zaidi & J. Rowsell (Eds.), *Literacy lives in transcultural times* (pp. 89–101). London, UK: Routledge.

Exley, B., Kervin, L., & Mantei, J. (2016). Playing with grammar: A pedagogical heuristic for orientating to the language content of the Australian Curriculum: English. *English in Australia, 51*(2), 100–110.

Exley, B., & Luke, A. (2010). Uncritical framing: Lesson and knowledge structure in school science. In D. Cole & D. Pullen (Eds.), *Multiliteracies in motion: Current theories and practice* (pp. 17–41). London, UK: Routledge.

Exley, B., & Singh, P. (2011). Social studies disciplinary knowledge: An Australian case study of tensions between state curriculum and national assessment in disadvantaged school communities. In F. Christie & K. Maton (Eds.), *Disciplinarity: Functional linguistic and sociological perspectives* (pp. 237–256). London, UK: Continuum.

Freebody, P. (2005). The dynamics of literacy lessons. An introduction to 'In teachers' hands: Effective literacy teaching practices in the early years of schooling'. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy, 28*(3), 175–178.

Freebody, P., & Luke, A. (1990). 'Literacies' programs: Debates and demands in cultural context. *Prospect, 5*(3), 7–16.

Freebody, P., & Luke, A. (2003). Literacy as engaging with new forms of life: The 'four roles' model. In G. Bull & M. Anstey (Eds.), *The literacy lexicon* (2nd ed., pp. 51–65). Frenchs Forest, NSW: Prentice Hall.

Hayes, D. (2003). Making learning an effect of schooling: Aligning curriculum, assessment and pedagogy. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *24*(2), 225–245.

Henderson, R. (2008). Mobilising multiliteracies: Pedagogy for mobile students. In A. Healy (Ed.), *Multiliteracies and diversity in education: New pedagogies for expanding landscapes* (pp. 168–200). South Melbourne, Vic.: Oxford University Press.

Honan, E. (2010). Literacies. In D. Pendergast & N. Bahr (Eds.), *Teaching middle years: Rethinking curriculum, pedagogy and assessment* (2nd ed., pp. 139–154). Crows Nest, NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Howell, A. (2016). Exploring children's lived experiences of NAPLAN. In B. Lingard, G. Thompson, & S. Sellar (Eds.), *National testing in schools: An Australian assessment* (pp. 164–180). London, UK: Routledge.

Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2008). *New learning: Elements of a science of education*. Cambridge, UK: 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.

Klenowski, V., & Wyatt-Smith, C. (2014). *Assessment for education: Standards, judgement and moderation*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Lingard, B., Thompson, G., & Sellar, S. (2016). National testing from an Australian perspective. In B. Lingard, G. Thompson, & S. Sellar (Eds.), *National testing in schools: An Australian assessment* (pp. 1–17). London, UK: Routledge.

Luke, A. (1999). Education 2010 and new times: Why equity and social justice still matter, but differently. Retrieved from http://education.qld.gov.au/corporate/framework/online.htm

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.

Luke, A., & Freebody, P. (1999). A map of possible practices: Further notes on the four resources model. *Practically Primary, 4*(2), 5–8.

McMillon, G. T, & McMillon, D. B. (2014). Social equity teaching in action: My community IS my classroom. In F. Boyd & C. Brock (Eds.), *Social diversity within multiliteracies: Complexity in teaching and learning* (pp. 154–167). New York, NY: Routledge.

Moje, E. B. (2008). Foregrounding the disciplines in secondary literacy teaching and learning: A call for change. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, *52*(2), 96–107.

Moll, L., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (2005). Funds of knowledge for teaching: Using a qualitative appraoch to connect homes and classrooms. In N. Gonzalez, L. Moll & C. Amanti (Eds.), *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities and classrooms* (pp. 71–88). New York, NY: Routledge.

Queensland Department of Education and Training. (n.d.). *Foundation paper: Age-appropriate pedagogies for the early years of schooling*. Brisbane, Qld: Author.

Ryan, J., Scott, A., & Walsh, M. (2010). Pedagogy in the multimodal classroom: An analysis of the challenges and opportunities for teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 16*(4), 477–489.

Ryan, M. (2008). Engaging middle years students: Literacy projects that matter. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy, 52*(3), 190–201.

Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content area literacy. *Harvard Education Review*, *78*, 40–59.

Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2012). What is disciplinary literacy and why does it matter? *Topics in Language Disorders*, *32*(1), 7–18.

The New London Group. (1996). A pedagogy of multiliteracies: Designing social futures. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(1), 60–92.

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. 9–42). South Yarra, Vic.: Macmillan.

The University of Adelaide. (2015). Pedagogical possibilities for the professions. Retrieved from https://www.adelaide.edu.au/professions/pedagogical-possibilities/

Vacca, R. T., Vacca, J. A. L., & Mraz, M. (2014). *Content area reading: Literacy and learning across the curriculum* (11th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2005). *Understanding by design*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2011). *The understanding by design guide to creating high-quality units.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Woods, A., Dooley, K, Luke, A., & Exley, B. (2014). School leadership, literacy and social justice: The place of local school curriculum planning and reform. In I. Bogotch & C. Shields (Eds.), *International handbook of educational leadership and social (in)justice* (pp. 509–520). New York, NY: Springer.

Wyatt-Smith, C., & Cumming, J. J. (2003). Curriculum literacies: Expanding domains of assessment. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy and Practice, 10*(1), 47–59.