# InitiaLit Extension Research background



## The need for differentiated materials for advanced learners

As primary school teachers tackle the critical task of ensuring every child in their classroom learns to read, they are faced with the challenge of catering to a range of abilities, requiring them to differentiate materials and teaching methods for different groups of children.

The goal of differentiation is to maximise learning, for students at *any level*, by providing them with tasks that represent a moderate (but not overwhelming) challenge. Research has shown that within-class differentiation is beneficial for all students (Steenbergen-Hu et al., 2016), but unsurprisingly, this approach is most successful when material and methods are suitably modified for different groups (Kulik & Kulik, 1992; Rogers, 2007; Slavin, 1987). However, studies have also found that teachers in Australia and elsewhere are not well-equipped during their training to respond adequately to *advanced* learners' needs (Dixon et al., 2014; Fraser-Seeto, 2013; Gross, 1999). Often, only minor adjustments are made for this group (Tomlinson et al., 2003), such as giving them extra practice exercises.

## How should materials be differentiated for advanced learners?

It is generally agreed that tasks for advanced learners should: (a) **accelerate**, (b) **enrich**, or (c) **extend** content covered (VanTassel-Baska, 1986).

Acceleration is best suited to the very small percentage of students across classrooms who are identified as highly gifted. These students can be moved on to higher grade level content and there is a large research base supporting this practice for these students (e.g., Munro, 2012; Rogers, 2007; Subotnik et al., 2011; VanTassel-Baska & Brown, 2009).

Enrichment and extension, on the other hand, can be used with a wider range of more able students. More research is still required, particularly in the primary years, to establish a firm evidence base for these techniques (Walsh et al., 2012). Yet, the few studies to date that meet criteria for providing efficacy data on such instructional techniques with young children do, on the whole, show that these teaching methods are effective. For example, providing five- to six-year-old gifted children with instruction in analogy construction significantly improves their creative thinking (Meador, 1995) and their interpretation of metaphor (Castillo, 1998).

The available studies also demonstrate that the benefits of enrichment and extension techniques are not limited to gifted children. Rather, they tend to result in improved outcomes for both gifted and able non-gifted students, both across learning areas (Subotnik et al., 2011), and when used specifically for reading instruction (Reis et al., 2011; VanTassel-Baska et al., 2009). In other words, enrichment and extension teaching techniques may be particularly suitable for a larger percentage of promising learners in regular classrooms.

#### How are the InitiaLit Extension resources designed?

The InitiaLit Extension resources respond to the research discussed above by providing suitable material for teachers to use with the top 15–20% of students in their class. Rather than accelerating learning, the books are designed to:

- Enrich allowing children to explore a particular content area in greater depth
- **Extend** encouraging children to use critical-thinking skills to see relationships and make connections between content areas.

The books provide teachers with thoughtfully designed, interesting and challenging material to use during teacher-led small-group time (in place of the InitiaLit Sounds and Words Books or RAD Reading Book), so that work can be easily and appropriately differentiated for advanced learners. The books offer more complex and detailed texts for children to read, accompanied by comprehension questions that tap higher-order thinking skills. They also offer suggestions for linked writing and research activities.

At the Foundation and Year 1 levels, the focus is two-fold. Children practise their letter–sound correspondences and decoding skills with a selection of harder words and sentences. They also work on applying these skills to progressively more connected texts. At the Year 2 level, for students whose decoding is well established, the focus moves to an exploration of four major themes through a range of reading, writing and discussion tasks. At all year levels, the tasks have been selected to promote inquiry and nurture *critical* and *creative* thinking. Practitioners agree that these are important skills to develop in all students, particularly those of high ability (Chandra Handa, 2015; Hines et al., 2019; Lee et al., 2021; Thompson, 2017). To help teachers and children explore the material together, downloadable teacher lesson notes are provided. It is important that open learning tasks, such as these, still be guided and structured by a teacher (Eysink et al., 2015).

Providing suitably challenging work for able children in heterogenous classrooms is part of a comprehensive approach to catering for more able children generally. By doing so, schools will also be establishing the necessary context for the discovery and development of exceptional talent in select children (Gentry, 2009; Renzulli, 1996).

An example of the activities at each year level is given below.





Stop and write Stop and write If you could send time capsule into outer space, what would you include? Work with your partner to choose the things you would like to send from the categories below. Share these lists with the group. 1. Five pictures from Earth 2. Five sounds of Earth and its people 3. Conservations and the second 1 3. Some songs or music

Ν

D

17

#### References

- Castillo, L. C. (1998). The effect of analogy instruction on young children's metaphor comprehension. *Roeper Review, 21*(1), 27–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/02783199809553922
- Chandra Handa, M. C. (2015). Imagination first: Unleash the power of possibility. *Gifted Education International, 31*(2), 117–141. https://doi.org/10.1177/0261429413489161
- Dixon, F. A., Yssel, N., McConnell, J. M., & Hardin, T. (2014). Differentiated instruction, professional development, and teacher efficacy. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 37*(2), 111–127. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353214529042
- Eysink, T., Gersen, L., & Gijlers, H. (2015) Inquiry learning for gifted children. *High Ability Studies, 26*(1), 63–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/13598139.2015.1038379
- Fraser-Seeto, K. (2013). Pre-service teacher training in gifted and talented education: An Australian perspective. *Journal of Student Engagement: Education Matters*, 3(1), 29–38. https://ro.uow.edu.au/jseem/vol3/iss1/5
- Gentry, M. (2009). Myth 11: A comprehensive continuum of gifted education and talent development services: Discovering, developing, and enhancing young people's gifts and talents. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *53*(4), 262–265. https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986209346937
- Gross, M. (1999). Small poppies: Highly gifted children in the early years. *Roeper Review, 21*(3), 207–214. https://doi.org/10.1080/02783199909553963
- Hines, M. E., Catalana, S. M., & Anderson, B. N. (2019). When learning sinks in: Using the incubation model of teaching to guide students through the creative thinking process. *Gifted Child Today*, 42(1), 36–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217518804858
- Kulik, J. A. & Kulik, C. C. (1992). Meta-analytic findings on grouping programs. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 36*(2), 73–77. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698629203600204
- Lee, L. E., Meyer, M. S., & Crutchfield, K. (2021). Gifted classroom environments and the creative process: A systematic review. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 44*(2), 107–148. https://doi.org/10.1177/01623532211001450
- Meador, K. S. (1995). The effects of synectics training on gifted and nongifted kindergarten students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 18*(1), 55–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/016235329401800105
- Munro, J. (2012, August 27). *Effective strategies for implementing differentiated instruction* [Paper presentation]. School improvement: What does research tell us about effective strategies? Melbourne, Australia. https://research.acer.edu.au/research\_conference/RC2012/27august/14/
- Reis, S. M., McCoach, D. B., Little, C. A., Muller, L. M., & Kaniskan, R. B. (2011). The effects of differentiated instruction and enrichment pedagogy on reading achievement in five elementary schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(2), 462–501. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831210382891
- Renzulli, J. S. (1996). Schools for talent development: A practical plan for total school improvement. *The School Administrator*, 53(1), 20–22. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312088592\_Schools\_for\_talent\_development\_A\_practical\_plan\_for\_total\_school\_improvement
- Rogers, K. B. (2007). Lessons learned about educating the gifted and talented: A synthesis of the research on educational practice. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *51*(4), 382–396. https://doi.org/10.1177/0016986207306324
- Slavin, R. E. (1987). Ability grouping and student achievement in elementary schools: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, *57*(3), 293–336. https://doi.org/10.2307/1170460
- Steenbergen-Hu, S., Makel, M. C., & Olszewski-Kubilius, P. (2016). What one hundred years of research says about the effects of ability grouping and acceleration on K–12 students' academic achievement: Findings of two second-order meta-analyses. *Review of Educational Research, 86*(4), 849–899. https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654316675417
- Subotnik, R. F., Olszewski-Kubilius, P., & Worrell, F. C. (2011). Rethinking giftedness and gifted education: A proposed direction forward based on psychological science. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest, 12*(1), 3–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/1529100611418056
- Thompson, T. (2017). Teaching creativity through inquiry science. *Gifted Child Today, 40*(1), 29–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/1076217516675863
- Tomlinson, C. A., Brighton, C., Hertberg, H., Callahan, C. M., Moon, T. R., Brimijoin, K., Conover, L. A., Reynolds, T. (2003). Differentiating instruction in response to student readiness, interest and learning profile in academically diverse classrooms: A review of the literature. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 27(2–3), 119–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/016235320302700203
- VanTassel-Baska, J. (1986). Effective curriculum and instructional models for talented students. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 30(4), 164–169. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698628603000404
- VanTassel-Baska, J., Bracken, B., Feng, A., & Brown, E. (2009). A longitudinal study of enhancing critical thinking and reading comprehension in Title 1 classrooms. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 33(1), 7–37. https://doi.org/10.1177/016235320903300102
- VanTassel-Baska, J. & Brown, E. F. (2009). An analysis of gifted education curriculum models. In F. A. Karnes & S. M. Bean (Eds.), *Methods and materials for teaching the gifted* (p. 75–106). Prufrock Press Inc. http://gift.fed.cuhk.edu.hk/download/Vantassel-Baska%20Article%202.pdf
- Walsh, R. L., Kemp, C. R., Hodge, K. A., & Bowes, J. M. (2012). Searching for evidence-based practice: A review of the research on educational interventions for intellectually gifted children in the early childhood years. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 35(2), 103–128. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353212440610