Review of the Literature on Speaking and Listening Skills

Report to the Ministry of Education

(Aotearoa New Zealand)

Amanda Denston

College of Education, Health, and Human Development

University of Canterbury

August 2021

Contents

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Seema Gautam and Karina Sandweg who supported this literature review. They both went to great lengths, including sourcing additional information around developing listening and speaking skills from their international networks, such as the American-Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA). Fiona Tyson, a specialist librarian in Education at the University of Canterbury (UC), was instrumental in setting this review on the right path and was unfailing in her support around literature and database searches. Thanks to Alison Arrow (University of Canterbury) for her constant support as my listening ear and sounding board. Letitia Fickel (University of Canterbury) was another constant support, providing me with numerous ideas and supporting me to manage my workload, which enabled me to do what 'I had to do.' Renee Downey (Knighton Normal School), kindly shared with me her insight and experience of using Dramatic Inquiry and Mantle of the Expert within the classroom setting; I am very appreciative. Cheryl Brown and Kathryn McCallum (University of Canterbury) provided me with helpful ideas and guidance around digital technology and social media. Thanks to John Everatt (University of Canterbury) for this thoughts and Jane Carroll (University of Otago) for her kōrero. Finally, a heartfelt thanks to Rachel Martin (University of Otago) who continues to mentor me on my cultural journey with manaakitanga.

Executive Summary

Aotearoa New Zealand's changing ākonga population

- Aotearoa New Zealand is experiencing a changing ākonga population, including growth in Asian and Pacific ākonga and a decrease in Pākehā ākonga in English-medium education.

- Most Māori ākonga attend English-medium schools. This number has increased over the past 10 years.

- Aotearoa New Zealand has a high-quality but low equity education system, meaning educational disparities exist, especially for Māori and Pacific ākonga. Data indicate these disparities are pervasive, requiring changes within our education system.

- Policies and strategies aimed to address educational disparities for Māori are ineffective because their implementation occurs within colonial practices, ignoring the role of culture, language, and identity in teaching and learning. They are not equitable, nor inclusive.

- Policies aimed to address educational disparities for Pacific ākonga must acknowledge the role of L1 in developing English.

- Success for Māori as Māori requires transforming current approaches to teaching and learning to include identity, culture, and language.

The importance of listening and speaking

- Listening and speaking skills are fundamental to engaging within and across the New Zealand Curriculum, including developing key competencies and the reciprocal use of these competencies to foster learning.

- Developing oral language skills that include listening and speaking skills hold a reciprocal relationship with literacy development and academic achievement; however, these effects are variable and can be influenced by:

    - Listening and speaking experiences within early childhood, including verbal and non-verbal behaviours and the influence of cultural practices and norms.

    - SES and family, social, and environmental risk factors.

- These factors, among others, are why tamariki have been identified as entering formal schooling with lower oral language skills; however, less than 40% of teachers appear to measure oral language or listening and speaking skills at school entry.

- Developing listening and speaking skills within English-medium educational contexts is influenced by teacher factors and ākonga factors, including:

    - Teacher beliefs around the development of listening and speaking skills in ākonga.
    - Teacher perceptions of ākonga and their language proficiency.
    - Teacher understandings concerning the development of listening and speaking skills.
    - The ability of teachers to be linguistically responsive to ākonga.
    - The ability of teachers to provide high-quality interactions through explicit teaching approaches and pedagogical practices; thus, providing opportunities for ākonga to develop listening and speaking skills.
    - Teacher confidence in developing listening and speaking skills in ākonga, including understanding learning content, interest levels, and responsive pedagogies that reflect culture, language, and identity.

- Current worldwide circumstances (Covid-19) are exacerbating OL differences in ākonga, although scant research in Aotearoa New Zealand explicitly addresses this. The reasons are complex, but lockdowns have differential effects for ākonga.

- While listening and speaking skills are fundamental to literacy development across the learning pathway, they receive little focus within Ministry of Education texts used by teachers.

Indigenous knowledge systems, language, and literacy

- Indigenous knowledge systems, including those of Māori and Pacific peoples, are embedded in oral and narrative structures that are tangible and intangible.

- Indigenous knowledge systems develop through experience within social and intergenerational contexts, are multimodal in form, and are inextricably linked with whenua.

- Oral language and literacy are fundamental to the success of Māori. Still, colonial practices within English-medium classrooms are often monolingual, focus on narrow curriculum areas, and fail to recognise the repositories of Māori knowledge and other Indigenous knowledge, including Pacific, which can be used to develop listening and speaking skills in ākonga.

- Pacific ākonga and other ELL learners experience a gap between school and home language, with little authentic recognition of bilingualism and L1 in English-medium classrooms.

- Understanding cultural relationships is fundamental to developing responsive pedagogies for Māori and Pacific ākonga and should include multimodal forms of learning.

- It is imperative to understand the influence of teaching approaches and pedagogical tools on developing listening and speaking skills in Māori and Pacific ākonga and identify the conditions that foster learning for ākonga.

The importance of speaking and listening skills

- Key reasons to focus on the development of listening and speaking skills include:
    - Listening skills are the foundation for speaking skills and literacy development; however, educational contexts place little emphasis on listening skills, instead emphasising speaking skills in teaching and assessment.
    - Proficient listening skills foster the development of speaking skills. Listening skills require ākonga to demonstrate inhibitory control, theory of mind, and comprehension monitoring. Some ākonga require additional support to develop listening skills.
    - Proficient listening and speaking skills have far transfer effects beyond academic achievement for ākonga, including developing key competencies, psychosocial development, and well-being.
    - Listening and speaking skills foster ākonga ability to resolve conflict, negotiate, and relate to others, which is fundamental to developing well-being in our young.
- Listening and speaking skills develop in complexity and should be explicitly integrated into teaching and learning programmes across the learning pathway.
- Listening and speaking skills are not homogeneous and include diverse types used for varying purposes, including informative, interpretive, practical/procedural, relational, and critical.
- Typologies of listening skills support the development of diverse speaking skills, which influence developing literacy skills.
- Developing listening and speaking skills requires teachers and ākonga to understand the sender and receiver's actions, including verbal and non-verbal behaviours.
- Dialogue that occurs within schooling contexts influences developing listening and speaking skills. Monologic and dialogic discourses are critical in education; however, the ability of teachers to respond to ākonga utterances is fundamental to extended dialogic interactions within the classroom.
- Dialogue and conversations are not synonymous. Dialogue is goal-oriented and purposeful.
- Dialogue is an essential teaching tool in education, but not all communication patterns are equally effective.

- Identifying teaching approaches and pedagogical tools to develop dialogue within educational settings that fosters listening and speaking skills in ākonga is fundamental.

Effective features of teaching approaches

- Scant literature is available that directly outlines how to develop listening and speaking skills within teaching approaches. The most effective teaching approaches in developing listening and speaking skills are those underpinned by dialogue and dialogic talk.
- Highly structured programmes are unlikely to foster listening and speaking skills in ākonga, even if teacher-ākonga interactions increase. Highly structured programmes in one learning area can negatively affect listening and speaking skills in other learning areas.
- Digital technology has expanded the conceptualisation of dialogue. Digital technology fosters listening and speaking skills through joint attention and multiple modalities; however, access to digital technology depends on availability and teacher and ākonga ability.
- Digital technology enables multimodal learning, including visual, auditory, and text-based functions that provide conditions for developing listening and speaking skills within interactive spaces. Digital technology supports inclusive practices for diverse groups of ākonga.
- Turn taking skills underpin dialogue. It is crucial that ākonga can effectively use turn taking skills to engage in interactions.
- Turn taking includes verbal and non-verbal behaviours such as grammar, pragmatics, and prosody.
- Turn taking requires ākonga to comprehend the speaker's message, suggesting that thinking time is essential.
- Developing turn taking skills requires explicit support from teachers to create extended interactions that foster listening and speaking skills.
- Dialogic talk is supported by topics or areas of inquiry that promote joint attention and the bridging of background knowledge with new understandings.
- Ensuring ākonga hold background knowledge is fundamental to ākonga engaging in listening and speaking interactions.
- Developing extended interactions can be supported by talking frames and local ground rules; however, these must be responsive to the backgrounds of the diverse population of ākonga within the classroom.
- Teachers require knowledge of effective teaching approaches to foster the development of proficient listening and speaking skills, enabling the transformation of strategies into tools within teaching and learning contexts. This must acknowledge the backgrounds of teachers and ākonga, including culture, identity, and language.
- Teachers require the ability to plan, model, and provide feedback to ākonga, supported within authentic teaching and learning contexts.

- Ongoing professional development, including coaching is the most effective approach to fostering teachers' skills, abilities, and knowledge, and to develop listening and speaking skills.
- Theoretical understandings could be developed within initial teacher education courses depending upon existing constraints.

Aotearoa New Zealand's changing ākonga population in education

Over the past 10 years, Aotearoa New Zealand's education system has experienced changes in the ākonga population. Enrolment data, collected by the Ministry of Education (2021a), indicates that ākonga numbers within our education system have increased, from slightly over 760 000 to over 820 000. In addition to growing numbers of ākonga, there is evidence of growing cultural and linguistic diversity. In 2011, around 72 000 ākonga identified as Asian; in 2020, there were about 116 000. Pacific ākonga numbers have also slowly increased over this period, from approximately 75 000 to 80 000. Māori ākonga have increased significantly from around 171 000 to over 200 000. Enrolments of European/Pākehā ākonga have decreased from around 415 000 to slightly under 390 000 ākonga. The majority of ākonga in New Zealand attend English-medium education. Few European/Pākehā ākonga are recorded as attending kura kaupapa Māori, although this number has doubled in the past 10 years. The number of Māori ākonga attending designated character schools has nearly tripled over the last 10 years, and numbers of Māori ākonga attending kura kaupapa Māori have steadily increased, from around 6100 in 2010 to 8200 in 2020. However, most Māori ākonga attend English-medium educational contexts, and this number is steadily increasing from around 163 000 in 2010 to around 185 000 in 2020.

It is fundamental that educators meet the needs of our changing population of ākonga. The New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2015) includes *all* ākonga within English-medium state schools. As such, educational environments and teaching and learning programmes must be inclusive to ensure equitable outcomes for all (Ayala et al., 2012). However, equity is a complex and contentious issue in Aotearoa New Zealand. Aotearoa New Zealand has a high-quality but low equity education system, resulting in groups of ākonga being consistently underserved (Berryman et al., 2017). Educational disparities between groups of ākonga within English-medium education have been evident over time and continue today (Berryman et al., 2017).

One group of underserved ākonga are Māori, the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa New Zealand. Data demonstrate the disparities between Māori and Pākehā learners. Ministry of Education data from 2019 indicates that Māori males experience stand-downs at around twice the rate of Pākehā males (65 versus 37.7 per 1000 cases), while Māori females experience stand-downs at nearly three times the rate of Pākehā females (31.5 to 10.6 per 1000 cases) (Ministry of Education, 2021b). Data is similar for another group of underserved learners, Pacific ākonga. Pacific males are stood down more frequently than Pākehā males (48.1 versus 37.7 per 1000 cases), while Pacific females experience stand-down rates nearly double of Pākehā females (20.2 versus 10.6 per 1000 cases). Disparities are also evident in school leavers' educational achievement data with NCEA (National Certification of Educational Achievement) Level 3 or UE standards (Ministry of Education, 2021c). Data from 2020 identified that 40.3% of Māori ākonga left school with Level 3 or UE standards, in

comparison to 55.8% Pacific ākonga, 60.4% European/Pākehā, and 81.3% of Asian ākonga. While rates have increased over the 2010-2020 period (29.4% for Pacific ākonga and 18.9% for Māori ākonga), there remains a significant achievement gap for Māori ākonga (Ministry of Education, 2021c), which can have negative effects on future pathways (Berryman et al., 2017).

Although policies, such as Ka Hikitia and Te Hurihanganui, have been developed to address educational disparities for Māori ākonga, and although the New Zealand Curriculum outlines success for all ākonga, little progress has occurred. What has precluded advances from being made is that issues around disparities often continue to be made within a framework of colonial practices that place authority and power within those who are privileged over less privileged groups (Berryman et al., 2017; Bishop et al., 2014). Bishop et al. (2014) and Skerrett (2020) argue that policies also fail to ignore ongoing issues of systemic racism while failing to account for the rangatiratanga of Māori. Systemic change, including through whole school reform, has been advocated that includes school culture and leadership, and classroom pedagogy (Berryman & Eley, 2017; Berryman et al., 2017). For many Māori ākonga, their success is measured through assimilation into English-medium contexts. However, this overlooks Indigenous knowledge systems and how they can positively contribute to schooling practices (Hare, 2011). Success for Māori requires transforming current approaches to teaching and learning to account for Māori knowledge systems and their identity, culture, and language (Berryman et al., 2017; Skerrett, 2020), which is influential to engagement (Bishop et al., 2007), well-being (Skerrett, 2020), and identity development (Hare, 2011). Interestingly, these aspects are key objectives underpinning the Ka Hikitia 30-year vision for Māori enjoying and experiencing academic success in New Zealand (Ministry of Education, 2021d). However, success requires Māori to have rangatiratanga (self-determination) over the education of their tamariki. This requires a shift from kāwanatanga (representing Crown governance) to a liminal space where guidance over the shared concern includes rangatiratanga and kāwanatanga, thus adhering to the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) (Charters et al., 2019), of which Aotearoa New Zealand became a signatory in 2010.

A Background to Listening and Speaking

The centrality of language to learning with the New Zealand Curriculum means that developing skills within the English learning area is essential for tamariki to experience success within and across the curriculum. The Ministry of Education (2015, p.18) states that "by engaging with text-based activities, students become increasingly skilled and sophisticated speakers and listeners." Thus, speaking and listening skills are fundamental to engagement and success within the English learning area and in all learning areas across the learning pathway. These skills are also crucial to tamariki participating within the wider educational system and contributing to and participating in Aotearoa New Zealand and beyond.

Speaking and listening skills are contained within two interrelated strands within the English learning area. The strands include oral, written, and visual forms of language and are related to making or creating meaning, which increases in depth and sophistication across the learning pathway through the continued development of skills. Achievement objectives

outline learning processes, knowledge, and skills that are aligned to ensure the learning needs of tamariki are met. However, beyond reference to the connections between oral, visual, and written language and the use of oral language for effect and to sustain interest (Ministry of Education, 2015), there is scant explicit reference to how speaking and listening develops. This may reflect the notion that texts are synonymous with written language, which is highly valued within the Western culture (Ritchie & Rau, 2008). Listening and speaking have a clear role across all learning areas within the curriculum. Each learning area contains its own language or languages, which requires teachers to support developing listening and speaking skills. Some groups require additional support in their learning, including English Language Learners (ELL) and tamariki new to English-medium contexts. Such support is fundamental to ensuring that the vision for our tamariki as lifelong learners who are confident, connected, and actively involved is met (Ministry of Education, 2015).

Speaking and listening skills are inherent within the key competencies of the New Zealand Curriculum and are fundamental to all learning. The key competencies include thinking, using language, symbols, and texts, managing self, relating to others, and participating and contributing (Ministry of Education, 2015, p.12). The development of key competencies is reciprocal. Successful learners develop and use competencies along with other resources within the social domain, which contributes to the continued fostering of competencies alongside other goals (Ministry of Education, 2015). Thus, proficiency in listening and speaking skills is fundamental to tamariki developing key competencies, such as thinking, managing self, and relating to others, as well as using these key competencies to accomplish other learning goals.

Oral Language and Literacy Development

Developing oral language (OL) that includes listening and speaking skills is crucial to children's success within the educational system, and across the lifespan (Dobinson & Dockrell, 2021). The differential influence of OL skills on outcomes for tamariki is clear within the literature. Tamariki who experience difficulties in developing OL skills are likely to demonstrate lower levels of academic achievement at school (Jalongo, 2008). In contrast, a positive association has been identified between proficient OL skills and academic achievement (Snow, 2016). The association between academic achievement and OL is due to the critical association between OL and the development of literacy skills, including reading and writing. Lonigan and Shanahan (2013) reported a strong predictive association between OL and early decoding skills and later reading comprehension. Justice et al. (2013) found that tamariki at Grade 5 (Year 6) identified as poor comprehenders demonstrated poorer language comprehension and production skills across early childhood, compared to tamariki with typically developing reading comprehension skills or poor decoders. OL skills influence the ability of tamariki to decode and make meaning of texts, which increases in complexity over the learning pathway (Shanahan & Lonigan, 2020). Developing OL skills is fundamental to ākonga experiencing success within and across the curriculum due to its association with reading and writing skills. According to Carter and Hopkins (2020, p.4), this means

"educators must understand oral language and know how to support and promote the acquisition of oral language skills for all students."

The link between OL and literacy development is apparent within national literacy documents. However, these texts clearly emphasise reading and writing skills over OL. Effective Literacy Practice in Years 1 to 4 focuses on teaching ākonga reading and writing skills. The text draws attention to the role of OL in underpinning written language skills, although there is an obvious lack of how to develop listening and speaking skills in ākonga beyond practising OL across the school, home, and community contexts (Ministry of Education, 2003). The Ministry of Education (2003) explicitly states that educators should not delay reading and writing instruction until strong OL has developed. However, this is debatable given the link between OL skills and literacy development. Such statements may have contributed to misconceptions that listening and speaking skills are of little importance to literacy development and there is no need to incorporate explicit instruction of these skills into teaching and learning programmes. This viewpoint directly contrasts the importance of listening and speaking skills in developing te reo Māori within English-medium classrooms, where reading and writing skills are not initially an explicit focus (Ministry of Education, 2011). The importance of OL skills is inferred within Effective Literacy Strategies in Years 9 to 13, with the Ministry of Education (2004) stating that "literacy teaching is just as important for academic success in year 13 as it is in year 9" (p. 7). However, OL is conveyed as an outcome of reading and writing skills, "so they can translate written language into spoken language and vice versa" (Ministry of Education, 2004, p. 53) or a means to introduce ākonga to new types of texts, text structures, and content vocabulary, rather than a set of skills that require explicit instruction within the secondary years.

The effects of OL on the development of literacy skills are variable. International research indicates variation in the incidence of language difficulties in tamariki. In the United Kingdom (UK), incidence rates range from 7.56 per cent of tamariki demonstrating language difficulties of an unknown origin (Norbury et al., 2016) to 40 per cent (Law et al., 2009). Language difficulties in childhood have been identified as a significant risk of literacy difficulties in adulthood (Law et al., 2009), although this appears to be influenced by multiple factors. Tamariki, who have developed OL before school entry, have been found to hold a working vocabulary over 50% greater than tamariki with lower developed OL skills (Van Hees, 2011). Outcomes are worse for some tamariki, including those from low socioeconomic status areas (SES) (Hoff, 2006) and high deprivation (Dobinson & Dockrell, 2021), who are likely to experience additional challenges to OL development and learning due to poverty (Wamba, 2010), family and social risk factors (Foster et al., 2005), or environmental effects, such as earthquakes (Gomez & Yoshikawa, 2017).

The influence of SES (socioeconomic status) on oral language development is documented within the literature. Seminal research by Hart and Risley (1995) found that tamariki of lower SES parents were exposed to significantly fewer words than tamariki of high SES parents, resulting in significant differences in cumulative vocabulary sizes by three years of age. Variation in the language heard between high and low SES tamariki illustrated

differential interaction types. However, variation in the type of language experiences provided by mothers has been identified in research examining interaction types between high SES mothers due to contextual factors (Hoff-Ginsberg, 1991, 1998). Interestingly, research has also identified non-verbal behaviours as influential to oral language development. Rowe & Goldin-Meadow (2009a) found the use of gesture within early childhood within different SES groups, which increased or decreased meaning within communicative interactions was influential to later linguistic development, including vocabulary development. They found gestures, within early childhood carried different meanings and were predictive of later verbal vocabulary size (Rowe & Goldin-Meadow, 2009b). These findings highlight the role of non-verbal behaviours in language and communication development and highlight the complexity of language development that is influenced by multiple factors that include culture, context, and setting.

Data from the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS, 2016), which measures trends in reading achievement in ākonga across five-yearly cycles over approximately 50 countries, has identified that literacy skills at school entry vary. However, the influence of education systems makes between-country comparisons difficult (Chamberlain, 2019). Data gathered from school principals in Aotearoa New Zealand, reported that 44% of schools had less than 25% of tamariki enter formal education with early literacy skills, while only 5% of schools had more than 75 % of tamariki enter with early literacy skills (Chamberlain, 2019). Levels of early literacy skills in Aotearoa New Zealand, were well below the data reported from other countries, except for Australia (Chamberlain, 2019). Low levels of literacy at school entry may be partially accounted for by low levels of OL, as identified in recent research by Gillon and colleagues (2019). They reported that in a sample of 247 tamariki from seven primary schools in Christchurch, 61.5 percent (n = 152) of ākonga held low OL skills. Caution is required in generalising this research, due to environmental effects that include the ongoing effects of the Canterbury earthquake sequence. However, the data suggest that a high percentage of ākonga are likely to experience difficulties in literacy development due to low OL skills. These data align with other reports, such as Van Hees (2011), who noted increasing numbers of young ākonga (5 and 6 years of age) experiencing difficulties expressing ideas, which impacts their ability to engage with the curriculum and develop literacy skills.

Understanding OL within early education is more complex due to the high variability around OL assessment within the first year of school. A nationwide survey carried out by Cameron and colleagues (2019) across Aotearoa New Zealand schools found that only 38% of respondents assessed oral language in ākonga through the Tell me subscale of the School Entry Assessment (SEA). While 48% of respondents used the Junior Oral Language Screening Tool (JOST), this was more often used (71%) with ākonga of concern. Most notably, Cameron et al. (2019) reported that only 14% assessed expressive or receptive language skills. Interestingly, there appears to be little assessment of listening and speaking skills within authentic contexts. Cameron et al. (2019) suggested that the high percentage of respondents using the JOST reflected concern regarding OL skills in ākonga and their association with developing literacy skills.

The longitudinal effects of low OL are reflected in PIRLS data, which has long indicated a persistent gap in the development of literacy skills between high and low performing ākonga (Tunmer et al., 2013). PIRLS data from 2011 indicated a decrease in reading performance in Year 5 ākonga from 22nd to 29th (Chamberlain, 2019), while PIRLS data from 2016 found that although 41% of ākonga demonstrated the ability to engage with more complex texts, there was a significant decrease in the mean reading score across the board in ākonga (Ministry of Education, 2017), including Māori and Pacific. These data suggest that many of our ākonga are likely to experience barriers to accessing the curriculum to their full potential due to literacy difficulties that are related to low OL skills. These data also support the call by the Education Review Office (ERO) (2017) for the Ministry of Education to focus on OL across the learning pathway from Years 0 to 8, including developing clear curriculum expectations, assessment tools, and resources for learning.

Present worldwide circumstances may be exacerbating existing differences in OL ability. While data outlining the effects of Covid-19 on educational outcomes in Aotearoa New Zealand are still emerging, in a review of studies, Mutch (2021) reported that lockdowns during the Covid-19 pandemic had exacerbated inequalities within education for disparate groups, including Māori and Pacific ākonga. These groups had less access to online modes of education delivery, less access to digital devices, and were less likely to have conducive study environments (Mutch, 2021). Other common experiences included decreased social interaction among ākonga and enjoyment in learning, which are important to developing OL skills. Hood (2020) noted that changing interactions from in-person to online meant a loss in non-verbal cues, important to in-person interactions and conversational turn-taking, and a loss of sustained conversations from teachable moments. However, online interactions supported some ākonga to speak and contribute more than during in-person interactions, meaning that online interactions may allow for more reluctant speakers to engage within classroom interactions, although teachers may find this challenging to develop.

Variation in experiences during lockdown was clear. According to Hood (2020), variation was evident within and between schools, including between classes across the lockdown period (Hood, 2020). Overall, lockdown produced a range of experiences for ākonga. UK data provides insight as to the effect of Covid-19 on developing OL skills. The Oracy All-Party Parliamentary Group in the United Kingdom [APPG] (2021) reported that differences in OL abilities are increasing due to the long-term effects of the Covid-19 pandemic and its ongoing impacts on schools, including closures and online learning; however, the data suggests the increasing gap is due to multiple factors that extend beyond Covid-19.

Research cited within the APPG report found that 70 % of teachers found it difficult to develop oracy skills via online schooling due to lower levels of interaction. Less than 50 % of teachers were confident on curriculum requirements for oracy and only 32 % of students reported a focus on oracy within their schools. These data align with Dobinson and Dockrell (2021), who outline several aspects that influence teachers' ability to develop speaking and listening skills in tamariki. Some teachers perceived that speaking and listening skills develop

in tamariki implicitly, meaning they did not engage in explicit skill teaching. Some teachers view speaking and listening as comprising separate skills, which means that the interconnected nature of these skills and their bidirectional relationship with reading and writing development and the need for developing proficiency in these skills lacks recognition (Dobinson & Dockrell, 2021). Latham (2005) noted that listening and speaking are viewed as less important than other learning areas, such as reading and writing, which leads to fewer learning experiences. This lack of importance may derive from misconceptions that derive from existing frameworks. Latham (2005) reported that teachers wrongly assumed that listening and speaking skills developed within the Literacy Hour in the UK, thus, resulting in a lack of explicit focus.

The key recommendation of APPG (2021) for the Department of Education (UK) included developing guidance materials for oracy. Further recommendations included effective approaches, clear learning progressions for the development oracy including for diverse learners, provision of resources that support classroom teaching, and fostering oracy in disadvantaged groups. This suggests a lack of understanding exists in education about the effective development of listening and speaking skills in ākonga and what these skills consist of across the learning pathway.

Culture, Indigenous knowledge systems, and language and literacy

Traditionally, for Indigenous cultures, oracy provided the basis by which Indigenous knowledge was transmitted and learned (Hare, 2011). For numerous Indigenous cultures, oracy carries traditions and histories inextricably tied to their people's past, present, and future lives, as individuals and as a collective (Mahuika, 2012). During language acquisition, tamariki acquire an implicit sign system and internalise cultural perspectives around meaning-making under varying social circumstances (O'Connor & Michaels, 2007). Thus, language acquisition in tamariki extends beyond language to include identity development formed through cultural ideologies and power relations that differ across generations (Anchimbe, 2007; Martin, 2017). Linguistic identity considers the interaction between language and culture, which reflects the linguistic reality of the social world of tamariki (Martin, 2017).

Cultural variation influences early language development in tamariki, including differences in vocabulary development (see Hoff, 2006 for a detailed explanation of cultural variation). Culture influences the degree to which tamariki are spoken to, the number of communicative interactions that tamariki are exposed to, and how they are exposed to these interactions (Hoff, 2006). During these interactions, tamariki develop their sense of self as they negotiate and renegotiate relationships within their social world (Atkinson, 2011). These interactions, along with a developing sense of self, influence language development, and language-based experiences that ākonga enter early childhood education or formal schooling with vary widely. Indigenous daily practices significantly contrast with school-based language practices (James, 2014). This sets Indigenous ākonga up to fail because the contrasting practices negatively affect engagement and interest in formal schooling (Hare, 2011; James, 2014), which compounds because oral language and literacy instruction and assessment are underpinned by Standard forms of English, which ignore cultural forms of

vernacular (James, 2014). Bridging contrasting practices requires creating space for Indigenous knowledge to be incorporated into the schooling context that includes whānau and community, as well as culture, language, and identity (Hare, 2011),

Cultural norms are influential to how ākonga engage in listening and speaking within the schooling context. Ākonga from Asian ethnicities are more likely to favour listening and note-taking over speaking for reasons that relate to conflict, power, and social status (Shi & Tan, 2020). Female ākonga from some Asian ethnicities are more likely to be silent participators due to cultural norms around the female voice and public arenas (see Shi & Tan, 2020). Torres and colleagues (2018), in their cross-cultural research of Year 4 (8-9 years of age) classrooms in the UK and Chile, found that teachers demonstrated similar levels of teacher regulatory talk that included directive (directed student thinking), guided/scaffolded (scaffolding to support ākonga regulation), and autonomy/supportive (self-regulation by ākonga). However, in Chilean ākonga, directive talk was negatively associated with guided and autonomous talk, but this was not the case for English students. This suggests that the same type of talk can have distinct functions for diverse cultures (Torres et al., 2018), including fostering distinct types of talk in ākonga. Due to cultural influences, listening and speaking skills may not be easily transferred between contexts.

Culture is an influential factor in the types of listening and speaking skills that influence the development of self-regulation in ākonga. Torres et al. (2018) identified differential outcomes for self-regulation related to the patterned use of specific types of talk. Guided talk fostered self-regulatory (metacognitive monitoring and control) behaviours in Chilean and UK ākonga. In the UK sample, directive talk was negatively associated with developing self-regulation in ākonga. This was not the case for Chilean ākonga, which Torres et al. (2018) suggested may reflect societal practices of collectivism and directive parenting. Autonomy talk was positively related to developing self-regulation in Chilean ākonga but had a negative effect on UK ākonga. Interestingly, they noted differential effects between Chilean and UK teacher regulatory talk on the development of other aspects, including self-efficacy. Torres and colleagues (2018) suggested that different communicative practices may hold different connotations for groups of ākonga. This means that teachers need to have an awareness of how communicative acts that are culturally developed contribute to developing behaviours and skills in ākonga.

Māori, Indigenous knowledge systems, language, and literacy

Indigenous knowledge systems are well recognised as including oral and narrative structures that develop within social and intergenerational contexts through experience (Hare, 2011). For Māori, knowledge systems are part of one's cultural identity, holistic and embodied within place and environment (Hindle & Matthewman, 2017). In te ao Māori, developing a sense of self would include linguistic connections to the past via whakapapa (ancestral origin and genealogy) (Martin, 2017). The deliberate subjugation of the Māori language due to colonisation practices influenced how one negotiated a sense of self within their identity development, which continues across generations (Martin, 2017). Te reo Māori enables Māori to live as Māori. Te ao Māori is reflected when literacy is represented through

culture and connections to the natural world (Hindle & Matthewman, 2017). How literacy, place, and environment are represented, vary, including through tangible (knowledge and skillset required to complete a task) and intangible (quality) forms (Hindle & Matthewman, 2017). Both aspects are fundamental to identity and place and can lead to differences in how knowledge is presented and its impact (Hindle & Matthewman, 2017). The intangible aspect of representation, which Hindle and Matthewman (2017) conceptualise as *being*, is a challenge within Eurocentric forms of literacy practice because they are not easily described. However, intangible representations support other literacy practices, including written and multimodal forms. Multimodal forms of literacy are embedded within oral traditions, such as the use of kōwhaiwhai (patterns) to learn about whakapapa (Hindle & Matthewman, 2017). Francis and Reyhner, as cited in Hare (2011), argue that oral narrative skills are a vital cultural resource, which educators have missed. They further argue that oral narratives are high-quality, thus promoting oral language skills, including language comprehension, and listening skills, which introduce tamariki to various text structures and language features. The overlooking of this cultural resource may be attributed to colonising practices and the increasing prominence of written language, which Hindle and Matthewman (2017) argue should be part of broader communicative practices that include oracy and symbolism.

Proficiency in literacy and language, which includes listening and speaking skills, is fundamental to Māori ākonga succeeding as Māori (Berryman & Eley, 2017). To foster literacy in a way that represents culture, language, and identity in an authentic manner, literacy activities need to explicitly connect to place, environment, identity, and wairua using tohu (symbols) from within the Māori world, and local hapū and iwi (sub-tribes and tribes) (Hindle & Matthewman, 2017). These include pōwhiri (rituals of encounter), whakataukī (proverbs), waiata (song), and local cultural narratives such as pūrākau (Hindle & Matthewman, 2017), which are repositories for Indigenous knowledge. To understand the embodiment of Māori culture within the natural world and place, Skerrett (2020) argues that this requires teachers to hold mātauranga Māori and cultural understandings, including te reo Māori. Translanguaging (while contentious in some circles) can support ākonga of minority languages (Seals & Olsen-Reeder, 2020) because it provides ākonga with the ability to create spaces where metalinguistic identities, including te ao Māori, can be applied to programme activities and resources underpinned by Eurocentric ideologies (May et al., 2006; Seals & Olsen-Reeder, 2020). Children view the boundaries between languages, such as te reo Māori and English, as fluid (Gutiérrez et al., 2017) which Anchimbe (2007) calls linguabridity.

Pedagogical actions are fundamental to ensuring the effective engagement of Māori ākonga in learning and creating equitable conditions for developing listening and speaking skills. In Te Kōtahitanga, which examined how to improve Māori achievement in secondary school, Bishop and colleagues (2007) found that classroom interactions that were dominated by transmission types of interactions were prevalent but had a minor impact on learning for Māori ākonga. Classrooms, where transmission interactions were prominent, focused on controlling ākonga behaviour, which compounded adverse effects for Māori ākonga. These interactions reinforced dominant Eurocentric notions, leaving little opportunity for creating relationships that underpinned responsive pedagogies. Speaking in whole class interactions

caused Māori ākonga whakamā, which Bishop et al. (2007) suggested may be related to differences in cultural identity (collective vs. individual), thus, resulting in higher levels of silent participation in ākonga. Māori ākonga reported feeling more comfortable during interactions, including talk, discussion, and debate. According to Berryman et al. (2015), these interactions or spaces provide opportunities for sharing aspects such as knowledge, identities, and connections and provide ākonga with rangatiratanga in decision-making around engaging in dialogue.

In Te Kōtahitanga, Māori ākonga reported that learning was more meaningful in smaller groups or when there were shared opportunities for ākonga to interact conversationally, rather than whole-class interactions (Bishop et al., 2007). Notably, changes in interactions also resulted in positive changes to teacher-ākonga relationships. Ākonga felt more comfortable to ask questions of teachers, thus, fostering speaking and listening skills, which created opportunities for positive interactions between ākonga and teachers. This suggests that contexts for learning are influential to developing listening and speaking skills in Māori ākonga, and that as Berryman et al. (2018) noted, teachers' actions and how they relate to ākonga are fundamental to engagement in learning. Interestingly, Bishop et al. (2007) reported that professional development outside of the classroom was much less effective in developing discursive practices in teachers, than co-construction meetings and shadow-coaching. This suggests that professional development aimed at the engagement of Māori ākonga in learning is more likely to be effective when carried out within the classroom context. This may be related to teachers focusing on the nature of their cultural relationships with ākonga (Berryman et al., 2018) rather than simply aiming to be culturally responsive. While Te Kōtahitanga was situated in secondary schools, the implications are applicable within and across the learning pathway because they foster success for Māori, as Māori (Berryman & Eley, 2017). This is supported by data from Bishop et al. (2007) that found cultural relationships and responsive pedagogies within literacy had positive effects for ākonga in Maths, especially for Māori ākonga.

Pacific, Indigenous knowledge systems, and language and literacy

The Pacific Islands, including Samoa, Fiji, Cook Island, Nuie, Tonga, Tuvalu, and Tokelau, represent a diverse population of ākonga in Aotearoa New Zealand. Often termed Pacific or Pasifika, this umbrella term has led to misconceptions of homogeneity among peoples whose cultures differ (Flavell, 2017; May, 2020; Reynolds, 2017). As aforementioned, educational disparities exist for Pacific ākonga. This is due to the home-language gap, which is the gap in the correspondence between home and school language and academic achievement (May, 2020). It is exacerbated by longstanding colonial practices relating to monolingual education where ākonga are submersed in English-medium education, resulting in the overrepresentation of Pacific ākonga in our longstanding literacy tail of achievement (May, 2020). However, this is complex for Pacific peoples because te reo Māori is clearly acknowledged within the New Zealand Curriculum, bilingualism is not (May, 2020). Data from the Ministry of Education (2021c) suggest that this overrepresentation has changed slightly over the past ten years; however, educational disparities remain of concern.

Although Pacific peoples are diverse, their cultures are underpinned by collectivism and core values, such as reciprocity and respect, family and relationships, spirituality, and service (including to the church), love and belonging (Anae, as cited in Civil & Hunter, 2015). These core values shape the lived realities of Pacific peoples, even if generational differences exist (Reynolds, 2017), and have been identified as critical to Pacific ākonga experiencing success in education (Fletcher et al., 2005). There is a clear link between Pacific languages and identity development. According to Davis et al. (cited in May, 2020), language identifies one's belonging within specific Pacific communities. The role of Pacific languages and culture in schools has been identified as influential to the confidence and self-esteem of Pacific ākonga (Fletcher et al., 2009). In the Samoan culture, language and oral cultural narratives are closely tied to psychosocial development (self-esteem and confidence) and cultural identity (Kruse Va'ai, 2015; May, 2020). Like for Māori ākonga, policies and plans have identified that language, culture, and identity are fundamental to Pacific ākonga experiencing success in their learning. While Pacific languages are inextricably linked to identity and culture, weaving threads of genealogy, through the rich figurative language of nuance, metaphor, and intonation (Kruse Va'ai, 2015), the exclusivity and dominance of English, as the language of schooling in education, often subjugates and devalues formal and informal Pacific language use. School practices reinforce the devaluing of Indigenous languages. ELL ākonga are primarily withdrawn from their primary learning context to receive English language support, which does not often acknowledge the role of L1 in bilingual language development (May, 2020). May (2020) raises fundamental questions around how our education system can reduce persistent educational disparities when the system fails to recognise the interdependence of languages for bilinguals, including Pacific, ākonga.

In terms of listening and speaking, the daily practices of Pacific ākonga are highly likely to contrast approaches encountered within English-medium educational contexts. This means that ākonga are unable to use their L1 language comprehension, which includes prior knowledge and inferencing skills, to bridge the gap between their existing knowledge and their knowledge yet to be developed within the English-medium context (May, 2020). This compounds when academic performance and achievement are measured using Standard forms of English (including in instructional reading texts). Fletcher et al. (2009) found that English language concepts within texts were unfamiliar to Pacific ākonga or were less translatable to L1 languages, which influenced the development of reading comprehension. Interestingly, teachers within this study highlighted the importance of oral language skills to reading development in Pacific ākonga, noting the influence of rich discussions within the home, through an ako context, on successful reading development.

The role of cultural values is influential to listening and speaking skills in Pacific ākonga. They are more likely to engage in listening, especially with teachers, because it marks a sign of respect rather than engaging in questioning (Fletcher et al., 2009). However, a preference for listening may also relate to reluctance in risk-taking. Fletcher et al. (2009) found that Pacific ākonga were less likely to take risks in learning or to expose low levels of knowledge, especially if presented concepts do not align with ākonga experiences. This can lead to

misconceptions around ākonga engagement and subsequent achievement. Challenging misconceptions is fundamental. Research has found that misconceptions have resulted in teachers holding deficit beliefs around Pacific (and Māori) ākonga, including low expectations around achievement (Turner et al., 2005). These deficit beliefs also extended to whānau, with teachers viewing whānau as uneducated and unable to provide their tamariki appropriate support (Turner et al., 2015), even though this was highly valued by whānau.

In her research with whānau from a variety of Pacific cultures, Flavell (2017) noted that whānau engaged in listening as a sign of respect with teachers and that the lack of understanding around Pacific cultures resulted in misconceptions around parental engagement in the education of their ākonga. Flavell (2017) identified that communication with both ākonga and whānau was negatively influenced by not holding understandings and knowledge of whānau perspectives that are underpinned by culture, language, and identity. Flavell (2017) argued that actively listening to whānau and engaging in communicative acts was fundamental to developing reciprocal relationships, which she noted fostered inclusion for both ākonga and whānau. Flavell's (2017) research is indicative of the importance of bridging the cultural disconnect between Pacific cultures and the English-medium education context. It also suggests that teachers need to develop their understanding and knowledge of Pacific ākonga and their differing cultures, enabling them to understand the values of Pacific ākonga, whānau, and their communities (Spiller, 2012). Developing relationships between teachers and Pacific ākonga is fundamental, and student voice is essential to enacting these relationships (Reynolds, 2017). This would contribute to reconstructing the lens that some teachers use to construct understandings of Pacific ākonga within our current education system (Reynolds, 2017).

The Importance of Speaking and Listening Skills

The importance of speaking and listening is recognised within education, both nationally within the New Zealand Curriculum and internationally, for example, within the Common Core State Standards (US (United States)) and the National Curriculum of England. Holding quality listening and speaking skills is often viewed as fundamental to education (APPG, 2021), and teachers' roles in developing these skills are considered crucial (Jones, 2007). International research (Justice et al., 2018; Piasta et al., 2012) found teachers who were linguistically responsive and who used explicit strategies to foster the participation of tamariki within conversations were associated with positive gains in productivity and complexity of language in tamariki. Research by Justice et al. (2014) also highlights the significant role of peers in OL development within the early years of schooling. In a sample of nearly 700 US pre-school ākonga, Justice and colleagues found that peers were influential in fostering pragmatic language abilities (social aspects of language) in other peers. Tamariki who held low OL skills made more significant gains when exposed to tamariki with stronger OL skills, especially if they held an Individual Education Plan, signalling the presence of a disability. These studies suggest that professional development is integral to developing teachers' ability to implement strategies that support the inclusive development of OL in tamariki (Dockrell et al., 2017). However, it also suggests that educators in leadership

positions engaged in classroom composition and programme development require awareness of the role of peers in OL development to ensure conditions for fostering such skills are considered (Justice et al., 2014). This is crucial because tamariki with difficulties often do not qualify for specialist support (Gillon et al., 2019), and needs often outstrip the capacity to support these learners in developing OL skills.

Tamariki are expected to use speaking and listening skills within their learning across a wide range of learning contexts. Speaking and verbal interactions have been identified as a commonly used tool for learning (Alexander, 2013) and are increasingly considered best practice for demonstrating knowledge and reasoning (Remedios et al., 2008) and engagement in learning (Shi & Tan, 2020) meaning that teachers often use speaking as a tool for assessment practices (Peterson et al., 2010). However, the heavy focus on speaking fails to account for other ways that ākonga engage in learning activities through behaviour, cognition, and affect (Shi & Tan, 2020), and how the role of culture, language, identity, as well as place can influence ākonga participation in speaking activities (Remedios et al., 2008). Individual factors are also influential, such as low interest, lack of confidence, and low understanding of learning material (Remedios et al., 2008). Environmental factors are influential to developing listening and speaking skills where sources of a language model and opportunities for communication are absent for ākonga (Hoff, 2006), such as for tamariki who are deaf, blind, or experience processing difficulties.

A focus on speaking skills has been argued as fundamental within early education, which includes capturing profiles of tamariki and their strengths and weaknesses within a Tier 1 context (Dobinson & Dockrell, 2021). This focus may reflect the association between the quality of language provision and speaking skills in tamariki and research findings regarding the close association between speaking skills and literacy. However, when interpreting research results caution must be extended to account for differing methodological frameworks and data reporting from measures. A primary focus on speaking skills is arguable given that listening is the foundation of language development and is from where speaking, reading, and writing develop (Jalongo, 2008). Listening enables individuals to function between what is known and unknown, and typically a willingness to use speaking skills emerges when there is an accumulation of comprehensible input (Jalongo, 2008). According to Haroutunian-Gordon (2015), listening is fundamental to dialogue, fostering listening skills. Thus, listening and speaking skills are reciprocal and have multiple spinoff effects because of their basis in cognition and emotion.

Literature is clear that listening during learning is preferred for some learners or learning within smaller groups (Khoo, 2003). ELL can be challenged by the existing language of the classroom, which includes idiomatic English and content-related vocabulary, as well as by socio-cultural forces that include norms around power structures and body language (Remedios et al., 2008). Because speaking develops from listening, ELL learners may initially rely heavily on listening within their environments. Listening enables them to develop communicative competence (socially and academically) in language/s other than their mother tongue and develop linguistic repertoires in the acquired language (Boyd &

Rubin, 2006). While personal and socio-cultural differences exist that influence the development of speaking skills, these skills are influential to the perceptions that teachers hold around ākonga. Vega and colleagues (2018) found that teacher perceptions of tamariki and their overall development were strongly correlated to speaking skills. These perceptions are influential to the quality of language interactions tamariki experience. Justice and colleagues (2013) identified a bi-directional association between the use of syntactic forms between teachers and tamariki, with teacher's utterances adjusting to mimic the syntactic levels of tamariki. This suggests tamariki with lower speaking skills may be recipients of lower quality verbal interactions with teachers, creating barriers that further affect their ability to develop crucial speaking and listening skills and achieve academically.

Tamariki with OL difficulties can experience other barriers to learning that extend academic achievement (Jalongo, 2008). Tamariki who experience OL difficulties are significantly more likely to demonstrate difficulties in components of well-being (Miller et al., 2013), including socio-emotional and behavioural difficulties (Norbury et al., 2016). In contrast, proficient OL skills are positively associated with socio-emotional development and mental health across the lifespan (Schoon, 2010) and self-esteem (APPG, 2021). Fostering socio-emotional well-being in tamariki has positive effects on academic achievement (Corcoran et al., 2018), and academic achievement is associated with aspects of psychosocial development, including self-efficacy (Amitay & Gumpel, 2015); Lee & Jonson-Reid, 2016; Liew et al., 2008). Dialogue has been identified as one factor influencing the development of Socio-emotional wellbeing (SEW). Dialogue can foster ākonga to develop conflict resolution skills, negotiation skills, and collaborative skills, thus contributing to developing emotional resilience (Trickey & Topping, 2006). Recent research from Fickel and colleagues (Denston et al., 2021, in review) provides insight as to why OL may influence well-being in ākonga in Aotearoa New Zealand. Data from four cohorts of ākonga across 2019 and 2020 from a primary school and a secondary school identified elevated levels of peer difficulties in ākonga, along with concerning low levels of prosocial skills. Teacher data from the same study identified the ability of ākonga and teachers to communicate proficiently using listening and speaking skills underpinned the ability of ākonga to develop relationships (Denston et al., 2021 in review). Without these skills, ākonga experienced difficulties resolving peer difficulties or enacting prosocial behaviours, and fostering communicative skills resulted in decreased peer difficulties and elevated prosocial skills in some ākonga. These findings support the role, and importance of developing listening and speaking skills for social interactions and relationship development in ākonga (Education Review Office, 2017).

The association between socio-emotional and cognitive development, including oral language skills (Corcoran et al., 2018; Schoon, 2010; Taylor et al., 2017), means that schools and teachers have been identified as central to developing well-being in ākonga. Thus, focusing on developing speaking and listening skills within teaching and learning programmes is beneficial to ākonga. This notion increases in importance when placed within broader findings related to well-being in Aotearoa New Zealand. Data indicates that the well-being of our young is decreasing, which is of considerable concern. UNICEF (2020) ranked Aotearoa New Zealand 35th out of 41 OECD nations on child and adolescent well-being

outcomes, a decrease in standing from 34th in 2017. Furthermore, Aotearoa New Zealand holds the highest suicide rate in youth globally (Mental Health Foundation, 2021). Data has found high variability in the ability of schools to respond to and promote well-being (see Education Review Office, 2015a, 2015b). National responses, including the 2019 Child and Youth Wellbeing Strategy (Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet, 2019) that outlines government aspirations for well-being across multiple aspects, reflect the central focus of well-being in tamariki within Aotearoa New Zealand.

The development of listening skills in ākonga

Developing listening skills requires teachers to understand the listening process, knowledge, and best practice pedagogies and how the environment can foster the development of skills or act as a barrier. For teachers to develop listening (and speaking) skills in ākonga, they require in-depth knowledge of the skills that contribute to the development of listening, including three key aspects. Firstly, developing listening skills requires individuals to demonstrate inhibitory control, which requires the listener to maintain attention to the speaker while filtering out distractions (Jalongo, 2008; Kim & Phillips, 2014), including classroom noise (Fisher & Frey, 2019). Secondly, the listener must apply theory of mind that enables them to think about their mental states and that of others (Fisher & Frey, 2019). Thirdly, the listener must monitor comprehension that allows them to reflect on the meaning and construct understandings (Fisher & Frey, 2019). The complexity of these skills, which increase along the learning pathway, means that some tamariki may require additional support to develop these skills (Whitehurst, 2006).

Listening skills are developed in the context required for their use, meaning that listening and speaking skills develop for different purposes and reasons. Waks (2015) outlines multiple types of listening, including informative (information), interpretive, practical (procedural), relational, and critical, while Jones (2007) identifies four areas including social, communicative, cultural, and cognitive. Developing diverse listening skills in ākonga supports the development of reading and writing skills due to the alignment between listening and literacy types. For listening skills to be developed, teachers need to understand the actions of the speaker and listener within each typology of listening and the strategies that support listening skills development. Listening skills develop when individuals apply their interpretation or comprehension of messages meaningfully, thus becoming active listeners (Jalongo, 2008). This suggests that listening and speaking skills develop across the learning pathway. The most fundamental type of listening is effective listening (Jalongo, 2008), where the listener receives verbal and non-verbal messages. Attention to messages requires effort and engagement to enable the assignment of meaning through the interpretation or comprehension of messages (Jalongo, 2008). According to Shi and Tan (2020), ākonga engagement includes behavioural, emotional, and cognitive dimensions. Engagement is contextually situated; therefore, levels of engagement are likely to differ depending upon the learning activities and ākonga characteristics (McWilliam et al., as cited in Shi & Tan, 2020), which also influences the development of listening and speaking skills.

The importance of non-verbal behaviours to developing speaking and listening skills may increase for tamariki with lesser developed speaking skills or silent participants. Rowe and Goldin-Meadow (2009b) and Blincoe and Harris (2013) noted the importance of gesture as supporting spoken communication through meaning as it provides an avenue for communication when one is unable to express meaning via speech, thus supporting vocabulary and syntax development. As such, teachers who are more receptive and knowledgeable around non-verbal behaviours may positively influence language development in their learners. The joint attention that emerges from a focus on the verbal and non-verbal behaviours of tamariki is influential to language development (Rowe & Goldin-Meadow, 2009b). According to Knapp (as cited in Gordon & Druckman, 2018), seven dimensions are fundamental to communication through non-verbal behaviours. These dimensions differ in whether they provide meaning via expression or information. Meaning can also be supplied through presentation, including kinesics or body language, paralanguage, physical contact via touch, and proxemics, including interpersonal space. Non-verbal behaviours that provide information include physical characteristics, artefacts, and environmental factors, including physical settings. Non-verbal behaviours include intentional and unintentional acts. They are encoded by the sender, decoded by the receiver, and influenced by socio-cultural factors (Gordon & Druckman, 2018) and must be considered within the context in which they occur. Roles may frequently change as turn taking occurs within dialogic exchanges (Gordon & Druckman, 2018). While fundamental to the communicative act, the role of non-verbal behaviours receive less focus within research and even less focus within education. However, Blincoe and Harris (2013), in their review of nonverbal behaviours in education, highlighted the effect of teacher nonverbal behaviours on student attitudes towards teachers, class, and learning content. McCroskey and colleagues (2006) outlined the association between nonverbal behaviours in teachers and their effectiveness within multi-cultural classrooms. This suggests that nonverbal behaviours in communicative acts are essential to developing effective listening and speaking skills in diverse groups of ākonga.

The importance of verbal behaviours to developing listening skills is also evident. One barrier to developing listening skills occurs when didactic methods become talk that is teacher dominated with little engagement by ākonga (Waks, 2015). This barrier may reflect teachers' and schools' perceptions regarding the role of speaking (and thus listening) within the classroom context. Alexander (2008) identified five typologies that reflect the relationship between teaching, culture, knowledge, and learning. Three typologies relate to rote, recitation, or instructional learning. While Alexander (2008) notes that these typologies have a place within the classroom, these typologies are less likely to support the development of listening skills or higher-order cognitive skills in ākonga. Teachers use these typologies to control student behaviour and primarily involve informative listening in silence. Success is based on the recall of information and understanding (Waks, 2015) or following instructions (Alexander, 2008; 2010). Teachers who listen evaluatively (for the correct answer) ask questions differently than when listening interpretively (to what ākonga are thinking) (Wiliam & Leahy, 2015).

Historically, while didactic methods prepared ākonga for future roles within society that were often largely repetitive and heavily supervised, within current contemporary society, the focus on the production of information and services requires intellectual capabilities (Waks, 2015). Thus, the development of teaching approaches and pedagogies that disrupt existing and persistent didactic patterns of restrictive typologies of listening is fundamental to "establish patterns of listening and speaking more conducive of thinking and learning" that consider the needs and concerns of our learners (Waks, 2015, p. 4). Fundamental to the development of approaches and pedagogies, according to Waks (2015), is the ability of teachers to translate strategies into tools for their teaching and learning contexts. However, listening and speaking skills do not equate with learning (Fisher, 2007). It is fundamental that teachers clearly understand the conditions required to develop listening and speaking skills in students. These include the ability to plan for developing listening and speaking skills, how to emphasise these skills within instructional strategies (Fisher, 2007), the subject knowledge within which the skills are developed (Alexander, 2010), and the ability to attend to ākonga and the patterns of listening and speaking within interactions (Wiliam & Leady, 2015).

According to Jalongo (2008), developing listening skills requires teachers to make listening skills the emphasis of learning. Emphasising listening increases the ability of ākonga to access information (Jalongo, 2008), which means that teachers should explicitly plan to develop these skills. While Jones (2007) advocates for teaching cognitive skills, which she views as fundamental to effective learning (Jones, 2007), the link between cognition and emotions suggests that developing skills that foster relationships is also crucial. Jalongo (2008) notes several conditions integral to creating an environment that enables listening skills to develop. These conditions range from ensuring the assessment of prior knowledge and setting a clear purpose for listening. Inclusiveness and equity are affected for underserved learners, such as Māori and Pacific ākonga, if L1 knowledge and diverse cultural contexts are ignored. Other conditions also exist in terms of fostering the ability of students to engage within a listening environment. These include creating a learning environment that attends to how messages are structured, including verbal and non-verbal behaviours.

Constructivism and UDL

The central tenet of constructivism is that learning and meaning making occur through active engagement within social interactions (Schrader, 2015). Within Piagetian constructivism, the learner (or group of learners) and peer relations are essential, and knowledge is constructed or reconstructed through equal power within relationships (Schrader, 2015), thus fostering equity. Within Vygotskian sociocultural constructivism, meaning making occurs through a more knowledgeable other (Schrader, 2015). However, Vygotsky did not privilege the learner, arguing that culture underpinned the construction or reconstruction of knowledge (Sawyer & Stetsenko, 2014). According to Vygotsky (1962), more complex knowledge systems occur through scaffolding the disparity between knowing and learning. The role of culture in the construction and reconstruction of knowledge means that language and collaborative dialogue is inherent in sociocultural constructivism (Schrader, 2015). Thus, the construction of knowledge in ākonga is underpinned by listening and

speaking. Vygotsky (1962) viewed external speech and inner speech as holding essential functions. Inner speech enables ākonga to bring forth thought, while external speech enables thought to be personified in language. The merging of thought and speech enables the development of higher-order skills, including abstract thinking and conceptual reasoning skills (Sawyer & Stetsenko, 2014).

One framework, which supports sociocultural constructivist learning and can be used to develop and enact listening and speaking skills in ākonga is Universal Design for Learning (UDL). UDL was developed at the Centre for Applied Science Technology (CAST) in response to the US's reauthorisation of the Individual with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The UDL framework sought to address disconnect between the emergence of diverse populations of ākonga (including ELL, those with behavioural difficulties, speech and language difficulties, hearing/visual difficulties, physical difficulties, and autism spectrum disorder (ASD)), and an increasingly narrow curriculum that was primarily concerned with academic achievement (Edyburn, 2005; King-Sears, 2014; Metcalf, 2011). UDL recognises that ākonga vary in how they process information (Rao & Meo, 2016). The framework includes three principles that recognise the variation in interaction between cognition, learning, and affect in developing new skills (Rao & Meo, 2016). The principles include multiple means of engagement, multiple means of representation, and multiple means of expression (Edyburn, 2005). Rapp (2014) proposed a fourth principle, multiple means of assessment.

Multiple means of engagement include accounting for how ākonga engage in learning (Ministry of Education, 2016), including consideration around how ākonga engage in diverse tasks, which can vary between learning contexts (Rapp, 2014). Aligning learning with ākonga interests, goal setting, and self-regulation can foster engagement (Rapp, 2014). Multiple means of representation include accounting for ākonga learning needs (Ministry of Education, 2016), which represents the input for learning. Inherent in this principle is the notion of equity because multiple means of engagement increase the likelihood that all ākonga can engage in learning and reflects the importance of multimodal learning for ākonga, including Māori and Pacific, rather than representing learning in narrow ways, which privileges specific learners. Multiple means of representation also provide opportunities for learning to be reinforced in ākonga and provide students with opportunities to make their own decisions around the representations that best fit the need at hand, thus, reflecting rangatiratanga. Multiple means of expression accounts for the ways that learning can be demonstrated by ākonga, which need to extend beyond traditional means of expression (i.e., writing and speaking) (Rapp, 2014). Learning outcomes must be represented by multiple modes of output (Rapp, 2014). These can include physical, written, communicative, and digital technologies (Ministry of Education, 2016; Rapp, 2014), which foster equity and inclusiveness for underserved learners, including Māori and Pacific ākonga. Multiple means of assessment account for how teachers assess students, which must reflect the means of engagement by ākonga (Rapp, 2014). Together these principles enable teachers to design flexible teaching and learning programmes for ākonga that actively incorporate variation in learning and respond to the identified strengths and needs of ākonga (Doran, 2015).

Essential to UDL is the intentional use of strategies that support both cognition and affect in learning (Rao & Meo, 2016) and reduce barriers to learning to ensure teaching and learning programmes are equitable for all ākonga (Rao & Meo, 2016), including from underserved groups including ELL, with learning and thinking differences (including cultural and linguistic), or impairments such as hearing or visual (King-Sears, 2014). Importantly, teachers must consider barriers within the learning environment before learning, which means consideration can be given to accessibility and engagement (Rao & Meo, 2016). According to Coyne and colleagues (2006), this enables teachers to focus on learning, rather than on how ākonga will present or express their understandings as outcomes. The UDL framework includes guidelines and checkpoints that support the inclusion of responsive pathways with teaching and learning programmes (Lapinski et al., 2012). These checkpoints define physical and cognitive access and ākonga engagement (Rao & Meo, 2016), as well as language and communication (Doran, 2015). Redesigning instruction within UDL requires teachers to understand the skills and knowledge to be taught, but because UDL is ākonga centred, it can be interactive between teachers within different learning areas, which provides another means for scaffolding learning for ākonga (Coyne et al., 2006).

Within the UDL framework, barriers to learning are the primary way that listening and speaking skills can be fostered in ākonga. By identifying aspects of listening and speaking that act as barriers to learning, teachers can provide support and guidance within the multiple means of representation. Importantly, UDL means that support and guidance occur on an individual basis (Pisha & Stahl, 2006), which creates more flexible learning environments, fostering ākonga engagement and success (Coyne et al., 2006). Metcalf (2011) noted that in UDL, barriers to learning concerning OL, including vocabulary, can be represented in numerous ways, including verbally or pictorially, or expressed with a partner whereby one ākonga speaks while the other uses non-verbal behaviours. Identifying barriers to learning may also facilitate listening and speaking indirectly. Metcalf (2011) noted that barriers to learning concerning attention and memory could include representations of verbal stories supported by visual representations or with read-alouds, while difficulties in transferring information could be expressed through power points. For ākonga who experience visual difficulties seeing or reading words, text could be recorded digitally, enabling verbal descriptions of illustrations to be included (Pisha & Stahl, 2006). For ākonga who experience low vocabulary or decoding skills, words and meanings can be accessed digitally (Pisha & Stahl, 2006). Fundamental to using UDL to support listening and speaking skills is the ability of the teacher to identify barriers for learning that relate specifically to listening and speaking, as well as having the knowledge and skills to provide multiple means for developing listening and speaking skills.

UDL is argued to align with culturally responsive teaching. According to Gay (2010), culturally responsive teaching requires using cultural knowledge, experiences, points of view, and ways of learning to make learning relevant and effective. Culturally responsive learning, including language and culture, is heavily embedded in socio-historical and political contexts. These histories and experiences are brought to school by ākonga and influence how they experience their schooling (Rao & Meo, 2016). According to Doran (2015), one’s culture sits

at the centre of UDL and does not actively privilege one culture over another; however, its individualistic focus may negate the collectivist nature of cultures including, Māori and Pacific ākonga. Gay (2010) noted that relationships between school and whānau could be strengthened through culturally responsive teaching that acknowledges cultural relevance and histories. Because UDL is implemented within cultural contexts, equity is implicit (Doran, 2015). It is sought from the outset by prioritising all the needs of diverse learners, including language accessibility using mother tongue (Doran, 2015).

UDL is a means by which the diverse demographic of ākonga within Aotearoa New Zealand, can be recognised. However, it is also clear that barriers have existed when integrating UDL within Aotearoa New Zealand classrooms. According to Butler (2018), educators struggled to understand the relevance of UDL and differences in terminology, which created barriers to implementation. Butler (2018) outlines efforts to translate UDL authentically within the context of our nation. Interestingly, this requires explicitly placing people at the centre of the framework, which enables explicit connections to te ao Māori to occur (Butler, 2018). The effectiveness of UDL is related to teacher knowledge, skills, and abilities, which could be partially developed within initial teacher education. However, planning UDL is complex due to shifting skills and qualities in ākonga, which are fluid (Meyer et al., 2014). The requirement to build in multiple flexible learning pathways from the conception of planning means teachers must develop the ability to proactively predict learner responses across contexts (Rao & Meo, 2016). This contrasts with accommodations or differentiation in learning, which occur for ākonga at specific points within the planning process (Doran, 2015) or reactive modifications during or after teaching and learning experiences. Professional development should be provided within authentic teaching contexts following initial teacher education development to support its practical implementation.

Teaching Approaches and the Development of Listening and Speaking Skills

Dialogue

Dialogue and discourse are inherent within contemporary classrooms. Tamariki engage in dialogue with tamariki, tamariki with teachers, teachers with teachers; discussions occur one-to-one, in small and large groups, and can be formal and informal, arising over various texts (O'Connor & Michaels, 2007). This inherency is why dialogue has been identified as a critical teaching tool within education to foster thinking and learning in tamariki (Reznitskaya et al., 2009). However, not all patterns of communication are equally effective for engagement (Bishop et al., 2007) and the development of higher-level skills (Reznitskaya & Gregory, 2013), including self-regulation (Whitebread et al., 2018). Dialogue is not simply a conversation or talk; dialogue is goal-oriented and includes exchanges that become meaningful interactions (Latham, 2005; O'Connor & Michaels, 2007).

The successful use of dialogue requires that ākonga understand conversational features that include turn taking (Stivers et al., 2009). Research in the English language has found that turn taking is specifically organised to avoid gaps and overlaps in turns (Barthel et al., 2017; Stivers et al., 2009), meaning there is a lack of pauses between turns. Research findings also

suggest that there is little cultural variation across languages in terms of the cues, although there is some variation in the timings of turns (Stivers et al., 2009). Research has examined recognising cues for turn transitions and timings of turns (Stivers et al., 2009). Listeners must use grammar and pragmatics to engage in turn taking effectively, although debate exists regarding the role of intonation/prosody in turn taking (Bögels & Torreira, 2015).

Dialogue and Turn Taking

Turn taking is complex. To effectively develop turn taking in ākonga, teachers require knowledge of features that underpin turn taking within dialogue. Incoming speakers plan the timing of turn taking during the speaker's turn (Barthel et al., 2017). The listener's ability to do this is influenced by their comprehension of the speaker's message (Barthel et al., 2017; Lerner, as cited in Breive, 2020). The listener must be able to monitor pragmatics, grammar, and prosody cues for turn taking, which include explicit and implicit techniques such as non-verbal behaviours, to determine when to initiate responses (Barthel et al., 2017; Lerner, as cited in Breive, 2020), which are contextually influenced (Breive, 2020). Research supports the importance of developing turn taking cues, finding that the presence or absence of these cues affects the identification of completion points in speaking (see Barthel et al., 2017). Identifying completion points is fundamental when dialogue includes self-selected speakers, who must identify a place where speaking can be transitioned to the new speaker (Breive, 2020). This is more complex if ākonga have difficulties comprehending the speaker's message. According to Barnes (2008), disjointed hesitations and self-reflections are indicative of ākonga experiencing problems in assigning meaning to the speaker's message, although this is influenced by the type of talk engaged in.

Literature suggests that the lack of pausing within turn-taking influences the development of thinking skills in ākonga. According to Wiliam & Leahy (2015), teachers often pace their lessons on the speed of ākonga responses rather than the quality of responses. Thus, little time may be given to thinking during listening to support the development of speaking skills. Furthermore, teachers evaluate the listener's message during their speaking time, which decreases the likelihood of thinking time occurring. While this reflects turn-taking in dialogue, ākonga, who are slower processors of information or who experience difficulties in making meaning of the speaker's message (including ELL), will be less likely to follow dialogue and will receive fewer opportunities to develop higher-level cognitive thought. Furthermore, if ELL, including Māori and Pacific learners, cannot use their L1 to foster comprehension, accessing dialogue becomes inequitable. However, developing thinking skills is fundamental to the listener processing the speaker's message, thus facilitating their capacity to engage in speaking. Developing such skills requires that teachers incorporate thinking explicitly into turn taking. According to research, thinking time should be between 3 and 5 seconds (Wiliam & Leahy, 2015). It is contextually influenced by teachers' types of questioning strategies (Wiliam & Leahy, 2015). According to Wiliam and Leahy (2015), thinking time enables ākonga to think about what they want to say and to develop their responses further, thus, contributing to the demonstration (and development) of higher-order thinking skills.

Within Aotearoa New Zealand, lower levels of OL mean that explicit language support that includes the development of turn taking cues and listening comprehension is likely to be fundamental within the early years of schooling to ensure that ākonga can engage and experience success within and across the learning pathway. One specific cue that may support less skilled ākonga to develop turn taking skills is syntax (a part of grammar). Research by Lammertink et al. (2015), involving toddlers learning Dutch and English, found that toddlers, like adults, relied more upon syntactic cues than prosody within turn taking. They found that toddlers enacted adult-like syntactic cues, although this could be due to the ability of toddlers to use this tool consistently, unlike prosody cues, which may differ in function and require mapping with pragmatics (Lammertink et al., 2015). According to McGinty and Justice (2010), meaningful conversations, i.e., dialogue, are fundamental to ākonga developing syntax. Thus, a focus on developing syntactic cues may provide ākonga with a consistent means to develop turn taking and contribute to developing linguistic comprehension. McGinty and Justice (2010) inferred that syntax could be used to recast ākonga responses through feedback, thus contributing to language development. Recasting concerns the use of correct grammatical structures within utterances to correct incorrect grammatical structures. While this may benefit ākonga with low levels of OL, caution should be extended. McGinty and Justice (2010) noted that recasting did not foster extended dialogue in ākonga, which is crucial to developing turn taking and linguistic comprehension. Within their example, they noted the attunement between the adult and the developmental level of the tamariki. However, the association between ākonga speaking skills and teachers' perceptions means that teachers are required to ensure that ākonga do not receive lower quality verbal interactions from teachers, which can negatively affect their ability to develop listening and speaking skills. This may occur if recasting becomes the focus of interactions between teachers and ākonga with low OL.

Turn taking in ākonga can be developed through questioning. Early research by Hoff-Ginsberg (1990) found that young tamariki responded to questions more frequently than non-questions, which suggested tamariki paid more attention to these utterances. Hoff-Ginsberg (1990) also identified differences in terms of question complexity. Tamariki were more likely to respond to question forms containing more concrete questions, such as what and where (Hoff-Ginsberg, 1990). This may be related to the use of concrete question forms by whānau within early childhood and the linguistic capacities of tamariki in terms of being able to make meaning from more abstract questions, such as questions containing why. Developing turn-taking could be fostered by teachers effectively using questions to elicit and extend phrases with tamariki that are responsive to the context. Research by Breive (2020) in Kindergarten (Year 1) ākonga found turn taking was developed through questions aimed at developing additive/multiplicative mathematical thinking. Furthermore, Breive (2020) found that ākonga used verbal and non-verbal cues to develop turn taking, including gaze, word emphasis, touch, and direct verbal prompts, which aimed to move the problem-solving conversation towards an outcome. Cabell and colleagues (2015) found that a higher concentration of elicitations and extensions in discussions was related to vocabulary growth over time in tamariki. This may be related to teacher elicitation and elaboration acting as a model of complex sentence use with ākonga (McGinty & Justice, 2010). This supports the

development of linguistic comprehension and the ability of tamariki to develop turn-taking skills, potentially fostering their ability to engage in conversations.

Teachers holding quality listening skills are crucial. Professional development may enable teachers to increase their sensitivities within their existing listening skills and foster language skills for dialogue within teaching and learning programmes. The importance of teacher sensitivities was identified in Breive (2020), who found that teachers could alter the development of turn taking in ākonga through what Breive termed as interference. In this study, extended dialogue in ākonga changed significantly when teachers engaged in interference, thus, altering turn taking by self-selecting their turns and the turns of ākonga; however, it supported re-establishing the collaborative nature of the task (Breive, 2020). Thistle and McNaughton (2015) found that professional development (in this case, Speech and Language Therapists) that focused on active listening skills affected positive change in communication with tamariki, whānau, and other communication professionals, leading to extended dialogue of improved quality. However, these effects may be related to changes in non-verbal behaviours that were also targeted during professional development. This suggests that non-verbal behaviours, including body language, are also essential for teachers developing active listening skills. Overall, the successful use of dialogue within classroom settings has been linked to teachers understanding the complexity of its development, consistency, clarity around application, and verbal and non-verbal behaviour changes for both teachers and tamariki (Topping & Trickey, 2014). These factors may be why variation is apparent across classrooms and why dialogue as a teaching tool for learning is resisted by some educators, even when research indicates its effectiveness in teaching and learning programmes (Fisher, 2007). Literature is also less clear how dialogic approaches are applied within education (Reznitskaya et al., 2009) and how teachers generate and engage in quality learning experiences with tamariki (Sanjakdar, 2019).

Resistance may also be related to dialogic and monologic[1] discourse being viewed as distinct learning tools. Monologic discourse is criticised for its high emphasis on teacher talk and questioning (Mercer, 2003), with little opportunity for student responses (Topping & Trickey, 2014) or extension of talk. Teachers often produce most of the classroom talk, ranging between 60 and 90 %, and research has found that teachers do not listen effectively (Boyd & Rubin, 2006; Jalongo, 2008), which is required to foster the development of listening and speaking skills in ākonga. This may be related to the tendency of teachers to use initiation-response-evaluation/follow-up (IRE or IRF) or fill-in-the-blank patterns of discourse (Boyd & Rubin, 2006), although this may be unintentional. The negative effect of curricula scripted with monologic talk has been found in literature. In their ethnographic study, Park and Bridges-Rhoads (2012) examined the use of a scripted literacy programme in young children. They found that teachers transferred the principles of the scripted literacy programme to mathematics. This negatively affected teachers' use of innovative practices

[1] Monologic is described by Batkin (as cited in Reznitskaya & Gregory, 2013) as when the truth is known by someone, who instructs someone else who is ignorant or in error.

with tamariki who received limited opportunities to develop important mathematical content and conceptual knowledge. Park and Bridges-Rhoads (2012) noted that this was more likely for ākonga in low decile areas of minority ethnicity. Similar findings were evident in Dull and Murrow (2008). Their qualitative study compared teachers across 14 high schools in the US. They found ākonga in low SES schools experienced highly restrictive patterns of dialogue that focused on monologic discourse that reflected teacher initiation and student response in the revision of content. In comparison, ākonga from high SES schools were provided with dialogic interactions to develop interpretative and reflective understandings.

Within the UK, research indicated the negative impact of the highly structured literacy hour, as part of the National Literacy Strategy, on teacher and ākonga interactions in primary schools. A study of 30 teachers by English and colleagues (2002) found a decline in extended interactions (beyond 25 seconds) following the introduction of activities within the literacy hour, even though teacher-student interactions had increased. They reported that only 10 % of utterances from ākonga contained more than three words during the literacy hour, while only 5% contained more than 10 words. However, ākonga utterances appear to be influential to developing extended dialogue. Research by Boyd and Rubin (2006) in 4th and 5th-grade students found that ākonga utterances were contingent on teachers asking questions that extended or elicited elaborated discussion in ākonga. Authentic teacher questions aimed at creating dialogic talk, resulted in monologic dialogic when ākonga responses were not considered. Monologic questions were viewed as inauthentic because the teacher knew the answer provided scaffolding that fostered elaborated ākonga discussion when ākonga utterances were considered (Boyd & Rubin, 2006). O'Connor and Michaels (2007) suggest that classrooms require monologic and dialogic discourse, meaning that dialogue exists along a continuum and is influenced by the ideological stances of speakers and listeners, and what Mercer (2003) terms communicative functions. According to Dull and Murrow (2008), all ākonga need to experience different forms of dialogue because it enables them to practice skills essential for contributing and participating in society. However, given the disparities in equity for some ākonga, notably those in lower SES contexts, identifying the barriers to effective dialogue within these contexts will be fundamental to ensuring equitable access to the development of speaking and listening skills in ākonga, across the learning pathway.

Dialogue and digital technology

Technological advances and increases in the availability of digital technology have resulted in it becoming a mainstay within developed societies. The revision of the Technology learning area in the New Zealand Curriculum to include digital technology reflects the importance of digital technology in schools in Aotearoa New Zealand, and to ensuring ākonga become digitally capable individuals (Ministry of Education, 2018). Because of the Covid-19 pandemic, the recent lockdowns have also highlighted the importance of digital technology to teaching and learning programmes accessible to ākonga for continued learning. Digital technology can play multiple roles within classrooms and schools, including being used as a passive tool, an object of interaction, a participant within an interaction, and an active tool for learning (Beauchamp, 2016). Choices around how teachers use digital technology influence learning because it changes the locus of control and power dynamics

within learning interactions (Beauchamp, 2016). Choices are made more complex by the speed of technological change, which means that teachers must keep informed to ensure that digital technology is used effectively for learning (Beauchamp, 2016). However, alongside the pervasiveness of digital technologies exist differences in individuals' abilities to access digital technology (MacIntyre, as cited in Brown et al., 2016), as well as in individuals' abilities to use digital technologies, in the form of digital capital (Brown et al., 2016). These factors influence the learning experiences of ākonga, and, as aforementioned in Mutch (2021), access and use of digital technology in Aotearoa New Zealand, lack equity. Thus, underpinning the effective use of digital technology to foster listening and speaking skills in ākonga are experiences that create equitable conditions for learning for all ākonga and account for individual differences in access and ability. Major et al. (2018) found that inclusion and engagement were compromised when unequal access to digital technology occurred or low participation rates by ākonga in activities. According to Sailer and colleagues (2021), it is fundamental that all ākonga hold the basic digital skills to participate in society effectively.

Digital technology can contribute to growth in listening and speaking skills and contribute to reconstructing views around traditional notions of face-to-face dialogue (Major & Warwick, 2019). Within digital technology, dialogue is viewed more expansively. Kerawall and colleagues (2013, p.100) describe the dialogic space as one "where ideas [can] be put forward, respected, scrutinised, and challenged in a supportive discursive environment." Within this dialogic space sits social media, which is the activity of interacting with others through programmes or websites, such as blogs, wikis, forums, social networking sites, curating sites, and media or content sharing sites (Beauchamp, 2016). However, the role of social media in developing dialogue in ākonga is complex due to age restrictions around use. Digital technology does not necessarily extend dialogue in terms of utterances. For example, microblogging uses social media or instant messaging applications to share, short messages via the internet that represent or create opportunities for knowledge creation in real-time (Rasmussen et al., 2019; Schrader, 2015) that can be used as prompts for learning (Major et al., 2018).

One of the key benefits of using digital technology to support the development of listening and speaking skills is its capacity to foster thinking through joint attention. Schrader (2015) conceptualises these as communities where shared activity occurs and notes that social media, especially, creates connections within more extensive global communities. These communities often include more diverse members because of differences in interpersonal skills when using digital technology (Schrader, 2015). Thus, digital technology, especially through social media, may foster conditions for equity, although this is influenced by individual access and their abilities to use digital technology. It certainly provides ākonga with opportunities to be exposed to different viewpoints and perspectives (Major et al., 2018; Schrader, 2015), which have been linked to aspects of socio-emotional well-being (Gehlbach, 2010). Joint attention fosters a more profound, shared consideration of information and ideas and the development of reasoning skills to occur in ākonga as they co-construct understandings and knowledge (Mercer et al., 2019; Schrader, 2015). As such, digital technology, including social media, can be used as a tool and/or an environment for developing a shared dialogic space for learning (Major & Warwick, 2019; Schrader, 2015), in which listening and speaking develop.

Digital affordances relate to the interrelations between object and subject (Merleau-Ponty, as cited in Major & Warwick, 2019). It denotes the possibilities for the use of digital technology within the dialogic space, known as action possibilities. Major and Warwick (2016) extend action possibilities to include enacted affordances which views digital affordances in terms of how fostering dialogue within a reciprocal relationship. Mediating this relationship is the development of dialogic pedagogies by teachers (Major & Warwick, 2019). Research suggests that digital technology provides multiple affordances, to foster listening and speaking skills. One key affordance is the multimodal nature of digital technology, the enactment of which promotes listening and speaking skills. Within the multimodal space, digital technology can be viewed in terms of how it can be enacted through visual, auditory, and text-based functions (Major et al., 2018; Major & Warwick, 2019), and how it provides ākonga with the opportunity to exert control over their learning. Multimodal spaces may provide opportunities for engagement by Māori and Pacific ākonga because it provides a platform where different views and perspectives are discussed, and diverse levels of meaning can be represented (Hindle & Matthewman, 2017). However, this may be influenced by opportunities to foster ākonga connections to culture, language, and identity and how the multimodal space is enacted. According to Sailer et al. (2021), within the interactive, constructive, active, and passive (ICAP) model, listening and speaking are more likely to occur within interactive activities because they require ākonga to build upon contributions, usually through dialogue. However, in a large sample of teachers across different educational contexts in Germany, they found that teachers were more likely to foster passive activities based on storing information rather than interactive activities that constructed knowledge or involved problem-solving.

Fisher and Frey (2019) outline the role of listening stations (auditory digital tools or applications that can be extended to be multimodal by including other aspects) in developing ākonga knowledge within content areas through listening skills. Listening stations enhance engagement and equity because they bridge the gap between listening comprehension and reading comprehension by providing ākonga with access to more complex texts accessible via written text. While the gap between listening comprehension and reading comprehension is argued to narrow over time, it is persistent (Fisher & Frey, 2014), meaning that digital technologies used in a multimodal manner can be used across the learning pathway. It also provides valuable opportunities to develop listening skills, as ākonga can pace the input of knowledge by pausing, rewinding, or reviewing material that fosters processing to create meaning (linguistic comprehension) (Fisher & Frey, 2014). When enacted in multimodal spaces, digital technology can enhance engagement and equitable outcomes for ākonga, including those with reading or processing difficulties and ELL. However, Fisher and Frey (2019) caution that listening stations (and other digital technologies) can become problematic if used in isolation because it removes the social interaction required for dialogue. They argue one of the fundamental conditions of the effective use of listening stations, as a form of digital technology, is the application of listening through interaction with others.

Digital technology can be enacted in ways that acknowledge the fluidity and transitory nature of ideas within and between ākonga (Major & Warwick, 2019). Within the dialogic space, digital affordances such as via microblogging or applications enable ideas to be adapted, changed, or modified over time through visual, verbal, or written strategies. This means that variation can occur to meet ākonga developmental needs, such as using visual and

speaking strategies to record ideas for ākonga demonstrate low written language skills (Ousselin, 2015) or who may experience written language difficulties. Sharing in such spaces enables ākonga perspectives and contributions to be recognised (and at times critiqued) through manipulating shared ideas, which is a key component of learning via dialogue (Rasmussen et al., 2019). Research with 8–9-year-old UK students by Warwick and colleagues (2010) found that using an Interactive Whiteboard (IWB) within a dialogic space enabled ākonga to be positioned within the activity, which was supported using provisional placings of materials (in this case of solids and liquids), rather than final placings. The activity supported cumulative knowledge building because it enabled a third category to be added, leading to a repositioning of provisional placings; furthermore, the visual representation of ākonga developing understandings via digital technology for revisiting later. Thus, digital technology becomes a tool for creating learner histories and ongoing dialogue (Mercer et al., 2019), which is not always possible when using physical artefacts within classroom spaces. However, similarities exist between digital technology and physical artefacts and how dialogic talk can be anchored and extended with ākonga (see Cowie et al., 2008).

The speed of change in digital technology means that teachers are likely to require ongoing support to ensure it is enacted effectively in the classroom. Having digital technologies alone does not support their effective use in student learning (Major et al., 2018; Sailer et al., 2021). Research is paramount to understanding how teachers and students interact with digital technology (Rasmussen et al., 2019). According to Sailer et al. (2021), teachers who hold basic digital skills are more likely to use digital technology in their teaching, including interactive activities. Major et al., 2018 found that familiarity with digital technology fostered collaborative talk. However, longitudinal research by Orlando (2014) in a group of Australian primary and secondary teachers found their needs were disparate from the support offered by school-based professional development. Support that reflects teachers' needs becomes critical when digital technology is enacted within a dialogic space because the task must share, expand, or challenge one's knowledge, thus, providing opportunities for thinking and reasoning and fostering dialogue (Mercer et al., 2019). Rasmussen and colleagues (2019) noted that digital technology adds complexity to dialogue, which means the explicit teaching of collaborative and problem-solving strategies for learning is required. This complexity is why Mercer, Rasmussen, and colleagues (Mercer et al., 2019: Rasmussen et al., 2019) have consistently advocated for talk or local ground rules to foster dialogue and collaboration via digital technology[2]. However, Rasmussen et al. (2019) noted high variability in the degree to which teachers implemented ground rules successfully. Variability may be due to the task at hand (Rasmussen et al., 2019), whether the rules targeted collaboration or behaviour management, and whom the ground rules privileged (i.e., speakers who hold ideas and are not silent participants), meaning that talk or interaction rules must be responsive and equitable to ākonga.

Several other barriers and facilitators have been identified in using digital technology in a dialogic space. To enact digital affordances effectively, teachers must be aware of the

[2] Talking rules or local ground rules are further expanded upon in exploratory talk (see page 35). The short discussion here of talk/ground rules, specifically related to literature addressing dialogic talk within the digital technology space.

technology's actual properties and capabilities rather than the perceived properties and capabilities (Major et al., 2018). Teachers must also hold factual and procedural knowledge that enables the technology to be utilised to its potential by both teachers and ākonga, which is influential in retrieval; thus, positively or negatively affecting engagement and equity (Beauchamp, 2016). Teachers need to be conscious of how to enact digital affordances within learning to promote listening and speaking within dialogic spaces, which are influenced by teachers' pedagogical beliefs and understandings. Mercer and colleagues (2019) note that teachers' pedagogical stances and understandings of digital affordances influence the effective use of digital technologies. However, they noted most professional development related to developing digital technology skills, rather than utilising existing resources to create spaces for dialogue and critique existing strategies through explicit links between theory and practice; without which, pedagogical practices cannot be enhanced, contrasted, or developed. This type of workshop model (research-informed, school-based professional development) has been identified as effective within research (see Hennessy et al., 2017). However, Orlando's (2014) research suggested that pedagogical changes may not be instantaneously evident in teaching practice. Orlando (2014) found changes did not occur until the third year of the five-year study, although this was related to the teachers' context and their responses within the context. Orlando (2014) suggested that changes in teaching practice were associated with changes in knowledge and learning organisation, meaning that fostering dialogue using digital technology as a tool or an environment requires multi-faceted professional development.

Dialogic talk

Variation in classroom talk is evident in the work of Robin Alexander, whose cross-cultural research identified that classrooms organised their communicative processes differently. Dialogic talk describes effective types of classroom interactions and occurs when teachers and ākonga contribute in tangible and meaningful ways to support learning in moving forward (Mercer, 2003). Dialogic talk provides opportunities for sustained dialogue with conversational partners (Mercer, 2003), which provides significantly more opportunities to talk than in traditional classroom settings (Reznitskaya & Gregory, 2013). The inclusion of open or divergent questioning promotes metacognition and deeper understandings of knowledge, including argumentative skills and content area knowledge (Dull & Murrow, 2008; Reznitskaya & Gregory, 2013). Fluid meaning is constructed through dialogue and is the product of different voices (Fisher, 2007), supporting the active involvement and engagement of tamariki within this approach. Dialogue, which is thoughtful and reasoned, leads to coherent or common understandings (National Literacy Trust, 2012) provides tamariki with models of language strategies for practicing; thus, dialogic talk can include complex language structures. Well-structured oral activities within collaborative contexts are associated with on-task behaviours that are maintained over time (Alexander, 2008), alluding to dialogic talk leading to greater engagement in learning by tamariki.

Dialogic talk appears to emphasise speaking as tamariki are required to share their thinking. Thus, dialogic talk can privilege ākonga who hold speaking skills or are more confident to apply speaking skills within given learning contexts. The National Literacy Trust (2012) emphasises what dialogic talk sounds like while indicating how speaking skills can be

scaffolded within the classroom for silent participants or less confident ākonga. One essential tool the National Literacy Trust (2012) outlines for developing speaking skills during dialogic talk is talking frames, which Austin (2020) noted can be used by teachers to foster inclusion to diverse learners. According to Frey and colleagues (2013), talking frames reduce the linguistic load on ākonga by providing some of the vocabulary required to engage in the dialogue, thus, promoting advanced language use. This provides scaffolding for ākonga, including those who may need additional support, including ELL (Frey et al., 2013), or less confident speakers or speakers with lower oral language skills. Talking frames can be used to provide scaffolding for tamariki to build dialogue (Frey et al., 2013), including extensions to interactions (in addition to …), changes or switches of topic (we have covered…), or reflecting upon ideas (to go back to… again) (National Literacy Trust, 2012). Speakers can also provide feedback using specific talking frames (That is interesting…). Feedback should include verbal and non-verbal behaviours, including gestures (National Literacy Trust, 2012) and written (or visual) language, such as the use of journals to record ideas (Austin, 2020).

Although dialogic talk has been identified as contributing to the success of Māori as Māori, it is unclear how talking frames would influence the engagement of Māori or Pacific ākonga in learning or illustrate equity. Talking frames need to provide conditions where ākonga can express culture, language, and identity, contributing to making sense of meaning (Berryman & Eley, 2017). For ākonga, making connections to L1 is fundamental. Talking frames may be less likely to support developing relationships and conversational styles of talk, which enhance the learning of Māori and Pacific ākonga; thus, negatively affecting engagement. This is where rangatiratanga is paramount. The composition of talking frames and their use requires dialogue with Māori and Pacific ākonga, although research is necessary to determine how to do this effectively.

Strategies, including the explicit use of rules that support ākonga about dialogue parameters (Fisher, 2007; Pennell, 2014), can be created by ākonga. Other questioning techniques, such as pose-pause-pounce-bounce (PPPB) (Wiliam & Leahy, 2015), aim to ensure deep thinking before extracting understandings from ākonga. These can be combined with other techniques, such as no-hands-up unless for questions (Wiliam & Leahy, 2015). Fundamental to the success of these techniques is providing ākonga with opportunities for engagement, thinking time, and the cumulative building of ideas, through dialogue (National Literacy Trust, 2012). These tools can create conditions that aim to foster inclusion. However, Austin (2020) noted that teachers need to ensure they do not become enforcers of rules. Inclusion, as a form of empowerment for ākonga, means that decision-making around contribution levels to dialogue should lie with ākonga, which can only occur if opportunities to contribute are present for all ākonga (Austin, 2020). As with talking frames, the use of rules (or guidelines for interactions) needs to acknowledge the decision-making capacities of Māori ākonga. Thus, compulsory speaking rules to control ākonga behaviour are unlikely to promote engagement and are not equitable. Supporting the engagement of Māori ākonga can occur through other conditions, such as the use of smaller groups or one-to-one interactions or the use of translanguaging skills to support the use of L1.

While much emphasis on dialogic talk is placed on the speaker, Haroutunian-Gordon (2015) argues that listening skills underpin dialogic talk because it requires tamariki to engage in listening to resolve a question. Tamariki (and teachers) must listen actively and purposefully for dialogic talk to occur. Dialogic talk disrupts traditional power relations, promoting equitable engagement through meaning-making created through joint construction (Sanjakdar, 2019), and shared responsibilities among participants (Reznitskaya & Gregory, 2013), although different points of view exist. Thus, dialogic talk is an approach that transforms traditional classroom structures into communities of learning (Reznitskaya & Gregory, 2013). Therefore, the inclusion of underserved learners through the promotion of ākonga voice can meet the needs of ākonga through discussion that includes knowledge and opinion. However, dialogic talk is dependent upon open structures of discussion that are cumulative, which vary across contexts (See Sanjakdar, 2019).

While dialogue is open, effective dialogic talk requires planning, including active thinking time. According to Fisher (2005), thinking time combined with dialogue is fundamental to learning within dialogic talk. Teachers need to have a repertoire of tools to develop active thinking in ākonga, which fosters listening and speaking skills. Literature suggests that other conditions are required to promote dialogic talk. These conditions include a tenet of involvement and respect between teacher and ākonga, the ability to phrase questions to foster discussion between ākonga as they share their ideas and fostering interpersonal relationships within the learning space (see Boyd & Burrow, 2006). Within these conditions, teachers require specific skills, including the ability to model quality reasoning (i.e., think alouds) and the provision of meaningful feedback that fosters further talk, thus contributing to the development of metacognition (Reznitskaya & Gregory, 2013).

Difficulties related to fostering conditions for dialogic talk link to the scant availability of comprehensive pedagogies for teachers, for developing the necessary skills and abilities to promote dialogic talk and the development of associated skills and knowledge in ākonga (Reznitskaya & Gregory, 2013). Reznitskaya and Gregory (2013) argue that developing dialogic talk requires that teachers critically examine existing communication patterns within their classroom. Teachers become consciously aware of language use and pedagogical choices through this examination. Professional development for teachers is fundamental but attempting to do this within teacher training would be unlikely to provide an authentic context for analysis. However, teacher training programmes offer a place developing knowledge related to language use and effective pedagogies for fostering dialogic talk. Research found that targeted interventions or top-down programmes lack effectiveness in developing pedagogy that shifted classroom patterns towards dialogic talk, instrumental for long-term effectiveness (Smith et al., 2004).

Exploratory talk

Exploratory talk is a form of working for understanding, which facilitates effective learning (Jones, 2007). Exploratory talk occurs when ākonga reshape old or known knowledge with new or unknown experiences or understandings (Barnes, 2008; Jones, 2007). Working for understanding is carried out by ākonga as they share relevant information

(Whitebread et al., 2018) to reach consensus, with support from teachers (Barnes, 2008). Inherent in exploratory talk is attending to all ideas (Mercer et al., 2019), even though discomfort may occur as ākonga experience cognitive conflict (National Literacy Trust, 2012). This occurs as familiar views or understandings of the world are challenged by the ideas and viewpoints of others (Barnes, 2008; Whitebread et al., 2018). Working for understanding through exploratory talk provides ākonga with opportunities to test and confirm new understandings in a flexible manner (Barnes, 2008), which has been identified as influential to the development of self-regulation skills (Whitebread et al., 2018). Exploratory talk fosters metacognitive skills in ākonga, over other types of talk including disputational and limited (Grau et al., 2018). Interestingly, Grau and colleagues (2018) did not identify an association between cumulative talk and metacognitive regulation, suggesting that facets within exploratory talk, such as critiques or examinations of ideas, provide a context for metacognitive skills to develop. As ākonga developed, they applied metacognitive regulation outside of extended interactions (Grau et al., 2018). Webb and colleague's (2017), synthesis of research, found exploratory talks, in ākonga from 11 to 14 years of age, exerted moderate to large effects in reasoning skills.

Exploratory talk is characterised by hesitations, pauses, interjections, and incomplete ideas. Thus, listening and speaking within exploratory talk include verbal and non-verbal behaviours, including paralanguage. These behaviours indicate that the speaker is attempting to make meaning as they speak, making this approach less structured than dialogic talk (National Literacy Trust, 2012). Rules of talk are crucial to exploratory talk due to less structure. Explicit rules of talk, must be taught to ākonga, thus, contributing to fostering a community of learning through common understandings (National Literacy Trust, 2012). Rules of talk have been critiqued in literature because it results in talk structures that actively privilege certain groups of ākonga and are not culturally or linguistically responsive to the identities of other ākonga (Lambirth, 2006). Mercer (as cited in Patterson, 2018) argued that ākonga agreement through localised rules of talk would lessen constraints (and thus increase equity) for some ākonga. According to Sacks (as cited in Rasmussen et al., 2019), rules of talk created through ākonga interaction and agreement reflect the social and cultural makeup of those present but must be enacted responsively. However, research suggests that talk rules may also be developed implicitly. Civil and Hunter (2015) found that values inherent within the Pacific culture, including collectivism and family, contributed to developing norms for ākonga interaction within their research; however, these implicitly developed through ākonga social talk. As with dialogic talk, rules of talk (or ground rules) can provide scaffolding for ākonga who are developing exploratory talk or turn taking skills, supporting engagement in learning, thus, fostering notions of equity, although whether these need to be explicit is debatable.

Equity is enhanced when culture, language, and identity are present within exploratory talk. It is essential not to relegate listening and silent participants to the background, which may reflect cultural norms. It is the ability of ākonga to listen and bridge their understandings and innovative ideas to make meaning that underpins exploratory talk. Exploratory talk places emphasis on ākonga as speakers as they test out new understandings (Barnes, 2008) and co-construction of innovative ideas via productive discussion (Webb et al., 2017), during which teachers are in the background. Exploratory talk also provides conditions for equity, as exploratory talk can occur using mother tongue or second languages (Webb et al., 2017),

thus, fostering a context that acknowledges bilingualism in learning. Civil and Hunter (2015) emphasise the importance of having access to L1 to develop argumentation skills within mathematical dialogue.

Exploratory talk is linked with developing abstract reasoning skills, attributed to thinking aloud between ākonga (Webb et al., 2017). Abstract reasoning skills have far transfer effects to different knowledge domains for ākonga, over time (6 to 12 months), suggesting this approach fosters ākonga ability to reason on topics unrelated to the current learning (Webb et a., 2017). Grau and colleagues (2018) also identified far transfer effects for metacognitive skills. As ākonga developed these skills, they could apply metacognitive regulation outside of extended interactions. Interestingly, Barnes (2008) explicitly contrasted exploratory talk with presentational talk, which in Aotearoa New Zealand commonly occurs as speeches. In presentational talks, the speaker focuses on the audience; thus, adjustments to language, body language, or content align with the audience's needs rather than the speaker's needs. Presentational talk means the speaker has made meaning of the message, conveying this to an audience as a final product for evaluating information and forms of speech, although it is often free from any authentic context. Barnes (2008) argues that presentational talks (and related writing) are often premature because there has been little opportunity for exploring innovative ideas. However, exploratory talk could be a basis for presentational talk because working for understanding provides a context for ākonga to attend to current ideas. Undoubtedly this increases the value of presentational talks because exploratory talk provides ākonga with essential opportunities to develop their understandings from the understandings of others, which leads to more reasoned construction of ideas. Because exploratory talk occurs within the social domain, it provides valuable support to ākonga, who struggle with the traditional way presentation talk is taught and learned. However, presentational talks in Aotearoa New Zealand are primarily delivered through speech, meaning the teaching of being responsive to audience needs is also fundamental to its success.

The effectiveness of exploratory talk is influenced by group composition and age. In a study of ākonga from 9 to 16 years of age, Grau and colleagues (2018) found that exploratory talk was more effective in small group situations. They identified a positive association between small group size and metacognitive regulation, which they associated with higher levels of quality talk in groups from early adolescence onwards. Webb and colleagues' (2017) research synthesis found that exploratory talks exerted moderate to large effects on reasoning skills in ākonga from 11 to 14 years of age. Small group formats of mixed ability ākonga provide a context in which collaborative argumentative skills, such as in mathematics, can be developed (Anthony & Hunter, 2017; Civil & Hunter, 2015). However, the involvement of non-dominant ākonga in mathematical argumentation has been a source of longstanding research concern for Hunter and colleagues (Civil & Hunter, 2015). Exploratory talk occurs within learning contexts underpinned by existing socio-cultural practices that privilege some learners' culture, identity, and language, thus negatively affecting underserved ākonga (see Civil & Hunter, 2015). Therefore, small group approaches are not contexts that automatically create learning environments that benefit all ākonga in developing listening and speaking skills (Hunter et al., 2005). For Pacific peoples, whose lived realities are underpinned by respect, ākonga considered learning via listening to teachers more appropriate because teachers were considered elders who, thus, held unquestionable knowledge (Hunter & Anthony, 2011). This level of respect also extended to peers, with ākonga less likely to

engage in argumentative talk if it leads to embarrassment for their peers (Hunter & Anthony, 2011).

Understanding socio-cultural practices is fundamental to creating conditions that foster listening and speaking skills through exploratory talk. Negative interactions and peer pressure reduce engagement in small group learning that negatively affects the construction of meaning and the consensus being worked towards (Hunter et al., 2005). The stereotyping of ākonga can result in less value being placed on some ideas of ākonga, thus reinforcing the norms of the privileged ākonga in meaning-making (Hunter et al., 2005). These factors negatively affect performance, achievement, and psychosocial development, including self-efficacy and self-perceptions (Hunter et al., 2005). Hunter and colleagues (2005), in their research in Canada with 1727 ākonga in Grades 5 to 11, found evidence of gender differences in listening and speaking skills in small group formats. By Grade 8, they identified a persistent gender gap with females making a higher quantity and higher quality of oral contributions, including voicing ideas and opinions, engaging in clarification, engaging with tact, style of interjections, and demonstrating respect. Interestingly, Hunter and colleagues (2005) found that males held low estimations of the importance of speaking and listening skills. By Grade 8, they had low estimations of their skill levels, which influenced small group participation. While females demonstrated high-quality listening and speaking skills, their self-perceptions as listeners demonstrated a plateau between Grades 5 and 8, increasing at Grade 11. This suggests the importance of focusing on listening and speaking skills throughout the learning pathway but recognises that growth does not follow the same trajectory across genders. These findings are why Hunter et al. (2005) argued that working in groups must be developed in ākonga, highlighting the role of teacher modelling that also accounted for verbal and non-verbal behaviours.

Teacher knowledge, skills, and abilities are required to develop exploratory talk in ākonga and to plan for their effective use within teaching and learning programmes. According to Mercer and Littleton (2007), these skills, knowledge, and abilities require explicit teaching. However, this is problematic because, as Patterson (2018) notes, scant research literature provides the pedagogical practices that would support teachers in facilitating exploratory talk, within teaching and learning programmes, in an authentic manner. Without knowledge, skills, and abilities, teachers are likely to find it difficult to identify opportunities within the curriculum where exploratory talk can foster listening and speaking skills (Jones, 2007). According to the National Literacy Trust (2012) teachers must pose questions that cause cognitive conflict, stimulate higher-level thinking skills, and explicitly model speaking skills. Jones (2007) noted that effective learning through exploratory talk requires that teachers be clear about the task, so ākonga know the type of talk needed, and that the selected topic fosters ākonga to bridge the known with the unknown. Fundamental teacher skills include modelling interjections, disagreements, and turn taking skills. Teachers also need to understand how the role of culture, language, and identity in ākonga may influence the development of exploratory talk within socio-cultural contexts of learning. For Pacific and Māori ākonga, developing ground rules for exploratory talk can occur implicitly through a relational lens reflecting cultural values. This challenges the notion that ground rules must be explicit within exploratory talk, suggesting that further examination of the role of culture in exploratory talk is required.

The complexity of exploratory talk for teachers and ākonga may influence its use, with more positive effects being found from early adolescence onwards. Some research exists within the early years of schooling that suggests that the characteristics of exploratory talk may differ across the learning pathway. In Patterson's (2018) involving reception (Ages 4 to 5) and Year 3 (Ages 8 to 9) aged ākonga, they found cognitive challenges were more likely to be reflected through non-verbal behaviours among younger ākonga. Furthermore, consensus did not always occur within younger students, although this skill had developed by Year 3 when ākonga used their speaking skills to challenge ideas and reach agreement. The foundations of exploratory talk can be developed in younger ākonga, but teachers need to recognise verbal and non-verbal behaviour contributing to extended interactions. Interestingly, Barnes (2008) argues against the overuse of small groups, noting that how ākonga engage in the absence of a teacher is essential. However, within the younger years, Patterson (2018) reported that all exploratory talk occurred within small groups, contributing to fostering speaking and listening skills, including non-verbal behaviours. These findings suggest that group size and composition change as ākonga develop; however, interactions within the group are fundamental to developing listening and speaking skills. While speaking is favoured within older ākonga, teachers must teach ākonga how to listen to the contributions of others, providing ākonga with a context for using new understandings to challenge existing knowledge. Mercer and Littleton's (2007) argument that exploratory talk should be a regular approach for learning is supported by Webb and colleagues (2017) finding that reasoning skills develop in ākonga over time.

Socratic talk

Socratic talk is a complex form of dialogic talk that includes interpreting text and negotiating meaning amongst a group (Tensen & Shea, 2017). Within Socratic talk, teachers are usually non-participants, which means that relationships between ākonga are essential to effective outcomes. While preparation before engagement often appears in literature as an independent activity, such as in Tensen and Shea (2017), where it was a homework task, preparation can occur within the classroom. This provides opportunities for inclusion as ākonga work one-on-one or in small groups with their peers, supporting cognitive load, and developing relational skills and meaning making. The development of questions within Socratic talk differs from dialogic talk because they tend not to use explicit talk frames but more complex syntactic forms of talk such as paraphrasing and evaluations. According to Barker et al. (2016), classroom relationships are fundamental to developing equal and critical dialogue within Socratic talk.

Prior preparation means that materials may vary widely, and the independent nature of preparation suggests that Socratic talk, as a teaching approach, is better suited to upper primary or secondary students. However, discussion topics, background preparation, and access to text are all factors that influence the initial engagement of ākonga in Socratic talk. In Tensen & Shea (2017), the vast range of text topics used by tamariki to prepare for Socratic talk around the discussion topic hindered the ability of ākonga to engage in talk because they were unable to gain depth in conversation due to the wide breadth of researched material. Tensen & Shea (2017) identified that engaging in Socratic talk required texts that all students could access. While Tensen and Shea (2017) reported this difficulty, it highlights the

role of multimodal texts and digital technology in supporting access to texts and the development of background knowledge. Furthermore, instead of engaging in Socratic talk, tamariki appeared to engage in presentational talk due to cognitive overload (Tensen & Shea, 2017), which may be related to the breadth of information derived from the identified discussion topic.

Fostering speaking and listening skills in ākonga can occur through Socratic talk. One strategy that promotes listening and speaking skills within Socratic seminars is the instructional tool called the fishbowl[3]. The fishbowl includes two concentric circles, with each circle of tamariki assigned an initial role of listener or speaker (Tensen & Shea, 2017). The concentric circles aim to support the ability of ākonga to apply speaking skills by limiting the number of speakers, which may be necessary for groups of ākonga, such as Pacific, who prefer small group learning. Supporting turn-taking within the fishbowl is essential to ensuring that speaking within the circle is not dominated by more confident tamariki who dominate the role of speaker and that ideas contributed by ākonga are not marginalised. Furthermore, teachers must ensure that the quantity of interactions or length of utterances is targeted over the quality of talk (see Tensen & Shea, 2017). Concentric circles provide additional challenges, especially when the role of speaker or listener remains fixed for the whole session that fails to support reluctant ākonga or silent participators. While in Tensen and Shea (2017), support was given to tamariki who were reluctant speakers, including using interference by calling on tamariki specifically rather than developing skills in ākonga that would support them to use turn taking cues to enter discussions independently. Within Barker and colleagues (2016), different supports fostered speaking skills in ākonga that reflected tuakana teina. Teachers scaffolded dialogue via one-to-one teacher conferencing that incorporated the developing ideas of tamariki within their preparation notes to encourage and support the independent use of speaking skills. The key role of the listener is to actively listen to their partner within the speaking circle while monitoring participation across the group. According to Tensen and Shea (2017), this required intensive and in-depth preparation around the targeted text, including developing questions for sharing during the seminar. The use of Bloom's taxonomy to create questions in Tensen & Shea (2017) suggests that the complexity of Socratic talk could be varied to meet ākonga needs and used to develop higher-order skills, including critical thinking. The development of high order skills, which also reflects the key competencies, fosters the development of more complex listening and speaking skills; thus, a reciprocal effect occurs.

Developing listening skills within the fishbowl technique requires digital technology, which enables the listener to record interactions and discussions. The teacher monitors these interactions for engagement by tamariki in listening; however, it is also apparent that digital technology can foster inclusion in multiple ways. The use of backchanneling platforms (Barker et al., 2016) to support engagement is a clear example of how dialogic and Socratic talk can foster inclusion and equity within the classroom. Instead of speaking skills being crucial, tamariki use technology to engage in dialogue through online conversations, which run simultaneously with the dialogic or Socratic talk. In Barker et al. (2016), the backchanneling platform was available to all students, providing ākonga with a means of

engaging in dialogue when otherwise silenced or unsuccessful. Thus, backchanneling facilitates engagement, which can occur external to the concentric circle, providing a tool for less confident ākonga or silent participants to contribute to interactions. It also provides a means for engagement by which ākonga with processing difficulties or hearing impairments can engage. The multimodal nature of digital technology means that recorded interactions can be visual, written, or verbal, which enables the material to be reviewed, fostering making meaning. According to Barker and colleagues (2016), tamariki involvement via backchanneling platforms reflected engagement in complex dialogic talk, the development of metacognitive skills, student voice, meaning making, and relationship building. The use of backchanneling platforms fosters conditions for equitable engagement in speaking and listening roles In Barker et al. (2016), ākonga moved between the concentric circles, with listeners using the platform to guide subsequent discussion as they moved to the role of speakers. The skills, abilities, and knowledge that teachers require for dialogic and exploratory talk are transferable to Socratic talk, along with digital affordances and pedagogical tools for fostering engagement, including text and question selection, and using concentric circles effectively. This suggests that modelling with ākonga is fundamental for Socratic talk; however, it is primarily developed through practice.

Philosophy for Children

Philosophy for children (P4C) is an umbrella approach that provides opportunities to develop philosophy skills in ākonga. P4C involves tamariki philosophising, or problem-solving, existential questions collaboratively, often referred to as a community of inquiry (Lipman, 1981). P4C involves all tamariki, inferring an elevated level of inclusion and engagement in learning, regardless of whether it occurs at a whole class or small group level. P4C is a form of dialogic talk (Fisher, 2007), meaning that listening and speaking skills play critical roles within this approach. The approach emphasises the development of multiple skills and intelligences, including critical and creative thinking skills, logical and verbal reasoning, and philosophical and emotional intelligence, which reciprocate with developing listening and speaking skills.

The focus on existential questions means that curiosity is fundamental to P4C. The natural curiosity of ākonga is needed to create knowledge and develop dialogic skills (Fisher, 2007). However, background experience and existing knowledge are influential to the ability of ākonga to express curiosity about existential questions. Austin (2020) notes that Bourdieu's *capital* means that ākonga can be advantaged or disadvantaged by their background knowledge and experiences, which influences their ability to be successful within education. This suggests that curiosity is fundamental to P4C; however, higher social capital may privilege ākonga, who hold background experiences and knowledge, and the listening and speaking skills that enable them to engage in dialogic discussions. Background knowledge can be fostered in ākonga, which can vary across the learning pathway from highly scaffolded to more independently guided, as in Socratic talk, and the use of digital technology to support neurodiversity in ākonga. In Austin (2020), teachers used games and storybooks to develop background knowledge around friendship which underpinned the

existential question. Pennell (2014) used picture books and vocabulary discussion to facilitate the identification of philosophical issues, while Trickey and Topping (2006) noted the use of stories and poems. Because P4C is a philosophical approach, background knowledge is supported through explicit links to previous learning, reinforcing prior learning while enabling ākonga to bring current thinking to the fore (Trickey & Topping, 2006). Teachers must create contexts that foster ākonga to bridge their understandings with innovative ideas to make meaning.

The influence of social capital on the ability of ākonga to engage in dialogic talk within P4C appears to have differential effects. Austin (2020) found that ākonga with lower social capital engaged in critical thinking. This engagement will foster a reciprocal impact on developing listening and speaking skills. Demirtaş et al. (2018), identified an association between the quality of the answers provided by ākonga and their ability to pose complex questions, highlighting the reciprocal effect between listening and speaking skills. However, Austin (2020) identified that teachers' pre-conceived expectations around social capital were influential to ākonga engagement in discussions. This suggests the ability of ākonga to engage in P4C is related to teachers' perceptions of ākonga, which means teachers are influential to fostering or creating a barrier to learning for ākonga. This approach would have a reciprocal effect on developing listening and speaking skills in ākonga.

Teacher knowledge, skills, and abilities are fundamental to P4C. Teachers are required to hold knowledge around philosophical aspects and have the capacity to develop these understandings within ākonga. Philosophical questions may be prepared by ākonga or teachers to provide scaffolded support to ākonga (Fisher, 2007). However, the teacher often determines the suitability of questions for philosophical discussion, suggesting that teachers need to understand their socio-cultural constraints. P4C is underpinned by open-ended sentences and extended verbal responses from the teacher and ākonga. It is essential that teachers interpret questions within philosophical understandings to ensure they are not constrained or reinforced by dominant viewpoints, demonstrate collaborative dialogic talk through speaking and listening, and recognise when clarification of thinking is required for ākonga (Austin, 2020). Trickey and Topping (2006) outline the dialogic process, highlighting the importance of teachers being able to foster ākonga understandings about points of view and how these can be supported by reason. They also note that teachers need to enable ākonga to understand how points of view can vary between individuals, which is fundamental to creating conditions for inclusion and equity.

While most output within P4C is through speaking, listening skills are fundamental to ākonga and teachers engaging in P4C and in various perspectives, which fosters developing points of view that vary between ākonga and teachers. The articulation of thinking skills is fostered through developing philosophical academic language (Austin, 2020), which can be supported through digital technology (including visually and verbally). Austin (2020) argued that elaborated language code within philosophical academic language enabled ākonga to access higher-level thinking and understanding. However, in that study, all participating teachers held strong beliefs around the role of academic language in learning, suggesting they

held high perceptions of ākonga. This may be why Austin (2020) argued that teachers who explicitly teach philosophical academic language for higher-level thinking have higher expectations of tamariki, scaffolding them for further success.

Austin (2020) noted teaching P4C through modelling and peer dialogue was supported using talk frames (i.e., "I think… because…); however, variability existed in the complexity of student language and thought at the outcome, which focused on speaking skills that ranged from silent participation to group dominance. According to Dawes et al. (as cited in Topping and Trickey, 2014), teachers often assume that ākonga hold skills that support them to engage in discussions; however, as aforementioned, verbal behaviours are also related to diverse cultural values, such as for Pacific and Asian ākonga. If successful outcomes of P4C are weighted in speaking skills, active engagement becomes narrowly defined, conveying the notion that silent participation is not appropriate, and listening is a less valuable skill. Consideration of how learning outcomes could be demonstrated in diverse ways was less clear in Austin's (2020) research. Consideration was apparent within the planning with P4C, including journal writing to record developing philosophical dialogue and academic language; however, journal writing was a tool for behaviour management.

P4C is a complex teaching approach. Research has suggested that the approach is highly teacher-sensitive, requiring in-depth professional development (Trickey & Topping, 2004). Austin (2020) notes that P4C is challenging for some ākonga due to the P4C space being unpredictable and the emergence and exploration of different ideas within open dialogue, which requires shifting towards higher levels of ākonga talk. However, this suggests that such an approach aligns with te ao Māori because it moves the talk to ākonga within open dialogue, altering power relationships. It also requires teachers to listen to ākonga rather than focus on managing behaviours (Trickey & Topping, 2004), which is likely to foster engagement in ākonga, especially Māori and Pacific. Austin (2020) argues that the challenging nature means that P4C fosters developing resilience in ākonga and teachers, which is required to cope with learning within P4C. However, Austin (2020) also identified that the development of resilience was different between teachers and tamariki. For teachers, the facilitation of P4C was challenging due to the complexity of the process and nature of open dialogue, which alters traditional power dynamics. For ākonga, resilience is required in P4C, as emergent thinking is challenged by the ideas of others and develops through new understandings and knowledge as they make meaning. According to Austin (2020), developing understandings of the normalcy of discomfort was influential to developing resilience in ākonga because it evidenced flexibility in thinking. The challenging nature of P4C means student confidence is likely to develop within smaller COL groups, in comparison to the whole-class context (Austin, 2020; Trickey & Topping, 2004); however, this may also be due to cultural preferences around small group formats (Bishop et al., 2007). Multiple reasons exist for the silence, reluctance, and frustration that can emerge within P4C. Teachers are required to understand conditions for learning that foster ākonga participation, including the influence of different group sizes and relational pedagogies that reflect cultural responsiveness within P4C.

Collaborative Reasoning

Collaborative learning models are an example of an instructional approach underpinned by the construction of understandings, shared as knowledge within the public realm, usually with peers (Remedios et al., 2008). Within such an approach, it is an expectation that all students contribute to group learning through participation in reasoned arguments. Collaborative reasoning (CR) is a collaborative approach underpinned by dialogic inquiry (Reznitskaya et al., 2009). CR is predicated on understanding a problem or controversial issue that requires ākonga to work together in groups to determine a path forward, thus reflecting mahitahi (working together as one) and kōtahitanga (purpose) (Berryman et al., 2015). CR enables ākonga to "engage critically in societal issues" (Ministry of Education, 2015, p. 32), providing a means by which equity and social justice issues can be openly discussed, from Indigenous and other underserved settings, thus fostering inclusion (Berryman et al., 2015). Controversial issues encourage the sharing of different viewpoints, underpinned by attitudes, perspectives, and values that reflect social, cultural, and political factors (Lintner, 2018; Taylor & Keown, 2016). Thus, CR cannot be used effectively without developing relationships underpinned by trust (Lintner, 2018), mutual respect, and interdependence that fosters an equitable space for ākonga (Berryman et al., 2015). Otherwise, a safe environment will not exist[3]. Fundamental to CR is using speaking and listening skills to become better informed and agents of change. According to Reznitskaya et al. (2009), CR supports tamariki to develop an argument schema based on extended dialogic discussion where no information is withheld regarding the controversy (Lintner, 2018) that can lead to social action. CR involves gaining understanding through critical reflection and reasoning, evaluative skills (Lintner, 2018), and analysis of values (Taylor & Keown, 2016) concerning the existence of dissonance among individuals when exploring controversial issues, which is reflective of everyday life when encountering individuals who hold their viewpoints.

The CR approach often includes pre-determined rules related to speaking and listening (see Schifflet & Henning, 2017), which Lintner (2018) noted are the cornerstone of democracy. This suggests that the skills underpinning rules require a focus as part of teaching and learning programmes; however, as aforementioned, pre-determined rules, which commonly emphasize speaking when collaborating with others, can act as a barrier for ākonga. According to Remedios and colleagues (2008), emphasising verbal interaction with peers as a marker of active engagement within CR is highly problematic. They argue it reinforces the premise that silent participation in collaborative approaches is inappropriate that fails to reflect cultural values. It may decrease the engagement of Māori ākonga because rules are unlikely to provide a context for conversational styles of dialogue.

As part of their two-year ethnographic research, Remedios et al. (2008) examined the experiences of 30 first-year physiotherapy ākonga[4]. They identified 21 ākonga as silent participants, who spoke between 0 and 5 times per session with limited utterances, lack of questioning, debate, or discussion. In comparison, other students inputted a range of utterances more than 45 times per session. They found silent participants included both ELL learners and local Australian speakers. While they argued that these did not reflect language

differences as the source of silent participation, socio-cultural factors influenced participation. Socio-cultural factors privileged specific types of ākonga heightened ākonga sensitivities to non-verbal behaviours, understanding of verbal behaviours including humour, and understanding of using turn taking cues to enter interactions. Difficulties around engaging in group interactions were noticeable when they included complex explorations or elaborations of content. Such challenges more complex when background and content knowledge in ākonga were lower. This affected underserved ākonga because they could not align their background experiences to the social issue and when ākonga demonstrated difficulties in building on the understandings of others to make meaning. They found that speaking emphasised constrained students who preferred to demonstrate understandings and knowledge by multimodal methods, including writing or drawing. Students also held concern that questioning would halt the pace of learning and perceptions of superficial discussions of the material. They also found that ākonga were engaged in the collaborative process through active listening and that ākonga often wanted to increase their level of participation but found it difficult to do so without the skills that facilitated their ability to apply speaking skills effectively. These findings support existing literature that silent participation may occur for several reasons (see Shi & Tan, 2020).

CR, along with Socratic talk,[5] can be conceptualised as a teaching approach that contains minimal teacher guidance (MGA) (Kirschner et al., 2006). Within minimally guided approaches, tamariki are not presented with essential information but construct essential understandings on their own (Kirschner et al., 2006), which can support ākonga identity, culture, and language. In comparison, direct instruction includes the explicit instruction of concepts and procedures required for learning (Kirschner et al., 2006). MGA suggests that participation in developing such knowledge is vital, which requires tamariki to use listening and speaking skills. Existing literature indicates that while CR is a minimally guided approach, teachers need the ability to select controversial issues that align with the developmental level of ākonga (Lintner, 2018), as well as understanding ākonga themselves to meet learning needs. Background and contextual knowledge are fundamental to CR, meaning that teachers need to know how tools (i.e., interactive book reads and reading material – see Schifflet & Hennig, 2017) can be inclusive and equitable of all ākonga. This is fundamental to ensuring that tamariki hold knowledge that enables them to participate in extended dialogue, which contributes to bridging the development of new understandings. The balance between instructional tools and MGA may be related to the child's developmental levels. Younger children may require higher levels of teacher guidance, while older students may experience MGA. Listening skills can be an explicit focus within the CR approach because this approach can facilitate the development of diverse listening skills, i.e., listening for information, interpreting information, and listening with relational focus to maintain trust and safety.

Challenging existing assumptions through social justice and equity issues within CR requires that teachers understand their own culture and associated socio-historical factors to ensure that ongoing dialogue does not reinforce the silencing of the worldviews of minority cultures. Kelly (as cited in Lintner, 2018) notes that dialogue can be encouraged through teachers

sharing their own views impartiality creating a condition where different perspectives are welcomed, contributing to increased engagement and equity among ākonga. This is made more complex by differing viewpoints underpinned by multiple contextual factors, which means that vocabulary can be complex. Taylor and Keown (2016) note the importance of teachers, and therefore ākonga, holding language (i.e., vocabulary) that supports the exploration of an issue, which supports developing listening and speaking skills. This suggests that teachers need to ensure that ākonga hold the vocabulary to engage in dialogic talk. This is likely to be more complex for ELL but can be supported by L1 use. One risk within CR that is speaking skills become the indicator of student learning; however, speaking skills should not be a barrier to participation if the teacher incorporates tools enabling ākonga to express viewpoints, including non-verbal behaviours, i.e., thumbs up/down/sideways (Taylor & Keown, 2016). Incorporating such tools recognises the development of listening skills in CR and their contribution to meaning making. Given the alignment between Socratic Talk and CR, it is also highly likely that other instructional strategies, such as backchanneling that incorporates multimodal digital technology, can enhance engagement and equity for ākonga, who are less confident in speaking or who are silent participants.

Experiential Learning Experiential learning is an approach that supports ākonga to develop valuable learning skills (Kolb & Kolb, 2009). Fundamental to EL is life experiences or real-world situations, which are grasped and then transformed, resulting in knowledge creation (Kolb, 2015). Within EL, the central tenet includes the active engagement of learners as participants within the learning process (Morris, 2020), which emphasises cognitive knowledge[3] (Waks, 2015). The formalised learning process itself is cyclic and contains two phases, beginning with a *concrete experience* that is realistic in their environment. While the notion of concrete experiences is contested within literature (see Morris, 2020), the experience is underpinned by ākonga taking ownership and holding most of the responsibility within the experience. The next part of the cycle is *reflective observation*, which requires tamariki to think reflectively about the concrete experience. Reflective observation occurs in terms of content knowledge gained (i.e., maths skills) and how the experience may have led to growth or change in terms of developing perspectives around social issues (Morris, 2020). Reflective observation precedes *abstract conceptualisation*, during which time a working hypothesis develops that passes through *active experimentation* as the conditions are tested within a context that enables novel concrete experiences to occur (Morris, 2020).

According to Kolb and Kolb (2009), engaging in this learning cycle enables ākonga to perceive themselves as learners with the learning process, providing conditions for developing attention, effort, and task-based behaviours. They further suggest positive spin-off effects for ākonga. These include the development of learner identity, positive peer relations, and positive self-concept and metacognitive skills that enable ākonga to monitor the fit of the learning process with their ways of learning and the demands of the learning at hand rather than a narrow focus on learning outcomes. Hutt (2007) found learning-related anxiety in Maths could be reduced in ākonga through a focus on developing learner identity associated with teacher perceptions. This research highlighted the importance of knowledge and skills for teachers, which included consciously attending to unconscious processes, fostering in-

depth discussions between ākonga and self-talk within ākonga. This means that, like P4C, risk-taking is an essential element of EL as ākonga develop their learner identities and develop resilience. According to Kolb and Kolb (2009), the development of learner identities requires trust in new experiences and processes, controlling emotional reactions to failure, and reassessing beliefs around learning. Thus, a safe environment for learning is imperative. However, according to Hutt (2007), a safe learning space for developing learner identities depended upon how the teacher related to the student, thus suggesting that teacher self-perceptions are also influential to ākonga developing learner identities over time.

One of the challenges in EL is its bias on cognitive development on an individualistic basis, meaning that language and communication within the social context in which EL occurs are not recognised (Waks, 2015). This may be why listening and speaking skills are often not assessed within the formalised cycle of EL. However, when the social context is acknowledged, EL is an approach where multiple contexts exist that foster speaking and listening skills in tamariki (Waks, 2015), especially when viewing EL within an Indigenous lens. For Indigenous tamariki, EL provides crucial learning environments, including kapa haka, to learn about their culture, language, and identity within their natural world (Education Review Office, 2021), thus reflecting the importance of whenua to cultural context knowledge systems. Tamariki engage in EL to learn about their environment and place, contributing to learning about Indigenous histories, beliefs, and identities (Hare, 2011). EL creates a place where tamariki can develop cooperative relationships with others (relational listening skills), informational listening as tamariki prepare to engage in the activity with others, and practice listening skills as tamariki engage in experiences (Waks, 2015).

Critical listening skills can be fostered within the formalized cycle through active experimentation and feedback sessions. Although Kolb and Kolb (2009) identify numerous ways of learning that are dynamic states, learning within the EL cycle is typically judged on the written language outcomes of ākonga (see Conle & Boone, 2008); thus, favouring Western over Indigenous knowledge systems. Understanding how to develop speaking and listening skills in EL is more complex by the lack of empirical research relating to EL within primary and secondary contexts (Hutt, 2007). In Morris' (2020) systematic review of EL studies from 1323 journals, only 60 EL journal articles identified. Of these 60 articles, only three pertained to middle school education and two further articles related to teacher education. The lack of research related to primary or secondary education, in comparison to within specific professions, including nursing, business management, and adult samples of English Language Learners (ELL), may be related to the level of content knowledge required for concrete experiences to occur. However, it also reflects the ignoring of Indigenous knowledge systems within EL.

Engaging in a formalised cycle of EL requires a core basis of knowledge to be developed in individuals. According to Kirschner and colleagues (2006), even though EL is considered a minimally guided approach[4], it is not until background knowledge is at a sufficient level whereby ākonga can guide their learning process that enables effective engagement in EL. They reiterate the importance of background knowledge by stating that ākonga will be

expected to engage in cognitive activities that are unlikely to lead to learning due to memory storage. This means within EL, didactic experiences occur as a requisite precursor to concrete experiences. These didactic experiences include tamariki and a more knowledgeable other, most commonly a teacher, which enables tamariki to develop specific content knowledge that establishes foundational knowledge within long-term memory. Literature also suggests that background knowledge reduces cognitive load, especially for neurodiverse ākonga or ELL. Background knowledge enables tamariki to fully engage (and derive maximum benefit) from the concrete experience that constitutes EL, leading to greater learning, unlike higher cognitive loads that lead to lower understanding (Tuovinen & Sweller, as cited in Kirschner et al., 2006).

EL is underpinned by the active involvement of tamariki throughout the learning process. However, this requires EL to be recognised as a context whereby ākonga are responsible for learning within a collaborative space, thus, acknowledging the social construction of knowledge (Morris, 2020; Waks, 2015). This contrasts with tamariki engaging within the learning process as a lone scientist, such as in Kolb's model, with tamariki taking full responsibility in transforming experiences to create knowledge. It is within the depth and breadth of EL (Coker et al., 2017) where opportunities to develop speaking and listening skills exist. Depth relates to time invested within the EL process that provides opportunities for developing listening and speaking skills and higher-order thinking skills via collaboration. In a Canadian case study by Conle and Boone (2008), the collaborative space was underpinned by the engagement of tamariki in the decision-making process concerning determining 'who was a hero?' as opposed to categories being pre-determined by the teacher. Engagement was reflected throughout the case study, as tamariki had opportunities to make connections using their understandings and experiences that included cultural [and socio-historical] contexts and personal dispositions (Conle & Boone, 2008).

Breadth refers to effort related to the types of experiences contributing to developing soft or core skills, such as social competence through teamwork. Within these experiences, social interactions are fundamental, with dialogue leading to deeper understandings (Morris, 2020). It is within the breadth of experiences that EL may provide opportunities for inclusion that are equitable. In Conle and Boone (2008), multimodal media enabled tamariki to engage in discussions in multiple ways, including written text (magazines, poetry anthology), video, and audio recordings. This supported the development of critical discussions that provided ākonga with opportunities to construct novel experiences related to developing new understandings. Learning outcomes of the Conle and Boone (2008) case study included a written biography; however, outcomes can consist of intentional activities that promote inclusion while enabling speaking and listening skills to be demonstrated in variable ways. This includes using digital technology to visually present outcomes, such as recording speech, graphic novels, role-playing, or audio recordings. The EL approach requires a high level of planning and pedagogical knowledge to ensure that teachers can foster conditions enabling ākonga to access learning within the teaching and learning cycle. Professional development in this teaching approach would be essential to its success.

Dramatic Inquiry

Dramatic Inquiry (DI) is a teaching approach that combines drama and role-taking to explore imagined worlds that contain tension, along with inquiry-based learning through exploration (known as metaxis) to develop understandings in the real world (Edmiston, 2014; Farrand & Deeg, 2019), within the classroom. According to Heathcote and Bolton (1995), making meaning is optimal when it occurs with the whole class and when a degree of tension exists for ākonga and teachers. For ākonga, feelings of anticipation or conflict can occur within a task or in content knowledge development. For teachers, tension exists around the planning and execution of the approach with ākonga. According to Farrand & Deeg (2019), facilitation must include explicit modelling of inclusive practices. They further argue that developing practices in ākonga fosters problem-solving skills, communication skills, and socio-emotional competencies.

The use of inquiry and dramatic spaces means DI includes a variety of materials and promotes communication through multiple modalities, including music, movement, discussion, tactile engagement, and art, supporting inclusion and equity by drawing on the linguistic, social, and cultural strengths of all children (Edmiston, 2007). The inclusion of silent or reluctant participants occurs through providing a space for the observation of ongoing work, which can support ākonga engagement (Downey, personal communication, 26 August 2021). Downey also noted that silent or reluctant participant by ākonga does not mean a lack of engagement within the process and that learning still occurs. Downey suggests that DI privileges ākonga with greater developed speaking skills or higher levels of confidence to a lesser degree than other approaches (or teaching practices) that emphasise reading and writing tasks that privilege some ākonga. DI fosters engagement and equity by providing ākonga with opportunities to step in and out of multiple roles, including of ‘ākonga’ and ‘other’ (Farrand & Deeg, 2019).

Listening and speaking have a primary role in DI, which develops through collaboration. Expansion of DI includes elements of dialogic talk, through drama-based pedagogies, including theatre games and role work. Edmiston (2008a; 2008b) extended role-play to include character acting, which requires teacher intervention to encourage the construction and reconstruction of understandings. According to Dawson & Lee (2016), drama tools foster engagement through utilising diverse ways of learning, which creates an inquiry-based environment and cross-curricular links. In Downey’s (personal communication, 23 August 2021) experience, DI provides more opportunities to develop listening and speaking skills in ākonga than otherwise would be provided. The range of experiences can also be highly varied, moving away from how skills are traditionally represented in teaching and learning programmes. For example, while speeches can be a component of presentational talk within DI, they do not occur outside of an identified context. Speeches can be presented using multiple modalities, including online, via phone, or surreptitiously. This suggests that DI can be responsive to ākonga needs, fostering engagement and inclusion.

DI may particularly benefit underserved ākonga. In Downey’s (personal communication, 23 August 2021) experience, DI benefitted Māori males because they could access learning (and experience the curriculum), even though they were more likely to hold lower literacy

skills. The benefits extended beyond growth in listening and speaking skills to written language skills and increased engagement and self-efficacy. Downey noted that difficulties in written (and reading) language skills would have traditionally prohibited some ākonga from accessing learning; thus, DI creates conditions for learning for all ākonga. Classroom conditions may create a context that fosters the use of DI. The use of mixed ability groups and tuakana teina can promote a classroom ethos where ākonga are a team; therefore, any focus on ability within learning does not exist (Downey, personal communication, 23 August 2021). A reciprocal effect may occur with the classroom ethos supporting the use of DI, fostering conditions for inclusion, supporting collectivistic cultures, including Māori and Pacific ākonga (Civil & Hunter, 2015). In contrast, individual performance or achievement reinforces a tail of underachievement in groups of ākonga, contributing to the subjugation of underserved learners, including Māori and Pacific ākonga.

Within DI, there exist multiple approaches, including child-structured dramatic play, process drama, drama for learning, mantle of the expert (imagined world). Two additional models exist based on mantle of the expert, including the commission model and the rolling role model.

Child structured-dramatic play (CSDP)

The focus of the child structured-dramatic play (CSDP) approach is on younger tamariki and their creation of an imagined world, rather than being assigned roles or characters (Aitken, 2020). The creation of imagined worlds is supported by background knowledge or information, such as through picture books, which is integral to children structuring their dramatic play. Teachers are non-participants and sit outside of the play process, only intervening as necessary through role play. CSDP may foster the development of listening and speaking. Tamariki freely transfer between listening and speaking skills as they move from actively representing text using listening and visual cues to recreating text through play, including verbal and non-verbal behaviours. This provides opportunities for ākonga to recreate beyond a text as they act out their thoughts to develop their imaginative world (Aitken, 2020; Dunn, 2011). CSDP may provide a context to develop writing skills, as ākonga transfer listening and speaking skills to written language (Aitken, 2020; Dunn, 2011). CSDP creates conditions for inclusion and equity because ākonga apply their background knowledge, including language, identity, and culture, within their response, which may sit outside the context of the media used to foster the dramatic play. One challenge to CSDP is that teachers must be aware of text and media choices, ensuring they do not reinforce dominant discourses and marginalise Māori ākonga and other underserved groups.

Process drama

Process drama (PD) is underpinned by an inquiry topic devised by the teacher. PD enables ākonga to explore issues or conflicts within a fictional world to make sense of these within the real world (Kana & Aitken, 2007). In PD, tamariki are active participants as they collaborate within the drama process to create an experience for themselves (Aitken, 2020). As with CSDP, background knowledge is essential. However, in PD, the text is used to

establish a context for the question of inquiry that can contain a deeper theme, such as bullying, which can be subsequently acted out, for example, through improvisation. Within PD, listening and speaking skills appear vital because they foster collaboration as ākonga improvise solutions to the issue or conflict. There is high alignment between the features of PD and dialogic and other forms of talk, including a collaborative and safe environment based on reciprocation, which builds extended dialogue that is purposeful (Stinson, 2015). In an Australian case study with 22 Year 4 ākonga, Stinson (2015) found that PD fosters OL development in context, register, and vocabulary. The inquiry topic enabled ākonga to make explicit connections between their background knowledge and new learning, even though the inquiry topic was situated within a global context. Smythe (2020) argued that bridging between cultures was fostered by ākonga ability to make critical connections through understanding and knowledge of aspects, such as gender. This suggests that PD can provide opportunities for equity and inclusion for ākonga through global and local issues. Stinson (2015) identified that growth in oral language skills transferred to positively influence whānau relationships at home through the increased use of speaking and listening skills supported by the context of inquiry.

Engagement is supported within PD because tamariki and teachers can move in and out of the drama, which acts as a safe space to explore different perspectives and reflect on the action (Aitken, 2020; Hulse & Owens &, 2015; Wells & Sandretto, 2017). CSDP and PD are used primarily with younger children because the focus is on engaging within the fictional world. However, it has been researched within the tertiary setting to examine cultural exclusion (Kana & Aitken, 2007), suggesting increasingly complex topics of inquiry. Notably, issues and conflict can extend to global issues, creating links to other cultures within culturally diverse populations of ākonga. According to Wells & Sandretto (2017), PD can enhance classroom literacy programmes through making meaning of multimodal texts situated within socio-cultural contexts. This suggests engagement is enhanced when language, culture, and identity are used to make meaning of text within the PD approach.

Wells and Sandretto (2017), in a qualitative study in Aotearoa New Zealand, with two teachers and ākonga in Years 0 to 4, integrated PD into a literacy programme. There was no reference to listening or speaking skills in this study; however, they identified increased engagement in PD because of its collaborative nature. They suggested that engagement would foster literacy development as they engaged in multimodal texts (Wells & Sandretto, 2017), suggesting growth in listening and speaking skills. They argued that teachers were fundamental to the effectiveness of PD because they worked alongside ākonga in-role, positively influencing ākonga engagement. Working in-role provided less confident and reluctant ākonga with a safe space to participate, supporting meaning making and developing higher-order thinking skills (Wells & Sandretto, 2017). Growth in written language skills was evident in ākonga, especially within imaginative writing. One challenge to PD is that teachers require knowledge to integrate PD effectively into classrooms, which requires a specific focus on using drama conventions within literacy. However, in Wells and Sandretto (2017), teachers initially held little understanding of PD. This study's high support and scaffolding required for teachers suggest that professional development would be necessary. Having this

support within the classroom would better support the development of a repertoire of PD pedagogical skills.

Drama for Learning (DL) Compared to PD, where tamariki spend most of the time within the imagined world, within DL, tamariki enter the imagined world for a brief period to establish a context for learning and create connections with the learner (Aitken, 2020). Within DL, there is no background knowledge as the sole function of DL is its application across the curriculum at any time.

Mantle of the Expert

Mantle of the Expert (ME) can be viewed as an extension of PD. The teacher's role in empowering ākonga requires the facilitation of learning, which must occur from within DI and not outside (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995). Tamariki engage in real-life inquiry to co-construct understandings specifically related to a commission. A commission is an authority who poses a fictional question or problem to tamariki via the classroom teacher, situated within an authentic, real-world context. Tamariki are viewed as experts by the commission, which challenges the power dynamics between teachers and tamariki (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995). Thus, ME creates conditions for developing key competencies, specifically managing self, relating to others, and participating and contributing, which may contribute to motivation and developing self-esteem (Huxtable, 2009), which operate reciprocally to influence future learning. Unlike PD, the inquiry question may not be controversial, but there is a clear connection to concrete outcomes. While understandings may have an explicit theme (i.e., bullying) (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995), cross-curricular learning also may naturally emerge as ākonga engage in real-life inquiry to problem solve a fictional question at hand (Downey et al., 2019).

According to Heathcote and Bolton (1995), it is fundamental that ākonga develop the required skills to engage in ME, which develop over time. Heathcote further argues that ākonga need to be aware of the skills or concepts being learned, which fosters their ability (and need) to take responsibility for their learning. Background knowledge is integral to co-constructing learning about the question or problem; therefore, which can be scaffolded to align with ākonga needs. Farrand & Deeg (2019) included 12 pre-schoolers with developmental or speech delays in their US case study. Background knowledge was developed in tamariki using a strategy called 'pass the object,' which incorporated tactile methods and extended thinking time and listening skills. Learning is extended in other populations, including older ākonga, when background information is developed independently, such as in Socratic talk. The use of accommodations within Farrand & Deeg (2019) that aimed to ensure inclusion appeared to foster listening and speaking skills within ākonga, primarily using questions that engaged tamariki in thinking. Within ME, tamariki move in and out of role as a collaborative group, speaking (sharing) when comfortable; thus, reflecting rangatiratanga. However, it is unclear the conditions that foster engagement in speaking.

The use of ME has been examined in Aotearoa New Zealand, using kaupapa Māori and culturally responsive pedagogies. Downey and colleagues (2019) used ME with 96 ākonga across Years 1 to 6 to foster writing outcomes. A specific focus was placed on Māori ākonga, 30% of the group. Pirini (Aitken & Pirini, 2013) used ME within a Year 3 classroom of a special character religious school with primarily Pākehā ākonga, many with learning and literacy difficulties. Both Downey et al. (2019) and Pirini developed a curriculum that integrated school-based values with ME. Pirini (Aitken & Pirini, 2013) connected a religious theme with Māori conceptions of creation and tapu o te whenua (sacredness of the land), and as with Downey et al. (2019), incorporated the use of culturally responsive pedagogies, including tuakana-teina and ako, along with multimodal aspects including visual representations of te ao Māori. Downey and colleagues (2019) found their approach supported Māori as Māori. ME repositioned power within the classroom by including student-led approaches of tuakana-teina and ako, challenging Eurocentric approaches as central to learning while making te ao Māori visible (Berryman et al., 2017) through the inclusion of whānau, local iwi, and hapū, and their cultural narratives. The repositioning of power was also present in Pirini (Aitken & Pirini, 2013) by the teacher taking on board a low-status role of a character reliant on ākonga to reconstruct knowledge. Interestingly, ākonga showed higher engagement and ownership in learning in both studies, suggesting emotional connections existed for ākonga, fostering engagement and the desire to develop more complex skills (Huxtable, 2009). Downey and colleagues (2019) attributed this to the ME process, rather than the writing outcomes that had also demonstrated positive gains for Māori ākonga. The increased engagement and ownership through ME may have been due to approaches responsive to culture, identity, and language (one of Downey and colleague's ME focused on the local Māori History Museum) and the importance of oracy for Māori.

Mixed ability groups can foster engagement and develop listening and speaking skills. This appears contrary to Heathcote, for whom best practice for DI and ME included whole-class approaches (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995), suggesting that small group work may provide conditions for fostering inclusion and engagement in learning. In Pirini, multimodal forms of learning were present, including visual arts and storying. However, the higher engagement came from character role-playing that placed ākonga in high-status roles as the more competent 'adult in tuakana teina via kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face) (Aitken & Pirini, 2013), which developed the ability of ākonga to relate to others. Pirini noted that repositioning ākonga behaviour increased focus and positive behaviours that reflected the role as 'adult,' which fostered the ability of ākonga to manage themselves. Pirini also noted the implicit development of turn taking skills, including waiting for the others to finish speaking before talking and the development of language, which reflected their 'adult' relationship to each other within the ME. Pirini reported that her language register developed and posed questions that created contexts for extended dialogue that positively influenced developing listening and speaking skills (Aitken & Pirini, 2013). These skills were not considered in the links to curriculum beyond oral presentations, although they are essential to the process of ME (Aitken & Pirini, 2013).

Rolling role model is when distinct groups, for example, multiple classrooms, work together to form a community threatened by a fictional challenge. Within the rolling role model, work is co-constructed by distinct groups who leave their work incomplete for another group to move forward with the inquiry. These models appear to be suited to upper primary and secondary ākonga. The *Commission model* extends upon ME by placing the inquiry within a real client and, therefore, not fictional.

DI provides many opportunities to implement strategies with equitable outcomes for tamariki using materials that promote inclusion (i.e., images, drawings, music, or touch to accompany teacher talk, instead of written text to develop understandings) (Farrand & Deeg, 2019). While DI can emphasise literacy skills, such as reading and writing, these can be adapted to reflect multimodal forms, including collages (Farrand & Deeg, 2019), video or audio recordings, visual language, and assisted digital technology presentations (i.e., posters or stories). Because DI includes inquiry and co-constructing meaning around a question or problem, including neurodiverse and underserved learners occur through carefully selecting the focus of inquiry and encouraging connections to self throughout the inquiry. One challenge to DI is that it is not a specialist subject but a pedagogical approach, which may result in difficulties in understanding for teachers. Teachers are required to acknowledge that drama is a context in which meaning can be constructed and reconstructed amongst tamariki, and as such, is an authentic learning experience. Heathcote and Bolton (1995) note that because ME requires ākonga and teachers to operate within drama, these challenges existing conceptions of power within the classroom. Teachers may only consider drama in terms of the tension within the imagined world without translating it to inquiry-based in the real world. This may be why literature focuses on teaching strategies and actions rather than developing skills in tamariki, including listening and speaking skills. Developing skills appears complex because they vary to the task at hand, knowledge to be developed, learning area, and social health of ākonga (Heathcote & Bolton, 2005). While Farrand and Deeg (2019) outline accommodations to teaching strategies within DI that may foster the development of listening and speaking skills. In general, their development is incidental to the learning process. Overall, teachers are likely to require professional development that provides support and learning to teachers around how DI can develop listening and speaking in ākonga explicitly. Professional development would need to support the general planning and preparation required to implement DI effectively, which has been a significant factor influencing the uptake of DI by the classroom teacher (Heathcote & Bolton, 2005).

Recommendations

1. The Ministry of Education to fund and develop an overarching rationale for developing listening and speaking skills within English-medium education in Aotearoa New Zealand. It should include a focus on:
    a. Acknowledging the importance of listening and speaking skills in ākonga, including in the development of literacy skills.
    b. A coherent and systematic set of curriculum expectations, resources, and assessment tools that explicitly support the teaching and learning of listening and speaking skills.
    c. The benefits of developing listening and speaking skills within the English Learning Area and other learning areas across the entire learning pathway.
    d. Recognise the benefits of listening and speaking skills in developing associated skills, including critical thought, abstract reasoning, argumentative, metacognitive skills, self-regulation, and in fostering psychosocial development and well-being in ākonga.

2. Research to develop an understanding of listening and speaking skills in the diverse population of ākonga in Aotearoa New Zealand. Research should explicitly focus on:
    a. Identifying the influence of socio-cultural and historical contexts, place, and space on the development of listening and speaking skills.
    b. Understanding the role of culture, language, and identity on developing listening and speaking skills, including verbal and non-verbal behaviours. Research should occur in conjunction with key groups, including Māori, Pacific, Asian, and neurodiverse ākonga, and those experiencing impairments in language, literacy, hearing, and sight.
    c. Understanding the role of digital technology and digital affordances in developing listening and speaking skills, including using digital technologies for dialogue, teacher awareness of properties and capabilities, and enacting technology ensuring its active and intentional use.
    d. Identifying pedagogical practices and teaching approaches, including those currently used that create conditions for fostering listening and speaking skills in diverse groups of ākonga.

3. The Ministry of Education provides teaching approaches, pedagogical tools, and associated resources responsive to culture, language, and identity. These should be supported by:
    a. Ongoing and targeted professional development for teachers in developing listening and speaking skills grounded in theory, including diverse types and purposes of listening and speaking skills.
    b. Ongoing professional development should be explicitly linked to practice to enable facilitators to challenge teacher beliefs and perceptions around tamariki and growing teacher capabilities.
    c. Ongoing and targeted professional development for teachers on the role of digital technology and digital affordances in creating conditions to foster listening and speaking skills in diverse groups of ākonga.
    d. Ongoing and targeted professional development for schools that support the development and ongoing consolidation of listening and speaking skills within and across the learning pathway.

e. Ongoing incorporation of theoretical understandings related to listening and speaking skills within Initial Teacher Education (ITE).

References

Aitken, V. (2020). Real learning in imagined worlds: Supporting literacy learning with dramatic inquiry. *Literacy Forum NZ, 35*(3), 16-27.

Aitken, V., & Pirini, E. (2013). Te mana, te wehi me te ihi: Teaching from who we are. In D. Fraser, V. Aitken, & B. Whyte (Eds.). *Connecting curriculum, linking learning* (pp. 128-147). NZCER.

Alexander, R. J. (2008). *Towards dialogic teaching: Rethinking classroom talk.* Dialogos.

Alexander, R. J. (2010). Speaking but not listening? Accountable talk in an unaccountable context. *Literacy, 44*(3), 103-111.

Alexander, R. J. (2013). Improving oracy and classroom talk: Achievements and challenges. *Primary First*. 22-29.

Amitay, G., & Gumpel, T. (2015). Academic self-efficacy as a resilience factor among adjudicated girls. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth, 20*(2), 202-227.

Atkinson, D. (Ed.). (2011). *An identity approach to second language acquisition.* Routledge.

Austin, A. (2020). *Philosophy for all children: enhancing knowledge.* https://researcharchive.vuw.ac.nz/xmlui/handle/10063/9055

Ayala, E., Brace, H. J., & Stahl, K. (2012). Preparing teachers to implement universal design for learning. In T. E. Hall, A. Meyer, & D. H. Rose (Eds.), *Universal design for learning in the classroom: Practical applications* (pp. 135-152). Guilford Press.

Barker, L. M., Chisholm. J. S., & Quillen, B, (2016). Under discussion: Teaching speaking and listening - Digitalizing the fishbowl: An approach to dialogic discussion. *The English Journal, 105*(3), 88-91.

Barnes, D. (2008). Exploratory talk for learning. In N. Mercer & S. Hodgkinson (Eds.), *Exploring talk in school: Inspired by the work of Douglas Barnes* (pp.1-12). Sage Publications.

Barthel. M., Meyer, A., & Levinson, S. (2017). Next speakers plan their turn early and speak after turn-final "go signals." *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 393.

Beauchamp, G. (2016). *ICT in the classroom: How, when, and who?* (2nd Ed.) Routledge.

Berryman, M., & Egan, M., & Ford, T. (2017). Examining the potential of critical and kaupapa Māori approaches to leading education reform in New Zealand's English-medium secondary schools. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 20*(5), 525-538.

Berryman, M., & Eley, E. (2017). Accelerating success and promoting equity through the Ako (Note1) Critical Contexts for Change. *Asian Education Studies, 2*(1), 99-112.

Berryman, M., Ford, T., Nevin, A., & Soohoo, S. (2015). Culturally responsive contexts: Establishing relationships for inclusion. *International Journal of Special Education, 30*(3), 39-51.

Berryman, M., Lawrence, D., & Lamont, R. (2018). Cultural relationships for responsive pedagogy. *SET, 1*, 1-10.

Bishop, R., Berryman, M., Cavanagh, T., & Teddy, L. (2007). *Te Kōtahitanga Phase 3 Whanaungatanga: Establishing a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations in mainstream secondary school classrooms. Report to the Ministry of Education.* Ministry of Education.

Bishop, R., Ladwig, J., & Berryman, M. (2014). The centrality of relationships for pedagogy: The whanaungatanga thesis. *American Educational Research Journal, 51*(1), 184-214.

Blincoe, S., & Harris, M. J. (2013). Nonverbal behavior and education. In J. A. Hall & M. L. Knapp (Eds.) *Nonverbal communication; nonverbal communication* (pp. 771-803). De Gruyter Mouton.

Bögels, S., & Torreira, F. (2015). Listeners use intonational phrase boundaries to project turn ends in spoken interaction, *Journal of Phonetics, 52*, 46-57.

Breive, S. (2020). The materialisation of children's mathematical thinking through organisation of turn-taking in small group interactions in kindergarten. In M. Carlsen, I. Erfjord, & P. S. Hundeland (eds.), *Mathematics education in the early years: Results from the POEM4 Conference 2018*, (pp. 281-299). Springer.

Brown, C., Czerniewicz, L., & Noakes, T. (2016). Online content creation: Looking at students' social media practices through a connected learning lens. *Learning, Media, and Technology, 41*(1), 140-159.

Cabell, S., Justice, L., McGinty, A., DeCoster, J., & Forston, L. (2015). Teacher-child conversations in pre-school classrooms: Contributions to children's vocabulary development. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 3*0, 80-92.

Cameron, T., Carroll, J. L. D., Taumoepeau, M., & Schaughency, E. (2019). How do New Zealand teachers assess children's oral language and literacy skills at school entry? *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 54*, 69-97.

Chamberlain, M. (2019). *PIRLS 2016: Schools and school climate for learning.* Ministry of Education.

Charters, C., Kingdon-Bebb, K., Olsen, T., Ormsby, W., Owen, E., Pryor, J., Ruru, J., Solomon, N., & Williams, G. (2019). *He Puapua: Report of the working group on a plan to realise the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Aotearoa/New Zealand.* https://www.tpk.govt.nz/docs/undrip/tpk-undrip-he-puapua.pdf

Civil, M., & Hunter, R. (2015). Participation of non-dominant students in argumentation in the mathematics classroom. *Intercultural Education, 26*(4), 296-312.

Coker, J. S., Heiser, E., Taylor, L., & Book, C. (2017). Impacts of experiential learning depth and breadth on student outcomes. *The Journal of Experiential Education, 40*(1), 5-23.

Conle, C., & Boone, M. (2008). Local heroes, narrative worlds, and the imagination: The making of a moral curriculum through experiential narratives. *Curriculum Inquiry, 38*(1), 7-37.

Corcoran, R., Cheung, A., Kim, E. & Chen, X. (2018). Effective universal school-based social and emotional learning programs for improving academic achievement: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 50 years of research. *Educational Research Review*, *25*, 56–72.

Cowie, B., Moreland, J., Otrel-Cass, K., & Jones, A. (2008). More than talk and writing: Exploring the multimodal nature of classroom interactions. *SET, 3*, 45-47.

Coyne, P., Ganley, P., Hall, T., Meo, G., Murray, E., & Gordon, D. (2006). Applying universal design for learning in the classroom. In D. H. Rose & A. Meyer (Eds.), *A practical reader in universal design for learning*, (pp. 1-13). Harvard Education Press.

Denston, A., Fickel, L., Martin, R., & O'Toole, V. (in review). *Teachers' perspectives of social-emotional learning: Informing the development of a linguistically and culturally responsive framework for social-emotional wellbeing in Aotearoa New Zealand* [Manuscript submitted for publication]. College of Education, Health, and Human Development, University of Canterbury.

Dobinson, K. L., & Dockrell, J. E. (2021). Universal strategies for the improvement of expressive language skills in the primary classroom: A systematic review. *First Language, 00*(0), 1-28.

Dockrell, J. E., Howell, P., Leung, D., & Fugard, A. J. B. (2017). Children with speech language and communication needs in England: Challenges for practice. *Frontiers in Education*, *2*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2017.00035

Downey, R., Grove, H., Alchin, H., & DeBoer, C. (2019). *Enhancing writing outcomes for Māori students through the application of dramatic inquiry approaches within culturally responsive practice* (Otaika Valley School TLIF 2 – 050). Otaika Valley School (TLIF 2-050) - Enhancing writing outcomes for Māori students through the application of dramatic inquiry approaches within culturally responsive practice | Education Counts

Dull, L., & Murrow, S. (2008). Is dialogic questioning possible in social studies classrooms? *Theory and Research in Social Education, 36*(4), 391-412.

Dunn, J. (2011). Child-structured socio-dramatic play and the drama educator: What's our role? In S. Schonmann (Ed.), *Key concepts in theatre/drama education*, (pp. 29-34). Sense Publishers.

Edmiston, B. (2007). Mission to Mars: Using drama to make a more inclusive classroom for literacy learning. *Language Arts*, *84*, 337-346.

Edmiston, B. (2008a). *Forming ethical identities in early childhood play*. Routledge.

Edmiston, B. (2008b). *Mountains, ships, and time-machines: making space for creativity and learning with dramatic inquiry in a primary classroom*. Creative Partnerships.

Edmiston, B. (2014). *Transforming teaching and learning with active and dramatic approaches: Engaging students across the curriculum.* Routledge.

Education Review Office (2015a). *A Well-being for success resource for primary schools.* http://www.ero.govt.nz/publications/well-being-for-childrens-success-at-primary-school/

Education Review Office (2015b). *A well-being for success resource for secondary schools*. https://www.ero.govt.nz/publications/wellbeing-for-young-peoples-success-at-secondary-school/

Education Review Office. (2017). *Extending their language - Expanding their world: Children's oral language (birth-8 years).* Author.

Education Review Office. (2021). *Te kura huanui: The treasures of successful pathways.* https://ero.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2021-06/Te%20Kura%20Huanui_English_Digital.pdf

Edyburn, D. L. (2005). Universal design for learning. *Special Education Technology Practice*, *7*(5), 16-22.

English, E., Hargreaves, L., Hislam, J. (2002). Pedagogical dilemmas in the National Literacy Strategy: Primary teachers' perceptions, reflections and classroom behaviour. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 32(1), 9-26.

Farrand, K. M., & Deeg, M. T. (2019). Dramatic Inquiry: An inclusive approach to learning with collaboration and multiple modes. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 52*(3), 128-1347.

Fisher, D. (2007). Dialogic teaching: Developing thinking and metacognition through philosophical discussion. *Early Child Development and Care, 177*(6-7), 616-631.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2014). Speaking and listening in content area learning. *The Reading Teacher, 68(*1), 64-69.

Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2019). Listening stations in content area learning. *The Reading Teacher, 72*(6), 769-773.

Flavell, M. (2017). Listening to and learning from Pacific families: The art of building home-school relationships at secondary level to support achievement. *SET, 2*, 42-48.

Fletcher, J., Parkhill, F., & Fa'afoi, A. (2005). What factors promote and support Pasifika students in reading and writing? *SET, 2,* 2–8.

Fletcher, J., Parkhill, F., Fa'afoi, A., Taleni, L. T., & O'Regan, B. (2009). Pasifika students: Teachers and parents voice their perceptions of what provides supports and barriers to

Pasifika students' achievement in literacy and learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25,* 24-33.

Foster, M. A., Lambert, R., Abbott-Shim, M., McCarty, F., & Franze, S. (2005). A model of home learning environment and social risk factors in relation to children's emergent literacy and social outcomes. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 20,* 13–36.

Frey, N., Fisher, D., & Nelson, J. (2013). Todo tiene que ver con lo que se habla: It's all about the talk. *Kappan, 94(*6), 8-13.

Gehlbach, H. (2010). The social side of school: Why teachers need social psychology. *Educational Psychology Review, 22*(3), 349-362.

Gillon, G., McNeill, B., Scott, A., Denston, A., Wilson, L., Carson, K., Macfarlane, A. H., (2019). A better start to literacy learning: Findings from a teacher-implemented intervention in children's first year at school. *Reading and Writing, 32*(8), 1989–2012.

Gomez, C. J., & Yoshikawa, H. (2017). Earthquake effects: Estimating the relationship between exposure to the 2010 Chilean earthquake and preschool children's early cognitive and executive function skills. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 38,* 127–136.

Grau, V., Lorca, A., Araya, C., Urrutia, S., Rios, D., Montagna, P., & Ibaceta, M. (2018). Socially shared regulation of learning and quality of talk. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 162,* 11-39.

Gutiérrez, K. D., Cortes, K., Cortez, A., DiGiacomo, D., Higgs, J., Johnson, P., Ramón Lizárraga, J., Mendoza, E., Tien, J., & Vakil, S. (2017). Replacing representation with imagination: Finding ingenuity in everyday practices. *Review of Research in Education, 41*(1), 30-60.

Hare, J. (2011). 'They tell a story and there's meaning behind that story': Indigenous knowledge and young indigenous children's literacy learning. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy, 12*(4), 389-414.

Haroutunian-Gordon, S. (2015). Can listening be taught? In L. J. Waks (Ed.), *Listening to teach: Beyond didactic pedagogy*, (pp 86-96). SUNY Press.

Heathcote, D., & Bolton, G. (1996). *Drama for learning: Dorothy Heathcote's Mantle of the Expert approach to education.* Heinemann.

Hennessy, S., Dragovic, T., & Warwick, P. (2017). A research-informed, school-based professional development workshop programme to promote dialogic teaching with interactive technologies. *Professional Development in Education, 44*(2), 145-168.

Hindle, R., & Matthewman, S. (2017). Māori literacies: Ecological perspectives. *SET, 3*, 32-37.

Hoff, E. (2006). How social context support and change language development. *Developmental Review, 26,* 55-88.

Hoff-Ginsberg, E. (1990). Maternal speech and the child's development of syntax: A further look. *Journal of Child Language, 17*, 85-99.

Hoff-Ginsberg, E. (1991). Mother-child conversation in difference social classes and communicative settings. *Child Development, 62*, 782-796.

Hoff-Ginsberg, E. (1998). The relation of birth order and socioeconomic status to children's language experience and language development. *Applied Linguistics, 19*, 603-629.

Hood, N. (2020). *Learning from lockdown: What the experiences of teachers, students and parents can tell us about what happened and where to next for New Zealand's school system.* The Education Hub.

Hulse, B., & Owens, A. (2019). Process drama as a tool for teaching modern languages: Supporting the development of creativity and innovation in early professional practice. *Innovation in Language Learning & Teaching*, *13*(1), 17–30.

Hunter, R. K., & G. Anthony. (2011). "Forging Mathematical Relationships in Inquiry-based Classrooms with Pasifika Students." *Journal of Urban Mathematics Education, 4*(1), 98–119.

Hunter, D., Gambell, T., & Randhawa, B. (2005). Gender gaps in group listening and speaking: Issues in social constructivist approaches to teaching and learning. Educational Review, 57(3), 329-355.

Hutt, G. (2007). *Experiential learning spaces: Hermetic transformational leadership for psychological safety, consciousness development and math anxiety related inferiority complex depotentiation.* Unpublished dissertation. Case Western Reserve University.

Huxtable, C. (2009). Mantle of the expert and the key competencies: An exciting and valuable partnership. Unpublished dissertation. University of Otago.

Jalongo, M. R. (2008). *Learning to listen: Listening to learn – Building essential skills in young children.* National Association for the Education of Young Children.

James, M. (2014). The Honey Ant readers: An innovative and bold approach to engaging rural indigenous students in print literacy through accessible, culturally and linguistically appropriate resources. *Australian and International Journal of Rural Education, 24*(1), 79-89.

Jones, D. (2007). Speaking, listening, planning and assessing: The teacher's role in developing metacognitive awareness. *Early Child Development and Care, 177*(6-7), 569-579.

Justice, L. M., Jiang, H., & Strasser, K. (2018). Linguistic environment of preschool classrooms: What dimensions support children's language growth? *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 42*, 79–92.

Justice, L. M., Logan, J., Lin, T-J., & Kaderavek, J. (2014). Peer effects in early childhood education: Testing the assumptions of special-education inclusion. *Psychological Science, 25*(9), 1722-1729.

Justice, L. M., McGinty, A. S., Zucker, T., Cabell, S. Q., & Piasta, S. B. (2013). Bi-directional dynamics underlie the complexity of talk in teacher–child play-based conversations in classrooms serving at-risk pupils. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 28*(3), 496–508.

Justice, L. M., Mashburn, A., & Petscher, Y. (2013). Very early language skills of fifth-grade poor comprehenders. *Journal of Research in Reading, 36*(2), 172-185.

Kana, P., & Aitken, V. (2007). She didn't ask me about my grandma: Using process drama to explore issues of cultural exclusion and leadership. *Journal of Educational Administration, 45*(6), 697-710.

Khoo, H. E. (2003). Implementation of problem-based learning in Asian medical schools and students' perceptions of their experience. *Medical Education, 37*(5), 401-409.

Kim, Y.-S., & Phillips, B. (2014). Cognitive correlates of listening comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly, 49*(3), 269–281.

King-Sears, P. (2014). Introduction to Learning Disability Quarterly Special Series on Universal Design for Learning: Part one of two. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 37*(2) 68-70.

Kirschner, P. A., Sweller, J., & Clark, R. E. (2006). Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discovery, problem-based, experiential, and inquiry-based teaching. *Educational Psychologist, 41*, 75-86.

Kolb, A., & Kolb, D. (2009). The learning way: Meta-cognitive aspects of experiential learning. *Simulation & Gaming, 40*(3), 297-327.

Kolb, D. (2015). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development* (2nd Ed.). Pearson Education.

Kruse Va'ai, E. (2015). Samoan narratives: Sociocultural perspectives. In F. Gounder (Ed.), *Narrative and identity construction in the Pacific Islands* (pp. 193-207). John Benjamins Publishing.

Lambirth, A. (2006). Challenging the laws of talk: Ground rules, social reproduction and the curriculum. *The Curriculum Journal, 17*, 59-71.

Lammertink, I., Casillas, M., Benders, T., Post, B., & Fikkert, P. (2015). Dutch and English toddlers' use of linguistic cues in predicting upcoming turn transitions. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*, 495.

Lapinski, S., Gravel. J., & Rose, D. (2012). Tools for practice: The universal design for learning guidelines. In T. E. Hall, A. Meyer, & D. H. Rose (Eds.), *Universal design for learning in the classroom: Practical applications* (pp. 9-24). Guilford Press.

Latham, D. (2005). Speaking, listening and learning: A rationale for the speaking and listening profile. *English in Education, 39*(1), 60-74.

Law, J., Rush, R., Schoon, I., & Parsons, S. (2009). Modeling developmental language difficulties from school entry into adulthood: Literacy, mental health, and employment outcomes. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research, 52,* 1401–1416.

Lee, Y. S., & Jonson-Reid, M. (2016). The role of self-efficacy in reading achievement of young children in urban schools. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 33*(1), 79-89.

Liew, J., McTigue, E. M., Barrois, L., & Hughes, J. N. (2008). Adaptive and effortful control and academic self-efficacy beliefs on achievement: A longitudinal study of 1st through 3rd graders. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 23*(4), 515-526.

Lintner, T. (2018). The controversy over controversy in the social studies classroom. *SRATE Journal, 27*(1), 14-21.

Lipman, M. (1981). Philosophy for children. In A. L. Costa (Ed.), *Developing minds: Programs for teaching thinking* (Vol. 2, pp. 35-38). Routledge.

Lonigan, C., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.) (2008). *Developing early literacy: Report of the National Early Literacy Panel. A scientific synthesis of early literacy development and implications for intervention.* Developing Early Literacy: Report of the National Early Literacy Panel (ed.gov)

McCroskey, J. C., V. P. Richmond, and L. L. McCroskey. (2006). Nonverbal communication in instructional contexts. In V. L. Manusov & M. L. Patterson (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Nonverbal Communication* (pp. 421–436). Sage Publications

McGinty, A., & Justice, L. (2010). Language facilitation in the preschool classroom: Rational, goals, and strategies. In M. McKenna, S. Walpole, & K. Conradi (Eds.), *Promoting early reading* (pp. 59-77). Guildford.

Mahuika, N. (2012). ‘Kōrero tuku iho’: Reconfiguring oral history and oral tradition [Doctoral, University of Waikato]. 'Kōrero Tuku Iho': Reconfiguring Oral History and Oral Tradition (waikato.ac.nz)

Major, L., & Warwick. P. (2019). Affordances for dialogue: The role of digital technology in supporting productive classroom talk. In N. Mercer, R. Wegerif, & L. Major (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of research on dialogic education* (pp. 394-410). Taylor & Francis.

Major, L., Warwick. P., Rasmussen, I., Ludvigsen, S., & Cook, V. (2019). Classroom dialogue and digital technologies: A scoping review. *Education and Information Technologies, 23*(5), 1995-2028.

Martin, R. (2017). *Te whakarauora reo nō tuawhakarere - Giving our children what we missed out on: Māori language revitalisation for Māori/English bilingualism*. [Doctoral, University of Canterbury]. https://ir.canterbury.ac.nz/handle/10092/13291

May, S., Hill, R., & Tiakiwai, S. (2006). *Bilingual education in Aotearoa/New Zealand. Key findings from bilingual immersion education: Indicators of good practices*. Wellington, New Zealand: Ministry of Education Research Division.

May, S. (2020). *Research to understand the features of quality Pacific bilingual education: Review of best practices.* Ministry of Education.

Mental Health Foundation. (2021). *Suicide statistics: What's behind the numbers*. Suicide statistics | Mental Health Foundation

Mercer, N. (2003). *The educational value of dialogic talk in whole class dialogue.* The educational value of dialogic talk in whole-class dialogue - OER in Education (cam.ac.uk)

Mercer, N., Hennessy, S., & Warwick. P. (2019). Dialogue, thinking together and digital technology in the classroom: Some educational implications of a continuing line of inquiry. *International Journal of Educational Research, 97*, 187-199.

Mercer, N., & Littleton, K. (2007). *Dialogue and the development of children's thinking.* Routledge. N.

Metcalf, D. (2011). *Succeeding in the inclusive classroom: K-12 lesson plans using Universal Design for Learning*. Sage Publications.

Meyer, A., Rose, D. H., & Gordon, D. (2014). *Universal design for learning: Theory and practice*. CAST Professional Publishing.

Miller, S., Connolly, P., & Maguire, L. (2013). Wellbeing, academic buoyancy and educational achievement in primary school students. *International Journal of Educational Research, 62*, 239-248.

Ministry of Education. (2003). *Effective literacy practice in Years 1 to 4.* Author.

Ministry of Education. (2004). *Effective literacy strategies in Years 9 to 13: A guide for teachers – A professional learning programme.* Author.

Ministry of Education. (2011). *He reo tupu, He reo ora: Teachers' notes.* Author.

Ministry of Education. (2015). *The New Zealand curriculum: For English-medium teaching and learning in years 1-13.* Author.

Ministry of Education. (2016). *UDL and the NZC*. Ministry of Education. UDL and the NZC on Vimeo

Ministry of Education. (2017). *PIRLS 2016: New Zealand's achievement.* Author.

Ministry of Education. (2018). *The New Zealand Curriculum online: Technology*. Author. https://nzcurriculum.tki.org.nz/The-New-Zealand-Curriculum/Technology

Ministry of Education. (2021a). *School rolls.* Author.

Ministry of Education. (2021b). *Stand-downs, suspensions, exclusions and expulsions from school.* Author.

Ministry of Education. (2021c). *School leaver's attainment.* Author.

Ministry of Education. (2021d). *Ka Hikitia: Māori are enjoying and achieving education success as Māori.* Author.

Morris, T. H. (2020). Experiential learning: A systematic review and revision of Kolb's model. *Interactive Learning Environments, 28*(8), 1064-1077.

Mutch, C. (2021). COVID-19 and the exacerbation of educational inequalities in New Zealand. *Perspectives in Education, 39*(1), 245-256.

National Literacy Trust (2012). *Understanding different types of talk*. Author.

Norbury, C. F., Gooch, D., Wray, C., Baird, G., Charman, T., Simonoff, E., Vamvakas, G., & Pickles, A. (2016). The impact of nonverbal ability on prevalence and clinical presentation of language disorder: Evidence from a population study. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *57*, 1247–1257.

O'Connor, C., & Michaels, S. (2007). When is dialogue 'dialogic'? *Human Development, 50*(5), 275–285.

Oracy All-Party Parliamentary Group Inquiry (2021). *Speak for change: Final report and recommendations from the Oracy All-Party Parliamentary Group Inquiry*. Author.

Orlando, J. (2014). Teachers' changing practices with information and communication technologies: An up-close, longitudinal analysis. *Research in Learning Technology, 22*(0), 1-15.

Ousselin, C. (2015). Engaging assessments for speaking and listening. *Learning Languages*, *20*(2), 13–15.

Patterson, E. W. (2018). Exploratory talk in the early years: Analysing exploratory talk in collaborative group activities involving younger learners. *Education 3-13, 46*(3), 264-276.

Pennell, C. (2014). In the age of analytic reading. *Reading Teacher, 68*(4), 251-260.

Piasta, S. B., Justice, L. M., Cabell, S. Q., Wiggins, A. K., Turnbull, K. P., & Curenton, S. M. (2012). Impact of professional development on preschool teachers' conversational responsivity and children's linguistic productivity and complexity. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, *27*(3), 387–400.

Pisha, B., & Stahl. S. (2006). The promise of new learning environments for students with disabilities. In D. H. Rose & A. Meyer (Eds.), *A practical reader in universal design for learning* (pp. 85-101). Harvard Education Press.

Rao, K., & Meo, G. (2016). Using universal design for learning to design standards-based lessons. *Sage Open*, *6*(4), 2158244016680688

Rapp, W. (2014). *Universal Design for Learning in action: 100 ways to teach all learners*. Paul H Brookes Publishing Company.

Rasmussen, I., Amundrud, A., & Ludvigsen, S. (2019). Establishing and maintaining joint attention in classroom dialogues. In N. Mercer, R. Wegerif, & L. Major (Eds.), *The Routledge international handbook of research on dialogic education* (pp. 411-424). Taylor & Francis.

Remedios, L., Clarke, D., & Hawthorne, L. (2008). The silent participant in small group collaborative learning contexts. *Active Learning in Higher Education, 9*(3), 201-216,

Reynolds, M. (2017). Video and vā: Caring for relationality in Pasifika education. *SET, 2*, 34-41.

Reznitskaya, A., & Gregory, M. (2013). Student thought and classroom language: Examining the mechanisms of change in dialogic teaching. *Educational Psychologist, 48*(2), 114-133.

Reznitskaya, A., Kuo, L-J., Clark, A-M., Miller, B., Jadallah, M., Anderson, R. C., & Nguyen-Jahiel, K. (2009). *Collaborative reasoning: A dialogic approach to group*

Ritchie, J., & Rau, C. (2008). *Te Puawaitanga: Partnerships with tamariki and whānau in bicultural early childhood care and education: A summary.* TLRI.

Rowe, M., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2009a). Differences in early gesture explain SES disparities in child vocabulary size at school entry. *Science, 323*, 951-953.

Rowe, M., & Goldin-Meadow, S. (2009b). Early gesture selectively predicts later language learning. *Developmental Science, 12*(1), 182-187.

Sailer, M., Murböck, J., & Fischer, F. (2021). Digital learning in schools: What does it take beyond digital technology? *Teaching and Teacher Education, 103*, 1-13.

Sanjakdar, F. (2019). Dialogic teaching: Towards reconfiguring classroom talk about sexuality. *Pedagogy, Culture, & Society*, DOI: 10.1080/14681366.2019.1570967

Sawyer, J., & Stetsenko, A. (2014). Vygotsky, Lev. In P. Brooks & V. Kempe, (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of language development* (pp. 664-666). Sage Reference.

Schifflet, R., & Hennig, L. (2017). Rethinking Columbus Day: Empowering learners through collaborative reasoning. *Social Studies and the Young Learner, 29*(4), 17-21.

Schoon, I., Parsons, S., Rush, R., & Law, J. (2010). Childhood language skills and adult literacy: A 29-year follow-up study. *Pediatrics, 125*(3), 459–466.

Schrader, D. (2015). Constructivism and learning in the age of social media: Changing minds and learning communities. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning, 144*, 23-35.

Seals, C. A., & Olsen-Reeder, V. (2020). Translanguaging in conjunction with language revitalisation. *System, 92*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2020.102277

Shanahan, T., & Lonigan, C. (2013). *Early childhood literacy: The National Early Literacy Panel and beyond*. Brookes.

Shanahan, T., & Lonigan, C. (2020). The role of early oral language in literacy development. *Language Magazine Improving Literacy & Communication*. https://www.languagemagazine.com/5100-2/

Shi, M., & Tan, C. Y. (2020). Beyond oral participation: A typology of student engagement in classroom discussions. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 55*, 247-265.

Skerrett, M. (2020). Early years bilingual language teachers for a diverse Aotearoa New Zealand. In A. Gunn, N. Surtees, D. Gordon-Burns, & K. Purdue (Eds.), *Te aotūroa tātaki: Inclusive early childhood education – Perspectives on inclusion, social justice, and equity from Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp.18-36). NZCER Press.

Smith, F., Hardman, F., Wall, K., & Mroz, M. (2004). Interactive whole class teaching in the national literacy and numeracy strategies. *British Educational Research Journal, 30*(3), 395-411.

Smythe, J. L. (2020). Epitexts, superheroes, and developing the global citizen. *Voices from the Middle, 28*(2), 33-36.

Snow, P. C. (2016). Elizabeth Usher Memorial Lecture: Language is literacy is language – Positioning speech-language pathology in education policy, practice, paradigms and polemics. *International Journal of Speech Language Pathology, 18*(3), 216–228.

Spiller, L. (2012). "How can we teach them when they won't listen?" How teacher beliefs about Pasifika values and Pasifika ways of learning affect student behaviour and achievement. *SET, 3*, 58-66.

Stinson, M. (2015). Speaking up about oracy: The contribution of drama pedagogy to enhanced oral communication. *English Teaching: Practice and Critique, 14*(3), 1-11.

Stivers, T., Enfield, N., Brown, P., Englert, C., Hayashi, M., Heinemann, T., Hoymann, G., Rossano, F., de Ruiter, J., Yoon, K., & Levinson, S. (2009). Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. *PNAS, 106*(26), 10587-10592.

Taylor, M., & Keown, P. (2016). Deepening thinking through viewpoints, values, and perspectives. In M. Harcourt, A. Milligan, & B. Wood (Eds.), *Teaching social studies for critical, active citizenship in Aotearoa New Zealand* (pp. 64-81). NZCER.

Taylor, R. D., Oberle, E., Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2017). Promoting positive youth development through school-based social and emotional learning interventions: A meta-analysis of follow-up effects. *Child Development, 88*(4), 1156-1171.

Thistle, J., & McNaughton, D. (2015). Teaching active listening skills to pre-service speech-language pathologists: A first step in supporting collaboration with parents of young children who require AAC. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools, 46*, 44-55.

Topping, K. J., & Trickey, S. (2014). The role of dialog in philosophy for children. *International Journal of Educational Research, 63*, 69-78.

Torres, P., Whitebread, D., & R. McLellan. (2018). The role of teacher regulatory talk in students' self-regulation development across cultures. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 162*, 89-114.

Trickey, S., & Topping, K. (2004). 'Philosophy for children': A systematic review. *Research Papers in Education, 19*(3), 365-380.

Trickey, S., & Topping, K. (2006). Collaborative philosophical enquiry for school children: Participant evaluation at eleven years. *Thinking: The Journal of Philosophy for Children, 18*(3), 23-34.

Tunmer, W., Chapman, J., Greaney, K., Prochnow, J., & Arrow, A. (2013). Why the New Zealand National Literacy Strategy has failed and what can be done about it: Evidence from the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) 2011 and Reading Recovery monitoring reports. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties, 18*(2), 139-180.

Turner, H., Rubie-Davies, C. M., & Webber, M. (2015). Teacher expectations, ethnicity, and the achievement gap. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies, 50*, 55-69.

UNICEF (2020). *Worlds of Influence: Understanding what shapes child well-being in rich countries.* Innocenti Report Card no. 16, UNICEF Office of Research. Authors.

Van Hees, J. (2011). The expressive realities of 5- and 6-year-olds in low socioeconomic schools. *SET 3*, 47-54.

Vygotsky, L. (1962). *Thought and language*. M.I.T Press.

Waks, L. J. (Ed.). (2015). *Listening to teach: Beyond didactic pedagogy*. SUNY Press.

Wamba, N. G. (2010). Poverty and literacy: An introduction. *Reading & Writing Quarterly, 26*, 109–114.

Warwick, P., Mercer, N., Kershner, R., & Staarman, J. (2010). In the mind and in the technology: The vicarious presence of the teacher in pupil's learning of science in collaborative group activity at the interactive whiteboard. *Computers & Education, 55*(1), 350-362.

Webb, P., Whitlow J., Jnr., & Venter, D. (2017). From exploratory talk to abstract reasoning: A case for far transfer? *Educational Psychology Review, 29,* 565-581.

Wells, T., & Sandretto, S. (2017). "I'm on a journey I never thought I'd be on": Using process drama pedagogy for the literacy programme. *Pedagogies, 12*(2), 180–195.

Whitebread, D., Grau, V., & Somerville, M. (2018). Commentary: Relationships between classroom dialogue and support for metacognitive, self-regulatory development in educational contexts. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 162,* 137-150.

Whitehurst, T. (2006). Liberating silent voices: Perspectives of children with profound & complex learning needs on inclusion. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities, 35,* 55-61.

Wiliam, D., & Leahy, S. (2015). *Embedding formative assessment: Practical techniques for K-12 classrooms.* Learning Sciences International.

Appendix 1: Scopes and Aim of the Review

This review was carried out under contract to the Ministry of Education (Aotearoa New Zealand), between May and August 2021. The review was to consist of a systematic review of rigorous quantitative, qualitative, and mixed-method studies that have demonstrated how an explicit focus on speaking and listening approaches contribute to improved learning across the whole learning pathway. The review contained one overarching goal.

> *The overall goal of the evidence review is to identify approaches that are effective in supporting the speaking and listening demands across the curriculum along with whole learning pathway.*
>
> *The speaking and listening approaches are effective for underserved groups of learners and that they create the conditions for successful learning, and promote well-being, metacognition, and self-efficacy whilst providing engaging learning experiences.*

The review was underpinned by two questions:

1. *What does the literature show to be the most effective, engaging, and equitable speaking and listening approaches that effectively support learning and speaking and listening demands across the curriculum along the whole learning pathway* (a specific focus was placed on primary and early secondary education contexts)
2. *What is the current state of teacher knowledge and practice in terms of these approaches?*

The scope of the review was to consider:

a. *Publications from the past 15 years, from Aotearoa New Zealand and internationally where curricula were predominately delivered in English, for example, Canada, USA, Australia, Scotland, Ireland, England, and Wales.*
b. *Give weight to speaking and listening approaches that effectively support learning in primary and early secondary and which foster engagement, wellbeing, metacognition, and/or self-efficacy, and that appear to be effective for underserved learners.*
c. *To ensure that future work in literacy gives practice effect to te Tiriti o Waitangi and meets the needs of ākonga Māori in English-medium schools, research focused on Māori learners, by Māori researchers or approached from a te ao Māori perspective should be included and prioritised above research from other countries*

The review should include an exploration of innovative and creative approaches to engagement that enrich learning experiences, including but not limited to:

I. *Experiential learning*
II. *Collaborative reasoning*
III. *Dialogic talk*
IV. *Dramatic inquiry*
V. *Philosophy for children*

The contract included two deliverables: an interim report and a final report. The feedback from the interim report, included some additional scope. These aspects included:

- *Description of current educational context, including literacy achievement and diversity of ākonga population*
- *Serve and Return and its importance to listening and speaking skills*
- *UDL and how it can promote speaking and listening for neurodiversity in learners and learners with disability*
- *Links to online communication and social media, as well as digital affordances*
- *Emphasis on the interaction between speaking and listening skills, literacy development, and key competencies*

Preliminary recommendations were supplied to the Ministry of Education on August 12th, 2021, at their request.

Appendix 2: Literature Search

Literature searches were conducted at the University of Canterbury by Amanda Denston, Seema Gautam, and Karina Sandweg. Initial database searches, following discussion with Fiona Tyson (Education Librarian) yielded excessive literature for each nominated teaching approaches, heavily weighted towards scholarly articles focused on English Language Learners (ELL). Subsequent discussions with Fiona Tyson, database searches (education) were performed with the identified parameters.

Field 1: [Identified teaching approach]

Field 2: AND: (Speaking or Listening)

Field 3: NOT: (tertiary education or university or college or tertiary institutions)

Field 4: NOT: (esol or efl or esl or ell or english second language or english language learners or second language learning)

The databases included in the literature search included Education Source, ERIC including EBSCO and ProQuest. TLRI, TLIF, and Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga were also searched**.** The paucity of literature that included an explicit focus on speaking and listening skills within the nominated teaching approaches within English-medium contexts, even when authors had identified speaking or listening skills as key words within their literature meant that the drawing of inferences was required to complete this review. The literature review also included a bottom-up review of literature identified from reference lists of identified literature. Reviews of known researchers' authorships lists were carried out, as well as reviews of literature suggested by colleagues. At times, Google Scholar was also used to identify relevant literature.

Overall, there were 489 pieces of literature identified for review. Of these 288 were identified outside of the scope of review, leaving 201 pieces of literature for inclusion within the review.

I acknowledge that I am influenced by my own backgrounds within a colonial society, as someone raised as Pākehā with Māori whakapapa (Waitaha, Kāti Mamoe, and Ngāi Tahu iwi). As an individual who operates within the liminal space (between Indigenous and Crown), this literature review reflects myself, the perspectives that I hold, and my experience of working within this liminal space with both Māori and Pākehā. Bringing Indigenous knowledge to the fore, to position Māori ways of knowing and being within education, is fundamental to align with the promises exchanged within te Tiriti o Waitangi, the founding document of Aotearoa New Zealand.