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Introduction

A major challenge facing learners is the move from the free-flowing, spontaneous language of the spoken mode towards the dense, compact language of the written mode encountered in academic contexts. This chapter will look at the characteristic features of spoken English and written English and the different roles they play in learning. It will then consider ways in which teachers can support students in the process of ‘moving along the mode continuum’ through practices such as text deconstruction and joint (re)construction of a text.

The mode continuum

We can think of the relation between the spoken and written modes as a continuum (Martin 1985), with the ‘most spoken’ features at one end and the ‘most written’ at the other. At the ‘spoken’ end of the continuum, we find the interactants face-to-face using language that is embedded in the physical surroundings. Because they share the same setting, it is unnecessary to be explicit. A family looking for the family dog that has gone missing, for example, might simply say something like *Is he in there?* rather than *Is the dog in the bedroom?* ‘He’ and ‘there’ refer outwards to things in the environment (Halliday & Hasan 1985) that are common knowledge between the interactants. At the written end of the mode continuum, on the other hand, the reader is distanced in time and space. The writer can’t draw on assumed knowledge, so everything has to be within the text itself. Rather than referring outside the text to the surrounding context, references must now be made to things that have been mentioned in the surrounding text. That is, the written text must be cohesive within itself.

When we engage in oral interaction, we generally have others who are able to support us – to finish our sentences, to contribute additional information, to answer questions, and to supply unfamiliar vocabulary items. There is typically considerable ‘give-and-take’ as interactants jostle for turns. We are also able to draw on clues from oral features such as intonation, pauses, stress, and facial expression. In the written mode, however, the writer needs to be able to compose a sustained text without being able to rely on any immediate support from others.

But perhaps the most critical factor in the move from spoken to written is the time available for reflection (Olson, Torrance & Hildyard 1985). When we speak, it is ‘first draft’, without the opportunity to edit or to order our thoughts systematically. In a long spoken turn, the speaker usually strings together a number of loosely related clauses, joined with conjunctions such as ‘and’, ‘but’ and ‘so’, as in this recount of looking for the missing dog:
**Text A**

But I couldn’t find him anywhere
so I looked under the bed
and he wasn’t there
and then I went outside
and called him
but he didn’t come
and I was really worried
so then I thought
that he must have gone for a walk with Dad.

The language is an unconstrained and unpremeditated flow of simple clauses, described by Halliday (Halliday & Hasan 1985) as ‘grammatically intricate’. A more formal report of the incident in the written mode might have resembled the following:

**Text B**

The apparent disappearance of the family dog resulted in a great deal of anxiety and fruitless searching.

Here we have a single clause that summarises the meanings expressed in the previous eight spoken clauses. In each of the spoken clauses, we find only a small number of content words (lexical items) such as ‘find’, ‘looked’, and ‘outside’. In the written clause, however, we find a total of nine lexical items. This degree of lexical density is typical of the written mode. When we are interacting, we tend to spread the content across a series of clauses as the listener doesn’t have time to process a high level of lexical material ‘in the moment’. In the written mode, however, the writer has the time to reflect on what is the main focus of the text, to edit out irrelevancies and redundancies, and to organize the content in a compact and efficient way. Conversely, the reader has time to read the text at a leisurely pace, re-reading where necessary to clarify the meaning. The written mode has thus developed very different characteristics from the spoken mode. In the above clause, for example, the density is intensified by the use of nominalization, where clauses (eg ‘It looked like the dog had gone missing’; ‘we were really worried // and searched everywhere // but we couldn’t find him’) are reduced to the status of a noun group (‘the apparent disappearance of the family dog’; ‘a great deal of anxiety and fruitless searching’).

We could represent the mode continuum as in Figure 1, with ‘language accompanying action’ at one end, ‘language in reflection’ at the other, and with a variety of intermediate stages along the way.
dialogue (interactive, jointly constructed) monologue (sole responsibility)
spontaneous, fleeting, ‘first draft’ planned, frozen, edited
flowing (‘grammatical intricacy’) compact
lexically sparse lexically dense
congruent nominalised

Figure 1: The mode continuum

Both ends of the mode continuum play different roles in the learning process. At the ‘spoken’ end, language enables the tentative exploration of the subject-matter in a context that provides support both from the physical setting and from the other interactants. Learners are able to participate and contribute to the construction of meaning, even with language that is fragmented and ‘inaccurate’. Opportunities are provided for questions, feedback and clarification. It allows for differentiated levels of participation, depending on factors such as confidence, language proficiency and knowledge of the topic. At the ‘written’ end of the continuum, learners have to take responsibility for constructing the text on their own, with time to look up references, to consult dictionaries, to organize material from their notes, to edit out irrelevancies, to fill in gaps in knowledge, to pull threads together and consolidate understandings, to think about relationships between factors, and to structure the text into coherent stages.

Implications for students and teachers

The shift from oral to written language has considerable implications for learners, not simply in terms of the language demands, but also in terms of the kinds of thinking and learning that are enabled at each end of the continuum. Learners who are accustomed to interacting face-to-face in highly supportive groupwork contexts, for example, might experience difficulties when they are required to then undertake independent reading to build up their knowledge of the topic and to demonstrate this knowledge in an individually-authored, cohesive, well-constructed written text. It is sometimes the case that students are stranded in the oral mode, with teachers reluctant to push too far along the continuum for fear that learners will not be able to cope with the challenges of reading and writing complex texts. On the other hand, some students are thrown into the deep, written end of the continuum, without sufficient opportunity to develop their understandings in the oral mode.

The mode continuum offers a planning tool for teachers, emphasizing the importance of hands-on, face-to-face engagement in the oral mode and then working slowly along the continuum, providing high levels of support as students gradually distance themselves from the ‘here-and-now’ towards the more reflective end of the continuum. This is sometimes referred to as ‘shunting along the mode continuum’, where carefully planned learning activities move along the continuum in a back-and-forth manner with the general trend from left
to right (Martin 1985; South Australian Department of Education and Children’s Services 2010), as suggested in Figure 2:

![Diagram of mode continuum](image)

**Figure 2: Shunting along the mode continuum (South Australian Department of Education and Children’s Services 2010, p.2)**

**A curriculum cycle**

In Australia, the mode continuum has been used as the basis for a curriculum cycle based on the Vygotskian (1986) notion of scaffolding, where students are provided with support from a more experienced ‘other’ in the context of shared activity in order to achieve outcomes that they would otherwise not be able to achieve on their own. The curriculum cycle generally involves an initial focus on developing the students’ understandings about the topic through involvement in oral, often hands-on activities. It then moves on to the teacher modeling the genre in question, looking at how it is organized in terms of the typical stages it goes through and some of its key language features. This phase might also involve intensive guided reading of the model text. The teacher then engages the students in writing collaboratively, providing students with a demonstration of how a more experienced writer goes about developing a text. Once the students have experienced the process of gathering information and jointly writing it up into a coherent text, they then go through the same process as individuals, independently researching a similar topic and writing their own texts.
Classroom application

The students described in this case study were all from non-English speaking backgrounds (NESB). They had been attending school in Australia for periods of between six months and one year, and, although all had made quite substantial progress, they were still very much in the process of developing control of spoken and written English. The students were attending an intensive English centre with a view to being integrated into the neighbourhood secondary school in the near future. It was important that they be able to cope with the demands of the mainstream school, so their teacher, Andrew, was working with them on the kinds of topics that they would encounter in the secondary curriculum, one of which was an understanding of an ecosystem.

Building knowledge of the field

Because the students were still in the process of learning English, the teacher was concerned to begin building shared knowledge of the relevant field (ecosystems), but more particularly he was keen that students had opportunities to develop control of the spoken English necessary to enable them to explore the field. The activities at the beginning of the unit thus involved much student talk, and could be described as ‘communicative’ in the sense that they were deliberately designed to provide students with opportunities for purposeful interaction. He organized for the class to visit a nearby freshwater pond to observe and document its ecosystem.

As they worked in pairs to explore the pond, they used language that was exploratory and context-embedded:

Text C

Look at this.
What is it?
Here's one.
I can't see any.
What's those over there?

Andrew had provided them with a matrix to record what they observed in the pond:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edge of pond</th>
<th>In the pond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 4: Matrix for recording observations*

**Stepping along the mode continuum**

When they returned to school, they were asked to share their findings from what they had observed in the pond:

**Text D**

*We saw some ducks*

... and some spiders

and I heard a frog

and there was a spider

and ... what do you call these?

*bullrushes*

yeah, bullrushes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘spoken’ (language accompanying action)</th>
<th>‘written’ (language in reflection)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>task-based oral groupwork exploring pond-life</td>
<td>unprepared oral sharing of observations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This was an important ‘distancing’ step, as they moved beyond the ‘here-and-now’ of the excursion to re-creating the experience in language.

As they recounted their observations, Andrew noted on the board all the plant and animal life on a large matrix similar to the one the students had used – a first step towards consolidating their knowledge and organizing the field in preparation for a written text. In doing so, Andrew was demonstrating the process of notemaking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of animal</th>
<th>Type of animal</th>
<th>Appearance</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Interesting facts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>duck</td>
<td>bird</td>
<td>brown and grey, green head, yellow bill</td>
<td>tadpoles, pond weeds, insects</td>
<td>migrates in autumn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turtle</td>
<td>reptile</td>
<td>brownish, greenish shell, sharp beak</td>
<td>small fish</td>
<td>can bite you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frog</td>
<td>amphibian</td>
<td>green, slimy, webbed feet</td>
<td>insects</td>
<td>has ears under its eyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5: Students’ collated observations

Extending knowledge of the field through guided reading

At this stage, the students needed to go beyond observations and prior knowledge to gather information from written texts. Andrew’s focus now shifted to further development of the field. To do this, he needed to explicitly and intensively teach students to read information reports about pond-life (Rose 2006).

‘spoken’
(language accompanying action)       ‘written’
(language in reflection)

| task-based oral groupwork exploring pond-life | unprepared oral sharing of observations | intensive and explicit teaching of reading for information |

He selected a text that was slightly beyond the students’ current proficiency level, modifying it as necessary. He began by providing an overview of the text – its content and structure – so that the students were able to anticipate what they would be reading. He then guided them through the text, drawing attention to the relationship between text and images, identifying information that would be
pertinent to their matrix note-making, and asking questions based on his understanding of functional grammar:

- What type of animal is this? ('participant')
- What does it do? ('process')
- Where does it live? ('circumstance of place')

Students highlighted relevant bits of the text in different colours and then inserted additional information into the matrix on the board.

**Modeling the genre**

In preparation for writing up a text from their notes, Andrew decided to familiarize students with the features of an information report. They discussed the purpose of information reports and looked at the stages the text went through: general introduction to the topic followed by 'bundles' of information.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘spoken’ (language accompanying action)</th>
<th>‘written’ (language in reflection)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>task-based oral groupwork exploring pond-life</td>
<td>unprepared oral sharing of observations intensive and explicit teaching of reading for information modeling of features of written report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importantly, Andrew also modeled features of the written mode. In particular, he focused on how this text revealed the highly crafted nature of written texts, with the opening paragraph using a foreshadowing move to predict how the text will unfold ('pond plants' and 'pond animals') – a strategy later echoed at the level of the paragraph ('birds', 'frogs and turtles' and 'fish').

**Text E**

Ponds are quiet, shallow bodies of water that allow enough sunlight to reach their bottom. Ponds often support a large variety of plant and animal life.

Some pond plants grow entirely underwater or have parts that extend above the surface. Leafy plants may float on the surface. Other plants can grow along the pond edge.

Pond animals include birds, frogs, turtles, and fish. Aquatic birds, such as ducks and waders, live mainly in the air and on the ground, but sometimes visit the ponds. Frogs and turtles can live both on land and in the water. But fish live in the water all the time.
He also drew students’ attention to another feature of written texts – lengthy noun groups such as ‘quiet, shallow bodies of water that allow enough sunlight to reach their bottom’ and ‘a large variety of plant and animal life’. They were guided to identify the head noun and to note those describers that came in front of the head noun (the premodifiers) and those that came after the head noun (the postmodifiers):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premodifiers</th>
<th>Head noun</th>
<th>Postmodifiers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>quiet, shallow</td>
<td>bodies</td>
<td>of water that allow enough sunlight to reach the bottom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a large</td>
<td>variety</td>
<td>of plant and animal life</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students subsequently did some work on constructing noun groups using their own notes from the matrix, eg ‘frogs are reptiles that have a brownish, greenish shell and a sharp beak’.

**Jointly constructing the information report**

Now that the students had gathered information from a variety of sources – the excursion to the pond, their prior knowledge and notes from guided reading – it was time to write up the notes from the matrix into a text. Rather than asking the students to write a report independently at this stage, Andrew provided support by leading them in a joint construction, where the students contributed the content matter and Andrew demonstrated how the content could be shaped up into a written text, drawing on the modeling of the genre that he had conducted earlier.

As the students contributed to the developing text, Andrew provided the kind of microscaffolding needed to create a linguistic bridge from the everyday oral towards the academic written mode (Gibbons 2002; Hammond 1990).

**Text F**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jointly constructed text</th>
<th>Teacher’s microscaffolding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1: ...plants...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Yes, water plants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- aquatic plants.</td>
<td>Specifying, using classifier (type of plant). Shifting to technical term.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Andrew and the students wrote the first paragraph of their information report together. The students suggested the wording of this paragraph and Andrew wrote their suggestions on the board. This activity involved quite extensive negotiation and some redrafting until they were happy with the introductory statement about the life in freshwater ponds. The students were then divided into pairs and each pair then wrote one other paragraph about either the plants, the animals or the birds, including details on such topics as appearance, diet or behaviour. The students were encouraged to talk to each other about what they were going to write and how they were going to write it. Several of these paragraphs were discussed by the whole class in order to comment on the positive features and to identify any features that needed to be modified. The students revised where necessary any sections of their own paragraphs then each paragraph was cut out and stuck in sequence onto a large piece of paper.

**Writing information reports independently**

Having experienced the process of collecting information and shaping it into a written text, the students now were in a position to undertake the writing of an independent information report – this time on a slightly different topic: the life in saltwater rock pools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘spoken’</th>
<th>‘written’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(language accompanying action)</td>
<td>(language in reflection)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **task-based oral groupwork exploring pond-life**
- **unprepared oral sharing of observations**
- **intensive and explicit teaching of reading for information**
- **modeling of features of written information report**
- **joint construction of information report**
- **independent construction of information report on related topic**

The students followed a similar process to that used in collecting information about the freshwater ponds. They were now responsible for collecting and recording in note form the information that they needed in order to write their information reports, using the same graphic organizer as above.

Using these notes as prompts, students then began writing their own reports. As they did, the teacher conducted ‘conferences’ with each child. A feature of these
conferences was the very detailed and explicit nature of the discussions that took place between teacher and students. These discussions included a focus on the overall organization of the reports; the ordering of information within paragraphs; the use of extended noun groups; use of present tense and so on.

The independent texts indicated that the students were developing a very good control of the genre. The texts were well organized, and the students showed a good control of language features appropriate for an information report.

**Further building the technicality**

At this point, the students were able to write a coherent information report classifying the different types of plant and animal life in ponds and rock pools. This was only a preliminary step, however, in developing an explanation of an ecosystem. As a class, they looked at images of ecosystems and discussed the relationships between the various elements of the system.

They now had to move from the relatively everyday classification of plants and animals in the pond in their information reports to a more technical classification based on the ways in which the pond elements interact in an ecosystem. Again, Andrew guided them in intensive reading sessions during which they extracted information from the texts to develop a taxonomy of the roles played by the various elements in the biosystem, as in Figure 6:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pond elements</th>
<th>living organisms</th>
<th>consumers</th>
<th>producers</th>
<th>herbivores</th>
<th>carnivores</th>
<th>scavengers</th>
<th>detritivores</th>
<th>decomposers</th>
<th>parasites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(biotic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-living organisms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(abiotic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

*Figure 6: Taxonomy of elements in the pond ecosystem*

Using the taxonomy as a framework, Andrew and the students again jointly constructed a text – this time a more scientific explanation of the ecosystem:

**Text G**

In a freshwater pond you will find different kinds of creatures interacting with one another. They also interact with their physical surroundings. This is called an ecosystem. The ecosystem is made up of living organisms such as birds, insects and animals (the biotic part) and non-living things such as rocks, water, sunlight, waste and mud (the abiotic part).

Living things in the pond can be divided into several different types:

- **Producer**: Organisms that make their own food.
• Consumer: Organisms that eat other ones. There are six categories of consumers:
  – Herbivore: these feed on producers such as algae.
  – Carnivore: feeds on other consumers by catching them live.
  – Scavenger: feeds on dead consumers.
  – Detritivore: feeds on small bits of dead plant and animals.
  – Decomposer: breaks down dead material. This group includes bacteria and fungi.
  – Parasite: lives and feeds on the surface of, or inside, other organisms.

While no-one would pretend that this represents yet what the students might be able to do independently, they all contributed to the construction of the text and experienced what is involved in the process of composing such a text.

**Extending the students further along the mode continuum**

When Andrew looked at the language of the textbooks used in the mainstream classroom, he realized that he would need to provide support to students as they attempted to read the highly dense language at the most written end of the mode continuum.

Typical of the textbook language is the following passage, representative of language at the far written end of the mode continuum:

**Text H**

**Human impact on aquatic ecosystems**

All ecosystems are having to deal with the problem of human impact on an unprecedented scale. Irresponsible human intervention in the natural environment is resulting in increasing degradation of aquatic ecosystems.

The main factors affecting these ecosystems include the inappropriate disposal of rubbish, nutrient or sediment run off, habitat destruction and fragmentation, and depletion of local species through overfishing.

Contamination of the natural environment through inappropriate disposal of rubbish and a range of pollutants—herbicides, pesticides, fertilizers, industrial effluents, and human waste products—is one of the most pernicious contemporary issues confronting the environment.

Habitat destruction and fragmentation disrupts ecological processes so that remaining …..

It is obvious that this language is far beyond the comprehension levels of the students in Andrew’s class. And yet, when they transfer to the mainstream school, the expectation would be that they could read such texts independently.
If we take a sentence from Text H, we can see why this text presents such challenges – even when students are familiar with the technical terms:

*Irresponsible human intervention in the natural environment is resulting in increasing degradation of aquatic ecosystems.*

The sentence is an extremely dense single clause containing ten lexical items. Andrew began by ‘unpacking’ it to two clauses, thereby decreasing the density.

1. *Aquatic ecosystems are being increasingly damaged*
2. *because human beings are intervening irresponsibly in the natural environment.*

Already the meaning had become clearer for many of the students, but there were still those who were struggling with it. He continued unpacking it until it resembled the kind of oral language that you might use with children – working backwards along the mode continuum towards the more ‘spoken’ end.

1. *Certain animals and plants live in the water*
2. *and they interact with each other*
3. *and they form communities*
4. *and these communities also interact with other non-living things*
5. *and this is called an ecosystem*
6. *but these ecosystems are being damaged*
7. *because human beings keep interfering*
8. *and spoiling the environment.*

What was originally a single dense clause has been unraveled into a grammatically intricate sentence containing eight clauses, each with only a few lexical items per clause.

**Scrambled grammar at the far end of the mode continuum**

It is not just that the sentences in the text are dense. The grammar has become ‘scrambled’. Halliday (Halliday & Martin 1993) refers to this phenomenon as grammatical metaphor, where meanings are realized through unexpected choices in the grammar, in contrast to the meanings being realized by more straightforward, ‘congruent’ patterns of grammar in the spoken mode. This can be illustrated by comparing a congruent, ‘spoken’ utterance (Sentence 1) with the following ‘written’ sentence from the text (Sentence 2):

**Sentence 1:**
*Because humans are intervening irresponsibly in the natural environment, aquatic ecosystems are being increasingly degraded.*

**Sentence 2:**
*Irresponsible human intervention in the natural environment is resulting in increasing degradation of aquatic ecosystems.*
In Sentence 1, the relationship of causality is expressed congruently through the conjunction ‘because’. In Sentence 2, however, it is the verb group (‘is resulting in’) that expresses the causal relationship.

In Sentence 1, the causal relationship is between two processes, expressed as clauses. In Sentence 2, these processes have been nominalised – turned into lengthy noun groups.

- irresponsible human intervention in the natural environment
- increasing degradation of aquatic ecosystems

In the scrambling process, the Process meaning (‘are intervening’) in Sentence 1, has become a ‘thing’ (‘intervention’) in Sentence 2. Whereas ‘humans’ were Actors in the process of intervening in Sentence 1, they have become simply part of the noun group in Sentence 2, now functioning as a Classifier (‘human intervention’). Similarly, what was a Circumstance of manner in Sentence 1 (‘irresponsibly’) has been downgraded to a Describer in the noun group in Sentence 2 (‘irresponsible intervention’). In Sentence 1, ‘in the natural environment’ is a Circumstance of place, but in Sentence 2 it has become a Qualifier in the noun group, providing further information about the ‘thing’ (‘intervention in the natural environment’).

This process of nominalization could be represented visually as in Figure 7:

![Figure 7](image)

A similar process of downgrading from clause to noun group can be seen in relation to the rest of the sentence:

Clause: aquatic ecosystems are being increasingly degraded.

>>> Noun group: increasing degradation of aquatic ecosystems
At this point, the students are dealing with the kind of abstract, dense, incongruent language at the far written end of the mode continuum that causes many students to discontinue their studies into senior secondary.

**Conclusion**

As we have seen, the nature of the spoken mode and the written mode at either end of the continuum is very different. Each plays a particular role in the learning process: the context-embedded oral interaction that allows for nimble exchanges in a highly supportive setting through to the internally cohesive, monologic written texts where the learner, given the time to craft and reflect, takes independent control of structuring meaning in a way that is more characteristic of the written mode. The challenge for teachers is to move students from the ‘spoken’ end of the continuum through to the more ‘written’ end. Drawing on a curriculum cycle over a sequence of lessons, the teacher of the class above provided a group of English language learners initially with opportunities to engage with others orally in building their understanding of the field in question. Activities were then designed to support students in the move from ‘language accompanying action’ through to ‘language in reflection’. Through activities such as text deconstruction and joint construction of texts, they were guided to observe how more experienced writers reconstruct experience in the written mode. Gradually they were introduced to the ways in which a written text is carefully structured in order to achieve greater coherence and clarity of expression. Their jointly composed and independent texts were testimony to what can be achieved in the space of a few weeks.

An awareness of the learning affordances and typical language features of the spoken and written modes allows teachers to develop programs that build in a progression from one end of the continuum to the other, dealing explicitly with the language demands along the way. Such teaching takes time, but can ultimately result in learning that is deeper and more sustainable.
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