Guiding Learning: Questions, Prompts, and Cues

Leading students to think through their own misunderstandings is a powerful way to teach.
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When learners get stuck, teachers must respond so that they can improve understanding, correct an error, or address a misconception. The way a teacher responds can leave the students feeling either successful or helpless. We call this phase of the teaching and learning process guided instruction because it represents a shared responsibility between the teacher and the students. When guided instruction is done well, students feel supported and teachers feel rewarded.

Observing Systemic Support

Of course, teachers can’t spend the entire day correcting mistakes through guided instruction. Hopefully, students are learning while their teachers are modeling and while they are working with peers. But when students do get stuck, teachers can provide systematic support. The system of guided instruction is built on the assumption that teachers know their content well enough to recognize errors and misconceptions. If that is so, teachers can use questions, prompts, cues, and direct explanations to guide learners to increased success. As the instructional leaders, principals should analyze the procedures that teachers use to resolve misunderstandings.

Questions to Check for Understanding

Guided instruction begins when the teacher poses a question to check for understanding. This is not the time to assess students, but rather a time to uncover misconceptions or errors. For example, when a mathematics teacher met with a group of students who were stuck on a problem, he prompted them by reminding them about the order of operations, rather than by telling them where they had made their mistake. Similarly, when a
Teachers must ensure that students have a successful learning experience, even if that means providing a direct explanation and giving the students the answer. Importantly, direct explanations should come after prompts and cues to increase the likelihood that students can connect this new information to a thinking process in which they were engaged.

Following the direct explanation, the teacher should monitor students’ understanding by asking them to repeat the information back in their own words or asking the original question and checking for understanding again. In this way, students are accountable for the information and for processing the experience with the teacher.

**The Trouble With Whole-Class Guided Instruction**

The process we outlined for resolving student misconceptions and errors works best with small groups of students. It’s a difficult process to put into place in a whole-class format. Although checking for understanding can be done effectively with the whole class, some students disengage when the teacher moves to prompt or cue. Some students don’t need the information that the teacher is providing, either because it’s not helpful to them or because they already understand the concept. When some students disengage, they distract others.

An observer might be tempted to discuss classroom management with the teacher. Improving classroom management, however, won’t improve the situation. Unless guided instruction is done quickly and expertly and all students have a task to do while the teacher prompts and cues those who need it, some students will lose focus. It’s just human nature. It’s better to address misconceptions or errors with small groups of students or
As instructional leaders, principals must ensure that teachers give this type of support to students who are stuck.

individuals—especially while students work collaboratively, cooperatively, or independently. In those situations, the teacher can scaffold learning through questions, prompts, cues, and direct explanations as needed.

Returning to the life sciences teacher and the definition of living, the teacher used prompts and cues to ensure students’ eventual understanding. Here is a conversation we heard in her classroom:

Jamal: One thing for life is breathing.
Teacher: Do all things breathe? Think about that.
Mubarik: Yes. We have to breathe or die.

Teacher: So, I’m thinking about plankton.
Anais: No, some things don’t breathe.
Mubarik: Oh, yeah, I forgot. But there is a word for what I’m thinking.
Jamal: Is it metabolism?
Mubarik: Yeah, that’s it. To be alive you have to have metabolism.
Anais: Yeah, that was in the book. I remember now.
Teacher: Is metabolism the same as evolution?
Jamal: No, but living things have to evolve or die.
Anais: Wait a minute. We said that before, that they will die.
Teacher: Take a look on this page. [She points to a Web site on the monitor.]
Mubarik: It says that living things have to reproduce. It doesn’t say nothing about evolution.
Jamal: So, maybe things don’t have to evolve to be alive. Maybe that’s more long term, not if the thing is alive right now.

As their conversation continued, the students in this group reached greater understanding of the content because their teacher did not simply tell them the missing information, but rather scaffolded their understanding through prompts and cues.

As instructional leaders, principals must ensure that teachers give this type of support to students who are stuck. Without guided instruction, students learn helplessness and become dependent on adults for information. That’s not a situation in which students perform better on high-stakes tests—or in life in general. 
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