As in *Visible Learning*, the (updated) rank order of those factors that have the greatest effect size in student achievement will be of interest to every teacher, administrator, and education professor.

Here is the rank-ordered list of the top effect sizes, with a half-dozen removed by me because they either refer to programs unknown outside of Australia & New Zealand – Hattie’s home base – or they refer to sub-sets of students (e.g. the learning disabled). And I am going to provide a bit of suspense with this list. I want you to guess which two factors come next after what is listed below; you’ll see why I wanted to add a bit of intrigue by the end. (I have also starred the factors that have an effect size of .7 or greater since these are significant gains):

* + - Student self-assessment/self-grading\*
    - Response to intervention\*
    - Teacher credibility\*
    - Providing formative assessments\*
    - Classroom discussion\*
    - Teacher clarity\*
    - Feedback\*
    - Reciprocal teaching\*
    - Teacher-student relationships fostered\*
    - Spaced vs. mass practice\*
    - Meta-cognitive strategies taught and used
    - Acceleration
    - Classroom behavioral techniques
    - Vocabulary programs
    - Repeated reading programs
    - Creativity programs
    - Student prior achievement
    - Self-questioning by students
    - Study skills
    - Problem-solving teaching
    - Not labeling students
    - Concept mapping
    - Cooperative vs individualistic learning
    - Direct instruction
    - Tactile stimulation programs
    - Mastery learning
    - Worked examples
    - Visual-perception programs
    - Peer tutoring
    - Cooperative vs competitive learning
    - Phonics instruction
    - Student-centered teaching
    - Classroom cohesion
    - Pre-term birth weight
    - Peer influences
    - Classroom management techniques
    - Outdoor-adventure programs

Can you guess the next two items on the rank order list?

“Home environment” and “socio-economic status.”

In other words, *everything on the list has a greater effect on student achievement than the student’s background* – despite the endless fatalism of so many teachers on this point (especially in the upper grades).

Co-incidentally, Jay Matthews in a recent [Washington Post](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/class-struggle/post/stunningly-reasonable-achievement-gap-approach/2012/01/04/gIQAehgfbP_blog.html) article discusses the remarkable gains in Arlington, VA, in which the achievement gap was greatly narrowed by sustained focused effort by district leaders. And the Gates Foundation released a [preliminary report](http://www.metproject.org/downloads/Preliminary_Findings-Research_Paper.pdf) on its Measures of Effective teaching project that shows convincingly what any of us who have worked in schools for years knows: good teachers make a considerable value-added difference.

It is thus high time that we call teacher fatalism about their ability to achieve gains with poor or unmotivated students what it is: unprofessional, passive, and cynical thinking that has no place in school. It is a form of prejudice that becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.
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