

During my first Practise Teaching Experience (PTE) I observed that the teacher would often use non-verbal communication to keep a child on task whilst delivering a lesson. Sometimes it would be a gesture such as pointing to her eyes or ears, on other occasions it was an exaggerated look. This allowed her to continue with the lesson and minimise any disruption to the other children. When I asked about it, she replied that this approach was more effective than interrupting the lesson to verbally speak to the child who was off task. After discussing various research questions with my colleague, we decided to focus on this area. The purpose and objective of our research is to find out if non-verbal language can be effective in keeping children on task during their lesson. The aim of this exercise is to determine, if the practitioner is focussing on a child within a focus group and the other children are not staying on task, is non-verbal communication sufficient to bring them back on task? Furthermore, does this non-verbal method minimise disruption to the other children within the focus group? We shall also be researching the question of how does non-verbal language effect children's learning compared to verbal language?

The first part of our research will be based within a large primary school referred to as school A in an area of high deprivation. I will be observing my colleague teaching a focus group of approximately eight children aged five to six years. The following day my research partner will observe me teaching the same lesson to a focus group of approximately five children. This will take place within a small primary school referred to as school B within an area of high deprivation and the children will be aged four to five years old. Approximately one third of pupils in both schools are eligible for free school meals (FSM). The percentage of children achieving the expected outcome of 5+ within the Foundation Phase (FP) areas of learning are 90.4% within School A and 80% within school B.

The importance of non-verbal communication within the classroom has been researched for many years. Miller (1980) pointed out nearly forty years ago that two thirds of communication is non-verbal and that going to a class with an outstanding teacher can equate to a visit to the theatre. Dobrescu and Lupu (2014) believe that information relayed to pupils using non-verbal strategies are decoded four and a half times faster than verbal interactions. Furthermore, during communication people's

response to words is 8%, intonation is 23% and body language is 69%. The Department of Education, Training and Employment (DoETE, no date) maintain that visual cards are long lasting whereas auditory information is fleeting. If the student does not understand the visual information the first time or forgets, he/she can remind themselves. Caudle et al. (2014) carried out a study and one of the questions they researched was 'How do teachers use verbal and non-verbal behaviour modification techniques?' This study involved children that were aged four to five years and they concluded that although teachers often use various types of verbal strategies to maintain children's attention, using nonverbal cues is likely to be more meaningful to young children. Furthermore, an early childhood classroom can be over stimulating and loud which results in a need for more non-verbal communication. In addition, they maintained that providing young children with a developing understanding of social cues alongside verbal instructions will result in desired behaviours more readily.

Wada (2016) points out that a teacher who begins the lesson by getting the children's attention non-verbally experiences less disruptive behaviour during the lesson. Furthermore, using the non-verbal tool of 'the pause' allows for children to settle and focus on the teacher. Cowley (2010) contends that it is appealing to use mainly spoken instructions to declare your wishes to a class however there are reasons why non-verbal signals are better. These include being able to use them on individuals, without alerting the rest of the class. In addition, it helps a teacher not give an audience to the attention seekers in the class and as the class gets to recognise the non-verbal instructions they can be used as a kind of non-verbal 'shorthand' to be able to talk to the class with.

Bambaeeroo and Shokrpour (2017) researched a slightly different question to ours which was does non-verbal communication impact on the success of teaching? They contend that during a conversation only seven percent of the concepts are expressed in the form of spoken words. The rest of the information is transferred through the complex combination of appearance, posture, limb movement, sight and facial expressions. Thus, body language has the ability to transmit the attitudes and emotions of people to others and in many cases, can work more effectively than verbal messages. Furthermore, Bambaeeroo and Shokrpour (2017) maintain it is important

to be aware of the nonverbal message. If there is a contradictory message between the verbal and the other non-verbal one being sent by the teacher; the non-verbal one will win. Students see the teacher's nonverbal message as a more honest reflection of what the practitioner is thinking and feeling. They contend this is because non-verbal cues reveal the intention of the sender of the message and reflects the practitioner's emotions. Babelan (2012) points out that some theorists believe that facial expression is more effective than other modes of non-verbal cues and gives one a lot of information about the emotional status of others. Patton (2002) supports this and believes that real communication between two persons begins when two of the persons establish eye contact. In addition, the research of Bambaeroo and Shokrpour (2017) concludes that attention to non-verbal communication skills can make a positive change in the future of a child's life.

Zeki (2009) points out that many communication experts believe that most interpersonal communication is nonverbal. However, much of the time children spend in the classroom is with their eyes fixed on a book, the board, an I-Pad or roaming randomly around the learning environment. The research of Zeki (2009) focussed on practitioner's eye-contact with students. Twenty-five per cent of students reported that teacher's eye contact is a source of motivation and concentration, furthermore thirty per cent of children maintain teacher's eye contact as a source for maintaining attention. However, there were a few surprises from the study, children indicated that teacher's eye contact reflects the mood of the teacher and the children can easily interpret whether the teacher is happy or not. Wada (2016) believes that the expression on a teacher's face can reassure or irritate a child. Furthermore, the child translates 'the look' into 'I'd better watch out'. Ledbury et al. (2004) points out this is a surprising result because eye contact is traditionally used for reading students' facial expressions but not for the interpretation of the teacher's mood by the students. Furthermore Wada (2016) believes that teacher's non-verbal communication creates a comfortable and relaxing atmosphere for children and this enables them to have self-confidence which also led to an increase in the participation and contribution to the lesson. In another study the benefit of nonverbal behaviour management included pupils feeling safe and secure (Battersby and Bolton, 2013).

The methodology used for our research is a lesson study (LS). Dudley (2014) points out that LS is a specific style of classroom action research which has an emphasis on the development of teacher practice knowledge. The Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF, 2009) maintains that LS is a model for collaborative classroom professional learning where two or more teachers work together to solve a teaching or learning based problem. In addition, practitioners are engaged in developing a teaching technique which is designed to improve aspects of learning for identified pupils. Norwich and Dudley (2016) suggests that lesson study has its critics and there are only a few experimental evaluations comparing lesson study with non-lesson study conditions and very few randomised controlled trials. Furthermore, the Education Endowment Foundation EEF (2017) contend that their large-scale lesson study evaluation concluded that there was no improvement on children's academic outcome. Moreover, schools that delivered more lesson study cycles did not achieve any more favourable outcomes than those that partook in one cycle. Dudley (2014) disputes this and believes that due to his introduction of LS to 500 government funded 'leading teachers' it resulted in a measurable impact on eleven-year-old test results when compared with those not using LS. Furthermore, teachers did rate the training highly and found the process interesting and well structured.

Herr (2004:53) contends that 'observation is one of the oldest and best methods for learning about children and maintains the simplest form of recording direct observation is an anecdotal record. It is a straight forward method of collecting information which doesn't require any special training or specialised equipment. However, Wolfinger (2002) disputes this and believes the notes that the researcher decides to write up can have a profound impact on the final ethnographic report. This is dependent on what they noticed and what did they choose to focus their attention upon? Richard and Farrell (2011) believe it is important to decide on the focus for the observation in advance and plan how it will be recorded. These are the main two strategies we will be using during our study, we have designed an observation schedule (see Appendix A and Appendix B) outlining the focus areas with regards to three specific pupils.

Richards and Farrell (2011) maintain that observation is an important part of Lesson Study however the limitations of it need to be remembered. Situations occur

simultaneously and it is easy to miss some important events. Furthermore, the presence of an unknown person within the classroom can sometimes influence the students and result in a different style of teaching to normal. However, Wolfinger (2002) points out it is essential to be objective and ensure no generalisations, attitudes and feelings of the children are recorded. Furthermore, observations should not include an interpretation of why something happened nor imply that an action by the focus child was wrong or right.

The data from our lesson study will be collected by the non-participant during the research lesson and focus group. Mack et al. (2005) points out that the strength of qualitative research is its ability to provide detailed descriptions of how people experience a specific research issue and this is the form our data will take. Furthermore, it offers a lot more flexibility with the usage of open-ended questions and has the ability to allow responses that are meaningful, unanticipated by the researcher and explanatory. Lancaster University (2016) points out that there are limitations to this method, these include small sample sizes and the subjective nature of the research. In addition, accusations of unreliability are common (different results may be achieved on a different day /different people). The researcher must interpret the data accurately to ensure themes are understandable and credible for the reader to understand.

Dudley (2014) suggests that once the research lesson has finished, the teacher interview the focus pupils to gain their opinions and ascertain how the lesson could be improved further. Bragg (2007) points out that adult belief in the pupil's voice is essential to realise its potential. The Welsh Government (2011) maintains that Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) sets out that that children's opinions must be taken into account when decisions are being made on any issues that affects them. Furthermore, the Teaching and Learning Research Programme (TLRP) 2009 research believes that there are four levels of consultation and participation within learning: the most effective is when learners are fully active participants and co-researchers within their learning. However, Bragg (2007) believes that some teachers have reservations about the voice of the student and this could be motivated by a reluctance to give up their own power. My colleague and I will conduct

a short interview with our respective focus children as soon as the lesson is complete. We will ask pre-planned questions (Appendix C) which last no more than five minutes as recommended by Dudley (2014). The DCSF (2009) believes that focus pupils may be underperforming students or they may reflect a range of different groups of learners in the class. The children in my focus group will not be decided upon until the day because I do not know what group of children I will be teaching. This will be decided by the class teacher who uses a rotation method with the four groups of children within reception class. The group I will be teaching will consist of approximately five children and I will choose three of them to partake in the short interview.

The Department for Education and Skills (DfES, 2015:5) points out that reflective practice is a process of thinking through professional issues, problems or dilemmas, which do not have an obvious solution'. Schon (1983) introduced the concept of reflection-in-action where the practitioner reflects during the teaching process and makes any changes required immediately. Alternatively, reflection-on-action occurs after lessons when practitioners look back to learn from their experience. During my lesson study I used Schon's reflection-in-action and changed an aspect of my lesson as I was teaching it. I noticed that the students were not as engaged with a particular section of the lesson as I thought they would be. In addition, Grigg and Lewis (2017) maintain it is important to consider alternative interpretations of occurrences when using reflective practice. For example, Brookfield (1995) believes to achieve critical reflection, practitioners should examine their teaching through four lenses. These include self, peers, literature and learning and I used these four steps during my lesson study. I reflected on my lesson whilst writing my arc (Appendix D) and this was followed by a discussion with my colleague. It was interesting to hear her ideas because as Grigg and Lewis (2017) believe we all have 'blind spots' and it is helpful to compare our reflections with a critical peer. In addition, whilst interviewing the focus groups after their lessons we were able to reflect using Brookfield's learning lens. This was very interesting because the two groups reacted very differently to the use of non-verbal language strategies in keeping children on task during their lesson. Finally I have researched much literature relating to our research question of 'does non-verbal instruction keep children on task within the classroom?'

Shaw et al. (2011) maintains that carrying out research with children and young people (CYP) can involve gaining several layers of permission from a range of different 'gatekeepers such as school staff and parents. We have sent a copy of the ethics form produced by the University of Wales Trinity Saint David (UWTSD) to the class teacher which details each stage of our research and it has been returned signed by the class teacher. Furthermore, a letter has been sent to the carer of each child who has been invited to partake in our research which will need to be returned and signed. Shaw et al. (2011) points out that for research studies involving CYP under the age of 16, the consent of a parent is required as well as that of the child. For our research we are using an Opt-in arrangement which means we must get active consent from each child partaking. Shaw et al. (2011) contends that for very young children consent must be obtained from the child's carer before speaking to the child. Furthermore, even if consent is given by the child's parent/guardian it is important that the child understands they can withdraw from the research at any time. In addition, if a child shows signs of distress or loss of either interest or engagement we must remind them that they can go and participate in a different activity at any point during the research.

When my colleague and I were planning our research project we discussed the issue of a reward for the children partaking as a token our appreciation, however decided against it. The British Educational Research Association BERA (2011:7) points out that any incentive must not have 'undesirable effects' for example sweets or chocolate for children. The Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC, no date) believes that the use of an incentive to participate is controversial and it can be seen as coercive. Furthermore, they contend any incentive should be mentioned to the participants during the consent process and we were concerned this may cause a bias to the children's response. The ESRC (no date) maintains that all participants who withdraw from the research should still receive their incentive however we were concerned the children may feel under pressure to continue with the research lesson to ensure they received their reward.

The learning objective of our study lesson was to take part in activities with others and talk about what they were doing. The success criteria was to match the vegetables to the picture cards (Appendix E). This was achieved throughout the lessons on both

occasions. The children were very animated when working in pairs and as a focus group. We spoke about our five senses and decided which ones we would use to help discover the vegetables on their plate. The first research lesson took place in school A and they began by talking about where vegetables grow and how soil is needed. They were intrigued that some vegetables grow under the soil and some on top. Pupil C told us she didn't like vegetables and Pupil A was happy to share with the focus group which vegetables she had tasted and which were her favourite.

Plymouth City Council (2011) points out that when observing children within the Foundation Phase Laevers has created a five-point scale to measure both well-being and involvement. This involves observing the children for approximately two minutes to ascertain their general levels of well-being and involvement. In an ideal environment they should be operating at level four or five which translates to the child looking happy, relaxed, no signs of stress and concentrate throughout the majority of the observation. Throughout both lessons the children were showing these traits and on reflection I feel they were all operating at level four to five.

During the introduction my colleague explained we were trying something new with the instructional cards and non-verbal gestures. They were shown to the children and the meaning of each picture was explained. The children collaboratively repeated what each card meant to ensure there was no confusion. When my colleague was addressing the entire focus group the cards worked very efficiently. Pupil A and B were both shown a card instructing them to listen and they stopped talking immediately. This allowed my colleague to continue delivering her lesson without any verbal interruption. Pupil C took the role of spokesperson for the focus group and during the first half of the lesson if any cards were shown to anyone she verbally read out the instructions. This was not a role that had been pre-arranged it was carried out entirely on her own initiative. However, during the second half of the lesson when she was working with her partner she lost interest and paid very little attention to any cards that were shown to either her or pupils A and B.

For the next part of the lesson the children worked in pairs and the dynamics of the lesson changed very quickly. My colleague was talking to a pair of children and simultaneously showing another pair of children, a card instructing them to use their

quiet indoor voices. However even though she held the card in front of them for ten seconds they did not respond at all. It was difficult to ascertain whether they had not seen the card because they were so absorbed with their task or they were ignoring it. The children were talking about their vegetables so they were still on task but their noise level was a little high. On another occasion the teacher showed pupil B the quiet voice card, he read out the instruction to his partner but then continued talking in a loud voice. On this occasion pupil B had definitely seen the instructional card but had chosen to ignore it. At this stage of the lesson all the members of the focus task were on task however the noise level was very high.

A very interesting aspect of the research lesson was when it was drawing to a close and my colleague returned to addressing the complete focus group as one. The children began responding to the instructional cards as they had during the initial part of the lesson. Furthermore, pupil C resumed her role of spokesperson for the focus group. When reflecting on this first research lesson it became clear that the focus group responded well to the instructional cards and gestures when the teacher was addressing them as one group. Thus, if the teacher needed to remind a pupil to stop talking or listen this could be done whilst continuing to deliver the lesson. However, when the children worked in pairs it was much harder to keep control using this method. The noise level got louder and it was very hard to bring it back down using just the instructional cards or a gesture from the teacher.

We talked about different strategies to modify our non-verbal communication however decided it would not change the way the children responded to them. The only change we made to the resources after the first lesson was to write the vocabulary on the behaviour cards and vegetable cards in both English and Welsh. The children in School A had been learning the names of vegetables in their Welsh Lessons and we thought to have the vocabulary in both English and Welsh would support the learning for School B the following day. The only aspect of the lesson plan I wanted to change was that the PowerPoint would be shown at the end of the lesson rather than the beginning. I wanted to use it as the plenary in the form of a quiz to clarify where the gaps were in their subject knowledge of vegetables.

My colleague and I agreed that the evidence we had collected during the first lesson was very comprehensive. I had noted each time a gesture or instructional card was used, which category it was and which pupil it was for. This allowed us to see if any particular pattern was forming in regard to the three focus pupils. We did not feel it was necessary to modify our research tools for the next research lesson.

The next day I delivered the identical lesson to my group in school B. The children were one year younger than those from school A and the group consisted of 3 pupils less. During the introduction I explained about the instructional cards and gestures that I would be using throughout the lesson. We went through each one to ensure the children understood exactly what they meant and they were very enthusiastic about them. I began the lesson by pointing to my eyes to indicate I wanted the children to be looking at me before reading the letter from Farmer Fred. They all responded immediately and this was the same response as we had experienced from class A the previous day. During the first part of the lesson the children were very animated discussing the vegetables they like and dislike. They used their senses to smell and touch the vegetables and the instructional cards and gestures worked very well. On one occasion I asked the children to place their bowls of vegetables in front of them however pupil A did not. I showed him the listening card and he immediately placed the bowl in front of himself.

During the research lesson the previous day pupil C had taken on the role of spokesperson. However, this did not happen within the lesson I delivered. All the children responded when shown a card or non-verbal gesture however nobody took responsibility to verbally speak the instructions out aloud. When the group split into pairs I was a little apprehensive about whether they would respond to the instructional cards due to our experience the previous day. However, they continued responding to any cards I showed throughout this part of the lesson. At one point the children were talking to loudly and I showed the quiet voice card. Child A noticed this and told her partner it was the first time I had used this card. Furthermore, Child B responded by using a quieter voice. On another occasion Child B got up to get whiteboard however I had asked another child to do this. I showed Child B the listening card and she sat back down again. Child C remained on task throughout the research lesson and only

had a card directed at her when it was for the entire focus group. When it was time for the plenary I showed the listening card and all the children stopped talking and looked at me. I was surprised at how quickly they responded especially because they were focussed on writing the name of their favourite vegetable and colouring it in.

I showed the children a power point with pictures of the vegetables they had been looking at during the lesson. We also chatted about which vegetables grew under the soil and which grew above. I thought they would enjoy bringing together all the information they had been researching during the lesson. However, this was not the case, they soon lost interest and began chatting with each other. I showed them the card to indicate I wanted them to listen however on this occasion it did not work. After a couple more, slides I instructed them to continue with their colouring which they were happy to do.

During the semi structure interview with Pupils A, B and C I asked them the same questions as had been asked the previous day (Appendix B). These included questions such as how had they travelled to school and what had they eaten for breakfast? When I asked the question if they would like to continue using this non-verbal strategy within the classroom their reply was very different to the previous day. They were still very enthusiastic about it even after experiencing it for approximately forty-five minutes and replied that they would like to have it in the classroom all the time. When I asked why they could not give a reason but just said they liked it. However, the previous class had said the opposite. They were all adamant they did not want to use this strategy anymore and did not like it. Once again when I asked why they struggled to reply with an answer,

Nashruddin and Nurrachman (2016) believe that lesson study builds and improves the teaching and learning process collaboratively, especially in planning and observing. Dudley (2014) points out that when approaching learning study, a group of three teachers is preferable and the teachers should be of mixed ability. Even though we didn't meet this criteria for we are a group of two and are both studying for our PGCE my colleague mentioned aspects of my lesson that I had not considered and it was definitely beneficial to me. Dudley (2014) believes that lesson study allows practitioners to see aspects of the lesson through the eyes of others as well as our

own. This prompts us to be aware of things that we are not aware of. When reflecting on the lesson with my colleague she pointed out that I had not used any of the cards to praise the children's positive behaviour, for example good listening or good work. The only time I had used the cards was to remind the children of the required behaviour required, this was an issue I had not considered. Wada (2016) reinforces this point that non-verbal techniques should not be thought of as a tool only used for redirection. During their research a teacher would put a bead into a jar for positive reinforcement furthermore if she wanted the pupils to get back on task she only needed to shake the jar.

Once, the lessons had finished we invited our focus groups to answer a few questions and this took the form of a semi-structured interview. Fargas et al. (2010) contends that until recently research was on children rather than with children or for children. However, children are now viewed as experts on their own lives and an emergence of participatory research methodologies has emerged. Dawson and Manderson (2005) point out that asking questions to the focus group is an effective way to produce a lot of information from the research lesson. Furthermore, with the flexibility of questioning attitudes and opinions may be revealed. Bragg (2007) maintains that it is important not to dismiss the complexity of the pupil's voice. Teachers can sometimes feel like they know their students views and can represent them themselves. However, these views and identities can be challenged by the requirement to listen alongside rather than on behalf of children.

When interviewing children in focus groups Fargas et al.(2010) maintains there are limitations to be aware of and one of these is that participants often agree with their fellow group members. This is something my colleague and I were aware of during our interviews with our focus groups. When we asked the children from school A if they liked using the nonverbal method child B replied no and then child A and C followed suit. The following day we asked the same question to the three children from school B. Child A said yes and this was followed by child B and C also saying yes. We were unsure whether the children genuinely thought this or were just agreeing with their classmates.

Breen (2006) believes it is important to ensure the focus groups are of similar demographics, this was not the case for our two focus groups. The first group from school A were aged five to six years old and they had been participating in a group of eight children. However, the children from school B were aged four to five years old and were in a group of five children. Whilst observing the first study lesson with School A it had been a very different experience to that of the second study lesson, even though they were following identical lesson plans. My colleague and I reflected on this and considered it may be due to the smaller class size which resulted in a much quieter and more relaxed atmosphere with the younger children. Thus, the lesson study experience of the two focus groups was very different which is a limitation. Next time I conduct a lesson study it would be favourable to ensure the children are from the same year group and working with the same number of pupils within the research lesson.

Bambaeeroo and Shokrpour (2017:1) believe that 'non-verbal communication is often more subtle and more effective than verbal communication'. Most gestures express feelings and attitudes without saying a word. () points out that facial expression is more effective than other modes of non-verbal cues and some theorists believe that facial expression is the most important source of information after language. When I was teaching my research lesson I definitely experienced this. On one occasion Pupil B got up to carry out a task I had asked another child to complete. I showed her the instructional card for listening and gave her a little smile. She looked back at me and responded with a grin as if to say 'I know you didn't ask me to get the white board but I wanted to!' This entire interaction was carried out sensitively and she happily returned to her seat to continue with her task.

In conclusion the purpose and objective of this research was to find out if non-verbal language can be effective in keeping children on task during their lesson. During my first PTE I observed that the teacher would often use this method to keep a child on task whilst delivering a lesson. This allowed her to continue with the lesson and minimise any disruption to the other children. This is not a new concept because Miller (1980) pointed out nearly forty years ago that two thirds of communication is non-verbal and that going to a class with an outstanding teacher can equate to a visit to

the theatre. The methodology used for our research was a lesson study and my colleague and I planned a research lesson which allowed us to develop and closely study the effects of non-verbal language in keeping children on task during their lesson.

I feel to take this research forwards we would need to change two aspects of it. The first is the disparity between the children's ages partaking in the focus groups. Breen (2006) believes it is important to ensure the focus groups are of similar demographics, however this was not the case for our two groups. The children from School A were a year older than those from School B. Furthermore, there were an additional three children in School A than those from School B. This changed the dynamics of the lesson particularly when the children were working in their small groups. Caudle et al. (2014) maintains that an early childhood classroom can be over stimulating and loud which results in a need for more non-verbal communication. The additional three children changed the volume within the classroom and it felt like the children were having to shout over each other to be heard.

On reflection I found the Lesson Study process very informative and it was interesting to work closely with my colleague. She observed issues with my lesson I had not considered and on some occasions, was not aware of. I would very much like to have the experience of working within a lesson study again. During my PTE 2 I shall include more non-verbal gestures when delivering my lessons. I had begun to use this practise in PTE 1 for example pointing to my eyes or ears whilst delivering lessons, especially within the reception class as was modelled by my teacher. It was particularly beneficial to use during carpet time when all the children were together. I have not used instructional cards before but the children were really excited to use them, especially when working in groups. I would like to use these instructional cards again, for research has shown that auditory information is fleeting whereas the visual representation of the card allows for a longer processing time. Furthermore DoETE (no date) maintains that communication breakdowns can often be the underlying issue behind behavioural issues and visual cues can supplement auditory instructions and help to clarify information and prolong engagement.

Reference List

Babelan, A. (2012) 'The correlation between verbal and non-verbal communication and its relationship with the students' academic success', *Journal of School Psychology*, Issue 1, pp. 46-61.

Bambaeeroo, F. and Shokrpour, N. (2017) 'The impact of the teachers' non-verbal communication on success in teaching', *Journal of Advances in Medical Education and Professionalism*, Volume 5, Issue 2, pp. 51-59.

Battersby, S. and Bolton, J. (2013) 'Nonverbal communication: Implications for the global music classroom', *Music Educators Journal*, Volume 99, Issue 4, pp. 57-62.

BERA. (2011) *British Education Research Association*. London: BERA.

Bragg, S. (2007) 'But I listen to children anyway!' teacher perspectives on pupil voice', *Educational Action Research*, Volume 15, Issue 4, pp. 505-518.

Breen, R. (2006) 'A Practical Guide to Focus-Group Research', *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, Volume 30, Issue 3, pp. 463-475.

Brookfield, S. (1995) *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Caudle, L., Jung, M., Fouts, H. and Wallace, H. (2014) 'Early Childhood Preservice Teachers' use of verbal and non-verbal guidance strategies across classroom contexts', *The Teacher Educator*, Volume 49, pp. 61-74.

Cowley, S. (2010) *Getting the Buggers to Behave*. (4th ed). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.

Dawson, S. and Manderson, L. (2005) 'A Manual for the Use of Focus Groups' <http://archive.unu.edu/unupress/food2/UIN03E/UIN03E00.HTM#Contents> [Accessed 31st March 2018].

DCSF. (2009) 'Improving subject pedagogy through Lesson Study' https://moodle.uwtsd.ac.uk/pluginfile.php/133343/mod_resource/content/1/2018%20Improving%20subject%20pedagogy%20through%20Lesson%20Study.pdf [Accessed 28th March 2018].

DfES. (2006) 'Reflective practice' https://moodle.uwtsd.ac.uk/pluginfile.php/133365/mod_resource/content/1/150611-reflective-practice-booklet-en.pdf [Accessed 30th March 2018].

DoETE. (no date) 'Tips for visual cueing systems' <http://education.qld.gov.au/asd-online-resource-kit/schools/learning-environment/docs/visual-cueing-systems.doc> [Accessed 1st April 2018].

Dobrescu, T. and Lupu, G. (2014) 'The Role of Nonverbal Communication in the Teacher-Pupil Relationship', *Social and Behavioural Sciences*, Volume 180, pp. 543-548.

Dudley, P. (2014) 'Lesson Study: a handbook.
https://moodle.uwtsd.ac.uk/pluginfile.php/133342/mod_resource/content/1/Lesson%20Study%20Handbook.pdf [Accessed 29th March 2018].

Dudley, P. (2014) *Lesson Study: Professional learning for our time*. London: ESCR.

Economic and Social Research Council (ESCR, no date) 'Compensation, rewards or incentives?' <http://www.ethicsguidebook.ac.uk/Compensation-rewards-or-incentives-89> [Accessed 2nd April 2018].

EEF (2017) 'Lesson Study'
https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/public/files/Projects/Evaluation_Report_s/Lesson_Study.pdf [Accessed 28th March 2018].

Fargas, M., McSherry, D, Larkin, E. and Robinson C. (2010) 'Research with children: methodological issues and innovative techniques', *Journal of Early Childhood Research*, Volume 8, Issue 2, pp. 17-192.

Grigg, R. and Lewis, H. (2016) 'Is reflective practice worth all the effort?', *School Leadership Today*, Volume 7.6, pp. 46-51.

Herr, J. (2004) *Working with young children*. USA: Goodheart-Wilcox.

Lancaster University. (2016) 'Qualitative and quantitative research',
<https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/media/lancaster-university/content-assets/documents/learning-skills/quantitativevqualitativeveresearchanswers.pdf>
[Accessed 7th April 2018].

Ledbury, R. White, I. and Darn, S. (2004) 'The Importance of Eye Contact in the Classroom', *Teaching English as a Second Language*, Volume 10, Issue 8, pp.2-8.

- Mack, N., Woodsong, C., MacQueen, K., Guest, G. and Namey, E. (2005) *Qualitative Research Methods: A data collector's field guide*. USA: Family Health International.
- Miller, P. (1980) 'Improving communication through what you don't say', *Psychology Today*, Issue 2, pp. 53-55.
- Nashruddin, W. and Nurrachman, D. (2016) 'The Implementation of Lesson Study in English Language Learning: A Case Study', *Dinamika Ilmu*, Volume 16, Issue2, pp. 169-179.
- Norwich, B and Dudley, P. (2016) 'Lesson study: are you doing it right?' <https://www.tes.com/news/school-news/breaking-views/lesson-study-are-you-doing-it-right> [Accessed 28th March 2018].
- Patton, M. (2002) *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. London: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Plymouth City Council. (2011) 'Leuven Well Being and Involvement Scales' <http://web.plymouth.gov.uk/documents-ldtoolkit/leuven.pdf> [Accessed 4th April 2018].
- Richards, J. and Farrell, T. (2011) *Practice Teaching: A Reflective Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shaw, C., Brady, L. and Davey, C. (2011) *Guidelines for Research with Children and Young People*. London: National Children's Bureau Centre.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner: How professionals think in action*. London: Routledge.
- Wada, C. (2016) *The Impact of Implementing Nonverbal Behaviour Management Strategies into An Elementary Classroom*. Thesis. (MA). Hamline University.
- Welsh Government (2011) 'Pupil Participation – Good Practice Guide' https://moodle.uwtsd.ac.uk/pluginfile.php/133359/mod_resource/content/1/Pupil%20Participation.pdf [Accessed 30th March 2018].
- Wolfiger, N. (2002) 'On writing fieldnotes: collection strategies and background expectancies', *Qualitative Research*, Volume 2, Issue 1, pp. 85-95.

Zeki, C. (2009) 'The importance of non-verbal communication in classroom Management', *Social and Behavioural Sciences*, Volume 1, pp.1443-1449.

Appendix

Appendix A

Alison Baker 1502641 & Gemma Morgan 0800218

Research Lesson Study Observation Schedule Date: 27/3/2018 School 1: Year 1: 8 pupils How non-verbal language can be effective in helping children remain on task?			
	Focus Pupil A (M) Level of children staying on task	Focus Pupil B (F) Level of children staying on task	Focus Pupil C (L) Level of children staying on task

Stage of lesson sequence	How they are observed to respond	How they are observed to respond	How they are observed to respond
Lesson introduction (5mins)	Pupil A responded immediately to any behavioural cards that were shown during the introduction.	Pupil B responded immediately to any behavioural cards that were shown during the introduction.	Pupil C took the role of spokesperson for the focus group and during the introduction if any behaviour cards were shown she verbally read out the instructions. This was not a role that had been pre-arranged it was carried out entirely on her own initiative.
Main focus (20mins)	When pupil A was working with the entire focus group & a behaviour card was shown she responded. However, when pupil A was working in a pair if Ms. Morgan showed her a behaviour card whilst talking to someone else she did not respond to the behaviour card. This was because she was so engrossed with her partner whilst working on the task she did not see Ms. Morgan showing her the behaviour card.	When pupil B was working with the entire focus group & a behaviour card was shown he responded. However, when pupil B was working in a pair if Ms. Morgan showed him a behaviour card whilst talking to someone else he did not respond to the behaviour card. This was because he was so engrossed with his partner whilst working on the task he did not see Ms. Morgan showing him the behaviour card.	Pupil C maintained her role as spokesperson for approximately half of the main focus of the lesson and then she stopped. When pupil C was working with the entire focus group & a behaviour card was shown she responded. When pupil C was working in a pair if Ms. Morgan showed her a behaviour card whilst talking to someone else she did not respond to the behaviour card. This was because she was so engrossed with her partner whilst working on the task she did not see Ms. Morgan showing her the behaviour cards.
Plenary (5mins)			
Overall level of children remaining on task	Pupil A remained on task throughout the entire lesson. The only time the cards were used was to remind her to listen and use her indoor voice when the noise level was a little high.	Pupil B remained on task throughout the entire lesson. The only time the cards were used was to remind her to listen and use her indoor voice when the noise level was a little high.	Pupil C remained on task throughout the entire lesson. The only time the cards were used was to remind her to listen and use her indoor voice when the noise level was a little high.

General observations			
----------------------	--	--	--

Appendix B

Research Lesson Study Observation Schedule Date: 28/3/2018 School 2: Reception: 5 pupils How non-verbal language can be effective in helping children remain on task?			
	Focus Pupil A (S) Level of children staying on task	Focus Pupil B (H) Level of children staying on task	Focus Pupil C (J) Level of children staying on task
Stage of lesson sequence	How they are observed to respond	How they are observed to respond	How they are observed to respond
Lesson introduction (5mins)	Child A knew what the cards represented and said out loud what they were. Pointed to eyes when showing the looking card.	Child B knew some of the cards and said good sitting when that card was displayed.	Child C was engaged and looking at the cards and the explanation for each card.
Main focus (20mins)	Child A pushed the bowl of vegetables into the middle of the table when asked to put them in front of them. When the teacher showed the listening card Child A put the bowl in front of them.	Child B was talking and when the teacher put their finger to their lips for child B to be quiet child B started talking using a quiet voice. Child B was playing with the vegetable instead of listening to the teacher so the teacher held up the listening card and child B put the	Child C was on task and didn't need to have any of the cards directed at them unless it was to the whole group.

		vegetable down. During the activity Child B got up to get a whiteboard but hadn't been asked to. The teacher said Child B name and then held up the listening card and then child B sat back down.	
Plenary (5mins)	When the quiet voice card was shown child, A said this is the first time the teacher used the lips card.	Child B is playing with a toy so the teacher showed the listening card and child B gave the toy to the teacher.	
Overall level of children remaining on task	Child A remained on task for the activity and was aware of times when the cards were being shown to the children.	Child B remained on task for the activity. There were a couple of times when a card needed to be shown but the child responded well to the cards.	Child C remained on task and listened well during the activity. Child C only had a card directed at them when it was directed at all the children.
General observations			

Appendix C

Focus group interview questions

General questions to put the children at ease e.g.

How did you get to school this morning?

What did you have for breakfast?

Have you enjoyed your morning?

What was your favourite part of the lesson?

How did you feel when the picture cards were used?

Which do you prefer the picture cards or thumbs up/down?

Do you prefer the picture cards being used or being told to stay on task/keep focused (could adjust this question based on how the lesson went e.g. keep the noise down or are you listening?)

Thank you it's time for break.

Appendix D

Model Beirniad Wedi Adfyfyrio (BWA) *Assisted Reflective Conclusions (ARC) Model*

Dyddiad/Date: 28.03.18 **Student** 1502641

Digwyddiad critigol (Ffocws)/Critical incident (focus): Vegetable Focus Task

Profiad/ Experience	
Teimladau/ <i>Feelings</i> Beth yw eich teimladau ynghylch y profiad? "What are your feelings regarding the experience?"	The lesson worked well using the visual aids and the children seemed to enjoy using them.
Cofio a Deall/	

Remember and Understand <i>Allwch chi restru'r agweddau ar y profiad dysgu a aeth yn dda?</i> <i>"Can you list the aspects of the learning experience that went well?"</i> <i>Pa elfennau o'r profiad dysgi oedd yn siomedig?</i> <i>"What were the elements of the learning experience that were disappointing?"</i>	The children responded as soon as I showed them the cards, most of them said out aloud the instruction that were on the instructional cards as soon as I showed it to them. This aspect of the lesson wasn't related to the visual cards however the power point did not engage the children as I thought it would. I only used a few slides of the presentation because the children were not focusing on it. If I was to deliver this lesson again I would begin it with the power point, towards the end of the lesson the children were happily completing their writing and pictures and I should have left them to complete it rather than finishing with the power point.
Gwerthuso a dadansoddi/ Evaluate and analyse <i>Beth fyddwch chi'n cadw'r un fath i sicrhau dysgu ac addysgu effeithiol yn y dyfodol?</i> <i>"What will you keep the same to ensure effective teaching and learning in the future?"</i> <i>Beth oedd achos yr elfen siomedig bwysicaf?</i> <i>"What was the cause of the most important disappointing element?"</i>	I would keep the lesson the same apart from the area mentioned above.
Casgliadau a chamau gweithredu/ Conclusions and actions <i>Beth yw eich atebion posibl i'r materiaon siomedig a nodwyd?</i> <i>"What are your possible solutions to the disappointing issues identified?"</i> <i>Beth ydych yn mynd i'w wneud nesaf?</i> <i>"What will you do next?"</i>	On reflection I did not use the visual cards for any positive reinforcement for eg good listening or thumbs up. The only time I used them was to keep them on task. If I was to use the visual aids again I would be much more aware of using them for both keeping children on task but also to reinforce their good behavior.
Y profiad newydd / Transformed experience	

Appendix E

Name of Trainee: <u>Alison Baker</u>		Session ref: <u>1 (9.30-10.30)</u>		Date: <u>28.3.18</u>		Class: <u>Reception</u>	
Targed(au) Hyfforddi Personol		S3.3.9 Managing learners' behavior constructively and promote self-control and independence. S2.1 Know and understand the seven areas of learning that form the Foundation Phase		Number of learners: <u>5</u>		Age: <u>4 – 5 years</u>	
Cynllun Ffocws y Cyfnod Sylfaen 2d							
Learning objectives/intentions:	Take part in activities with others and talk about what they are doing.	Success Criteria	Match the vegetable to the picture card. Match the cut-up vegetable to the picture card.	Meeting learners' needs:	n/a		

Introduction/plenary tasks	Main activities	Resources/ Key Vocabulary	Assessment for Learning (strategies and opportunities)
Introduction Explain that if somebody is not listening and joining in with the lesson, I will not use my voice to remind them to join in or listen but either use a card, thumbs up, thumbs down/ smile or hand by my ear or finger in front of my mouth to stop talking.	<u>Trainee focused task</u> Read the letter from Farmer Fred. Introduce the concept that some vegetables grow above the ground & some below. Show a variety of vegetables that have been cut up & complete ones. In pairs they will use their senses to feel and smell the vegetables. Talk about how they feel and smell with their partner and then match pictures of the vegetables to the names. The cards have both Welsh and English vocabulary so we can have the opportunity to introduce these words in both languages. As a group each child will say which is their favourite vegetable & why? In addition, they will tell the group what it feels like/smells like. Draw their favourite vegetable and label it in both English & Welsh. Using one words write how the vegetable feels/ smells.	Resources – vegetables, visual cards, ipad Key vocabulary – smell, touch, senses, leeks, sweet potato, cauliflower, mushroom, courgette, onion, carrot, french beans, potatoes and leek.	TTYP Question and Answers Use the Mr. Men characters when questioning the children about their work. E.g Mr. Happy represents they are happy with their work.
Plenary Show the Power point showing a variety of vegetables. Using questions & working in pairs to determine which vegetables the children are familiar with and if they remember if they grow above or below the ground. Once the lesson is completed I will ask 3 focus children about the activity.			
Curriculum coverage (range and skills)			
Become independent thinkers and learners.			

Activities that allow them to solve problems and discuss outcomes			
Literacy (LNF) Speaking, Listening, Collaboration and discussion.		Numeracy (LNF)	
DCF	Thinking Activating prior knowledge. Developing logical thinking and looking for patterns. Become independent thinkers and learners	ESDGC Describing what they have found out Communicating observations	YCC Incidental Welsh throughout the lesson