

How can pupil engagement be improved with group activities in a key stage two classroom?

**The Enquiring Teacher
ECPP7001**

Word count: 6714

Student number: 1700261

ASSIGNMENT DETAILS AND FEEDBACK

SOUTH WEST WALES CENTRE FOR TEACHER EDUCATION

*Sections marked with * should be completed by module lead*

Student name:	Emily Lowe	Student P number:	1700261
Programme: *	PGCE Primary		
Module: *	The Enquiring Teacher	Module Level (6 or 7):*	7
Module code: *	M7X2152	Contribution to Overall Module Assessment (%): *	100%
Module Lead:*	Catherine Morgan		
Assignment Title:*	Write a critical and analytical essay that discusses your practitioner research 'lesson study' in relation to a chosen field.	Assignment No (x of x):*	1/1
Start date:*	09/01/18	Submission deadline:*	16/04/18
Return date of provisional marks & written feedback:*			

Referencing:	In the main body of your submission you must give credit to authors on whose research your work is based. Append to your submission a reference list that indicates the books, articles, etc. that you have read or quoted in order to complete this assignment (e.g. for books: surname of author and initials, year of publication, title of book, edition, publisher: place of publication).		
Submission:	All assignments must be submitted to Turnitin unless otherwise instructed by the Lecturer. Note: the Turnitin version is the primary submission and acts as a receipt for the student. Late submission of the electronic version of the assignment will result in a late penalty. Penalties for late submission: Up to one week late, maximum grade D. Over one week late, Refer. Only the Extenuating Circumstances Panel may grant an extension.	Date:	16/04/18
Module lead to tick to indicate if a hard copy version of the assignment must be submitted.*			

Table of Contents

Purpose of research	4
Research context	4
Literature review	5
Methodology	8
Lesson study and analysis and discussion	12
Conclusion	20
Recommendations	23
Reference list	24

List of appendices

Appendix A	Observation schedule	27
Appendix B	Lesson plan	28
Appendix C	School 1 observations	29
Appendix D	Leuven scale of involvement	30
Appendix E	Interview school 1	31
Appendix F	Predictions	32
Appendix G	School 2 observations	34
Appendix H	Interview school 2	35
Appendix I	School 3 observations	37
Appendix J	Interview school 3	38

Purpose of research

Valentine and Collins (2014) state that pupil engagement is a fundamental aspect of a child's learning and achievement. During teaching experience it became clear that simply telling children to engage with their work was not enough. During my placement, it was observed that, although sometimes more efficient, when lessons included reading from a text book or watching video material or other isolating, sedentary activities, children appeared less engaged, easily distracted and unable to stay on task for long periods of time, thus leading to lower achievement in their work. With this issue always in mind, the query of 'How could teachers improve pupil engagement' arose.

Research context

The research was conducted across 3 different KS2 classes in 3 different schools. The first research lesson took place in a year 3 class of 28 pupils, in the local authority of Neath, Port Talbot. There are 442 pupils on role, 17% of which are entitled to free school meals (eFSM). The school identifies around 12% of pupils as having additional learning needs (ALN). This is significantly lower than the average for Wales.

The second school is in the outskirts of the City of Swansea and is in a designated Communities First area. The school houses and manages the Flying Start provision on site. There are 255 pupils on roll, about 55% of whom are entitled to free school meals, which is above the national average; also, the school identifies around 67% of pupils as having additional learning needs, which is above the average for Wales. The research will take place in a year 5 class made up of 30 pupils.

The final school is in the local authority of Bridgend. There are 451 pupils on roll, including 54 full-time nursery children. Approximately 53% of pupils are entitled to free school meals, which is above local authority and national averages. The school has identified 26% of pupils as having additional learning needs but very few pupils have a statement of special educational needs. The

research will take place in a mixed year 5 and year 6 class with a total of 30 pupils.

Literature review

According to Education reform (2016) pupil engagement in education refers to the internal states, for example, the degree of attention, curiosity, interest and enthusiasm the child has in their learning. However, the definition of pupil engagement can also be defined and interpreted differently. Meyer (2014) believes that pupil engagement is a result of students' involvement in their learning, such as participating in discussion or collaborating when solving a problem and listening attentively. I interpret this to mean that a pupil is engaged when they are actively participating in their work, whether physically or through communication, e.g. discussing the topic within a group.

Holt (1982) supports this view by stating that children 'learn to be stupid' in schools. He exclaims that pupils do this when teachers prioritise conformity, order and structure over pupil's engagement with their learning, underlining the concept that pupil engagement is a fundamental aspect of improving a child's learning and development.

It is acknowledged that pedagogy has changed since 1982, and it could be argued that Holt's views are somewhat 'out of date'. However, Holt's views are still shared today by Johnson (2012) who suggests that, if a teacher wants to increase pupil engagement in their classroom, then the teacher needs to increase pupil activity by encouraging them to physically move and discuss their topic of work.

The Education reform (2016) has revealed a connection between non- cognitive factors, for example, motivation and interest, and cognitive learning results, such as improved academic performance and information recall. This shows that when a pupils are inspired and interested in the topic of work, their active engagement is heightened, resulting in an improvement in their academic performance.

Jenson (2013) and The Education reform (2016) have also built a strong argument that learning improves when children are inspired and interested in their work. This gives credence to the belief that learning suffers when children are bored, as they disengage with the topic.

There is a strong argument that group work activities engage pupils in sustained on - task interactions with fewer opportunities for distraction.

As previously discussed, Johnson (2012) believes that discussion of the work between children can help to engage them with their learning. Group work does that, as Brame and Biel (2015), Classflow (2016) support by claiming that when the teacher changes role from the instructor to the facilitator of the groups, it helps to create the social environment for children to learn through interaction. Collaborative learning intensifies engagement and encourages the participation of every child.

On the other hand, it can be argued that, if children continually work within the same group, it can be difficult for less confident pupils to contribute in group activities, as pupils can fall into an established role within a group. It is still in the hands of the teacher to facilitate the groups and break down barriers between children to help maximise the benefits of collaborative learning.

However, other literature suggests that improving pupil engagement is not that simple; according to the Welsh Government (2017) 8.2 per cent of pupils were in infant classes of over 30 pupils, making it difficult for teachers to plan a lesson that captivates the interest of every individual in their class. This leads to further challenges as highlighted by Gareth Evans (2016) and The Department for Children, Schools and Families (2009) who are concerned about the 'gender gap' in attainment across Wales. It is claimed that boys are underperforming compared with girls and there is a call for strategies and interventions aimed at raising the attainment of boys as well as improving their motivation and engagement towards school and learning.

The Future Teaching Foundation (2014) implies that, as teachers, we naturally gravitate the delivery of lessons and learning ideas to what we ourselves would

have found appealing as a child. This in turn can result in lessons being more attuned to personal gender.

They claim that the solution to this is to gear work towards more boy orientated topics where you will instantly have an increase in male engagement in your classroom, whilst not harming the degree of female engagement, as they will be more enthusiastic about undertaking boy focused work than the other way around. However, although important to be mindful of, this is a generalised statement, and it is understood that every class, pupil and teacher is different. Also concerned with this topic, Stevens and Slavin (1995) launched a research into the effect of group work on a child's learning. They found that successfully managed group work supported academic progress, as well as working towards closing the gap in attainment between boys and girls.

Looking critically at the above research, which suggests that collaborative learning and work that interests the child will have a significant impact on pupil engagement, some other literature found that there are a number of other factors that can also have an impact.

The Engagement - Base Learning and Teaching Approach (2008) suggests that it is not just how teachers plan a lesson that achieves pupil engagement but that most students will not work to their best ability if they feel that the teacher does not personally care about them or their future. The relationship between a pupil and a teacher is vital to improve the engagement of children.

Pollard (2014) accompanies this view as he advocates that if children perceive their teacher as alert, knowing what is going on in the classroom, then they are more likely to remain on task and achieve the learning objective.

In addition to this, Classflow (no date) implies that a pupil's level of engagement is shaped both in and out of school and evolves continuously. It should be noted that engagement is an issue for every pupil in the class, including the most able. A child's level of engagement can shift from task to task and can be affected by external and internal factors.

Methodology

The methodology we decided to use was a form of action research called a 'Lesson Study'. Lesson Study research provides a rich assessment of pupil performance. Dudley (2011) states that a lesson study focuses on the development of teacher practice. It usually involves a group of teachers who collaboratively plan, teach, observe and analyse the learning and teaching in 'research lessons'

Stepanek et al. (2006) describe a lesson study as a process in which teachers engage to learn more about their practice and how to improve their pupils' learning. This methodology gives teachers the opportunity to examine how their students learn. Often, the observers follow one group throughout the research lesson, paying close attention to the conversations pupils have with one another and with their teachers. In addition to this, they analyse their interactions, reactions and their level of enthusiasm towards the learning.

Murata (2011, cited in Bjuland and Mosvold 2015:85), expands on these ideas, as she believes that the underlying idea of lesson study is that teachers collaboratively decide a shared question which is relevant to the learning of their classes. They then plan a lesson which ensures that the pupil learning is apparent and they examine and discuss what they observe in the research lesson.

During my experience as a teacher, I have found it difficult to ensure that every child is engaged and understands their learning, especially in a key stage two classroom where groups of children are working independently whilst the teacher works with a focused group. I welcome opportunities to look into ways to improve this. One of the advantages of participating in a lesson study is that two members of the triad act as 'extra eyes' in the classroom to observe things that the teacher may be too busy to notice.

Denscombe (2010) discusses a 'privileged insight' into a classroom that you are familiar with. This can mean that something which happens every day can be

considered too 'mundane' or obvious to note by the teacher and therefore creates the risk of missing something that could provide important evidence for the inquiry.

'Classroom life is full of habits and routines that pass unnoticed. They will often remain invisible until they are viewed from a different angle or in a new context' (Stepanek, Appel, Leong, Mangan, Mitchell, 2006: 1)

Using the method of lesson study will encourage me to address and overcome these issues as lesson study observation forces teachers to become conscious of things they would not normally be conscious of.

Dudley (2011) suggest that professionals that have used lesson study said that focusing on the learning needs and behaviours of individual pupils made them more aware of the needs of the individuals in their class.

When making the decision to use the methodology of lesson study, it was recognised that, as a triad, we would have to overcome some challenges arising from the process.

'Lesson study is easy to learn but difficult to master' (Chokshi and Fernandez 2004: 524)

It can be argued that lesson study research can be defined so simply, however, its simple definition may be the reason why misconceptions occur.

Bjuland and Mosvold (2015) imply that pupil learning is focal in lesson study. Usually teachers plan lessons with the aim of covering a certain content, but in a lesson study everything orbits around pupil learning. It could be asked if the planned research lessons are true to life? If so, can the aspects to improve be slotted into everyday teaching with ease?

Chokshi and Fernandez (2004) support this view as they emphasise that the driving force for the lesson should not be the desired research results and that the lesson should not be arbitrarily creative; it should be relevant and useful and should be grounded in the realities of the school and not isolated from the curriculum or everyday experiences for the pupil.

Saito et al. (2006) conducted a lesson study in Indonesia. They too found that when a lesson study was implemented, there were changes in relation to the academic base of the lessons, the structure of the lesson and the pupils' reactions. They concluded that there was a need to shift the focus from teaching methods to pupil learning and a need to involve the entire school for the method of lesson study to be successful.

Chokshi and Fernandez (2004) reported that some teachers felt too anxious and self-conscious when being observed by their peers.

A set of rules was established amongst the group to overcome this. Obeying the guidelines of BERA (2011), it was agreed that throughout the process we would remain professional and non judgemental. During the lesson observation we would strictly focus on the pupils' attainment, engagement and reactions to the learning rather than the teacher's performance. As a triad, we collaboratively planned the lesson, so ownership of the lesson was diffused across the group. Despite complications, the methodology of lesson study has proven to be very successful in improving teacher techniques and pupil progress (Dudley, 2011). We took comfort and placed trust in the advice from Chokshi and Fernandez (2004) as they claim that a lesson study does not have to be executed perfectly in order for it to lead to the desired results. Therefore, we felt more confident to deliver the lessons in our diverse teaching styles.

As a triad, it was decided that disclosed observation was used as the principal method of data collection.

To achieve this, the triad split into two; the teacher became the participant observer, whilst the rest of the triad became the non-participant observers.

'Observation involves hearing as much as it does seeing' (Sharp 2012 p. 83). We decided that the other two members should be non-participant observers, as it allowed them the freedom to observe the pupils with very little distraction and no other responsibility.

A semi structured observation schedule (appendix A) was used by the non-participant observers to articulate and organise their observations. As we were particularly interested in the engagement of the children, our schedule was adapted from Leuven's scale of involvement (no date, cited in Plymouth city council 2012). Sharp (2011) recommends a semi structured observation schedule as they are flexible and adaptable to accommodate unforeseen events.

It can be argued that lesson study is such a successful approach because it allows teachers to see aspects of pupil learning through the eyes of others as well as our own; it gives professionals a chance to compare actual learning observed in the research lesson with the learning we imagined would happen when we planned the lesson. Dudley (2011)

As recommended by Dudley (2011), a semi-structured interview was conducted shortly after the observation lesson. The main reason why we interviewed the three pupils at one time was for efficiency. However, as the selected children had diverse levels of attainment and confidence we had to be aware of how the group dynamic affected how the pupils answered. Borg (1981) pointed out that the eagerness of the respondent to please the interviewer may also effect the results.

A semi- structured interview allowed us to deviate from the sequence of the questions when necessary. The aim of the interview was to obtain the individual views of a pupils. We wrote the questions in aim to spark conversation between the interviewer and the interviewee. It was important to us that the interviewees had the freedom to reply as extensively as they wished and felt comfortable enough to air their true opinions. Flick (2011)

The interview solidified our research greatly, however, we do recognise that the three interviewed pupils are not representative of all pupils in their class and that results may change with different children and different circumstances.

In addition to this, to ensure observation notes were reliable and specific, the teacher of the lesson wrote notes from a participant observer's perspective at the end of each lesson. The notes purely focused on the engagement of the pupils.

Prior to the observation lesson, to relieve pressure for the non-participant observers, small samples of children were identified to observe and interview. Taking guidance from Dudley's (2011) recommendations, we decided who would observe each pupil to ensure we gathered even amounts of data on each pupil.

Three pupils were chosen as the sample, one from each attainment group and from different levels of confidence.

Prior to the lesson, the teacher, who knew the children the best, made predictions about how the children would respond at different points in the lesson (appendix F). The non-participant observers then noted each pupil's actions and reactions throughout the lesson, as well as any crucial incidents. As a triad we would then analyse the data and record whether it matched or differed from the original predictions.

Lesson Study and analysis and discussion

As can be seen in the lesson plan (appendix B), a lesson was designed which could be adapted to each year group across our study. The first lesson took place in school 1, in a year three class and was taught by the member of the triad who was most familiar with the class to ensure the children were comfortable and would continue their daily activities as normal. The remaining members of the triad carried out the observation of the three children between them, one member observing two pupils whilst another observed one. It was decided that this approach was most appropriate as two children of the group were sitting in close proximity to each other, whilst the other child was on the opposite side of the classroom. It was decided to group the children in mixed ability to gain a clearer understanding of the dynamics during the group activities.

The teacher began the lesson by announcing that an exciting problem had occurred and that the children's help was needed to solve a crime case. She then explained the task to the children and verbally informed them of the success criteria.

Child one appeared to be very engaged during the introduction of the lesson. She listened intently to the teacher, looking at her at all times; she responded appropriately to the story that the teacher was telling, for example, smiling and cheering. Whilst the teacher explained what the task was, child one looked around at her peers smiling, emphasising that she was excited about the lesson. When reflecting on the lesson, the pupil maintained a high level of engagement throughout the lesson, as anticipated. As seen in the observation notes (Appendix c) as a triad we decided that during the introduction to the lesson, the pupil would rank a level 4 on Leuven's scale of involvement (no date, cited in Plymouth city council 2012)(Appendix D). These findings reflect Jenson (2013) and The Education Reform (2016) view that children are more engaged in their learning when they are inspired and interested in their work.

When participating in the group work activities, it was observed that, as stated by the Classflow (2016) theory, less confident pupils struggled to contribute in the group activity and that they can fall into an established role within a group. As predicted, child one who is perceived as achieving the highest level of attainment in the class took control of her group by assigning jobs to other members and being the most vocal in the group. Also as predicted, child two, who was in the same group allowed child one to take control and sat back in her chair taking a more relaxed approach to the class. Child two is considered as achieving the middle level of attainment in the class and has a low level of confidence. Throughout the task child two took several orders from child one, such as to collect equipment that was needed, or to collect the next clue. Throughout the task, child two communicated with her group very little and appeared disinterested in the class as she was distracted by her surroundings in the classroom. (See appendix C)

When observing child 3, who was deemed to be achieving a lower level of attainment compared to the other two pupils observed, our previous predications were proved to be correct; the child was moderately interested in the topic but had little interest in completing or taking any responsibility in the task.

The Education Reform (2016) may argue that child three was engaged in the task as he was interested in the topic of super heroes. He frequently contributed in discussion, activated his prior knowledge about super heroes and voiced his opinion with reason to his group. Therefore, Johnson (2012) could argue that the discussion of the topic between children can help to engage them with their learning.

However, when listening to the child's dialogue, he did not refer to the task or the character profiles. He spoke only about what he knew from the films, which was not always relevant.

In addition to this, child three made no attempt to collect apparatus when needed, neither did he join the group when they were reading the clues or the character profiles. In fact, he did not even watch his group when they were reading the information out aloud.

When reflecting on the lesson, this caused the triad to ponder whether the child only discussed the topic because he wanted to interact with his group and if this was an individual task, would the child be engaged at all?

The lesson was then followed by an interview with the three participant children (see appendix E). When the children were asked if they preferred to work in a big or small group, child one and two both said they preferred to work in smaller groups as they found it easier to communicate, child three said that he preferred to work in a bigger group because then you receive more ideas. This was interesting as out of the three children, child three participated the least in helping his group complete the task, and was happy to let other members of his group complete the work.

We decided that we needed to modify our research tools in order to collect a more reliable set of data. We felt that our observation technique of allocating

one non-participant observer to one child, and the other observer to two children, did not give a good representative of the child's learning as with only one observer's perspective on the child's actions, the data may not be at the highest quality possible.

In addition to this, whilst observing the lesson we discovered that children of lower attainment levels took less responsibility in completing the group tasks and the children of higher attainment appeared to lead the group and take control of the task. With this in mind and considering Classflow (2016) theory, we decided to change the next lesson so that the children would be grouped by attainment levels rather than mixed attainment to research whether group dynamics had an impact on the children's engagement.

The second lesson observation took place in school two, in a year five class. Again, the lesson was taught by the member of the triad who was most familiar with the class and the remaining members divided the observation of the three children between them. Reflecting on lesson one, it was decided that the non-participant members would 'float' around the class and each observer would observe each child an equal amount.

It should be noted that this cohort is used to working within groups of their attainment level. It was predicted by the member of the triad, who knows the class best, that most of the children would engage in the lesson. However, in general, the class find group work difficult, so conflict may arise which might cause the children to disengage and refuse to work in their group.

The lesson began with a comprehension task of a new report that claimed a crime had been committed and the police needed the children's help to solve the crime. Reflecting on the interview that took place in the previous school when the children said they would prefer to work in smaller groups, we decided to trial this to see if it had an affect on children's engagement, therefore, this first task was undertaken in pairs. Child one who was placed in the group of higher attainment showed only a moderate level of engagement with the task, as she

showed few signs of motivation to complete the work and often became distracted by talking to another child at the table. During this task, pupil two was also only moderately engaged, however, as he is a pupil with high confidence, the child did take control of the group at times. (Appendix G)

This research contradicts the argument that 'group work activities engage pupils in sustained on task interactions with fewer opportunities for distraction.'

On the other hand, proving our predictions to be incorrect, pupil three, who was in the lower attainment group and of very little confidence, had a high level of engagement in this task, (see appendix G). The pupil concentrated well, was motivated to complete the task and communicated well with her partner. This is out of character for this pupil. Thus, this could support the argument of Jenson (2013) and The Education Reform (2016) who believe that learning improves when children are inspired and interested in their work, as well as Johnson's (2012) belief that discussion of the work between children can help to engage them with their learning.

For the next activity, the children were required to work in larger groups of 5 or 6. Throughout this task, pupil one did not contribute or take any responsibility in completing the task. It was predicted that the pupil would not have a large interest in the topic of superheroes but it was expected that she would still engage with the task and be motivated to complete it (Appendix G and F). In the interview conducted shortly after the lesson (see appendix H) pupil one stated that she did not like working in a big group as children were talking over one another and that two members of her group took control and directed the others. Therefore, it could be argued that, in this case, working in a group did not help improve the child's engagement.

As predicted (appendix F), it was observed that child two remained at a high to moderate level of engagement throughout the task. Some may argue that the group work aspect of this task accelerated child two's engagement with the task as he took control of his group, activated prior knowledge on superheroes to help solve the clues, and collaborated well as he listened to other opinions considerately and worked successfully as a team. Despite this, it was noted that

the child often got distracted and was talking in his group. However, when the participant teacher listened in on the group conversation, pupil 2 always seemed to be talking about the topic of the work. The data retrieved from observing this child supports Johnson's (2012) theory, especially as in the interview, (appendix H) child two also stated that he enjoys class work when it is fun and practical because it is more interactive.

Furthermore, in 1995 Stevens and Slavin found that successfully managed group work supported academic progress as well as working towards closing the gap in attainment between boys and girls.

It could be argued that the topic of work, Marvel Super Heroes, could be perceived as a more boy orientated topic. As discovered in the interview (appendix H) child two was the only pupil who said that he found the activity interesting and that he had watched the superhero films. This could consolidate The Future Teaching Foundation's (2014) claim that the solution to close the gender attainment gap is to gear work towards more boy orientated topics. On the other hand, they then proceed to state that this solution will not harm the degree of female engagement but, in this case, pupil one, who is female and was predicted to have a high level of engagement, did not engage with the topic at all.

As noted in the observations (appendix G) pupil 3 began the task with a high level of engagement and throughout the task her engagement increased. As stated before, pupil three has very little confidence in the class and is a pupil who speaks English as an additional language. However, during the task, there was a conflict in another group, which grew physical. As a result, one of the children who was involved in the conflict was moved into pupil three's group. After this incident it was noted that pupil three had frequent moments of very little activity, including no communication, therefore, it could be argued that this adjustment could have had a detrimental effect on the pupil's engagement. Reflecting on the lesson, this highlighted the significant effect group work can have on pupil engagement, albeit, as stated by Classflow (2016) it is still in the hands of the teacher to facilitate the groups and break down barriers between children to help maximise the benefits of collaborative learning.

Overall, pupil two engaged with the activity but only appeared to collaborate with one person in her group as she struggled to contribute to the wider group. This is supported by that fact that in the interview (appendix H) all of the children stated that they prefer to work in pairs rather than larger groups as it meant there is less fuss, they had more chance to get a say and that they found completing work easier.

When reflecting on the second lesson study, despite having some dominant members in each group we agreed that we made the right decision of grouping the children according to their attainment levels as each group worked at a similar pace and we noticed that they worked better as a group as a result of this. It was decided that we would continue to group the children according to their attainment for the last lesson study.

After a long discussion, we decided that, when undergoing the last lesson study, we would return to the original observation format where we would allocate children to one non-participant observer. This is due to the fact that in the second lesson study, when the non-participant observers were 'floating' they found it difficult to observe each child for a sufficient and equal amount of time resulting in their finding it difficult to get valid and informative data.

The final lesson observation took place in school three, in a mixed year five and six class. Again, the lesson was taught by the member of the triad who was most familiar with the class and the remaining members divided the observation of the three children between them.

As noted in appendix I, both child one and child two began the task engrossed with the work. Both children engaged with the group discussion, read the biographies and clues out loud to their group and discussed their opinions effectively, proving that working within a group does increase pupil engagement. However, as time proceeded, it was observed in both the children that their levels of engagement decreased. As predicted, when child one did not

have full control of the group, he did not collaborate effectively and began to read clues independently and did not confer with his group.

When observing child three, it was observed that quite often in her group, her contribution to the task was discarded and ignored. This was predicted by the teacher as the child has very little confidence and low self esteem. As a possible result of this, pupil three stopped contributing to any group discussion and fiddled with her pen instead.

During the interview which was conducted after the lesson (appendix J) when asked 'what would you do if your ideas were not listened to by the rest of your group?' pupil three answered that it would make her angry.

This is evidence that unless facilitated correctly, group work can have a detrimental effect on pupil engagement.

However, when the teacher questioned the group on their theory, pupil three could recall who the group currently suspected the culprit was, with reasons. This begs the questions that although the pupil did not appear actively engaged, she was somewhat engaged as she was evidently listening and learning from her peers.

When observing pupil two, it was noted that she was often distracted and off task. Her body language showed no display of active engagement as she rested her head on her hands. When her peers attempted to engage her in the discussion she ignored them and continued not to participate. It became even more evident that the pupil was not engaged or even listening to her group's discussion, as when the teacher called on her for an answer to his question, the pupil struggled to give a response and relied on her peers to answer for her. This confirms that The Education Reform (2016) is correct in revealing a connection between motivation and interest and cognitive learning results, such as improved academic performance and information recall, as when the child was not motivated or interested, she was unable to recall any information. The Education reform (2016) also believe that, when a children are bored, their learning suffers as they disengage with the topic. Our research provides evidence to support this view.

Overall, the majority of the findings from this research are consistent with the literature reviewed. As shown in school one, in order to improve pupil engagement, pupil activity should be implemented and discussion of the topic of work should be encouraged, Johnson(2012)

The research underlines how children need to be interested and inspired by their work otherwise it could have detrimental effects on their learning. This was displayed with pupil one in the second lesson observation.

Throughout the three schools where the research took place, I would agree with Brame and Biel (2015) that, when facilitated properly, group work activities played a significant role to encourage pupil engagement.

In light of our findings, when considering my class, I think group work is certainly an aspect that they find difficult and needs improving. To do this I would frequently ask the class to complete activities in pairs (which they stated they preferred) and as they improve at group collaboration the groups could be expanded. I think this is important as, in agreement with Meyer (2014), I believe that pupil engagement is a result of students' involvement in their learning, such as participating in discussion or collaborating when solving a problem and listening attentively. The majority of the class enjoyed the practical activity, stating that it was fun. The children felt that they engage more with the work if the activity is fun, practical and interactive. (Appendix H and J)

Conclusion

This research focused on how the method of lesson study could be used to investigate how pupil engagement could be improved through group work activities in a key stage two classroom. As a triad, we hoped that areas for development would become evident, so that they could be refined and pupil engagement would be improved.

There are many positive outcomes from using the lesson study method when conducting this research.

In agreement with Dudley (2011), it does force teachers to become conscious of things that they would not normally be conscious of, for example, in school two it was noted that pupil one was sometime acting engaged when she thought she was being observed, then returned to a state of no activity when the teacher had turned away. Only a non-participant observer viewing from a distant position could notice this. In addition to this, I felt I benefitted from the lesson study as it made me more aware of how individuals worked in my class, for example, in school two, pupil 3 was much more confident and out spoken than expected when working within a pair, however, when in a larger group she was more introverted. This taught me that that particular child benefits most from working in pairs.

I also felt that my personal development as a teacher grew when watching the other members in the triad teach. I found this was inspiring and a good opportunity to be opened up to new ideas and approaches. Working within a triad was motivating and educational as each member brought something individual to the team and discussing ideas ensured that method approach and refinements were purposeful.

Overall I would class the research study as successful, however, there were some limitations to the approach. Our research was conducted over three different schools, in three different year groups on three different days and at different times in the day and it should be recognised that any issues identified were personal to each class, so the findings can not be generalised.

The biggest obstacle found was the availability of time to successfully implement lesson study. Dudley (2015) advises researchers to refine and repeat each lesson, which when working under time constraints, is difficult to do.

The research lessons that we conducted were 'one off' lessons, as we had not taught in our class for 6 weeks, and then we had no opportunity to teach in that class again.

'No single trial gives us such cast-iron guidance on how to act'. (Research schools network 2017: 1)

It could be argued that the data and findings collected from the refinements could not be validated as they were not implemented on the same class.

This is without regard to the fact that other methods, such as interviewing the participating children, were used to collect data, which Taber (2007) emphasises increases validity and reliability in the research. This method allowed pupils to voice their opinions and for the teachers to receive direct judgements on the lesson and how to improve their approach. However, this method also presented disadvantages as in school one and three, the interviews took place during the children's play time. This meant that the children were not as vocal as desired as they were distracted by the noise from their classmates. Another limitation we discovered was that if a child did not understand a question, it was difficult to explain the question without giving examples and 'putting ideas in their heads and words in their mouths'. In addition to this, if one child did not understand the question they would often agree with the child who spoke first.

In conclusion, when evaluating the effect group work can have on pupil engagement, Johnson (2012) was proven correct that discussion of the work between children improves their engagement with the learning. However, the findings from this study argue that small groups or working in pairs contributed the most positive outcome to achieve this.

For group work to have a significant impact on pupil engagement, as Brame and Biel (2015) and Classflow (2016) stated, the groups and work have to be facilitated and monitored very carefully by the teachers. Our research found that group work can equally have a detrimental effect on a pupils' engagement, such as causing the less confident group members to shut down, or the dominant members taking control of the group and doing all the work whilst some members show little activity. Thus, when facilitated correctly group work can have an impact on pupil engagement but other factors are equally important, such as pupil interest in the topic and motivation, which can be improved by creating a relevant and practical topic and the student-teacher relationship.

Recommendations

As this research was constrained by time, it is recommended that the findings from this small-scale research should be shared with professionals, so that they can continue to investigate the effects of group work in a classroom. This way, further research can be launched to focus on improving children's group work and communication skills. This could also allow for an investigation to take place into whether group work can reduce the gender attainment gap.

If the research was to be repeated, it would be recommended to undertake a lesson study where the professionals focus on the effects the study has on one class.

This research has emphasised that investing time for teachers to implement group work across the curriculum and facilitating group work correctly is essential for children to reach their maximum potential and to ensure group work is used to improve pupil engagement.

References

Borg, W. R. (1981) *Applying Educational Research: A Practical Guide for Teachers*. New York: Longman.

Bjuland, R. and Mosvold, R. (2015) 'Lesson study in teacher education: Learning from a challenging case', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 52, Summer, pp. 83-90.

Brame, C.J. and Biel, R. (2015) 'Setting up and facilitating group work: Using cooperative learning groups effectively' Available at: <http://cft.vanderbilt.edu/guides-sub-pages/setting-up-and-facilitating-group-work-using-cooperative-learning-groups-effectively/>. [Accessed 4.4.2018]

Chokshi, S and Fernandez, C. (2004) 'Challenges to importing Japanese lesson study: concerns, Misconceptions and Nuances', March, pp. 520- 525. [Online] Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/doi/pdf/10.1177/003172170408500710> [Accessed on: 3rd April 2018]

Classflow, (2016) 'Five ways to maximise engagement in primary schools', *ResourceEd Promethean*, October, [Online]. Available at: <https://resourced.prometheanworld.com/maximise-engagement-primary-school/> [Accessed 2.4.2018]

Classflow, (No date) *A Quick Guide to Increasing Class Engagement*

Coe, R., Aloisi, C., Higgins, S. and Elliot Major, L. (2014) *What makes great teaching: Review of underpinning research*, [Online] Available at: <http://www.suttontrust.com/researcharchive/great-teaching/> [Accessed 2nd April 2018]

Collins, J, A. (2014) *Student Engagement in Today's Learning Environments*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Education

Denscombe, M. (2010), *The Good Research Guide for Small Scale Social Research Projects*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Evans, G. (2016) 'Girls outperform boys across the board in frightening schools gender gap' Available at: <https://www.walesonline.co.uk/news/education/girls-outperform-boys-across-board-11733184> [Accessed on 3.4.2018]

- Flick, U. (2011) *Introducing Research Methodology: A beginners guide to doing a research project*. Padstow: SAGE publishers. [e-book] Available at: https://books.google.co.uk/books?id=-EeXiLAi4TgC&printsec=frontcover&source=gbs_ge_summary_r&cad=0#v=onepage&q&f=false [Accessed 2nd April 2018]
- Iteach (2014) 'Promoting and managing effective collaborative group work' Available at: http://www.belb.org.uk/Downloads/i_epd_promoting_and_managing_collaborative_group_work_may14.pdf [Accessed on 3.4.2018]
- Jenson, E. (2013) *Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind*. Alexandria : ASCD
- Johnson, B. (2013) 'How Do We Know When Students are Engaged?' Available at: <https://www.edutopia.org/blog/student-engagement-definition-ben-johnson> Accessed on [2.4.18]
- Jones, R, D. (2008) 'Strengthening Student Engagement' Available at: <http://www.cesdp.nmhu.edu/prof-learning/docs/Teaching%20and%20Learning/Student%20Engagement/Strengthen%20Student%20Engagement%20white%20paper.pdf> Accessed on [1.4.2018]
- Leavy, A. (2016) 'Using Lesson study to support knowledge development in initial teachers education: Insights from early number classrooms', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 57, July, pp. 161-175.
- Meyer, K, A. (2014) *Student Engagement Online: What Works and Why*. John Wiley and Son, [e-book]. Available at <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/lib/trinity/detail.action?docID=1884197#> [Accessed: 2.4.2018]
- Plymouth city council Early Years Service (2012) 'Leuven well being and involvement scales', Available at: <http://web.plymouth.gov.uk/documents-ldtoolkitleuven.pdf> [Accessed 23 march 2018]
- Pollard, A. (2014) 4th edition. *Reflective Teaching in Schools*. London: Bloomsbury publishing.
- Research schools network, (2017) 'The limits of lesson observations and lesson study', Available at: <https://huntington.researchschool.org.uk/2017/11/10/the-limits-of-lessons-observations-and-lesson-study/> [Accessed on 9th April 2018]

Saito, E. Harun, I. Kuboki, I. and Tachibana, H. (2006) 'Indonesian lesson study in practice', 32, June, pp. 171-184. [Online] Available at: <https://web-b-ebsscohost-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=3929f0a4-a4fc-4300-8307-311d3dd6e651%40sessionmgr102> [Accessed 3rd April 2018]

Sharp, J. (2012) *Success with your Education Research project*. (2nd ed) Routledge. [e-book] Available at: <https://www-dawsonera-com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/abstract/9780857259493> [Accessed 2nd April 2018]

Taber, K. (2007) *Classroom-based Research and Evidence-based practice*. London: SAGE publications

The Department for Children, School and Families (2009) 'Gender issues in school- what works to improve achievement for boys and girls' Available at: <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/9094/1/00601-2009BKT-EN.pdf> [Accessed on 4.4.2018]

The Education Reform. (2016) 'Student Engagement' Available at: <https://www.edglossary.org/student-engagement/> Accessed on [1.4.2018]

The Future Teaching Foundation. (2014) *How To Become a Primary School Teacher*. Marston Gate: The Future Teaching Foundation Publishers.

Welsh Government (2017) 'Schools census results' Available at: <http://gov.wales/statistics-and-research/schools-census/?lang=en> [Accessed on 3.4.2018]

Appendix A

Observation Schedule

School:

Year group:

Learning objective:

Activities:

The Leuven Scale for Involvement

level	Well being	Signals
1	Extremely low	Activity is simple, repetitive and passive. The child seems absent and displays no energy. They may stare into space or look around to see what others are doing.
2	Low	Frequently interrupted activity. The child will be engaged in the activity for some of the time they are observed, but there will be moments of non-activity when they will stare into space, or be distracted by what is going on around.
3	Moderate	Mainly continuous activity. The child is busy with the activity but at a fairly routine level and there are few signs of real involvement. They make some progress with what they are doing but don't show much energy and concentration and can be easily distracted.
4	High	Continuous activity with intense moments. The child's activity has intense moments and at all times they seem involved. They are not easily distracted.
5	Extremely high	The child shows continuous and intense activity revealing the greatest involvement. They are concentrated, creative, energetic and persistent throughout nearly all the observed period.

Child Name	Leuven Scale for involvement level	Comments.

Appendix B

Canolfan Addysg Athrawon De-Orllewin Cymru		 The South West Wales Centre of Teacher Education		1B	
Session Plan – Key Stage 2					
Name of trainee: Emily Lowe			Session ref: 27.3.2018		
Personal target(s) in relation to QTS:					
Year group: 5		No. of learners: 30		ALN: 18	
Additional Adults: 1					
Learning objective(s): Work Cooperatively to solve problems.			Success criteria: Communicate effectively within a group to help solve a task.		
Links to previous learning:					
Curriculum coverage (range, skills)					
Geography- Locating places using maps.					
PSE- developing thinking.					
<i>Literacy(LNF)</i> Explain information and ideas, exploring and using ways to be convincing. Listen to others, asking questions and responding to both the content and the speakers view points. Contribute to group discussion, taking some responsibility for completing the task well. Use a range of strategies for skimming. Scan to find specific details.			<i>Numeracy (LNF)</i> Use measuring instruments with 10 equal divisions.		
DCF		Thinking Consider other views to inform opinions and decisions.		ESDGC YCC	
Key vocabulary(English/Welsh): Guilty Suspect Reading Group work					
Time	Session activities, organisation and management			Key questions & Assessment for Learning opportunities	
15 mins.	Introduction Children are to work in pairs and read the newsletter. In pairs children are to complete the comprehension task. As a group, children discuss what the task is and what they have to do.			What do you think? Why do you think that? Where in the text? How does the text imply...	
25 mins	Main activities Children are to read the biographies of each super hero (differentiated by ability). On child from each group is to collect a clue from the front of the class. As a group, children have to discuss and decide which super hero the clue is referring to. The children have to match the clue to the super heroes in order to solve the mystery.				
5 mins	Plenary As a class, discuss what each group found out and who they think is guilty and why.				

Appendix C

Observation notes school 1

School 1 (26/03/2018).

Pupil (P)	Scale	Involvement	Observation notes Signals	Lesson/Activity Part
1	4	High	At all times P1 was involved. P1 was not easily distracted and was listening on task (Sitting on floor near the front 2 nd row and next to P2).	Introduction
	4	High	P1 immediately took control of her group and the task however PS also helped other pupils especially P2. P1 she asked P2 on one occasion "Do you want to have a go?"	Task- Reading/Discussing Biograph
	4	High	P1 immediately took control of her group and the task however P1 also helped other pupils especially P2 again.	Task- Red Clues
	5	Extremely High	P1 continued with control of the group furthermore P1 showed continuous and intense activity revealing the greatest involvement. P1 was concentrating, creative, energetic and persistent throughout for nearly all the observed period. P1 activated her prior knowledge on Superhero's to help her thinking skills and process of elimination on the task. P1 was fully engrossed and volume raised however P1 stopped giving support to P2.	Task- Blue Clues
	5	Extremely High	P1 continued with control of the group furthermore P1 showed continuous and intense activity revealing the greatest involvement. P1 was concentrating, creative, energetic and persistent throughout for nearly all the observed period. P1 activated her prior knowledge on Superhero's to help her thinking skills and process of elimination on the task. P1 was fully engrossed and volume raised however P1 stopped giving support to P2.	Task- Green Clues
	5	Extremely High	P1 continued with control of the group furthermore P1 showed continuous and intense activity revealing the greatest involvement. P1 was concentrating, creative, energetic and persistent throughout for nearly all the observed period. P1 continued to work through the task using the clues to group to a Superhero. P1 was fully engrossed and volume raised however P1 started to again support P2.	Task- Yellow Clues
	5	Extremely High	P1 continued with control of the group furthermore P1 showed continuous and intense activity revealing the greatest involvement. P1 was concentrating, creative, energetic and persistent throughout for nearly all the observed period. P1 continued to work through the task using the clues to group to a Superhero. P1 was fully engrossed and volume raised however P1 started to again support P2. P2 concluded that that the clues led to the answer of it being Captain America however after working with others in the group she changed her conclusion to Spiderman.	Task- Conclusion/Prediction
	5	Extremely High	P1 controlled the group and furthermore showed continuous and intense activity revealing the greatest involvement. P1 concentrated and persistent throughout for nearly all the observed period. P1 continued to work through the task using the clues to group to a Superhero. P1 also listened to others ideas however this is an area for improvement.	Overall
2	3	Moderate	P2 showed that there were a few signs of involvement and engaged slightly. However P2 too often showed a lack of energy, concentration and was easily distracted (Sitting on floor near the front 2 nd row and next to PS).	Introduction
	2	Low	P2 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed (Moving Biographs), but	Task-

			there was far too many moments of non-activity participation especially communication. Furthermore P2 remained quiet, did not contribute, stared into space and generally looked disinterested and also allowed P2 to have control of the task.	Reading/Discussing Biograph
	2	Low	P2 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed (Moving Biographs), but there was far too many moments of non-activity participation especially communication. Furthermore P2 remained quiet, did not contribute, stared into space and generally looked disinterested and also allowed P2 to have control of the task.	Task- Red Clues
	2	Low	P2 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed (Moving Biographs), but there was far too many moments of non-activity participation especially communication. Furthermore P2 remained quiet, did not contribute, stared into space and generally looked disinterested and also allowed P2 to have control of the task.	Task- Blue Clues
	2	Low	P2 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed (Moving Biographs), but there was far too many moments of non-activity participation especially communication. Furthermore P2 remained quiet, did not contribute, stared into space and generally looked disinterested and also allowed P2 to have control of the task.	Task- Green Clues
	2	Low	P2 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed (Moving Biographs), but there was far too many moments of non-activity participation especially communication. Furthermore P2 remained quiet, did not contribute, stared into space and generally looked disinterested and also allowed P2 to have control of the task. P1 asked P2 to get the Yellow Clue however she did not and allowed another pupil in the group to get the Yellow Clue.	Task- Yellow Clues
	2	Low	P2 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed (Moving Biographs), but there was far too many moments of non-activity participation especially communication. Furthermore P2 remained quiet, did not contribute, stared into space and generally looked disinterested and also allowed P2 to have control of the task. Miss AW asked P2 what she concluded to check her understanding on the task however she gave a limited and labored answer without being able to explain why she struggled in front of the wider class. Another pupil stepped in to explain the reason why.	Task- Conclusion/Prediction
	2	Low	P2 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed (Moving Biographs) however there was far too many moments of non-activity participation especially communication. Furthermore P2 remained quiet, did not contribute, stared into space and generally looked disinterested and also allowed P1 to have control of the task.	Overall
Pupil (P)	Scale	Involvement	Observation notes Signals	Lesson/Activity Part
3	2	Low	The child was sitting on the carpet. He regularly looked at Miss Williams, but spent the majority of the time looking	Introduction

	2	Low	around the classroom/ out of the window. He had a vacant facial expression and did not physical react to the teacher at all even when his peers were cheering/ getting excited. The child did not make any attempt to read the biography. He did not involve himself in the discussion at all. However, he was leaning into the table and occasionally showed signs of listening to his peers, for example, raising his eye brows. The child eagerly stood up to collect the first clue. Another child in his group directed him to sit down and that someone else would get the clue. The child listened to his impact coach. Once seated he began to swing on his chair and look around the classroom whilst he awaited for the child to come back with the clue.	Task- Reading/Discussing Biograph Instructed to collect first clue.
	3	Moderate	The child looked at the child who was reading and his body language implied that he was listening to the child. Child 1 leant over the table and gave his opinion without prompting. Child made no attempt to stand up to get the clue.	1st clue
		High	When the clue was being read out, the child was leaning back on his chair and looking around the classroom. The child kept referring back to the film with the characters in, he would opening give his opinion with a reason to back his opinion up, his opinion was based on the film and not the evidence given. When speaking the child stood up and leaned over his table to be closer to his group. After offering his opinion 3 times and not getting a reaction either time, the child sat back down in his seat and began looking around the classroom again. When speaking, the child looked at his impact coach.	Instructed to get second clue. 2nd Clue Discussion of 2nd clue.
	1	Extremely Low	After offering his opinion 3 times and not getting a reaction either time, the child sat back down in his seat and began looking around the classroom again.	Discussion of 2nd clue.
	1	Extremely Low	Child 1 made no attempt to collect the apparatus needed. He also did not take any interest in measuring the footprint- he did not ask if he could join in, attempt to have a go, or watch his peers whilst the were measuring. Child 1 showed no clear signs that he was listening to the teacher. He was swinging on his chair and looking out of the window.	Discussion of 3rd clue (Measuring) Teaching talking and class discussing what they found. Returning to task.
	2	Overall engagement: Low	Despite that the child did not seem engaged, his knew what his group had to do to complete the task (sort the instructions so they were under one super hero) The child seemed to have a moderate interest in the topic as he kept referring to the films that he had watched. There was little to no attempt to take part in the group discussion and to take any responsibility to help solve the task.	Conclusion

Appendix D

The Leuven Scale for Involvement

level	Well being	Signals
1	Extremely low	Activity is simple, repetitive and passive. The child seems absent and displays no energy. They may stare into space or look around to see what others are doing.
2	Low	Frequently interrupted activity. The child will be engaged in the activity for some of the time they are observed, but there will be moments of non-activity when they will stare into space, or be distracted by what is going on around.
3	Moderate	Mainly continuous activity. The child is busy with the activity but at a fairly routine level and there are few signs of real involvement. They make some progress with what they are doing but don't show much energy and concentration and can be easily distracted.
4	High	Continuous activity with intense moments. The child's activity has intense moments and at all times they seem involved. They are not easily distracted.
5	Extremely high	The child shows continuous and intense activity revealing the greatest involvement. They are concentrated, creative, energetic and persistent throughout nearly all the observed period.

Appendix E

Interview for school 1

P1, P2 and P3 were interviewed together.

Miss EL delivered the majority of questions to the pupils and Mr KJ Miss AW occasionally added to the interview questioning

The interview was voice recorded.

1. Did you enjoy the lesson?

All three pupils said yes.

2. Do you like working as a team? Why/Why not?

P3- yes I like discussing with other children and they can help me

P1- Yes because it means you get to listen to people's different perspectives and it can help you learn in another way.

P2- It can help you when you are stuck.

3. What are the cons about working independently?

P3- it is sad and lonely

P1- Sometimes when you are clear on something it is hard to describe to someone else who does not understand.

P2- it is harder, you don't know what to do and have no one to help.

4. What would you do if your group does not listen to your opinions?

P3- tell teacher

P1- ask them to listen. Listen to their points first. Wait till an appropriate time to tell your opinion.

P2- tell the teacher.

5. Did you work well with everyone in your group?

All answered yes.

P1- sometimes I can be bossy in my group

P3- Yes because I think stuff in my mind then I tell the group

6. Did you find the activity interesting?

P3- no I could not figure out who was to blame.

P1- Exciting. All said they had heard of the superheroes before.

7. Did everyone listen to you in your group?

P1- yes

P2- I did not get much chance to speak.

P3- all listened. The group worked well.

8. Does having a good relationship with your teacher help your engagement?

P2 and P3 – yes

P1- better relationship makes you try harder because you want them to be proud of you.

All said if it is a fun lesson it does not make them want to try harder.

9. Do you prefer to work in a big group or a small group?

P1- small group, it is easier to communicate

P3- big, then you get more ideas.

P2- Small, find it difficult to hear everyone in a big group.

10. Would you prefer to choose your group?

P1 and P2- Choose.

P3- put in group.

Appendix F

Predictions for school 1

Most if not all children will engage with the lesson. There may be conflict between some children resulting in refusal to engage. All groups of children will be able to give a final decision. The children will complete the activity with minimal stress in regards to the level of work.

Child 3 (ALN – Global delay) – Will engage with group discussion because of the subject matter but comments may be ignored by other group members. Will struggle to read parts of clues and fact files. Will have large prior knowledge on the subject matter. Will be grouped with their peer impact coach.

Child 2 (EAL – Chinese) – Will attempt to engage verbally with group discussion but will lack confidence to succeed, other group members will dominate. Will struggle to read some clues. Should be able to read all of fact file. Will have little prior knowledge on the subject matter.

Child 1 – Will engage with group discussion and encourage peers to give thoughts and opinions. Will assign self a leadership role and take control. Will be able to fluently read all clues and fact files. Will have some prior knowledge on the subject matter. May get distressed should the group display any conflict.

Child one and two will be placed in the same group. This has been done in prediction that child one will attempt to encourage engagement from child two.

Predictions school 2

Most of the children will engage in the lesson. There may be conflict between some children which may cause them to disengage and refuse to take part in the lesson. The work set is at a medium difficulty level. The higher ability group will complete the task quickly whilst the lower ability group may take more time. Confident characters in the class may take over the activity and control the event.

Child one- HA.

Will engage in the group discussion. She is a confident character that may control her group. The child will find the work easy- this may cause her to disengage. It is

unlikely that the child will be interested by the superheroes in the topic but may enjoy the activity.

Child two- MA

Child two is a very confident child, he may control the group discussion. The child will enjoy the activity and be interested by the topic.

Child three - LA

May attempt to engage verbally with group discussion but will lack confidence to succeed. If the child is not listened to it is likely that she will disengage and get distracted.

Predictions school 3

I predict that nearly all of the pupils will engage in the lesson and there will be a low level of disruption. There may be disagreements between some pupils which may challenge their ability to collaborate as a group and stay on task. Every piece of work is differentiated for each ability group in which they are familiar with and set in general as a medium difficulty level. The higher ability groups have more comprehensive work to read and understand and more challenging clues. There are some confident characters in the class that may take over the activity and control the task and attention of the teachers.

Child one- HA

Pupil 1 will at large engage in the group task however he is controlling and is the only boy in the group. Furthermore often if the task is not set high enough or he does not have control he will not collaborate effectively and disengage and sometimes be disruptive.

Child two- MA

Pupil 2 is a bright pupil however she has very low self-esteem and confidence. She may struggle to collaborate and may get overpowered by other pupils in her group and as a result disengage in the task.

Child 3- LA

Pupil 3 will attempt to engage however she struggles to initiated ideas and often copies or builds on other in collaboration tasks. She can also get easily distracted by a male pupil who sits by her. Pupil 3 can easily go off task however hopefully the task will be engaging.

Appendix G

Observation notes for school 2

Pupil (P)	Scale	Involvement	Observation notes Signals	Lesson/Activity Part
PUPIL ONE	3	Moderate	P1 showed that there were a few signs of involvement and engaged slightly. However P1 too often showed a lack of energy, concentration and was easily distracted where she was off task talking to another girl in her group.	Introduction
	2	Low	P1 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed (Moving Biographs), but there was far too many moments of non-activity participation especially communication. Furthermore P1 remained quiet, did not contribute, stared into space, fiddled with her hair and generally looked disinterested and also allowed others in her group to have control of the task.	Task- Reading/Discussing Biograph .
	2	Low	P1 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed (Moving Biographs), but there was far too many moments of non-activity participation especially communication. Furthermore PE remained quiet, did not contribute, stared at the window, fiddled with her hair and generally looked disinterested and also allowed others in her group to have control of the task.	Task- Red Clues 1
	2	Low	Same as Red Clues	Task- Yellow Clues
	2	Low	P1 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed where P1 briefly discussed Spiderman, but there was far too many moments of non-activity participation especially communication. P1 continued to look disinterested and also allowed others in her group to have control of the task.	Task- Green Clues
	2	2	P1 Same as Green Clues (Also did not make an effort to collect any clues).	Task- Blue 1 (Map Clues)
	1	Extremely Low	P1 appeared absent and displays little energy. Furthermore P1 increasingly stared into space or look around to see what others are doing (disengaged).	Task- Red Clues 2
	1	Extremely Low	P1 Same as Red Clues 2	Task- Blue Clues 2
	1	Extremely Low	P1 Same as Blue Clues 2	Task- Yellow Clues 2
	1	Extremely Low	P1 Same as Yellow Clues 2	Task- Blue Clues 3
	2	Low	P1 gave off the impression she understood the activity however P1 struggled to answer Miss EL question in any sort of detail.	Task- Conclusion/ Prediction .
	2	Low	P1 gave off the impression she understood and engaged in the activity however struggled to contribute meaningfully. P1 continued to look disinterested and also allowed others in her group to have control of the task.	Overall
	3	Moderate	P1 showed that there were a few signs of involvement and engaged slightly. However P1 too often showed a lack of energy, concentration and was easily distracted where she was off task talking to another girl in her group.	Introduction
	2	Low	P1 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed (Moving Biographs),	Task-
PUPIL TWO	2	Low	remained quiet, did not contribute, stared into space, fiddled with her hair and generally looked disinterested and also allowed others in her group to have control of the task.	Biograph .
	2	Low	P1 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed (Moving Biographs), but there was far too many moments of non-activity participation especially communication. Furthermore P1 remained quiet, did not contribute, stared at the window, fiddled with her hair and generally looked disinterested and also allowed others in her group to have control of the task.	Task- Red Clues 1
	2	Low	P1 Same as Red Clues	Task- Yellow Clues
	2	Low	P1 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed where P1 briefly discussed Spiderman, but there was far too many moments of non-activity participation especially communication. P1 continued to look disinterested and also allowed others in her group to have control of the task.	Task- Green Clues
	2	2	P1 Same as Green Clues (Also did not make an effort to collect any clues).	Task- Blue 1 (Map Clues)
	1	Extremely Low	P1 appeared absent and displays little energy. Furthermore P1 increasingly stared into space or look around to see what others are doing (disengaged).	Task- Red Clues 2
	1	Extremely Low	P1 Same as Red Clues 2	Task- Blue Clues 2
	1	Extremely Low	P1 Same as Blue Clues 2	Task- Yellow Clues 2
	1	Extremely Low	P1 Same as Yellow Clues 2	Task- Blue Clues 3
	2	Low	P1 gave off the impression she understood the activity however P1 struggled to answer Miss EL question in any sort of detail.	Task- Conclusion/ Prediction .
	2	Low	P1 gave off the impression she understood and engaged in the activity however struggled to contribute meaningfully. P1 continued to look disinterested and also allowed others in her group to have control of the task.	Overall
	3	Moderate	P2 showed that there were a few signs of involvement and engaged slightly where he took control of the group. However P2 did show at times a lack of energy, concentration and was easily distracted where he was off task talking to another boy in his group.	Introduction
	4	High	P2 showed a greater involvement as the task went on and was happy to take control. P2 was concentrating, creative, energetic and persistent for nearly all the observed period. Used his thinking skills and process of elimination on the task. However when Miss EL asked the class for attention for more information P2 continued to talk and Miss EL had to remind him about the class rules.	Task- Reading/Discussing Biograph .
	4	High	P2 showed a greater involvement as the task went on and was happy to take control. P2 was concentrating, creative, energetic and persistent for nearly all the observed period. Used his thinking skills and process of elimination on the task. P2 also activated his prior knowledge on the Superhero's to support his opinion on who could have committed	Task- Red Clues 1
PUPIL THREE	4	High	P2 Same as Red Clues	Task- Yellow Clues
	4	High	P2 Same as Yellow Clues	Task- Green Clues
	3	Moderate	P2 showed that there were a few signs of involvement and engaged slightly where he took control of the group. However P2 did show at times a lack of energy, concentration and was easily distracted where he was off task talking to another boy in his group.	Task- Blue 1 (Map Clues)
	3	Moderate	P2 Same as Blue Clues 1 (Map Clues)	Task- Red Clues 2
	3	Moderate	P2 gave off the impression he understood the activity however P2 gave Miss EL brief answers when questioned.	Task- Conclusion/ Prediction .
	3	Moderate	P2 showed that there were signs of involvement and led the group at large throughout the task. However P2 also showed a lack of energy, concentration and was easily distracted where he went off task talking to another boy in his group.	Overall
	4	High	P3 showed good signs of involvement and was happy to take control. P3 was concentrating, creative, energetic and persistent for nearly all the observed period.	Introduction
	4	High	P3 showed good signs of involvement and was happy to take control. P3 was concentrating, creative, energetic and persistent for nearly all the observed period. However P3 was only worked with one girl next door to her.	Task- Reading/Discussing Biograph .
	3	Moderate	P3 showed signs of involvement as the task continued and was happy to take control. P3 at large was concentrating, creative, energetic and persistent for nearly all the observed period. However P3 was not collaborating with others bar 1 girl next door to her.	Task- Red Clues 1
	3	Moderate	P3 Same as Red Clues	Task- Yellow Clues
	2	Low	P3 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed however there was many moments of non-activity participation especially communication.	Task- Green Clues
	2	Low	P3 gave off the impression she engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed however there was many moments of non-activity participation especially communication. She became more distracted as a pupil was moved by the LSA and put by her.	Task- Blue 1 (Map Clues)
	2	Low	P3 Same as Blue Clues 1	Task- Red Clues 2
	2	Low	PN gave off the impression she understood the activity however PE struggled to answer Miss EL question in any sort of detail. Also she only really collaborated with the 1 girl next door to her.	Task- Conclusion/ Prediction .
	3	Moderate/Low	PN gave off the impression she understood and engaged in the activity however struggled to contribute meaningfully to the wider group. PN also could not give any depth to a question asked by Miss EL.	Overall

Appendix H

Interview conducted in school two.

1. Did you enjoy today's lesson?

All pupils- Yes

1- it was a bit tricky

2. What was the most enjoyable part of the lesson?

2- finding out the answer

1 + 3- When we had to figure out all of the clues

3. Did you like working in groups?

2- No

1- No

3- yes

4. Why not?

2- too much fussing, everyone was speaking at once.

1- two people were taking over each other, two people were taking charge and telling us what to do.

5. Why did you like it?

3- because you can help each other.

6. What are the good things about working independently?

2- you get your work done quicker

1- you get more time to think.

3- you learn more

7. Did you prefer working in pairs or bigger groups?

1- Pairs

2- Pairs

3- Pairs

8. Why?

1 + 2- it's easier, there is less fuss. You have more of a chance to have a say.

3- it is easier

9. If your group did not acknowledge ideas what would you do ?

All- leave to work independently

10. Did you find activity interesting?

2- yeah I have watched all of the superhero films

1-No

3- No

11. What helped you engage with the lesson, if you did?

2- the clues because they were fun to work out.

1 -there wasn't anything that made me engage.

3- I don't know

12. Does It make a difference is the work is fun and practical?

1- Yes, because it is more interactive

13. If you had to do this lesson again, how could the teacher improve it?

2- give the option of working in a group or individually or pair.

1- I would listen to other peoples ideas in my group.

3- not sure

14. Do you find you work better if task is too easy or too difficult?

1- difficult

2 +3- easy then get harder.

Appendix I

Observation notes- school 3

Pupil (P)	Scale	Involvement	Observation notes Signals	Lesson/Activity Part
Child three	4	High	The child was quick to engage with the biographies. Selecting one then being passed others by peers. The child showed continuous activity with intense moments. She <u>organised</u> the biographies into a line and read them aloud to her peer getting frustrated when he swapped them around "Oh stop it". As a consequence she continued to read the biographies silently. At all times the child seemed involved in the task, discussing the biographies with her partner and listening to the conversations of her peers. PC's response to question by adult directed to whole group "A thinks it is Wonder Woman, I think it's him, him or him." Child 3 constantly engaged with the biographies and listened to her peers. She did not engage in conversation beyond her partner.	Task – Reading biographies
	3	Moderate	P3 group engaged in a discussion of <u>who</u> they thought the culprit was before the clue was collected. P3 listened to the group and appeared engaged for most of the discussion through body language (leaning in towards the group, looking at whoever is talking), however rarely gave verbal contribution. On two occasions she attempted to interact but was ignored by her peers, "It can't be Superman ..." "She is the princess so why would she steal something?"	Task – Clue 1
	3	Moderate	P3 showed mainly continuous activity. But showed few moments of real engagement. She leaned across the table listening to her peers and repeated comments just spoken. She was quick to agree with the dominant group members. She directed any personal opinions to single members of the group with no reaction in return. P3 showed some moments of staring into space and being distracted.	Task – Clue 2
	2	Low	P3 attempted to take control by going to collect the clue shouting at her peer. Her peer ignored her abrupt request and collected the clue himself. PC displayed frequently interrupted activity. She was engaged in the activity for some of the time she was observed, but there were moments of non-activity when she was distracted by what was going on around her. Particularly by the other two female members of the group who had decided to work separately.	Task – Clue 3
	1	Extremely low	P3 was frequently distracted by and played with her pen. She did not contribute to the group discussion or engage with the activity.	Task – Map
	2	Low	P3 group had some conflict when deciding who should collect this clue. The child showed a moment of engagement with the activity by pointing to the superhero she thought the clue matched best to. The child spent most of this activity looking around at other groups and displays on the walls.	Task – Clue 5
	5	Extremely high	<u>P3 was questioned by Mr. KJ</u> . She could recall who the group currently thought the culprit was and give reasons. The rest of the group then engaged with the answer but PC <u>summarised</u> .	Pit stop
	5	Extremely high	The child was engaged with the activity throughout the observed period. She read aloud the biographies to the group and gave verbal input. <u>All the group were engaged with the activity with occasional off topic conversations.</u>	Task – Clue 6
	2	Low	The child collected the clue and read it aloud to her group. This was the only engagement P3 showed to the activity. <u>The child was distracted by her pen, banging it on the table.</u>	Task – Clue 7

Child two	3	Moderate	P3 repeated Mr KJ's instructions to the group and tried to take leadership by asking the group to raise their hands if they thought it was a certain character. The group ignored this. P3 was distracted by her pen and gave little verbal input when asked a question by her peer.	Task – Group conclusion
	4	Extremely High	P3 could give answer and reason to Mr KJ and also suggest who the group thought it could have been and was. She could recall the process the group took to get their final decision.	Sharing to whole class
	2	Low	The child initially engaged in reading the biographies with her partner but showed frequently interrupted activity. <u>P2 was often distracted by her peers who were moving around.</u> The child was engaged in the activity for some of the time by turn taking to read the biographies aloud. There were moments of non-activity when the child stared into space and yawned, ignoring her partner who was trying to engage in discussion.	Task – Reading biographies
	1	Extremely low	The child seemed absent and displayed no energy. She stared into space and looked around to see what others are doing. She showed no signs of engagement with the activity.	Task – Clue 1
	1	Extremely low	The child appeared absent and displayed no energy. She stared into space with no engagement with the activity.	Task – Clue 2
	1	Extremely low	The child made no attempt to engage with the activity. She stared and looked around her, leaning her head on her hands.	Task – Clue 3
	1	Extremely low	The child did not engage with the group or activity. Her peer sat next to her occasionally giving verbal input to group. P2 often looked around her and stared into space.	Task – Map
	1	Extremely low	The child had no engagement. She leaned on her hands and looked around.	Task – Clue 5
	2	Low	<u>P2 was questioned by Mr. KJ</u> . She struggled to give an answer and response. She looked briefly at all clues on the table looking at peers for help. Some <u>peers</u> whispered answers to P2. P2 did not give a certain answer. <u>Peers were asked by Mr. KJ giving a definite answer.</u> P2 stared into space and was not engaging with the other groups as they gave their answers.	Pit stop
	1	Extremely low	The rest of the <u>group were</u> engaged with the activity. P2 spent the whole of the observed period looking around and playing with her pen.	Task – Clue 6
	1	Extremely low	P2 showed no engagement with the activity but instead played with her pen and ruler.	Task – Clue 7
	1	Extremely low	P2 showed no engagement with the group discussion. She stared into space for the whole of the observed period.	Task – Group conclusion
	1	Extremely low	P2 did not engage with group answer. PG spent the whole of the observed period staring into space.	Sharing to whole class
	4	high	P1 volunteered to read the WALT out to the class. When the teacher was talking he was looking at the teacher and responding to the teachers questions.	Introduction
	5	Extremely	P1 appeared to be on task. He kept his eyes on the papers and read for the whole time he was supposed to be-	Task-

		high	even reading things twice. He kept his head down and was engaged with his work and did not get distracted. (Note that the child was sitting next to a window)	Reading/Discussing Biography
5	EH		P1 stood up to retrieve the clue. He read the clue to the rest of the group and openly gave his opinions. He listened to others well. (Note that he is the only boy on the table)	Clue 1...
5	EH		P1 takes the clue of the child who went to retrieve it. He gives his opinion with a reason.	Clue 2...
			A child in the group retrieved the clue. The group read the <u>task</u> .	Clue 3...
			The child was sat back in his <u>chair</u> , he looked at me (E.L) then suddenly took the clue off another child and read it. At this point E.L moved away from the child as I felt I was not getting a true observation	Clue 4...
			The child would stand up to read the clue. He then sat in his seat away from the group and read the <u>spiderman</u> bio independently. He discussed the clue, occasionally disagreeing with the group.	Clue 6...
			Measuring clue- The child was not listening to his group. He was spinning a piece of paper around on the table. When the group was stuck he snatched the clue and read it independently. He then <u>solve</u> the <u>maths</u> problem independently and told his group how he did it.	Clue 7...
			When the teacher was telling the class who it was. P1 was swinging on his chair only partially listening. When the teacher directly spoke to the child, P1 would not look at the teacher or make eye contact. When giving his prediction in front of the class P1 gave silly answers, he was laughing and looking around at his class mates-possibly for a reaction?	End of lesson.

Appendix J

Interview- school 3

Q.1 What was the most enjoyable part of the lesson?

3- Solving the questions

1- Predicting which one was the suspect

2- When Mr KJ told us who it was

Q.2 Do you like collaborating in a group? Why/Why not?

3 & 2- Yea, because you get more help

1- No I would rather work in a pair so it would be harder

Q.3 What are the pros and cons of working in a group?

3 & 1- when people disagree

2- No answer given

Q.4 Do you find it easier to complete work when you are working in a group or individually? Why do you think this?

1- Individually so then you would not talk so much so less distraction

3- Working in a group because you get more help instead of struggling by yourself

2- No answer given

Q.5 How would you react if your group did not acknowledge your ideas?

1- Um, just go with it

3- Get angry

2- Um, don't know (Mr KJ tries prompting PGP)

Q.6 Would you prefer having set roles in a group, or not having any roles? Why?

1- for the Teacher to say otherwise there might be an argument about who would go up

3- Chose amongst ourselves

2- (Mr KJ tries prompting PGP) Same as Thomas

Q.7 Did the Thinking Hats help your group focus on the task?

3- Yea some of us used it as a help

2- Not many used it

1- Our group did not use it

Q.8 Do you think you were engaged with the activity because it was fun, or because you were working in a group?

All- Because it was fun

Q.9 How can the lesson be improved if I was to teach the same lesson again?

1- Making the questions harder and changing the suspects

2 & 3- same as 1

Q.10 Put the following in order of what is the most important to have in a lesson to help you engage with the learning:

- Relationship with teacher

- Enjoyment of activity
- Easiness or difficulty of task
- Collaborating in a group

3 & 2- First would be enjoyment of the task

1- First would be difficulty, so then you get to work harder

3 & 2- add to 1 also a little bit more difficult also

(Mr KJ tries prompting P2)

2 - Working as a group next

3- Same as 2

(Miss EL asked the pupils "Where do the others come, do you think the relationship with your teacher is important? No can I ask why?")

1- No, because you like a teacher or you don't

(Miss EL asked the pupils "If you like the teacher does that make you try harder with your work?")

1- No

(Miss EL asked the pupils 2 & 3 "What about you?"- Same as P1