

**What is the impact of the strategy ‘See 3 before me’
in learners’ engagement within a foundation phase
class, which is participating within a continuous
provision task?**

	<u>Targed/Target</u>	<u>Yr hyn yr wyf wedi'i wneud yn yr aseiniad hwn.</u> <u>What I have done in this assignment.</u>
<u>Targed/Target 1</u>	Ensure that every opportunity to make explicit critical comments in relation to Lit. is taken.	<i>I have aimed to take a critical stance in my references to literature by providing a context to how the arguments were observed.</i>
<u>Targed/Target 2</u>	Continue to set strategies to address previously identified targets.	<i>I have set out to continue my targets from the past two assignments where I had to argue both sides to particular points and use paraphrasing.</i>
<u>Targed/Target 3</u>	Continue to proofread with care to maintain the accuracy and fluency of your expression	<i>I have proofread my own work thoroughly a number of times but also asked for others to read through my work and provide any recommendations or alterations I could consider.</i>

Introduction

“High-engagement classroom environments appear to have a significant impact on student achievement” (Wiliam, D, 2018, p.92). With this in mind, our research aims to justify whether a particular strategy, ‘see 3 before me’ can impact the engagement of learners on a continuous provision task in the foundation phase (FP). The early years settings approach pedagogy differently to Key stage 2, a much-discussed aspect in education in Wales at present. The implementation of continuous or enhanced areas where independent learning takes place in the form of challenge tasks or practical activities is one that has been highly

praised and offers a different interpretation to the 'traditional' methods of teaching. My PTE1 block 2 class has adopted these policies, and following my time in Key stage 2, I felt it would be fascinating to research the engagement levels that learners have within these areas.

Research Context

In my school, referred to as 'school 2' during this assignment, I was placed within a year 2 class of 24 pupils. There are some strategies put in place in ensuring engagement, however predominantly the learners are timetabled within areas and expected to complete their task within the time they are set in that area. Meanwhile, my research partner's school, 'School 1', use the strategy 'see 3 before me' continuously in the year 2 classroom. We decided that researching the impact of this strategy could provide an interesting set of results due to the differences between the both classes.

The strategy is implemented using three steps, firstly, the learner must '*think*' of how to complete the task independently. Secondly, they can *ask as friend or peer* to aid in providing guidance, and finally they can use the '*help desk*', which includes a variety of resources they can use in completing their challenge. We did contemplate investigating the influence of the strategy by judging the participants' attempted work on task. However, due to the range of activities that continuous provision (CP) provides, we felt assessing the engagement levels would provide a more accurate outlook to our research. Therefore, our research investigates what the impact of the strategy 'see 3 before me' has on learners' engagement in a foundation phase class, which is participating within a continuous provision (CP) task.

Literature Review

In consideration of literature, our main influence on our area of research stems from Successful Futures by Professor Graham Donaldson (2015) in his review that nursery and primary school leaders found the foundation phase pedagogy a significant strength of education in Wales. With this in mind, the suggestion has been put forward for this approach to be adopted through Key stage 2. Some schools that have adopted the philosophy are "finding success in increasing children and young people's engagement and creativity" (Donaldson, 2015, p. 87). Therefore, our research aims to examine the reasons behind the increased engagement of learners on independent tasks, with consideration of whether strategies are a positive part of the FP pedagogy.

In examining why engagement is vital to learners in schools, Turner et al express that, "Engagement is critical for academic learning" (Turner et al quoted in Stefanou et al, 2004,

p.97). Fredricks et al (2004) expand on this thought as they suggest that learning engagement is even more crucial during the early years of teaching as it can provide an early indicator of students dropping out of education. Therefore, the engagement of learners needs to be something embedded within pedagogy from an early age. Fredricks et al (2004) elaborate further about engagement and how it can be factored into three categories; behavioural, emotional and cognitive. They describe how behaviour engagement would be linked to participation in a task, emotional engagement in how they interact with peers or teachers in the environment, and cognitive engagement considers the level of investment and effort demonstrated to utilise skills needed to complete challenges. These three areas of engagement overlap throughout learning and were demonstrated throughout our lesson studies.

Teaching strategies and approaches would need to be a consideration of how engagement can be achieved from the learners. When considering the use of strategies in teaching, Riding and Rayner explain that a strategy is a “set of one or more procedures that an individual acquires to facilitate the performance on a learning task” (Riding and Rayner, 1998 quoted in Hewitt, 2008, p.19). Vermunt (1998) is of the belief that it is more effective to teach students to use self-regulated strategies as they can construct their own mental learning model. ‘See 3 before me’ provides the opportunity for learners to become further independent in their own continuous provision, and develop the skills to become self-efficient. Brown and Ferrera (1985) provide a different perspective, arguing that this approach will only benefit the higher attaining pupils, meaning the poorer learners will need extra support. Dweck (1999) also considers the term ‘*learned helplessness*’ where failure may lead to negative implications for the self and influence their ability to use their own minds in completing a task.

The arguments made above must be considered primarily in regards to the first step of the strategy, ‘*thinking time*’. This step encourages the learner to attempt the task themselves using their own understanding and knowledge, before using other available resources. Fisher (2008) argues that the quality of thinking skills influences the quality of life and learning throughout. He continues to argue that it is vital that everyone is intellectually developed as this is intrinsic for human development. Weinstein et al (2000) acknowledge cognitive engagement in describing the learner as a unique individual who is at the core in bringing their own personality, prior knowledge and previous achievements into their learning. These arguments provided strong evidence of encouraging ‘*think*’ to be the first step of the strategy that the learners should use in ensuring they are aiming to develop the skills needed throughout their educational lives.

The '*working with/asking a friend*' step can be linked to many aspects of theory involving educational learning. The social context, in contrast to the individual or environmental influences, is argued by Vygotsky who believed that "the social context in which a child develops is central to the process of learning" (Hewitt, 2008, p.5). Vygotsky's 'zone of proximal development', as Lloyd and Fernyhough (1999) mention, provides evidence of potential gaps in a learner's competence in a task or activity when they receive help from a 'more knowledgeable other' (MKO). Vygotsky's theories link to behavioural and emotional engagement in how the learner becomes a participant and their actions can be influenced by those around them. Kumpulainen and Wray (2002) explain how the interactions in peer groups give the learners opportunity to engage in productive classroom communication and learning. With this thought, working with a friend or peer not only encourages production, but engagement with what the learners are challenged to complete. A potential flaw of the social and collaborative step is that learners may only focus on how best to complete a task, rather than learners engaging in joint problem solving where their skills and engagement are shown (Kumpulainen and Wray, 2002). Therefore, the learners may seem engage, however their intentions could be different to what is perceived.

The final step of the strategy of using resources via a 'help desk' relates to one of Donaldson's (2015) twelve pedagogical principles that teachers should undertake a 'blend of approaches' to their pedagogy. He describes that learners should be given different contexts where they can demonstrate their skills in unfamiliar settings to work independently. In encouragement of engagement for this particular step, a range of approaches should be provided including verbal and practical demonstrative techniques to fully engage the learners (Gipps et al, 2000). Therefore, the help desk in this research would provide an alternative form of engaging with CP tasks for the participants.

Methodology

For the research a lesson study approach using observation notes, interview questions and evaluation forms were used. Peter Dudley first introduced the lesson study approach in the UK in 2001. Dudley (2014) explains that a lesson study entails specific research in the classroom environment which aids in teachers developing their own practice. Ross Archer (2016) agrees in the approach being beneficial to student teachers as it provides an opportunity to have an active approach in reflecting on any challenges that may occur in the classroom. The lesson study approach provided the motivation and encouragement for my

research partner and I to analyse and reflect on our own practice, drawing to theory and research from elsewhere (Furlong, 2015).

For the observation notes, we had to consider which of the qualitative or quantitative approach to undertake. As lesson study results usually provide longer term evidence, we felt the quantitative approach of data collection would be most beneficial in comparing the outcomes from both schools. The quantitative approach provided, as Barnham (2015) explains, a 'representation' of facts derived from the behaviours and actions that occur. He continues to explain that the 'copied' information from the observation could then be utilised in judgement of whether the facts are indeed 'true'. This would be beneficial in our case as we were using data approaches such as tally charts and scales in measuring the engagement in CP tasks of the participants. Furthermore, we agreed that the non-participant approach should be undertaken for the observation as Kumar (2014) explains that being a passive observer can aid in drawing immediate conclusions on what has been witnessed or heard during the research.

The observation notes (*LS1 Appendix A and LS2 Appendix G*) predominantly included tick boxes of when the strategy was used, and what particular steps of the strategy were undertaken. We aimed to have enough questions and considerations for the observer to retain the information heavily relating to the research question. The use of a Leuven scale was a valuable tool when considering engagement and involvement in a task. Leuven scales are used in measuring the involvement and wellbeing of learners within their environment, assessing any aspects that could be preventing the child or young person achieving deeper learning. Laevers and Declercq (2018) explain how involvement is shown in how children are absorbed or fascinated by a task, and how they engage within these challenges to the limits of their capabilities.

Following the observation, we planned interview questions (*LS1 Appendix C and LS2 Appendix H*) to discuss with the three participants. Due to the younger ages of the learners, we felt a group interview would be the appropriate approach as "it encourages interaction between the group rather than simply a response to an adult's question" (Cohen et al, 2011, p.433). This approach was more inclined with a qualitative method as the semi-structured interview provided the opportunity to use probing questions where the participants viewpoints and reasoning could be explained. Hitchcock and Hughes (1989, quoted in Cohen et al, 2011, p.223) explain that "in naturalistic enquiry it is possible to formulate a more detailed set of stages that can be followed". Therefore, the discussion would feel natural, with the participants providing honest and insightful feedback to their actions of the

observation. To summarise our interview approach (Cohen et al, 2011, p.436) explain that, “it is from the interaction of the group, the data emerges”

For reflecting on the lesson study, we used the ‘Assisted Reflective Conclusions’ (ARC) model to discuss our findings immediately on the day of the research. We completed an ARC, (*shown in LS1 Appendix D and LS2 Appendix J*), following both research lessons to ensure we could compare and contrast our thoughts and feelings of both studies. We felt this was important to reflect together as Pring (2000) explains how a ‘public’ reflection activity can aid in scrutinising and questioning the observation that had been taken. This particularly benefitted our reflection on Lesson Study 1, where we planned to consider any alterations or adjustments that would need to be made in preparation for Lesson Study 2. In further consideration of this, we felt it was important for both teacher and observer to undertake their own reflection, in providing further evidence to the overall results of the observation and interview processes.

The focus group of participants involved in the lesson studies were chosen on levels of attainment. We felt that our overarching question would be relatable to all pupils in the classroom, as all learners experience enhanced and continuous provisions throughout the school day. We believed that applying a range of attainment levels to the research study could provide the results of whether concepts, such as Dweck’s learned helplessness, were indeed true for CP areas. When deciding which three pupils to participate, we considered their daily attitudes and contributions to the classroom environment. All participants were randomly selected on attainment, following the submission of the consent forms.

Ethical Considerations

Before carrying out the research, we had to contemplate the situated ethical considerations that need to be interpreted in the particular environments we were placed (Simons and Usher, 2000, cited in Cohen et al, 2011). We ensured we understood and valued the ethical considerations in completing an ethics form. In accordance to BERA guidelines (2018), we assured the anonymity of all participants and schools involved throughout our research. We also contemplated the risks to all participants and observers, including the pressure of being involved or the potential of any allegations being made. In avoiding any risks occurring, we continually acted professionally and calmly, reassuring the participant that their actions and contributions would be natural with no consequences or judgement being made.

Before carrying out any research, we distributed letters of information and consent forms for parents to provide permission for their children to take part (*Appendix M*). The informed consent provided protection and respect for the observers, but also some responsibility to the participant if anything were to go wrong (Cohen et al, 2011). In clarifying information to the participants, we explained thoroughly the process of the observation and interview, elaborating further on why the research is taking place. We also assured the learners that they could withdraw at any point. Following this explanation, the learners signed assent forms to ensure they were comfortable with the process and happy to participate (*Appendix M, assent forms*).

Lesson Study results and analysis

As previously mentioned, our research was conducted via two lesson studies with the overall participation of six year 2 pupils. For this next section, I will be explaining the results we gathered from both studies. I will firstly review 'Lesson study 1' (LS1), by referring to the classroom context, observation notes and interview answers that are shown in '*LS1 appendices*'. I will then discuss 'Lesson Study 2' (LS2), using similar resources from the '*LS2 appendices*' document.

LS1 was conducted within a class of 24 year 2 pupils. The lesson study occurred on a Friday morning, approximately beginning at 9:20am, ending approximately after an hour. The class were split into three mixed ability groups. Two of the groups were led on focus tasks, one by my research partner, the other by the class teacher. Meanwhile, the third group included three of the research participants that were placed in the independent areas. As previously mentioned, the three participants were selected on levels of attainment, Child A being of lower, Child B middle, and Child C of higher attainment.

In CP of school 1, the learners had the choice of which challenge they are tasked to complete. As an extra motivation for the learners participating in provision areas, the class had a 'challenge book winner' decided on a Friday afternoon by the class teacher. The learners clearly knew that during the week they had to complete all challenges by Friday lunchtime in order to have a chance of winning this reward. The classroom was generally quite small, however there were 8 planned continuous provision tasks (*LS1 Appendix E*) that were all closely located to one another (*LS1 Appendix F*). The classroom layout, as shown in this appendix, demonstrates the help desk's position. It is permanently placed near some of the activities, however does seem further away from the carpet area where majority of the independent tasks were situated.

Before all learners were sent to their focus or CP tasks, they were reminded of 'see 3 before me' by the teacher (my research partner). The majority of learners showed good recollection of the strategy, with many contributing to the discussion of the steps and what they included. As the groups were sent to their respective areas, all learners of the group on CP, including the three participants, firstly collected their challenge books. Following this, Child A and Child B discussed, for approximately a minute, which task to attend. Meanwhile, Child C immediately went to the imaginative story writing task and sat with a friend at the continuous work desk (*shown in LS1 Appendix F*).

Throughout the entire lesson, Child A and B worked collaboratively. They firstly participated in the role play area, alongside another peer, and seemed engaged by acting out the intended roles that were required. I observed this involvement as a 'high' on the Leuven scale (*LS1 Appendix A*) as the learners were discussing the task and, working collaboratively to complete the challenge. This group of three pupils, including Child A and B, then moved on to the 'Gloria Globe' CP area where they worked collaboratively on the extension task of completing a jigsaw. The learners were even further engaged in this challenge, achieving 'extremely high' on the Leuven scale (*LS1 Appendix A*). Their engagement was demonstrated through the continued discussion of who had what piece and a willingness to complete the task by the end of the lesson. In consideration of the strategy, they continually asked one another for help, however they did not attend the help desk on any occasion. Due to finding some difficulty, Child A did ask myself (the observer) for some support to complete the challenge (*LS1 Appendix B*). I provided some support, however did use questioning such as, "what else could you do?" to determine whether the learner considered different options, perhaps related to the strategy.

The interview then provided the opportunity for further examination of the observation notes, scrutinising on whether some accurate presumptions were made. Child A was very confident in explaining what 'see 3 before me' entailed (*LS1 Appendix C1*) and had a clear understanding of what they needed to do on the activities. Child B seemed more unsure, however did also explain the strategy well (*LS1 Appendix C2*). Later in the interview, when utilising probing questions to ask about the help desk, Child B responded saying, "I wouldn't use it anyway" (*LS1 Appendix C2*). Child A then said they'd forgotten what the help desk was, despite describing accurately earlier in the interview (*LS1 Appendix C1*). Child A, however did remember that they skipped one part of the strategy in asking myself, the observer, for some help. Both participants however did acknowledge and seem adamant that they preferred working together in completing their challenges on CP tasks.

Child C was involved in three different challenges during the lesson. Firstly, writing an imaginative story at the CP desk. During this task, they were alongside friends and discussing, however this predominantly seemed like social discussion rather than about the task at hand. Despite this, Child C was clearly engaged in the task, producing a lot of written work, predominantly using the 'think' part of 'see 3 before me'. As shown in the Leuven scale (*LS1 Appendix A*), Child C achieved an 'extremely high' amount of engagement in all three tasks they participated in. One interesting observation in regarding Child C was when they explained and aided a friend in completing the fact file task. This displayed an example of the 'More knowledgeable other', as referred to earlier, and it provided the support in the peer engaging with their challenge. As shown in the interview notes (*Appendix C3*), Child C recognised that their friend would not have completed the task without their help. The evidence demonstrated also shows that Child C has a very strong awareness of the strategy and the steps it includes. In addition to the comments made by Child A and Child B, Child C also felt working with a friend was the most positive part of the strategy, but in contrast they did feel they would use the help desk if some extra resources were provided.

In preparation for LS2, my research partner and I ensured we made some slight adjustments. In reflection (*LS1 Appendix D*), we felt we needed to ensure further reminders of the strategy were used, aiming at a minimum of four to five times. Another adjustment would be to cater the help desk with relevant resources to the activities the learners would be completing. We determined these outcomes from the comments made throughout the interview notes (*LS1 Appendix C*) and consideration of the different routine that my class in school 2 would provide.

Identically, LS2 took place in a year 2 class of 24 pupils. Contrasting to that of LS1, the classroom is shared with the Year 1 class of 16 pupils, therefore providing a different environment to that of LS1. The study took place on a Monday morning, with the lesson duration at approximately 50 minutes, beginning at 9:20am. The beginning of a new week provided new CP tasks and activities (*LS2 Appendix K*), that were explained to all learners in the classroom. Alongside explanation of the tasks, the strategy of 'see 3 before me' was explained to the year 2 pupils, with a discussion about what each step included, and a demonstration of what resources were on the help desk.

In contrast to the classroom of LS1, where learners are given a choice of what CP tasks they can engage with, the learners of LS2 were timetabled to CP areas. The smaller nature of the classroom of LS2 meant the learners were set into CP groups of mixed attainment but also of age, with year 1 and 2 pupils together placed together. These groups would then follow

the timetable, meaning they were placed at particular CP tasks during the school day, rotating throughout the week.

The three participants chosen for the research study included, Child A (higher), Child B (middle) and Child C (lower). Child A and B are part of the same CP group and were timetabled to the 'Maths' tasks for this particular lesson. Meanwhile, Child C was timetabled with fellow peers on the 'Table top' challenge. Despite being in different areas, the participants were in proximity of one another (*LS2 Appendix L*) aiding my research partner observing. Child A immediately showed engagement with the task of 'greater and less than', demonstrating the use of 'think'. The observation notes (*LS2 Appendix G, question 2b*) clarify the use demonstrating understanding and working out skills. On the contrary, Child B, took a longer time to engage with the task. They skipped the first step of the strategy and decided to ask Child A for support. Child B therefore was not engaged in the task to begin with, however the utilisation of step 2 of 'see 3 before me' demonstrate an increase in motivation (*LS2 Appendix G, question 2b*). Subsequent to this action, in the interview Child B acknowledged this action confirming they did not use think time but then explained that "child A told me what to do" (*Appendix H2, question 4*). Child A meanwhile, explained the strategy very well and also elaborated further on the task they had to complete (*Appendix H1, question 1 and 2*), also confirming that helping Child B was a positive for both learners.

On the table top task, Child C demonstrated immediate engagement in the task through the 'think' step of the strategy. The engagement was obvious to the observer who shows how Child C had 'high' involvement on the Leuven scale (*Appendix G, question 6*). Child C also demonstrated a combination of both the 'think' and 'asking a friend' steps in their completion of the task. Working with a peer, Child C explained how they would look at the pictures and find the animals as their friend wrote down the answer. In the interview session, Child C mentions how they believe that 'working together' is their favourite part of the strategy (*LS2 Appendix H3, question 3*). In advance of their actions, Child C explained that they enjoyed the structure of the strategy and felt it was beneficial to completing their challenge in the lesson (*LS2, Appendix H3, question 4*). Child C, being of lower attainment, is an example of discounting Dweck's idea of learned helplessness, as they seemingly enjoyed having, firstly, the independence to work, then adjusting to working alongside a peer in enhancing their learning experience.

In regards to other actions during the lesson study, there were two occasions where the learners skipped a step. After completing their task, Child A and B skipped checking the help desk and asked me, the class teacher, what else they could do. The help desk did include

some extra resources the learners could have used, however the learners only used this when reminded it was there. This also occurred with Child C following the completion of their task who then used the help desk, following a reminder, to self-assess their own work. Child A and B clearly stated in the interview (*LS2 Appendix H1 and H2*) that they did find the help desk beneficial and suggested a number of different resources they would like to see available. Child C felt the help desk wasn't necessarily useful for this particular lesson, however they did feel it could be useful if there were extension activities such as, number formation sheets, that could be used.

Following the study, in our reflections (*LS2 Appendix J*) we clearly state how we felt the strategy did help the learners engage with their task. We mention how there is an increase in motivation in the tasks and the collaboratively working of the learners was apparent throughout the lesson. The collaborative working aspect was the most predominant result witnessed from both lesson studies, with engagement of the participants seeming highly influenced by who they were working with.

Reflection

The results of our lesson studies provided some very interesting conclusions. Overall, all participants demonstrated examples of engagement, with the observations being able to record non-verbal, natural behaviours of the participants producing longitudinal analysis (Bailey, 1994 cited in Cohen et al, 2011). The results gathered from the lesson studies demonstrate clearly that the learners were thoroughly endorsing the concept of 'working with a friend' and completing tasks collaboratively. The example of MKO by Child C in LS1 elaborates on Hattie's (2008) point how peer tutoring provides an excellent method of encouraging learners to become their own teachers. LS2 also demonstrated an example in Child B asking for support from Child A to complete the task. The strategy in this case seemed successful as we reflected that Child B may not have been able to engage in the task if it were not for the second step of asking a friend (*LS2 Appendix J2, box 3*). However, there is the possibility that this example provides potential evidence of Kumpulainen and Wray's point that suggests the learners, particularly Child B in this case, were not fully engaged in developing their own skills and understanding, but only to complete the task to move on to a different area.

A further result of the studies was the influence of repetition on learners use of the strategy. LS1 produced four total uses of the strategy, a surprising disparity to the seventeen of LS2. Both observations provided tally charts (*LS1 Appendix A and LS2 Appendix G*) in

demonstrating how LS1 only had the small reminder at the beginning of the lesson, meanwhile, LS2 had at last five reminders for the participants to use the strategy. Gipps et al (2000), reference from their study that several teachers find constant reminders of important points vital to their learners' engagement. Our results prove that repetition during a lesson clearly does influence engagement, not only with the strategy, but the task itself.

The final outcome that I feel should be highly considered is the fact introduction of something fresh or new can immediately impact the engagement of learners. LS1 participants were familiar with the 'see 3 before me' strategy, meanwhile the fresh introduction and thorough explanation enlightened the learners of LS2. The importance of introducing fresh and new approaches to the classroom links to Donaldson's (2015) point in that children arrive at school with different aspirations, interests and experiences, learning in their own individual way. The freedom of approaches must provide the engaging experiences that match the children's needs (Donaldson, 2015, p. 67). The participants of LS1 generally seemed happy with the strategy, however on this occasion did not use it as often. This could be argued due to the help desk needing new resources or a different strategy offering a fresh perspective to learning.

Conclusion

In conclusion of the research project, there are many strengths and limitations that we must consider. The main strengths that we witnessed were the non-participant approach providing detailed observation notes to refer back to. This aided our reflections where we felt we could reflect and act immediately on any alterations that were needed. We demonstrated this (*LS1 Appendix D*) when we adapted particular approaches in preparation for LS2. This particularly aided in my preparation for the enhanced activities, ensuring all aspects of the tasks were clear for learners.

The interviews were another factor which went really well and provided some interesting thoughts and results. I felt as researchers we followed the point of Arksey and Knight (1999, cited in Cohen et al, 2011), in establishing trust with the participants and ensuring they felt comfortable not to over-react. I felt we adapted to using appropriate language and an enjoyable approach resulting in the learners being able to understand and contribute. All participants involved displayed attributes that are accustomed to the four purposes that the new curriculum for Wales proposes for children and young people to achieve. I personally felt the encouraging feedback (*LS1 Appendix C and LS1 Appendix H*) the learners provided regarding the strategy would also aid in my future approach as a teacher. The learners

provided some insights, such as having number formation practice sheets on the help desk (*LS2 Appendix H3, questions 6 and 7*), that I would not have considered had the interviews not been carried out.

A limitation we considered following the results is that it was a small study with only one observer for both lesson studies. Cohen et al (2011, p.459) share that observations are 'inevitably selective' and depend on the observer's attention to carry out the observational instruments and data collection tools. For our research, having extra observers could have provided more thorough results regarding each participant's individual actions. It could have also provided a different perspective that may have influenced further questioning in the interviews. Having only the one observer for our lesson studies did provide positive data, however this could have been useful to compare between further researchers.

Recommendations

If I were to carry out the lesson study again, I would ensure that it is carried out at the same time during a school week. I felt the clear difference of LS1 pupils being fully aware and understanding of their challenges, did influence the amount of times the strategy was used. LS2 meanwhile, demonstrated how new activities and tasks meant the strategy was used thoroughly and repeatedly throughout the lesson, with every step being utilised by most participants.

If I had the opportunity to carry out the lesson study again, I would also consider the position of the help desk in the classroom. The help desk in LS1 was further to the back of the classroom, potentially difficult to attend by the pupils. The help desk in LS2 was accessible in a larger space and near all our participants of research. The positioning of resources, in our case the help desk, could provide differing results in a future lesson study and also be influential in the engagement of learners with their CP tasks.

In summary, I felt the lesson study did encourage a personal change in attitude to professional learning, especially impacting my own confidence as a teacher through the collaborative professional dialogue that I had with my research partner (Godfrey et al, 2019). I also feel the research has provided an opportunity to witness, as Hattie (2008) suggests, when learning is not taking place through engagement, and as a result of this, I can adapt strategies, such as 'see 3 before me' in order for the learners to achieve their learning goals on continuous provision tasks.

Reference List

- Archer, R. (2016) 'Lesson study in initial teacher education: students' positioning analysed through the lens of Figured Worlds', Adams, G (ed.), *Proceedings of the British Society for Research into Learning Mathematics*. Vol. 36, issue 1 (pp. 13-18).
- Barnham, C. (2015) 'Quantitative and qualitative research', *International Journal of Market Research*, Vol. 57, issue 6 (pp. 837 – 855).
- British Educational Research Association [BERA] (2018) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*, fourth edition, London.
- Brown, A.L. and Ferrera, R.A. (1985) Diagnosing zones of proximal development, in J.V. Wertsch (ed), *Culture, Communication and Cognition: Vygotskian Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University press.
- Cohen, L., Manion, K. and Morison, K.R.B. (2011) *Research Methods in Education* 7th ed. London; New York: Routledge.
- Donaldson, G. (2015) *Successful Futures*. Crown Copyright. Cardiff.
- Dudley, P. (2014) *Lesson Study: a handbook*. (Online - Accessed via free download at: <https://lessonstudy.co.uk/lesson-study-a-handbook/> last accessed: 19/2/20)
- Dweck, Carol S. (1999) *Self-theories: their role in motivation, personality and development*, Philadelphia: Psychology Press.
- Fisher, R. (2008) *Teacher Thinking: Philosophical enquiry in the classroom*. (3rd ed). London: Continuum.
- Fredricks, J.A., Blumenfeld, P. C., and Paris, A. H. (2004) 'School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence', *Review of Educational research*, Vol. 74, issue 1. (pp. 59-109).
- Gipps, C.V., McCallum, B. and Hargreave, E. (2000) *What makes a good primary school teacher? Expert classroom strategies*. London: Routledge.
- Godfrey, D., Seleznyov, S., Anders, J., Wollaston, N., and Barrera-Pedemonte, F. (2019) 'A developmental evaluation approach to lesson study: exploring the impact of lesson study in London schools', *Professional Development in Education*, Vol. 45, issue 2.
- Hattie, J. (2012) *Visible learning for teachers: maximising impact on learners*, London, Routledge.
- Hewitt, D. (2008), *Understanding effective learning: strategies for the classroom*, Maidenhead: McGraw-Hill Open University Press.
- Kumar, R. (2014) *Research Methodology*, London: Sage.
- Kumpulainen, K. and Wray, D. (2002) *Classroom Interaction and Social learning: From theory to practice*. London: Routledge/Falmer.
- Laevers, F. and Declercq, B. How well-being and involvement fit into the commitment of children's rights, *European Journal of Education: Research, Development and policy*. Vol.53, Issue 3, pp.325-335.
- Lloyd, P. and Fernyhough, C. (1999) *Lev Vygotsky: Critical assessments, Volume 4*. Taylor and Francis.

Pollard, A. (2002) *Readings for reflective teaching*. London: Continuum.

Stefanou, C.R., Perencevich, K.C., DiCintio, M., and Turner, J.C., (2004), 'Supporting Autonomy in the Classroom: Ways Teachers Encourage Student Decision Making and Ownership.' *Educational Psychologist*, Vol. 39, Issue 2. (pp. 97-110).

Vermunt, J.D. (1998) 'The regulation of constructive learning processes', *British journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 68 (pp. 149 -171).

Weinstein, C.E., Husman, J and Dieking, D.R. (2000) 'Self-regulation interventions with a focus on learning strategies, in M. Borkowski (ed.) *Handbook of Self-regulation*. New York: Academic press.

William, D. (2018) *Embedded Formative Assessment*, 2nd edition, Bloomington, Indiana: Solution tree press.