

Student name:	Tyler Zupic	Student ID number:	1801205
Programme:	Secondary PGCE English		
Module:	Principles of Teaching, Learning and Pedagogy in the Secondary Sector		
Module code:	ECSP6001	Contribution to Overall Module Assessment (%):	50%
Lecturer:	Alison S Evans	Internal Verifier:	
Assignment Title:	Part B, (i) and (ii)	Word count (or equivalent):	(i) = 1,500 (ii) = 2,000
Submission deadline:	26 November 2018	Return date of provisional marks & written feedback:	17 December 2018

This essay will focus on the theories that informed my decisions for the micro teach and I will also evaluate and reflect on the choices I made.

Literature Review

I used the Curriculum for Wales (Welsh Government Learning Wales, 2016) to inform my decision about teaching sentence types to Level 5 pupils as this is one area that pupils did not successfully accomplish. The correct usage of different sentence types would make the Level 5 that pupils were gaining in their writing task more secure and would further push them higher up in the band.

Behaviourism within the classroom assumes the learner to be passive. The teacher plays a central role as knowledge is believed to be within the teacher and passed onto the learners (Richardson, 1996). Biesta's learner paradox supports and justifies the behaviourist view of the teacher as a giver of knowledge as he argues 'If you don't know what you're looking for, how can you look for it? (Biesta, 2012, p. 40). It emphasises that a learner cannot be expected for example, to use a metaphor, if they have no understanding of what a metaphor is. This is also suggested by the argument put forth by Kirschner, Sweller and Clark (2006) who believe that minimal guidance during instruction is not always effective. The behaviourist view therefore informed my planning for the part of the lesson in which I used teacher-led instruction to teach new information. The rules of sentence types were identified, explained, and understood. The transferral of knowledge early on was vital to ensure following tasks involving the sentence type knowledge was accessible.

This also links to the idea of knowledge as if the focus is on the teacher giving information to pupils, then the teacher must have a sound knowledge of what is being taught (Coe et al, 2014). It is vital that new information taught is completely correct, as if it is not, incorrect information is passed onto pupils which will have a detrimental effect on pupils' future learning. This informed my planning for the whole lesson to ensure that any sentence types I spoke about or gave as examples were correct and followed the specific sentence type rule.

In contrast to behaviourism, the theoretical stance of constructivism and social constructivism puts knowledge not in the teacher, but in learners themselves (constructivism) and is built upon through interaction with others (social constructivism) (Amineh and Asl, 2015). Constructivist theorist Piaget (1929) believes that people make meaning themselves through self-exploration. This way, new information is self-discovered and old knowledge is built upon. This can cause problems for learners that construct knowledge incorrectly as if this incorrect knowledge is not immediately corrected, learners will continue to use the incorrect information further. A positive advance from constructivism is social constructivism where emphasis is also on the learner but learning here happens through social interactions with others. This can be seen as advantageous to learners as there is not only one person's knowledge being used, but instead there are multiple which can introduce new ways of thinking. That being said, as aforementioned, the meaning found can be incorrect which can be detrimental for future learning. Although social constructivism does have its drawbacks, this view informed my planning for the starter activity in which pupils used a think, pair, share activity to work out what sentence types were used and why, before being told the rules. I chose this to try and uncover any prior knowledge in pairs, as if done individually, pupils may not have been able to succeed if they had no knowledge of sentence types. I also used it for a group quiz in which learners constructed their own sentences using newly learned rules for the first time, again, as more knowledge and understanding is often

present form a group than individually. Pupils could therefore construct sentences and rectify misunderstandings together instead of having incorrect answers and not knowing why.

Differentiation is used by teachers to accommodate all learners in the class so that all have the best chance of learning. This takes place through resources, support, and task etc (Dunn and Darlington, 2016). This idea is extended by Allison and Tharby (2015) that point out how the emphasis for differentiation should focus on students of all levels. This links to Vygotsky's (1978) theory of challenge that states the brain learns best when there is a challenge, but over challenging will lead to stress and is in turn not effective. A learner needs to be put into the zone of proximal development, a place in which a learner can do something with guidance, to allow for this challenge to work (Shabani and Khatib and Ebadi, 2010). Therefore, through differentiation by task in which all pupils are challenged, all pupils should be in the zone of proximal development as they are challenged enough for their own ability. Whilst differentiation is useful in making sure pupils of all levels are challenged, like William and Leahy (2015) argue, teachers need to approach differentiation with caution because differentiation often assumes what a pupil is capable of, which may not be the case. Differentiation informed my planning to ensure that all pupils were challenged. I therefore differentiated through specific roles in a group task. Pupils were low Level 5's with two Level 6's, therefore I chose to appoint the Level 6 pupils as the 'police' of the group. It was assumed they would have a better grasp of the knowledge just learned than the Level 5 learners. For that reason, the Level 6 pupils were put in control of checking and rectifying mistakes when the different sentence types were constructed in groups. Level five pupils were still challenged as they had to use newly learned knowledge to create their own sentences.

Another theory is that of mindsets by Dweck (2007) that explains the fixed and growth mindset. A fixed mindset is the idea that knowledge and intelligence is innate and fixed. Contrastingly, the mindset that teachers want pupils to adopt is the growth mindset. This is the idea that knowledge and ability is not fixed and improvements can always be made as knowledge can be enhanced (Dweck, 2007). If pupils adopt a growth mindset, they are more likely to understand that hard work and failure is part of learning (Allison and Tharby 2015). This attitude of not being able to do something 'yet' is advantageous in the classroom as pupils are more likely to accept and try hard when faced with challenge. This means that in the classroom, teachers should encourage pupils to have a growth mindset so that they are motivated and strive to do better. This further links to the idea of teachers having high expectations of all students all of the time as it is argued that a reliable driver of student achievement is high expectations placed upon pupils by their teachers (Allison and Tharby, 2015). This suggests that by having high expectations of pupils, they in turn believe they are capable and will often achieve these expectations, known as the 'Pygmalion effect' (Rosenthal and Jacobson, 2003). The theory of growth mindsets and high expectations informed my idea of telling pupils my high expectations even though the upcoming work is difficult and that they should keep trying even if they get incorrect answers. I wanted to ensure that I was positive and encouraging towards pupils so that they in turn felt positive and motivated.

Linked to mindsets is praise within the classroom. Stan (2012) argues that using praise can increase self-esteem within a learner which can positively change their academic performance. Praise can assist the learner in believing in their own ability which can create confidence and resilience within the classroom. It is further argued that praise must be specific and should reward specific desired behaviours or actions, but should not focus upon natural intelligence (Burnett, 2001 and Stan, 2012). This links to mindsets as if pupils are rewarded for effort, they may believe that although they may struggle, they can still achieve. The idea of praise informed my decision about praising to reward actions or behaviour and

not natural intelligence as I wanted learners to consider that I believe in them which could in turn allow for an increase in self-belief. An increase in self-belief could lead learners to want to try to improve and accept challenges that may come as pupils may think they are capable of this achievement.

Assessment for learning (AFL) is a low stake formative practice that provides information to both teachers and students about what needs to be done to improve learning (Clarke, 2008). It is argued that formative assessment should take place within the classroom within every lesson as it enhances current learning through teacher diagnosis of current understanding (Wiggins, 1998). This allows for the teacher to immediately solve any difficulties in understanding that have been spotted, as like Wiggings (1998) in Dixon and Worrell (2016) argue, issues need to be solved in real time and not any later. It is not useful for the learner to progress through the lesson if the basic understanding that is needed to succeed is not there. A way to solve issues in real time is through questioning and checking the learner response after every aspect of the lesson is covered (Rosenshine, 2012). Lemov (2015) takes this a step further by arguing that asking how a pupil got an answer or why that specific answer is correct is vital to ensuring true pupil understanding and that the answer given was not correct simply through luck. This assessment for learning informed my planning of using questioning as a formative assessment after every aspect of teaching to judge current understanding. This allowed me to judge whether the class was ready to move on or if certain aspects of learning needed further explanation. This further informed my decision about using a no hands up approach to further ensure pupil understanding so that certain pupils answering questions do not set the standard of understanding for the whole class as this may not be truly representative.

Evaluation and Reflection

The micro teach findings cannot be taken as a completely reliable representation of how Level 5 and 6 pupils would respond to the lesson I taught, due to the cohort of students that acted as pupils obtained English degrees. The students taking on the role of pupils therefore will have had a better understanding of the sentence types taught. This also means that they may have found the ideas easier to understand and the work may have been completed quicker due to their level of knowledge and understanding, in comparison to that of Level 5 and 6 secondary school pupils.

I used the behaviourist view of putting the teacher in the central role as the giver of information by using teacher-led instruction to teach new content about the different sentence types. I believe this worked well as there was a successful transferral of knowledge. I gave the pupils rules and explanations about sentence types which they in turn used to provide correct examples that adhered to the rules of sentences that they had just learned. In line with Biesta's (2012) idea of the learner paradox, I do not believe that if pupils were not told of the rules for the simple, compound, and complex sentence types that they would have been able to construct them successfully. I do not think pupils can create certain sentence types without knowing what the type of sentence they need to construct is. During observation it has been noticed that a popular way to teach new content is also to use teacher-led instruction. I believe it is an effective method as this way, pupils are not wasting time trying to find an answer that they may never actually find for themselves. Countless hours could be spent trying to find an answer that could be also be incorrect. Also, if pupils are expected to find out all of the answers for themselves about topics they do not know much about, their own motivation and self-belief may decrease if they cannot find the answers. Therefore, I would use the behaviourist role of the teacher being the giver of information when introducing new content again, as I think it is the most useful and time effective way of teaching new content.

Linking to the behaviourist view is the idea of Coe et al (2014) about a teacher having a sound knowledge of what is being taught. This is definitely something that I tried to do as I believe in its undoubtable importance. Unfortunately, upon review, the complex sentence examples I was giving to the pupils were incorrect, showing that my knowledge was not what is expected as a teacher and was not what it should have been. This is troublesome as in a real-life situation, pupils would have taken that information as true and used it further, not knowing that it was in fact incorrect. This shows that I need to audit my own subject knowledge and review areas that I am not that familiar with. In future, I need to make sure that with every single topic that I teach, whether I think I have good subject knowledge or not, I need to carry out further research to ensure that what I teach is correct. I cannot risk teaching pupils incorrect knowledge as the whole point of teacher-led instruction is to be given the correct knowledge by the teacher. Therefore, giving pupils incorrect or misleading information is something that I will try my best to avoid in the future.

I chose to use the social constructivist idea of working in pairs in my starter activity to get pupils to try and identify the sentence types before they were told the rules and I think that it worked well to a certain extent. Whilst pupils did identify the different words and lengths between the sentence types, they could not give any rules on what was needed for a certain sentence to be a specific sentence, nor could they identify the names of the different sentences. Therefore, I would use this technique in future, but again only to activate prior knowledge as when pupils are not given information about something they do not understand, even with more than one mind present, it does not guarantee that what the teacher is looking for is found. In contrast, when the knowledge is understood and pupils then have to use it, working in pairs worked well as certain pupils had a good grasp of the knowledge and could aid and correct other pupils. I would use working in pairs again but only when knowledge has been understood.

I chose to differentiate through roles in a group based on the assumption that the Level 6 pupils would have a better grasp of the sentence structures, but I would not do this in the future. After reviewing understanding within the classroom, I have noticed like William and Leahy (2015) argue, you cannot assume certain pupils will have a better understanding of something because they are viewed as 'more able' as this is not always the case. I think it would be more useful to have additional challenging extension tasks that pupils could move onto if their work was completed correctly. This way, it does not assume certain pupils will understand something when they may not and it does not refuse further learning through challenge to those viewed as 'less able'. This way, all pupils have the opportunity to further their learning through more challenging work on the condition that the work they complete is correct, showing that the work has been understood.

It was my intention to promote the growth mindset by Dweck (2007) frequently throughout my lesson to try and expose the pupils to this positive way of thinking about learning. I promoted the growth mindset once in which I told my pupils that the work they were about to do was hard, but that I had the confidence in them to try it. I continued to say that mistakes made are a part of learning and that it is not something to worry about as we would keep working on the answers until they were correct. I believe this worked as pupils seemed less worried about being wrong as giving incorrect answers was viewed as part of the process, instead of a focus on the understanding/misunderstanding of a topic as a whole. I do think that I should have promoted this growth mindset more so that pupils internalise the idea that hard work and mistakes are a part of learning. In future, I would like to promote this growth mindset more so that pupils are not new to the idea of failure, or not knowing something yet. In each lesson I would like to introduce the practice of speaking about a growth mindset so that pupils will become more willing to attempt difficult tasks as the fear of being wrong is eradicated as it is instead viewed as part of the normal learning process. I also think I should

use the idea of growth mindset more as I believe it takes the pressure off having to be correct to succeed as the focus is the motivation to do better than last time.

Whilst I had the intention of praising the efforts and answers of every pupil that gave an answer, I often forgot to do this. There were multiple pupils that gave correct answers that did not receive any form of praise at all as I moved the lesson on. I believe that this lack of praise had a detrimental impact upon pupils' efforts and that pupils may have been put off from giving answers or even trying during the lesson because of a lack of self-belief due to the lack of recognition. Upon reviewing praise during observation within multiple classrooms, I have seen that the pupils, especially in Key Stage three and in lower ability classes, thrive off of teacher praise. Pupils want to try and impress their teacher. It was also noticed that pupils that do give answers and are praised are often the pupils that have high participation levels during teacher questioning and continue to want to give answers during the rest of the lesson which may be due to an increased self-belief like Stan (2012) argues. Also, in classrooms where praise is obviously apparent, there seems to be higher overall pupil participation during questioning and class discussion, which I again think is linked to wanting to impress the teacher. Therefore, in future lessons I will not make the same mistake of forgetting praise as I think it has a detrimental effect upon pupils' participation and overall self-belief. I will ensure that in all classes, I put the element of praise into practice and that all efforts are rewarded at least verbally, and that special efforts get rewarded by the school's chosen merit system. I need to do this to ensure that pupils feel that they have been given the recognition they deserve which can in turn possibly increase their motivations to learn and participate within the lesson.

Assessment for learning is something that I made sure I covered in my lesson as like Wiggins (1998) argues, it is a way to view current understanding in real time. I chose to do this through questioning. After every aspect of learning that was covered, I ensured I asked the class questions that would show to me what was understood/not understood. I believe this was useful as I was able to judge what needed to be gone through in a bit more detail. This questioning revealed that the complex sentences had to be explained in a bit more detail before the lesson moved on. I therefore gave time for extra explanation on complex sentences to ensure that pupils were clear before the lesson did move on. I also used the asking of 'how' or 'why' questions that Lemov (2015) argues to be vital to check true understanding to show answers are not based on lucky guesses. I would use this again as it was useful in showing to me that pupils got the answers correct because they understood the rules of the sentence types. If this was not done, the lesson could have progressed with pupils at the end of the lesson having no real knowledge of sentence types. Although the use of questioning for AFL was useful, I believe it may have gotten monotonous for the pupils. Upon review of AFL in the classroom during observation, a technique I will trial is peer review. It seems to work really well (after a quick questioning has taken place ensuring pupils understand content) as pupils get to use their own knowledge to check other work which not only checks own understanding, but also understanding of the other pupil. Another AFL technique was a questioning technique, but it was carried out through a game. I would like to use this in the future as this engages pupils in a fun way whilst still assessing understanding. It brings variety to AFL so that pupils do not become bored and disengaged.

ACTION PLAN - Objectives and programme for Term 1

Name: Tyler Zupic

Subject: PGCE Secondary English

Date 15/11/18

Objectives	Actions to be taken	Success criteria	Target date
To improve own subject knowledge. This links to This links to S1.7 Commitment to professional development as I understand I need to maintain my up-to-date professional knowledge.	(i) To review the topics that I will teach to pupils and understand what knowledge I need to possess. (ii) To read around these topics ensuring that I have the correct subject knowledge and understanding. (iii) Mind map the information that I will use in class and show subject teacher ideas that I am less familiar with to check my understanding and level of knowledge is where it should be for the lesson.	-Improved ability to correct any mistakes. -Better use of questioning about particular topic studied that lesson. Deeper probing into more intricate ideas and not just surface level questions. -Clear and successful explanations of newly taught information that pupils understand early on.	-Before any new lesson is taught. Dates will be continued throughout the PTE1.
To improve the use of praise.	(i) Develop good understanding of school praise system. (ii) Observe teachers with effective practice that pupils respond well to. (iii) Develop own praise routine that pupils become familiar with and can expect to see every lesson.	-Greater pupil participation in the classroom. This includes completion of work and participation within discussions and question answering. -School reward system to be used appropriately in every lesson. -Improved teacher-pupil relationship and response.	12/11/18

To widen the use of differentiation strategies.	(i)Observe teachers that teach classes I will take over to view the differentiation strategies that suit the needs of the individual learners. (ii)Read articles/books on different differentiate strategies and see what is deemed to be successful. (iii)Plan one or two lessons in which different differentiation strategies are used with the same class to see what is successful and what is not.	-Pupils respond well and accept differentiation strategy used. -Increased motivation in class as pupils are always working to own level of ability. -Pupils demonstrate progress in understanding and in completion of tasks as all pupils are always slightly challenged.	26/11/18 Continued dates if successful strategies are not found.
--	---	---	--

Bibliography

Allison, S. and Tharby, A. (2015) *Making Every Lesson Count: Six principles to support great teaching and learning*. Carmarthen: Crown House Publishing

Amineh, R. and Asl, H. (2015) 'Review of Constructivism and Social Constructivism', *Journal of Social Sciences, Literature and Language*, 1(1), pp. 9-16.

Biesta, G. (2012) 'Giving Teaching Back to Education: Responding to the Disappearance of the Teacher' *Phenomenology & Practice*, 6 (2), pp. 34-49.

Burnett, P. (2001) 'Elementary students' preferences for teacher praise', *Journal of Classroom Interaction*, 36(1), pp16-23.

Clark, S. (2008) *Active Learning through Formative Assessment*. London: Hodder Education.

Coe, R. et al. (2014) *What makes great teaching? Review of the underpinning research*. London: Sutton Trust.

Dixton, D. and Worrell, F. (2016) 'Formative and Summative Assessment in the classroom', 55, pp. 153-159. Available at:
https://moodle.uwtsd.ac.uk/pluginfile.php/185257/mod_book/chapter/4212/Dixton%252c%20D%20and%20Worrell%252c%20F%20%282016%29.pdf
(Accessed: 3rd November 2018).

Dun, K. and Darlington, E. (2016) 'GCSE Geography teachers' experiences of differentiation in the classroom', *International research in geographical and environmental education*, 25(4), pp. 344-357.
DOI: [10.1080/10382046.2016.1207990](https://doi.org/10.1080/10382046.2016.1207990).

Dweck, C. (2007) *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*. New York: Ballantine.

Kirschner, P. and Sweller, J. and Clark, R. (2006) 'Why minimal guidance during instruction does not work: An analysis of the failure of constructivist, discover, problem-based, and inquiry based teaching' *Educational Psychologist*, 41(2), pp. 75-86.

Lemov, D. (2015) *Teach like a champion 2.0*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Piaget, J. (1929) *The child's conception of the world*. London: Routledge.

Richardson, V. (1996) 'From Behaviourism to Constructivism in Teaching Education', *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 19, pp. 1-16.
DOI: [10.1177/088840649601900324](https://doi.org/10.1177/088840649601900324).

Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. (2003) *Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectations and Pupils' Intellectual Development*. Carmarthen: Crown House Publishing.

Rosenshine, B. (2012) 'Principles of instruction', *Education Digest*, 78(3), pp. 30-40.

Shabani, K. and Khatib, M. and Ebadi, S. (2010) 'Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development: Instructional Implications and Teachers' Professional Development', *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), pp. 237-248.

Stan, E. (2012) 'About praise and its efficiency in teaching', *Journal of Educational Sciences and Psychology*, 2(1) pp. 28-34.

Welsh Government Learning Wales (2016) *English Programme of Study - Key Stages 2-4*. Available at: <http://learning.gov.wales/resources/browse-all/englishnc/?lang=en> (Accessed: 1st November 2018).

Wiggins, G. (1998). *Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

William, D. and Leahy, S. (2015) *Embedding Formative Assessment*. Florida: Learning Sciences international.

Vygotsky, L. (1978) *Mind in Society*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.