

How can using peer assessment at different intervals during a lesson have an impact on student engagement in a KS2 classroom?

Module number: ECPP7001

Student number: 1700331

Word count = 6291

AIM, FOCUS AND PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH

The aim of this project is to discover whether implementing peer assessments at different intervals throughout the lesson will have an effect on the student's engagement. My research partner and I wanted to find out whether completing peer assessment activities during different intervals throughout the lesson will affect the children's engagement, and if so to what extent. During both research lessons, we will be recording the children's engagement leading up to the peer assessment, during the peer assessment and after the peer assessment. However, the levels of engagement after the peer assessment will mainly be focused on during my research partners lesson as it will be completed mid-lesson. Unfortunately, due to my lesson implementing the peer assessment at the end of the lesson, we will be unable to record the children's engagement levels afterwards, only before and during the peer assessment. The results from both peer assessments will be recorded every 10 minutes on the Leuven scale of involvement. My classroom teacher informed me that the children had never experienced peer assessment during a mathematical lesson as the work mainly consisted of closed-ended questions, therefore the feedback comments would include 'yes' and 'no' answers rather than a feedforward on how to progress their learning. In the long-term this would not have an effective impact on their peers.

RESEARCH CONTEXT

As part of our research, we decided to research into: "How can using peer assessment at different intervals during a lesson have an impact on student engagement in a KS2 classroom?" During our mathematical research lesson, the children will be involved in a written peer assessment activity, using the 'feedback sandwich' strategy. The 'feedback sandwich' strategy involves the children providing their peers with a positive comment, followed by a constructive criticism highlighting how / what they can improve, followed by another positive comment. My placement school is a large urban school, consisting of 432 pupils, (<https://www.■■■■■■■■■■.co.uk/our-school/welcome/>, 2019). During my placement I was based in the year 6 classroom which consisted of 26 pupils. There are two year 6 classes, my class containing the higher ability children ranging from a mixture

of abilities. Within my classroom, there are three pupils with ALN and one MAT pupil. My research partners school is a small urban school, consisting of 140 pupils, (<https://www.schoolguide.co.uk/schools/> [REDACTED] [pembrokeshire](https://www.schoolguide.co.uk/schools/), 2019). During her placement, my research partner was based in the year 5 and 6 classroom which contained children with a range of abilities, seven ALN pupils and four MAT pupils.

SHORT OVERVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

William and Black (1998) believe that peer assessment allows children to set targets for each other through identifying mistakes in ways which can be achieved effectively. Black et al. (2003) notes that involving children in their own self assessments and peer assessments has proven to have a very beneficial impact on their learning gains, in addition to being important factors within the AFL practice which works closely alongside the scaffolding strategy as they are using their ZPD. However, differing from this opinion, Ofsted (2012) found that the use of peer assessment within the classroom can interrupt children's learning when used early in the lesson. Arguably, Black et al. (2003) states that having the opportunity to assess their peers' work will expand their understanding of the specific learning outcomes and assessment criteria as they become more involved in their learning, whilst also developing their social skills throughout this process.

For peer assessment to be effective, children need to be engaged throughout the reflecting of their peer's work to consider how the work can be improved. Research by Black et al. (2003) has established that both peer and self assessment are highly significant when developing children's learning, as it allows children to provide each other with worthy feedback in order to progress their learning. Donaldson agrees with this research as he states in the new curriculum that:

“There is no automatic relationship between what is taught and what is learned and we can only find out what actual learning has taken place through sound assessment. The evidence from those assessments can be used formatively to determine what the next steps should be or summatively to give an account of what has been learned” (Donaldson, 2015 : 76)

Peer assessment provides the children with opportunities to discuss, explain and challenge, allowing the children to attain more throughout their learning. In agreements with this evidence is The Welsh Government, they state in their 'Pupil

Participation – a good practice guide’ (2011) that in order for pupil participation to have an effect on their learning and achievements, teachers need to implement a mixture of activities into different stages of their learning. An example of this is to involve children in their own self-assessment and peer assessment. According to Jones and Tanner (2006) children should have the ability to assess themselves, identifying their own strengths and weaknesses. Children need to develop the skill that will allow them to set targets for themselves which will improve their learning whilst also knowing how to use different resources that will support them in this skill.

Developing successful peer and self-assessment throughout children’s learning is not a natural instinct. Nevertheless, once this strategy is rooted in their learning the assessment process can be very beneficial in motivating this process. In agreement with Jones and Tanner (2006) research has revealed that for children to successfully complete peer assessment, teachers and learning support staff need to model the process by providing constructive feedback in the form of verbal comments and marking. This allowing children to familiarise themselves with the process before having the opportunity to evaluate and comment on their peers’ work.

However, in disagreement with Jones and Tanner (2006), Harris and Brown (2013) argue that if children are not given the correct volume of support and guidance prior to the peer assessing, their learning can undergo a negative experience due to not receiving the correct preparation. Children require support from teachers as effective feedback is being distributed, raising awareness of the different types of feedback given during assessments and how it can improve their peers’ learning. Assessment for learning works closely alongside the scaffolding strategy, moving children’s learning forward in the ‘Zone of Proximal Development’, developed by Lev Vygotsky in the year 1978. The AFL supports children as they’re developing their prior knowledge, to what they are able to extend next, using their ZPD.

One of the main motives for involving children in peer assessments is developing their independence throughout their learning. Later in life, children are required to develop a skill requiring them to complete tasks for themselves, having the opportunity to assess their own / peers work will support them when developing this skill. Jones and Tanner (2006) explain that:

“Assessment for learning is not something that is done to students, but a process that is under-taken in collaboration with them. If assessment is to have maximum impact on the learning process, then students must be active participants” (Jones and Tanner, 2006 : 59)

In agreement with Jones and Tanner (2003), recent studies have revealed that children’s learning is progressed further as they remain actively involved throughout their own learning and assessment, enabling them to become more effective throughout their learning and positively changing their outlook on learning throughout their education. This is achieved by the eagerness to engage in the process and absorb the information. Topping (2009, 2010) concurs with this research as he believes that peer assessment is one strategy which actively engages children throughout their learning as they are feeding back to their peers regarding their work.

Piaget (1977) explains that “their view of learning is essentially socio-constructivist, in that we believe that in the end children must construct knowledge for themselves through their own efforts” (Piaget, 1977, cited in Jones and Tanner, 2006 : 5).

Donaldson (2015) agrees with Piaget (1977) as he recommends that peer assessment should promote more responsibility in children’s learning throughout their education. According to Topping (2009) teachers may find that using different prompts and sentence starters will help influence children’s development of assessment skills by guiding them in the correct direction. The use of prompts and sentence starters during peer assessment activities will allow the children to develop the skill to identify appropriate feedback for a particular piece of work.

Overall, the research regarding peer assessment has implied a positive outlook on children’s learning, with few disadvantages. After comparing Black et al. (2003) views regarding the positive effect peer assessment has on children, and Ofsted’s (2012) views regarding the negative effect peer assessment may have on children if used early on in the lesson, I am intrigued to discover how children will react after completing various peer assessments during different intervals throughout the lesson. With my research partner implementing peer assessment mid-lesson, we will be able to compare her results and Ofsted’s (2012) views on peer assessment, whilst at the same time determine whether Black et al. (2003) positive views on peer assessment has the same effect on our pupils.

EXPLANATION OF YOUR LESSON STUDY DESIGN

Dudley's (2011) 'Lesson Study' is an important form of 'Classroom Action Research' which specifies on the development of teacher practice knowledge. Peter Dudley's lesson study has been used in Japan since the 1870s concentrating on teacher's development of practice knowledge. Dudley (2011) states that lesson study involves "groups of teachers collaboratively planning, teaching, observing and analyzing learning and teaching in 'research lessons'" (Dudley, 2011 : 1) recording the findings from those lessons. During these research lessons, teachers will develop approaches which will improve children's learning.

According to Stigler and Herbert (1999):

"Improving something as complex and culturally embedded as teaching requires the efforts of all the players, including students, parents and politicians. But teachers must be the primary driving force behind change. They are best positioned to understand the problems that students face and to generate possible solutions." (Stigler and Herbert, 1999 : 135)

In relation to this quotation from Stigler and Herbert (1999) is peer assessment. Considering the development of peer assessment throughout the children's learning is not a natural instinct, teachers may find it difficult implementing this strategy into their planning. However, once it has been implemented, the assessment process can be very beneficial throughout the children's education. Nevertheless, the children need to be engaged during the process of reflecting on their peers work in order for it to be beneficial. Furthermore, Harris and Brown (2013) state the importance of teacher support and guidance prior to this assessment strategy.

Lewis et al., (2006) concurs with Stigler and Herbert (1999) as he explains how and why lesson study helps to improve student learning and achievements, this being evident as teachers increase their pedagogy and content subject knowledge throughout their planning and as they deliver their lessons. Lewis et al., (2006) argues that lesson study and associated practices improve student learning and achievements.

A variety of observation methods were explored during the completion of this research project. I have established that I will use Laevers (1994) 'Leuven scale of involvement' to record the findings. The involvement scale associates with the

children's engagement throughout different lessons and activities which is measured as a necessity state for 'deep level' learning and development. Laevers (1994) created a 5-point scale ranked 'extremely low', 'low', 'moderate', 'high' and 'extremely high' and provided a list of components which could happen throughout each of the rankings (see appendix 1.1). To complete our observations my research partner and I devised a table for each individual child, observing them every 10 minutes on their involvement during the lesson (see appendix 1.2). From both observations we are aiming to compare how implementing peer assessment at different intervals of the lesson will impact student engagement. To help me capture significant information I will also be taking notes throughout the lesson as it will encourage me to prioritise the most important evidence which occurs during the lesson.

To ensure validity throughout our observation, both myself and my research partner will use the same observational method. This will guarantee both observations are recorded accurately and fairly. In conjunction with validity, is reliability. According to William (1992) reliability is associated with the amount assessment measures provides consistent results. However, validity is the agreement between something that is being measured and what the assessment should be measuring according to someone. In relation to our research project 'validity' is the pupils engagement and involvement levels during both research lessons, and the agreement to ensure validity throughout is the use of the same observational method which will be used.

The use of consistent observations will benefit the consistency of both recorded observations. This will guarantee the reliability that occurs throughout both observations. However, a possible effect on our data may occur due to experimenting with peer assessments at various intervals throughout the lesson, and therefore incapable of guaranteeing the same accumulated data from myself and my research partner.

McLeod (2017) cited in <https://www.simplypsychology.org/qualitative-quantitative.html> explains that qualitative data will be collected and produced throughout both observations and group interviews, defining the 'how' and 'why' certain incidents and behaviours occur during the lesson. The 'content analysis' approach will be used throughout both observations as it will assist me when

analysing verbal or behaviour data, allowing me to compare the children's behaviour from Laevers (1994) 'Leuven scale of involvement' with the observational notes.

Following the lesson observation, my research partner and I will interview the three target children. The judgment to focus on three target children was made after reading the 'Lesson Study' handbook by Dudley (2011). In making this decision, we took into consideration the different ability levels and the children's engagement levels throughout their lessons. The selected three children were chosen from a range of abilities, providing me with the opportunity to gain a representative sample, allowing our results to be generalized into a larger scale. McLeod (2014) cited in <https://www.simplypsychology.org/sampling.html> supports this sampling statement as he explains that the more representative the sample is, the higher the opportunity is for the results to be generalized into a larger scale. Conversely, taking into consideration that there are only three target children, the results may not consider the effects peer assessment during different intervals has on other children.

During the group interview, I will be asking open questions to the participants whilst my research partner is present in the same room. A semi-structured questioning technique with open questions will be used during these interviews, allowing the participants to talk freely without outside influences on their answers (see appendix 1.3). The group interview will provide an opportunity for my research partner and I to gain a better understanding of the children's knowledge on peer assessment and their feelings towards this AFL strategy.

Grigg and Lewis (2019) informs us that the reflection process plays a vital role in effective teaching. Taking Grigg and Lewis' (2019) reflection statement into consideration, I decided to investigate into a range of reflection methods, analysing each one prudently to confidently secure the correct decision. After comparing the positives and negatives of Kolb (1975 & 1984), Gibbs (1988), Schön (1978) and Brookfield's (1988 & 2005) models of reflective practice, I have decided to use Brookfield's model of the four lenses. Brookfield (1995) suggests that for teachers to develop into 'critically reflective' practitioners they need to scrutinize their teaching through the 'four lenses': self, students, scholarships and peers. Considering the 'self' lens is very broad, I have decided to implement Gibbs' model of reflective practice into the lens. To reflect on this lens, I will use Gibbs' six distinctive areas,

commencing from an explanation of how the lesson went and finishing with the conclusions and considerations for the children's next steps (see appendix 1.4). Dewey (1938) believed that the reflective procedure influenced teachers as it offers opportunities to work on any worries teachers have through bringing any questions / problems to attention, reasoning and testing out new methods.

ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Throughout this assignment the names of both primary schools have been taken away to ensure anonymity. Names of the teachers and pupils will all remain confidential throughout my assignment and will be referred to as 'Child 1', 'Child 2' and 'Child 3'. Before the commencement of the research project I gained written consent from the parents, and verbal assent from all three target children. All three target children were made aware that they were able to withdraw from the group interview at any point.

Before commencing with this research project, an ethics form was completed and approved by the university (see appendix 1.5). This ensuring that all research and data collected will minimise risk of harm. Throughout the completion of the form the ethical considerations which were discussed and acknowledged were consent / assent, anonymity, confidentiality and data protection. To coincide with all measures in place to minimise risk, the British Education Research Association 'Ethical Guidelines' 2018, Education Workforce Council 'Code of Professional Conduct and Practice for Registrants with the Education Workforce Council' 2016-2019, and the UWTSD 'research ethics & integrity code of practice' 2019 guidelines were adhered throughout.

LESSON STUDY 1 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The aim of both research days was to determine whether completing peer assessments at different intervals throughout the lesson would affect the children's engagement. Lesson study one was my research lesson which involved myself implementing the peer assessment activity at the end of the lesson. During the

maths lessons in the lead up to my research day, the children had completed work on time intervals which prepared them for the research lesson on bus timetables. During this research lesson the children had to read a bus timetable to collect information which answered the questions related to the text provided (see appendix 1.6). Unfortunately, one of my target children was absent on the research day, therefore, I had to select another child from the higher ability group. Due to not receiving many consent forms back I was very limited in choice of children. The outcome of this meant that I had two children from the higher group and one child from the middle group forming my final three target children, meaning that we were unable to collect data and information from all ability groups.

During the introduction, the children were made aware of how to collect information from a bus timetable. The final part of the introduction entailed the children being made aware of the 'feedback sandwich' peer assessment activity which was taking place at the end of the lesson. My feelings regarding the lesson and peer assessment activity are mainly positive. The children listened well during the introduction and on the whole were very responsive to questions (see appendices 2.0, 2.1 and 2.2). However, negative behaviour occurred during the explanation of the peer assessment activity, therefore, some children required more support than others. To gain a variety of effective peer assessment comments, I ought to have provided the children with a peer assessment sentence starter sheet which would have encouraged the children in the correct direction when writing their feedback. McSweeney (2012) supports the sentence starter statement as she believes that high-quality interactions within the classroom between the teachers, pupils and assessment materials all contribute to effective learning, allowing the children's assessment skills to progress with the more support and guidance provided to them. The outcome of using these sentence starter sheets will hopefully provide me with a variety of effective comments, allowing me to gain a better understanding of their completed success criteria.

Following up from the research lesson and group interview, it was clear to see that the peer assessment activity had a positive effect on my three target children as they reported back to my research partner and I in the interview. Results from the final 10-minute observation on Laevers (1994) Leuven scale of involvement also demonstrates the positive effect peer assessment had on child 1 and child 3 (see

appendices 2.0 and 2.2). However, due to conducting the peer assessment at the end of the lesson we were unable to record their engagement levels following the peer assessment activity. The children were unsure of how it would affect their engagement levels following the activity and explained during the interview that they wanted to complete a peer assessment mid-lesson to see how it would affect their engagement levels during the final part of the lesson. It became apparent during the interview that all three children believed that conducting the peer assessment at the end of the lesson would be more effective than mid lesson. Child 1 stated that:

“I would rather it at the end of the lesson because you can come together at the end and see how good your peer has done and see if you think they can do better or if they have done as good as they can” (Child 1, 2019)

Child 1 followed this statement up by explaining that completing a peer assessment mid lesson would not have fitted in well with the lesson as some children would have only managed to complete half of the work. Therefore, the feedback comments would not have related to their success criteria and given an effective comment. However, child 2 felt that completing the peer assessment at the end of the lesson had a negative effect on their learning as by the next lesson, they would have disremembered their feed forward comments, meaning that their level of work would not progress further. Although child 2 stated this, he then went on to explain that their peers’ feedback allows them to improve on aspects of work which they themselves have not picked up on, “you have a backing of what other children think of your work, not just you” (Child 2, 2019).

All three children clarified separately during the interview (see appendix 1.3) that their engagement and involvement levels ranked on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 being low and 5 being high) were ranked at a 4. Child 2 explained to us that he felt more involved and engaged during the lesson as it was partner work, they were able to confirm and discuss their success criteria before completing the main activity. Meanwhile, child 3 explained that he needed to work more independently to challenge himself more. All three children admitted to being easily distracted by the noise and actions from other children.

During our reflection time at the end of the lesson and group interview, it was interesting to see what my research partner had observed. By looking at the

observation checklists (see appendix 2.0 and 2.1) it is clear to see that although child 1 and child 2 are of a higher ability, their engagement levels are more fluctuant than child 3 who is currently grouped in the middle ability. During the introduction child 1 and 2 were eager to answer questions and be involved in their learning, however, written evidence from my research partner (see appendix 3.1) states that both children's attention would start to wander after a while. Meanwhile, during the main activity it took all three target children a little while to get into their work. The cause of this was due to a shortage of glue sticks, which meant the children were wandering around the room. During the main activity, child 1 and child 2 were able to complete their work independently whilst staying engaged throughout until it was completed. However, written evidence from my research partner (see appendix 3.2) explains that child 3 continued to fluctuate in and out of his work with his partner. During the peer assessment at the end of the lesson, the observation checklists (see appendix 2.0, 2.1 and 2.2) show me that all three target children were engaged whilst they were completing the peer assessment. Unfortunately, due to completing the assessment at the end of the lesson we were unable to record the engagement and involvement of each child afterwards.

My research partner and I felt that the research methods were beneficial for our research question as we were able to collect reliable and valid data throughout both observations. However, we concluded that our research questions needed to be more relevant to our research question, this I felt was a limitation regarding our research methods. In preparation for my research partners lesson we decided to alter them accordingly to make it more reliable and relevant to our research question. To improve on this lesson for future learning I would supply the children with peer assessment sentence prompts / starters, hopefully encouraging more effective feedback comments.

Jones and Tanner (2006) states that peer assessment throughout children's learning has proven to be quite difficult. However, once children are familiar with how it works it can have a very beneficial effect on their learning. The National Foundation for Educational Research (2007) explains that for children to have successfully completed their peer assessment, teachers are required to model the process through constructive feedback, verbal comments and marking. Unfortunately during the peer assessment activity in my research lesson, I did not supply the children with

sentence prompts guiding them in the right direction of effective feedback. Topping (2009) agrees with this as he believes that teachers and children would benefit in peer assessment activities from the use of different prompts and sentence starters. He states that children will develop beneficial skills through providing appropriate feedback throughout their peers' work. Arguably, Black et. al. (2003) states that peer assessment allows children to become more involved in their learning whilst broadening their social skills in the same process. This statement was evident during the interview as child 3 explained that he felt more involved and engaged during the lesson as he was able to work with his partner and discuss each other's feedback.

LESSON STUDY 2 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

My research partner's lesson entailed the children learning about the conversion from miles to kilometres (see appendix 2.3) The aim of the lessons was to plot information onto a graph and reading at intermittent points, calculating what the conversion between miles and kilometres are: 3.1 miles = 5 kilometres.

Following up from the research lesson and group interview, it was clear to see that completing peer assessment mid-lesson had a positive effect on my research partner's three target children. All three children definitely felt that completing peer assessment mid-lesson helped progress their learning forward. According to child 3, she felt that completing it mid-lesson worked well as they had enough time to finish their feedback comments, whereas when they complete it at the end of the lesson, they feel that all their comments are rushed.

"When I got my feedback from my partner, he told me to remember to add the units of measurements. So, for the lesson after the peer assessment I made sure I added all of my units of measurements." (Child 3, 2019)

Child 3 followed this statement up by explaining that if it was not for her peer correcting her mistakes by mid-lesson, she would have carried on making the same mistakes. She believed her peer allowed her to correct her mistakes whilst progressing her learning all in one lesson, "you are seeing it from another person's point of view" (Child 3, 2019). However, in disagreements with child 3 is child 1 as he believed that completing the peer assessment mid-lesson disrupted part of the

success criteria as he explained that one success criteria point was to complete the work independently. However, during the peer assessment he felt that he was not working independently, therefore he did not successfully complete that one success criteria point. Nevertheless, he followed this up with a positive explaining that his peer had provided him with a worthy comment, allowing him to correct errors which he did not notice. Child 1 stated that:

“If you have peer assessment at the end, you receive your two positive and a persevering comment, however, by the next lesson you may have forgotten them. Whereas, with the mid-lesson peer assessment you receive your feedback comments and are able to understand what you need to do to improve your work now.” (Child 1, 2019)

During the interview (see appendix 1.3), all three target children clarified separately that their engagement and involvement levels ranked on a scale of 1 – 5 (1 being low and 5 being high) were ranked at a 4. All three children explained that they were easily distracted by the other children in the classroom, however, they tried their best to carry on with their work. Child 2 believed that she felt even more involved / engaged in her lesson after completing the peer assessment mid-lesson. She ranked herself as a 5 by the end, whereas the two other children felt like they stayed the same, they did not feel completing the peer assessment mid-lesson affected their engagement.

In comparison to delivering the lesson myself, it gave me the opportunity to observe closely on the three target children. By looking at the observation checklists (see appendix 2.5 and 2.6) it is clear to see that child 2 (year 6, low ability) and child 3's (year 5, high ability) engagement levels are less fluctuant than child 1 (year 6, high ability) (see appendix 2.4). During the introduction child 2 and 3 were eager to discuss answers with their partners and confirm in front of the whole class. However, child 1 decided not to discuss answers with his partner and when he did, his partner disagreed with him. This he did not like at all. Meanwhile, during the main activity child 1 and child 3 were highly engaged in the main activity, whereas it took child 2 a little while to get into her work. Throughout the main activity all three target children were able to complete their work independently. However, the children required more support to complete the extended task. The classroom has a class rule,

“ASK3B4ME”. This rule encourages the children to ask three different pupils about the work before asking for teacher support. However, during the extended activity all three target children did not comply with this rule and had their hand up straight away requiring teacher support. This is evident on the observation checklist as child 1 and child 2’s engagement was moderate during the whole task (see appendix 2.4 and 2.5). During the peer assessment mid-lesson child 3 was highly engaged, however, it took child 1 and child 2 a while to get into it. Child 3 was conferring with her peers what they were going to write instead of thinking independently. Due to my research partner completing her peer assessment mid-lesson, I was able to record their engagement during the activities following the assessment. It is clear to see from the observation checklist (see appendix 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6) that all three target children were highly engaged in their activities following the peer assessment. Throughout the plenary all three children were eager to answer questions and be involved in their learning.

During the reflection time after the group interview, we felt that our choice of research methods benefited our research questions as we managed to collect reliable and valid data throughout the observation. However, after my research partner’s lesson we felt we were able to discuss the children’s engagement and involvement within the lesson more efficiently and in depth as the peer assessment was completed mid-lesson. In comparison to my lesson, we believed that there was more information and results to analyse after the mid-lesson peer assessment. The outcome of altering the interview questions accordingly resulted in my research partner and I receiving more relevant answers relating to our research project. Reflecting back on both research lessons, we concluded that to collect better evidence we need to implement peer assessment numerous times within the lesson rather than at the end of the lesson. Due to my lesson conducting peer assessment at the end of the lesson, we were unable to record the children’s engagement after the assessment activity, therefore, the data collected was not as efficient as the mid-lesson peer assessment.

In comparison to Ofsted’s (2012) statement during my literature review regarding how completing peer assessment mid-lesson can interrupt children’s learning due to it being done too early, it became apparent that the use of peer assessment mid-lesson did not have an affect on their engagement levels whilst I was observing my

research partner's lesson. All three children explained that the use of a mid-lesson peer assessment allowed them to correct their errors there and then, allowing them to progress their learning straight away. William and Black (1998) relates to child 3's statement regarding having the opportunity to correct mistakes before the lesson following the assessment, as they believe that peer assessment provides opportunities for children to identify mistakes which are effectively achievable at that precise moment. Empirical evidence from the observation which I completed during my research partners lesson suggests that completing peer assessment mid-lesson is highly more effective than what research has stated. Evidence from all three observational checklists (see appendix 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6) show clearly how the engagement and involvement of all three target children during the lesson after the peer assessment were either high or extremely high.

CONCLUSION

Overall, I believe that both research lessons were efficient as we successfully managed to collect reliable data comparing the children's engagement during the mid-lesson and end of lesson peer assessment. However, due to my research lesson implementing the peer assessment activity at the end of the lesson, we were unable to record the children's engagement following the peer assessment, therefore felt this was a limitation within our research. During the reflection time my research partner and I agreed that if we were to complete this research again, we would implement peer assessment numerous times within the lesson rather than at the end, hopefully allowing us to gain even more efficient results of their engagement. Nevertheless, the results from the observational checklist displayed their engagement levels from the commencement right through to the peer assessment activity. The use of our consistent observations during both research lessons aided the consistency of both observations, allowing us reliable results. However, implementing peer assessment at different intervals during the lesson meant that there was a risk of not being able to accumulate the same data. Our triangulation of data helped us ensure validity throughout our observations as we used the same observational method, this allowed us fair and accurate results as we drew evidence from our findings. Laevers (1994) Leuven scale of involvement allowed us to capture

the children's engagement every 10 minutes, whereas note taking allowed us to capture significant information that occurred during the lesson. This information was recorded in our notebooks (see appendix 3.1 and 3.2) and not on the Leuven's scale of involvement, therefore we were able to compare and contrast both types of data occurring every 10 minutes, and whether the three children had done something significant that would have had an impact on their engagement during the lesson. Due to all school contexts being different, the findings from both research lessons cannot be generalised.

One of our strengths during the research project was the choice of research methods. Neither of us had difficulties observing each other's lessons, allowing us to collect efficient data and information regarding the children's engagement during the lesson, before and after peer assessment. One of the main limitations throughout this research project was the lack of literature surrounding implementing peer assessment at different intervals during a lesson. As I was completing my literature review, I researched into many theories from different theorists regarding peer assessment in general, however, there was very few theories on implementing peer assessment at different intervals during a lesson. This I believed had a negative impact on my research as I was unable to support my data. One other limitation during our research was regarding our interview questions. After conducting the interview after the first research lesson, we discussed during the reflection that we ought to have changed certain questions, making them more relevant to our research question. Nevertheless, the outcome of altering the interview questions after the first research lesson concluded in the children providing my research partner and I with more relevant answers relating to our research project.

I found Laevers (1994) Leuven's scale of involvement a very efficient way of collecting results as it presented a clear guide to where the children were at the particular times, whilst the note taking gave me a reason to why a child was marked as 'low', for example. To help me move forward and gain more efficient results during the research lesson if I was to complete it again, I would supply the children with sentence prompts to assess their peers effectively, hopefully encouraging the children to provide more effective feedback comments, relating to their success criteria. For example, I would create a sheet of paper containing a variety of sentence starters... "I feel you did well with...", "In future you need to...", "You've

done really well. Next time...". According to Lewis et al., (2006) modelling and providing opportunities for this process will improve the children's learning and achievements, whilst allowing us researchers gain more effective data.

After completing our research and discussing the strengths and limitations, we feel more research and theories needs to be done surrounding our topic. Although there was plenty of research regarding peer assessment in general, I found it difficult to support my results and findings as there was not much research regarding implementing peer assessment at different intervals during the lesson. If this lesson study was to be completed again, I would implement peer assessment during numerous intervals throughout the lesson. It would be interesting to observe whether the children's engagement and involvement during the lesson would be any different in comparison to mid-lesson and end of lesson peer assessment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Black, P., and William, D. (1998) *Assessment and classroom learning*, *Assessment in Education*, 5 (1)

Black, P., Harrison, C., Lee, C., Marshall, B., and William, D. (2003) *Assessment for Learning: Putting it into Practice*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

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

Dewey J. (1938) *Experience and Education*. New York: Macmillan.

Donaldson, P. (2015) *Independent Review of Curriculum and Assessment Arrangements in Wales*. [online] Gov.wales. Available at: <https://gov.wales/docs/dcells/publications/150225-successful-futures-en.pdf> (Accessed: 18th January 2019).

Dudley, P. (2011) Lesson study: A Handbook. (online) Available from: https://moodle.uwtsd.ac.uk/pluginfile.php/133342/mod_resource/content/1/Lesson%20Study%20Handbook.pdf (Accessed: 22nd January 2019).

██████████ school (2019). *Welcome*. [online] Available at: <https://www.██████████.co.uk/our-school/welcome/> (Accessed: 15th April 2019).

Grigg, R. and Lewis, H. (2019) *UWTSD Moodle 2018/19: Log in to the site*. [online] Moodle.uwtsd.ac.uk. Available at: https://moodle.uwtsd.ac.uk/pluginfile.php/133362/mod_resource/content/1/Is%20reflective%20practice%20worth%20all%20the%20effort.pdf?fbclid=IwAR13mY5QcFQlqg8TSkXskVZQ69QJgcb50rqVzbeOGFMGeZraa6AMtjH1_DY (Accessed: 22nd January 2019).

Harris, L. R., & Brown, G. T. L. (2013) *Opportunities and obstacles to consider when using peer- and self-assessment to improve student learning: Case studies into teachers' implementation*. Teaching and Teacher Education.

Jones, S. and Tanner, H. (2006) *Assessment*. 2nd ed. London: Continuum International Publishing Group (Accessed: 15th January 2019).

Laevers, F., (Red.), (1994) *The Leuven Involvement Scale for Young Children*. Manual and video. Experiential Education Series, No 1. Leuven: Centre for Experiential Education.

Lewis, C., R. Perry, J. Hurd, and M.P.O'Connell. (2006) *Lesson Study Comes of Age in North America*. Phi Delta Kappan. 76.

McLeod, S. A. (2017, Dec 05) *Qualitative vs. quantitative research*. Retrieved from <https://www.simplypsychology.org/qualitative-quantitative.html> (Accessed: 22nd January 2019).

McLeod, S. (2014). *Sampling Methods*. [online] Simplypsychology.org. Available at: <https://www.simplypsychology.org/sampling.html> (Accessed: 18th April 2019).

McSweeney, K. (2012). *Assessment for Learning: from Theory to Practice*. [online] Teachingcouncil.ie. Available at: https://www.teachingcouncil.ie/en/_fileupload/Research/Bursary-Summaries/WEB-Final-Teaching-Council-Report-2012-Kathryn-Mc-Sweeney.pdf (Accessed: 18th April 2019).

Ofsted (2012) *Moving English forward: Action to Raise Standards in English*, Reference no: 110118, Available at: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/surveys-and-goodpractice/m/Moving%20English%20forward.pdf> (Accessed: 17th January 2019).

Piaget, J (1977) *The Grasp of Consciousness: Action and Concept in the Young Child*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Schoolguide.co.uk. (2019). [redacted] *School Review and Catchment Area | School Guide*. [online] Available at: [https://www.schoolguide.co.uk/schools/\[redacted\]](https://www.schoolguide.co.uk/schools/[redacted]) (Accessed: 16th April 2019).

Stigler, J., and Hiebert. (1999) *The Teaching Gap*. New York: Free Press.

The National Foundation for Educational Research. (2007). *self and peer assessment*. [online] Available at: <https://www.nfer.ac.uk/pdf/getting-to-grips-with-assessment-4.pdf> (Accessed: 18th April 2019).

Topping, K. J. (2009) *Peer Assessment, Theory into Practice*, 48 (1)

Topping, K. J. (2010) *Methodological quandaries in studying process and outcomes in peer assessment: Commentary*. Learning and Instruction, 20 (4)

Welsh Assembly Government (2011) *Pupil participation- a good practice guide*.

Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government. [Online]. Available from:

<http://www.pupilvoicewales.org.uk/uploads/publications/540.pdf> (Accessed: 23rd January 2016).