

	Targed/Target	Yr hyn yr wyf wedi'i wneud yn yr aseiniad hwn. What I have done in this assignment.
Targed/Target 1	Revise how to avoid comma splicing.	Read books on grammar rules in terms of comma splicing in order to avoid these mistakes.
Targed/Target 2	Consider ways in which you can further engage critically with the sources that you cite. What are the limitations and the implications of this in your context?	Tried to generate more of a dialogue within my literature review by linking the literature back to my own research.
Targed/Target 3	N/A	N/A

'To what extent does differentiated scaffolding have an effect on pupils' productivity?'(5,499)

The aim of my action research project was to assess the impact that differentiated scaffolding had on overall class' productivity within an extended writing task. My research partner and I were interested in focusing upon this particular aspect of teaching as we both teach literacy focused subjects, English and Spanish, to the same mixed-ability Year 8 class. The school in which I have undertaken my action research shall be referred to in this essay as School X, in accordance with BERA guidelines (BERA, 2018). In School X, the pupils' ability varies greatly within classes. There are approximately 468 pupils in the school (MyLocalSchool, 2019) with 4 sets to a year group, meaning that classes are large and vary widely in capability as they are mixed sets. Therefore, the purpose of my action research is to determine whether pupils' productivity in mixed-ability groupings can be improved upon by producing tailored resources to suit different capabilities.

In my class there are vast variations in pupil ability and productivity. The class is made up of 28 pupils. As shown within the class' SIMS information 17 of those 28 pupils are at Special Educational Needs level, with 4 pupils speaking English as an additional language (figure 6). As an English teacher, the expansion of extended writing within the class has been something that I have focused on throughout my placement at School X. Therefore, I raised the concept of focusing on differentiation through scaffolding rather than differentiation through outcome with my research partner. To which they agreed, due to their similar interest in increasing the class' productivity when writing extended responses within their Spanish lessons. We decided to base the setting of our scaffolding upon pupils' reading ages in order to test whether they could be encouraged to be more productive whilst still regarding their reading level and managing expectations and support fairly through the level of support. The research question devised by myself and my research partner was to determine '*To what extent does differentiated scaffolding have an effect on pupils' productivity?*' Upon discussing this question with both of our class teachers it was agreed upon distributing the differentiated scaffolding based on setting pupils' reading ages at three levels: higher, intermediate and lower ability pupils.

My research partner and I decided to focus on differentiation, it is an aspect of both our practices that we wished to develop and reflect upon. In order to allow for the use of differentiation to be assessed in terms of developing pupil progress, observation of the teaching practice and the implemented scaffolding should be undertaken (Vantassel-Baska, 2012). As this allows teachers to reflect and enhance the resources that they provide to

pupils based upon the comments of other practitioners which allow for self-criticality (Vantassel-Baska, 2012). Therefore, the article supported our initial interest as it highlighted the inherent need for differentiation of pupils' materials as a key tool of an effective practitioner, it also stated that differentiation is not implemented enough within classrooms and therefore, is something that should be built upon (Vantassel-Baska, 2012). Similarly, Eursery demonstrates the integral nature of effective differentiation. This is done through an extended metaphor that describes learning as a road trip with teachers inherently being required, as part of their role, to "map out" the pupils' learning journey, foreseeing the need for support and extension activities in order to aide all pupils at their individual levels (Eursery, 2016). As educational practitioners it is imperative that we convert the raw data that we are provided with on pupils' results and reading ages into a way to tailor and enhance their education, through a differentiated learning plan (Eursery, 2016). In contrast, although Askell-Williams et al accentuate the responsibility of teachers to be aware of pupils' educational needs, they also highlight the need for student autonomy (Askell-Williams, et al, 2012). In the sense that pupils should be aware of their own strengths and weaknesses and consider how to develop upon these (Askell-Williams, et al, 2012). This concept coincides with the new Welsh curriculum, as it is outlined by Donaldson's report that pupils should have independence within their learning in order to develop ambitious, capable learners (Donaldson, 2015). This is one of the fundamental Four Principles that are the hinge points of the Donaldson report (Donaldson, 2015). However, due to the extent of the mixed ability within our shared class, my research partner and I felt that differentiation of extended writing tasks that required literacy skills were essential.

Focusing on differentiation, we decided to differentiate through scaffolding rather than task or outcome, as the most suitable way to test the effectiveness of differentiation over pupil productivity. Scaffolding is a form of supportive steps, implemented to reduce the amount of pupil independence attributed to a particular task aiming to develop the pupil's focus on a skill often deemed difficult, that is essential for them to attain in order to complete the task (Bruner 1978, found in Gibbons, 2002). Therefore, scaffolding is not a compilation of hints and tips for pupils to complete a task, successful scaffolding resources strive to be a temporary assisting tool for pupils, allowing them to develop understanding of a new skill (Gibbons, 2002). My lesson study will focus on developing pupils' comparison skills within extended writing, this is an essential skill at GCSE level English Language. If the scaffolding is successful, it should be able to be removed or reduced after they have practiced the skill, whilst being able to replicate the same level of work (Gibbons, 2002). Scaffolding has clear links to constructivist theory and Vygotsky's concept of *Active Learning*, whereby you provide pupils with resources and allow them to build upon them in order to reach a certain outcome (Vygotsky, 1978). Similarly, Professor Donaldson's ideas of pupil autonomy and

developing their own understanding through the provision of teacher's resources links to constructivist ideas and differentiated scaffolding (Donaldson, 2015).

We needed to address the means in which we could fairly differentiate, as pupils perform differently across subjects. Therefore, after discussions with both our class teachers we decided to differentiate based on reading age, aiming to support the lower levels, prompt the intermediate levels and stretch the higher ability pupils. Often in classes, more able pupils are rendered bored within lessons due to the work being unchallenging, as teachers inherently focus on establishing a common pace that the majority of the class can maintain (Berman, et al, 2012). This leaves pupils that can excel this pace, bored and disinterested once they have completed the tasks, therefore, it is essential that effective classroom practitioners seek to stretch and challenge higher ability pupils (Berman, et al, 2012). It is integral however, that teachers who challenge higher ability pupils through scaffolding are able to formulate clear guidelines and expectations for those pupils to meet within the task (Vantassel-Baska, 2012). Likewise, Jones et al argue that pupils with lower level reading ages need tailored intervention approaches as they may excel in other literacy areas and therefore, may become oversaturated with unnecessary literacy support if the teacher's strategies are not targeted to their specific needs (Jones, Conradi, Amendum, 2016). Therefore, our differentiated scaffolding needed to clearly challenge the higher ability pupils, whilst specifically targeting areas of weakness that we had both experienced from the lower ability pupils when marking their extended writing pieces.

As part of our research project the methodology my research partner and I chose to use was a lesson study. Lesson studies are a form of action research. We chose to utilise this form of research as action research can be used within any setting that requires a change through the means of tasks and procedures it can affect change therefore, creating a more desirable outcome (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2009). Furthermore, my research partner and I utilised the action research lesson study method, in order to change pupil productivity throughout extended writing tasks. It is greatly beneficial to classes but also as practitioners to undertake action research within the classroom as it enables teachers to not only theorise within their research but also consider their practice from a critical, reflective perspective (Hopkins, 2002: 66, found in Koshy 2010). Undertaking a lesson study has enabled me to reflect and think critically in order to further inform my developing practice. Under *Successful Futures*, teaching is evolving into a far more research informed profession, therefore, developing reflective research skills within lesson studies is beneficial to good practice. Teaching should be informed by research and evidence; teachers should utilise these aspects to develop their practice (Hargreaves 1996, in Koshy 2010). Action research is a useful form of education research as it allows for the research to take place within an authentic classroom setting, it is also a flexible form of research as researchers

can evolve and modify their practice as they proceed with the project (Koshy, 2010). The research methodology behind a lesson study approach, entails a collaboration between teachers considering an aspect of learning that they wish to improve upon, lesson studies include planning lessons together and observing each other's practice within the lesson, in order to address a particular aspect of student learning (Anfara Jr, et al, 2009). Therefore, the lesson study will take place between myself and another trainee teacher, our research question was determined by a joint aim that we shared in terms of pupils' literacy and productivity. Within our research we undertook two lesson studies one where I taught a lesson that they observed, and another where I observed a lesson taught in a similar vein by my research partner.

The methods of data collection used within were formulated by myself and my research partner, they were based on readings that we had undertaken to ensure that we recorded data in an efficient manner. Firstly, the observation method of data collection that was utilised as part of both our lesson studies was an observation schedule. It entailed a chart that had a check-column for each of the observed pupils, the observer would check the according boxes that sought to indicate the pupil's productivity at each stage of the lesson, as well as their engagement with the differentiated scaffolding resources that were aimed to increase productivity within the main task of the lesson. The observation schedule was as concise as possible to ensure the observer could record the relevant information to our research through the means of qualitative data, whilst we ensured to include space for any additional notes on the lesson when we designed the schedule (figure 2 & 3). Therefore, we adopted a semi-structured observational style as it allowed for awareness of the class context and to record any factors that hindered the data we aimed to collect, allowing for more authenticity within our results (Cohen et al, 2009). The semi-structured schedule allowed the observer the scope to record any information pertaining to the lesson study that was unable to be foreseen within the check-list style observation schedule (Sharp, 2012). Both myself and my research partner assumed a non-participant observer role within the respective lessons whilst the other was in the position of the teacher, as our research was conducted within both our ITT placements, our class teachers also served as observers within our individual lessons.

Firstly, my research partner and I conducted interviews with the focus group. Our chosen focus group was compiled of the three observed pupils, these pupils were the same throughout both lesson studies as we sought to observe their levels of productivity in relation to the differentiated scaffolding, we provided them with. The sample size was kept to a minimum of three as we chose pupils from each tier of the class: higher, intermediate and lower. These classifications were determined through pupils' reading ages. These interviews entailed of asking each pupil a question and then transcribing their answers on their own

labelled interview sheets. The utilisation of an interview format rather than a questionnaire-based response to the lesson study was deemed by both of us to be more beneficial as interviews would allow pupils to produce more detailed, honest answers than would be possible within the boundaries of a questionnaire (Koshy, 2010). Therefore, we were able to generate more qualitative data to process and reflect upon in terms of each of our lesson studies. In order to conduct our interviews, my research partner and I developed a series of pre-piloted, semi-structured questions, that we maintained as open-ended in order to attempt to gather as much information as possible from the pupils' perspective.

Regarding my own reflections and that of my research partner, we designed a reflective model that we completed immediately after the interviews in order to relay our own thoughts and feelings pertaining to the lesson study. We designed the reflective model to have a section for each of our reflections, so that we could consider the outcome of the lesson study independently and were therefore, not influenced by each other's perceptions so as not to introduce bias into our reflections (figure 4-5). The reflective model was adapted from *Gibbs' reflective model* (figure 4-5). It focused on addressing my description of the events within the lesson; my feelings in regards to the lesson; my evaluation of what went well and could have been improved; my analysis of the situation; my conclusion of the overall success of the lesson study regarding our research question and my action plan-addressing what I would change if I conducted the lesson again. My research partner completed this model respectively at the same time. In addition to *Gibbs' reflective model*, we decided to incorporate the student lens aspect from Stephen Brookfield's *Four Lenses*, whereby we each reflected upon the interview feedback from the pupils' perspective to consider the successes and weaknesses of the lesson study. The data that was collected throughout our lesson studies was entirely qualitative, whilst we did consider quantitative data when we addressed the class' reading ages to determine our focus group.

There are many ethical considerations that are involved when conducting classroom research within the forms of a lesson study. At the forefront of our ethical concerns, was ensuring pupil anonymity. Confidentiality is an aspect that we maintained throughout our action research, with pupils' names being omitted from the SIMS reading ages, as well as referring to the pupils within our focus group as student 1, student 2 and student 3. This was done so in accordance to BERA guidelines regarding confidentiality within research projects (BERA, 2018). Secondly, we followed the advice of the University's ethical guidelines and therefore, made the conscious decision not to record visual or audio data, as this may have resulted in complications with pupils' consent forms and compromised the ethical nature of our study. Regarding pupil consent, my research partner and I sent out consent forms to the pupils and their guardians. Along with these consent forms we attached a letter that clearly outlined the parameters and objectives of our research project, therefore, we ensured that

there was transparency between us, as the researchers, pupils as the participants and pupils' guardians. This was done so as to maintain the University's reputation and policies, whilst working in accordance with our placement school.

The initial lesson study was conducted by myself whilst my research partner-teacher 1- was observing and completing the observation schedule as I taught my English lesson. The lesson built upon the previous five lessons that I had taught, aiming to enable pupils to compare two poems within an extended writing context. The lesson objective sought to have pupils draw comparisons and develop links between the poems. The purpose of the lesson was to have pupils produce an extended written response, analysing the similarities between the two poems in terms of poetic techniques, meaning and contextual knowledge. The lesson fit into our action research as pupils were then given extended writing plans based upon their reading ages, they were set at three levels: higher, intermediate and lower.

Pupils had been given 'Point, Evidence, Explain' grids that analysed each poem individually in the lesson prior, these grids then served as a plan so that pupils could use them to draw links between the two poems. Within the starter task, pupils had to rank the most important similarities and differences and then decide whether or not they thought the poems were similar or different. This served as a sufficient planning basis to allow pupils to begin their comparative essays on the two poems. Pupils were then shown a model answer which I broke down to pupils. I modelled each section and detailed what they needed to include for each paragraph in a formulaic manner, I then removed the model answer from the board in an attempt to see pupils only use the scaffolding to guide them with the main task of the lesson.

I then distributed the differentiated scaffolding plans to the pupils that my research partner and I had agreed upon based on our analysis of their reading ages. All pupils were given a 'connective word bank' to help them. Student 1 was given the higher-level scaffolding, student 2 was given the intermediate scaffolding whilst student 3 received the lower ability scaffolding as previously assigned based on their reading ages (figure 1). The mixed-ability year 8 class was disruptive within the context of the lesson and low-level noise disruptions led to a staggered approach to the work with a few pupils off-task at various points of the lesson. This led to a low-level disruption within the entire class dynamic that negatively impacted the productivity of the lesson.

I felt that the extent of the low-level noise disruption from various members of the class was detrimental to the higher and intermediate pupils' productivity. I felt that if pupils could have come into the lesson with the same level of preparation and working attitudes, the overall lesson and writing task would have been far-less disruptive and could have allowed for the action research to effectively test the impact of differentiated scaffolding upon

pupil productivity. However, due to absences and cross-curricular interventions within the class, the lack of parity across pupils' preparation could not have been avoided.

Pupils accessed the materials and seemed to appreciate that there was clear support and guidelines for the writing task provided in front of them throughout the course of the lesson. It was beneficial to pupil autonomy as they did not have to continuously ask what they had to do next, rather they could follow the written plans and work within their own pace. However, the independence that was inherently attributed with being given time and written instruction to complete the task instead of consistent reminders, check-ins and verbal prompts meant that there was constant cross-classroom disruption from various pupils. Although pupils did like having access to the differentiated scaffolding directly in front of them, as is evidenced within the student feedback interviews, it in fact made no difference to pupils' productivity. Productivity and time management are major issues within this class however, the action research conducted within my lesson demonstrated that the use of differentiated scaffolding, to maintain the focus those who were on-task, had no bearing on overall pupil productivity.

Based on the interviews with student 1, student 2 and student 3, it was evident that the lower ability and intermediate level pupils appreciated having support in front of them as they did utilise the scaffolding resources within the course of the lesson. They sought to complete as much of the plan as they could within the disruptive classroom environment however, the scaffolding did not positively improve the productivity of pupils' work. In contrast, student 1 did not engage at all with the higher-ability scaffolding as they found the intermediate-level resources to be easier to utilise, therefore, they did not seek to challenge themselves or improve their productivity with regards to the impact of differentiated scaffolding that our action research is focused upon.

To improve upon this lesson retrospectively, I would have chosen a different way to assign the scaffolding resources. If I was to repeat my action research lesson, I would ask pupils what level of scaffolding they would want to use to complete the extended writing task. Although this could limit my opportunity to encourage high-ability students to push themselves, it may have a positive impact on productivity as pupils could engage with scaffolding that they feel comfortable with.

In preparation for the next lesson study, my research partner and I have decided that they should utilise a model answer for the entirety of the extended writing task. Teacher 1 will therefore model an extended answer within their Spanish class and then have pupils replicate their own, using the differentiated scaffolding to shape and change the model template. This should have a more positive impact on productivity as pupils have a clear understanding of the amount of writing they need to produce within the allotted time frame.

The second lesson study that we undertook was a Spanish lesson that was conducted by my research partner, teacher 1, whilst I assumed the role of non-participant and completed the lesson observation schedule. The lesson sought to use the verb 'Vivir' meaning to live in when describing their future homes, the lesson aimed to improve pupils' literacy through the utilisation of new sentence structures and to develop progress in the Pupils' Spanish translation skills. The learning objective given to pupils was 'to describe what type of house you live in and where you are going to live', teacher 1 aimed to have pupils produce an extended paragraph outlining their descriptions of houses. The aim was similar to the lesson study that I conducted, both myself and my research partner sought to analyse the effects of differentiated scaffolding in terms of pupils' productivity with extended writing tasks.

At the beginning of the lesson pupils were drilled on the vocabulary they had used in the previous lesson, this task aimed to activate prior knowledge that would be used within the course of the lesson. From my observation pupils were engaged in the drilling activity and seemed to have a very good understanding of the vocabulary that they would be required to utilise within the course of the lesson. They then developed upon their initial knowledge by incorporating the vocabulary into two paragraphs that aimed to describe: who they are, where they live and where they are going to live. Most pupils seemed to be engaged within this task from my observational perspective, however, some pupils needed prompts to begin to write.

In terms of productivity, I felt the overall lesson was successful as students were able to use vocabulary and previously learnt sentence structures. Therefore, it met the aims of the lesson. In comparison, however, teacher 1 reflected upon the issues that I had faced in getting pupils to produce an extended amount of written work. In light of this, we decided that it would be interesting within our action research for teacher 1 to utilise a golden example that was kept on the board throughout the writing task, in contrast to my lesson. Whereby, I removed the exemplar paragraph in an attempt to have pupils only use the differentiated scaffolding. Throughout the writing task, the majority of the pupils were engaged. The pupils that were involved within the lesson study, as part of the three pupils within the focus group, were able to complete the task however, only one of them was able to complete the writing task within the time limit set by teacher 1.

When considering our research question, and the utilisation of scaffolding and its effect over pupils' productivity there was some engagement from the focus group that I was tasked with observing within the lesson. The scaffolding was utilised by the pupils initially however, it was evident that throughout the class the pupils found the exemplar paragraph was more beneficial to help them complete their extended writing work. From my observations, it seemed that pupils found it far easier to alter and adapt the example that

was provided for them by teacher 1, rather than forming their own work through the utilisation of prompts that were provided for them within the scaffolding resources. Therefore, the differentiated scaffolding did not seem to provide an impact over pupil productivity within the course of the lesson, whilst there was evidence to show that having an answer that they could adapt for themselves did benefit their extended writing capabilities. Furthermore, this teaching tool is easier to utilise within modern foreign language lessons as they seek to develop vocabulary and sentence structures which can be replicated with the alteration of details, whilst my extended writing task sought to have pupils explain their opinions and could therefore not be as easily replicated. Pupils did seem to appreciate the additional supports, scaffolding and golden examples, that were provided within the lesson.

From the pupils' perspective based on our interviews, pupils who were deemed to be within the lower ability grouping were more aided and were in fact more productive within the course of the lesson and the writing task. Contrastingly, the two more able categories engaged less with the scaffolding and were ultimately proven to be less productive upon inspection of their writing tasks. The highest level of scaffolding was completely unused by student 1 as it was deemed too complicated to utilise.

Similarly, to the lesson that I conducted, in retrospect my research partner and I could have altered the dissemination of scaffolding resources to suit pupils' confidence levels rather than based on their reading ages. The reading age data was not indicative of the correct ability grouping that we associated with each level of scaffolding, as the higher ability pupils seemed to work more comfortably with the intermediate level scaffolding, as was the case within my lesson study. Therefore, we have concluded that in order to measure the influence of differentiated scaffolding and its potential benefits to student productivity, we could assess pupils' confidence levels with the task. The choice of differentiated scaffolding could be determined by pupils through a traffic light system depending on their understanding of the task after the explanation. Pupils with sound understanding would identify themselves as green and be given the higher ability scaffolding. Pupils with an understanding of the task, that would like some more support would be distinguished as amber and be given the intermediate level scaffolding. Then those pupils who need more support and explanation of the task in hand would rate themselves as red and be given the lower level scaffolding with more support attributed than the other two. I would also allow pupils the opportunity to switch their scaffolding if they deem themselves as needing more support after attempting to use theirs first, or to move up abilities in terms of scaffolding to challenge and stretch themselves of their own accord. This would then ensure that all pupils' needs were catered towards within each task based upon their ability level in

each learning situation and task, rather than placing their ability levels in umbrella categories based entirely upon reading ages.

In terms of the findings that we were able to accumulate from across the two lesson studies, it was evident that the reading age data as determining pupils' ability groupings was not indicative of the level of scaffolding resources they required. If we were to repeat the action research a choice method would be implemented as the means for pupils deciding for themselves the level of scaffolding that they wish to utilise. The option of choosing scaffolding is often a more effective form of differentiation, as grouping pupils on ability can often be harmful to pupils' views of themselves which can affect productivity especially within lower ability pupils who adopt a defeatist attitude from being set below their peers (Platt, 2018). We discovered that within a modern foreign language context, pupils found the inclusion of a golden example as more beneficial to the replication of an extended writing answer, rather than scaffolding that featured step by step sentence plans and prompts. When students are unfamiliar with a specific language it is integral to provide more than systematic support. Therefore, modelling the expectations of a writing task is an essential tool for teacher's scaffolding techniques, especially when pupils are learning the language (Rundle, found in Irie and Stewart, 2012). This is something that was particularly evident within our research findings, whilst pupils were still not productive in engaging with the differentiated scaffolding within an English lesson context. Therefore, the advantages of a model answer being displayed throughout a task may have transferrable value from a modern foreign language to English classroom. Another limitation of our research was the *Hawthorne Effect*, despite the fact that both teacher 1 and I adopted a non-participant observational perspective. This additional observational presence by another teacher may have impacted pupil productivity and behaviour, as it appeared that in both instances the lower ability pupils were more productive in an attempt to demonstrate their capabilities (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2009). Therefore, the observation may have had positive bearings over lower and intermediate level pupils' productivity. This weakness of the study was unavoidable, as the use of cameras in place of the non-participant observer would have been severely unethical in terms of BERA and University guidelines. Similarly, whilst in the observational role there are limitations to the extent that a person is able to note and observe at the same time, therefore the observation schedule may have omitted details that could have affected the outcomes of the research, that neither myself or my research partner would have been able to observe due to the nature of the environment (Holliday, 2007; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2009).

With regards to the validity of the action research we undertook, the Hawthorne effect and the influence of an observational party within the classroom may have compromised the validity of the findings. In the first lesson study, pupils were overly

disruptive, and intentionally misbehaving so as to disrupt the lesson. Whilst it should be noted that the lower ability pupil, student 3 excelled their usual work productivity, this may have been due to being observed and feeling more pressure to perform. Therefore, although all possible steps were undertaken by me and my research partner, the lesson studies' validity may be tainted regardless. To avoid this, we could have filmed the class instead and observed the recording to undertake the lesson study, however this had too many ethical implications to be a viable option. Ultimately, the action research is as valid as possible within the learning research environment. Furthermore, when considering the reliability of our findings there were apparent issues with the distribution of the differentiated scaffolding. Student 1, the higher ability pupil, disregarded the higher-level scaffolding instead choosing to utilise the intermediate level scaffolding resources in both of the lesson studies. Therefore, in terms of reliability of results it may have been more beneficial from an observational perspective to group and seat pupils in accordance with the level of scaffolding that we determined was attributed to their reading ages. However, this equally would have created a change in the class dynamic which may have further exacerbated the observation effect within the context of the lesson study. Overall, there were unavoidable complications associated with generating our data and conducting our action research, however, we maintained our ethical standpoint that was outlined in the ethics form whilst taking these validity and reliability issues into consideration in terms of our research findings.

The aim of the action research is not to develop conclusive, generalisable data rather to consider an aspect of one's teaching practice within collaboration with other educational practitioners then reflect upon it. The overarching aim of any lesson study as part of action research is to consider the impact of the teacher's actions within that specific context and reflect upon it within the wider scale of informing one's practice (Koshy, 2010). There were definitive strengths along with the weaknesses I have already discussed, overall undertaking action research benefitted my developing teaching practice greatly. This is especially prevalent with the research question we considered, as it allowed me to reflect and critically analyse how I adapt learning resources for pupils as well as determining the appropriate scaffolding for my pupils' needs. I have gone on to utilise our findings from the differentiated scaffolding to help me develop resources for the same class, whilst deploying the choice theory that my research partner and I decided would be more suitable than reading ages. Although, pupils interacted more with their chosen scaffolding, the more able pupils chose the scaffolding that was set at the intermediate level and therefore, did not make the conscious effort to challenge themselves. Therefore, developing pupils' choices in terms of supporting and challenging themselves is something that I endeavour to examine within my next school experience. As well as this I aim to share our research findings within

our school network with the intention of collecting other student teachers' opinions on how best to utilise differentiated scaffolding within a mixed ability classroom.

Reference List:

Anfara Jr, V.A., Lenski, S.J. and Caskey, M.M., (2009), '*Using the lesson study approach to plan for student learning*', *Middle School Journal*, 40(3), pp.50-57.

Askill-Williams, et al, (2012), '*Scaffolding cognitive and metacognitive strategy instruction in regular class lessons*', *Grace international science*, pp413-443.

BERA guidelines, (2018), Found at: https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/BERA-Ethical-Guidelines-for-Educational-Research_4thEdn_2018.pdf?noredirect=1

Berman. KM, et al, (2012), '*A lack of awareness and emphasis in preservice teacher training, preconceived beliefs about the gifted and talented*', vol 35, number 1.

Cohen. L, et al, (2009), '*Research methods in Education*', sixth edition, London and New York, Routledge.

Donaldson. G, (2015), Found at '<https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2018-03/successful-futures-a-summary-of-professor-graham-donaldsons-report.pdf>'.

Eursery, Kelsey, (2016), '*Differentiation: Closing the gap between frustration and success*', Vol 4, iss.3, Westerville, AMLE Magazine.

Gibbons. P, (2002), '*Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning, Teaching second language learners in the Mainstream Classroom*', Heinemann, Portsmouth.

Irie, K. and Stewart. A, (2012), '*Realizing autonomy, practice and reflection in language education contexts*', Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

Jones, J.S., et al, (2016), '*Matching interventions to Reading Needs: A case for differentiation*', vol.70, p307-317.

Koshy, V., (2010), '*Action Research for improving educational practice; A step by step guide*', 2nd edition, London, SAGE publications.

Mylocalschool, (2019), Found at: <http://mylocalschool.gov.wales/School/6704076?lang=en>

O'Brien. T & Guiney. D, (2001), '*Differentiation in Teaching and Learning, principles and practice*', London and New York, Continuum.

Platt. J, (2018), '*How far does choice theory succeed, within classics, as a form of differentiation in the classroom?*'.

Shabani, K., 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.

Sharp. J, (2012), '*Success with you Education Research Project*', 2nd edition, London, SAGE publications.

Vantasssel- Baska. J, (2012), '*Analyzing differentiation in the classroom: Using the Cos-R*', vol. 35, pp42-48.