

Student Self Evaluation Form

This section repeats in brief the common assessment criteria detailed on previous pages. The *extent* to which these are demonstrated by you determines your mark. Using these criteria, tick the box that best indicates the level of achievement you feel you have achieved with regard to each of them.

Common Assessment Criteria Applied	REFER		D	C	B	A
	OUTRIGHT FAIL	UNSATISFACTORY	SATISFACTORY	GOOD	VERY GOOD	EXCELLENT
1. Subject Knowledge and Understanding (which includes using research-informed literature and knowledge and understanding of the subject)				✓		
2. Intellectual Skills (Analysis)				✓		
3. Pedagogic and Professional Applications (Practical Application and Deployment)				✓		
4. Key Transferable Skills				✓		

PLEASE COMMENT ON AREAS IN WHICH YOU FEEL THAT YOU HAVE PERFORMED WELL	PLEASE COMMENT ON AREAS YOU FEEL THAT YOU NEED TO DEVELOP
I feel that I have developed my understanding and knowledge of think time. I have tried to engage with support literature around this focus. I feel that I have also increased my knowledge in Lesson Study. Before this research project, I was not familiar with this method.	To keep developing my academic writing skills and to continue analysing the links between different research.

STUDENT NUMBER: 1701011
GROUP 3

ECPP7001: The Enquiring Teacher

How can thinking time enhance pupil response to
the learning outcome?

Word Count - 6463

Contents Page

Aims, Focus and Purpose of the Research	4
Research Context.....	4
Short Overview of the Relevant Literature	4
Explanation of Lesson Study Design	6
Ethical Considerations.....	9
Analysis of Lesson Study 1 and Lesson Study 2	10
Discussion of Research Findings	13
Conclusion.....	14
Recommendations	15
References	16
Appendices.....	19
Appendix A.....	19
Appendix B.....	32
Appendix C	33
Appendix D	34
Appendix E.....	35
Appendix F.....	36
Appendix G	37
Appendix H	38
Appendix I	40
Appendix J	41
Appendix K.....	42

Aims, Focus and Purpose of the Research

The issue that interested me was the idea of giving pupils more time to think after posing a question. This focus was one that I did not have much awareness of and I thought that this was an ideal opportunity to explore it further. In my class, questions played a vital role within lessons to gauge understanding and inform next steps. I always tried to be aware of the feedback I was giving but did not focus so much the actual amount of time I was giving the pupils to think before I expected them to respond.

Research Context

The research will be conducted in two schools and will be based on one class from the Foundation Phase within each school. School 1 is located in Bridgend town centre. There are 437 pupils on roll, including 58 pupils in the school's nursery. About 8% of pupils are eligible for free school meals, which is lower than the national average of 21%. A small minority of pupils speak Welsh at home and very few pupils speak English as an additional language. School 1 has around 12% of pupils identified with additional learning needs and a small number have a statement of special educational needs (Estyn, 2017).

School 2 is situated in the east of Swansea and was opened in April 2007 as a result of an amalgamation. There are 353 pupils on roll, which includes 53 pupils in the two part-time nursery classes. Around 35% of pupils are eligible for free school meals, which unlike School 1 is higher than the average for Wales. School 2 has around 16% of pupils identified with having additional learning needs and very few have a statement of special educational needs. No pupils speak Welsh as their first language and around 16% speak English as an additional language (Estyn, 2014).

Both classes participating in the research are mixed gender and each consist of 29 pupils. Research in School 1 will be based on a Year 1 class where pupils are 5 – 6 years old. The research in School 2 will be based on a Reception class, where pupils are 4 – 5 years old.

I was based in School 1 with the Year 1 class and used this as an opportunity to explore pupil's think time. I discussed this with my partner and we decided to investigate whether increasing the pupils' think time would impact the response that we received after asking a question and the impact it would have in the classroom during our questioning. This brought us to our research question, which is: how can thinking time enhance pupils' response to the learning outcome?

Short Overview of the Relevant Literature

I looked further into this by reading books, journal articles, government documents and other online materials. I found that there was ample research into pupil think time. Firstly, it is important to note that throughout research, think time has been referred to by different names. For example, Rowe (1974) refers to it as 'wait time', Stahl (1990) describes it as 'think time' and Alexander (2004) refers to it as 'thinking time' (Ingram and Elliott, 2016). For the purpose of this research, I am going to refer to the subject as 'think time'.

Teachers acknowledge that questioning plays an important role within their practice and in particular as a tool for assessment for learning, however, it has been identified that teacher questioning is not being used to its full potential (Black et al. 2003). Rowe (1974) identified that on average teachers waited just under a second between posing a question to their pupils and before intervening if they had received no response in return. It is suggested that this short interval does not allow sufficient time for the pupils to think about their answer and relay it back to the teacher (Black et al. 2003).

Having identified the short amount of think time teachers gave to pupils after asking a question, Rowe (1974) went on to explore the outcomes of increasing the 'wait time' (Black et al. 2003). Rowe (1974) advocates for the wait time to be increased to about three seconds or more to see positive effects in the responses. Her investigation found that increasing the wait time to a minimum of three seconds had desirable outcomes; responses from pupils were longer with pupils having more confidence in relaying them, the number of pupils failing to respond reduced and more pupils were able to offer more explanations and expand on and sometimes challenge the views of their peers (Black et al. 2003). Therefore, by increasing the think time, the pupils were able to offer more substantial responses, which could be beneficial to the teacher to validate understanding to use as a tool to inform their assessment for learning.

However, there are arguments that increasing the pupil think time could lead to the class losing focus within the lesson. Ingram and Elliott (2016) argue that by increasing the think time it could open the lesson up to the opportunity of undesirable behaviour from the pupils. This was also raised in Black et al. (2003) research through teachers, as they were anxious that pupils would lose interest and engagement during the extended think time. As well, Carlsen (1991) argues that whilst a teacher is questioning a pupil, the lengthy pause has the potential to encourage other pupils to shout out or lose interest due to the pace of the lesson being slowed down. Kirton et al. (2007) also suggest that whilst some pupils responded with better-quality answers, the extended think time others became bored. Thus, giving validity to the extended think time promoting undesirable behaviour. This suggests that extending think time is not always a positive but can be a negative influence as well. This could convey that the teachers need to be aware of their classroom management and continually monitor the pupils' engagement and be ready to adapt the pace.

However, Black et al. (2003) highlighted by giving the pupils a longer think time, that over time they began to realise that they were required to give a more thought out response. Therefore, this is suggestive that during the extended think time pupils may not have engaged with the think time initially, but as they became more familiar with the idea, they began to use the time to think about their response and formulate a better-quality answer.

Nevertheless, arguing against this promotion of undesirable behaviour is Rowe (1986), who that questioning at a quick pace is a method teachers use to control the behaviour management within their classroom. Whereas, Rowe (1986) views the extended wait time as a method of influencing the pupils' motivation, which then

influences their attention and cooperation. This was demonstrated in Rowe's (1986) research through a quote from a pupil talking to his parent, whose teacher was experimenting with the three second think time: "It's the first time in all my years in school that anybody cared about what I really thought – not just what I am supposed to say" (Rowe, 1986: 44).

There is a strong evidence base that demonstrates the beneficial effects of increasing the think time of pupils, although the research discussed so far can be criticised. It is primarily based on 11-year-old pupils or older. Thus, does not consider young children. Given that our Lesson Study is based within the Foundation Phase context, we can only generalise the findings from the literature discussed so far.

Medcalf Davenport (2003) proposes that asking a question and expecting a direct answer is unnatural for young children and recommends that young children should have the opportunity to express ideas from previous questions later on. Medcalf Davenport (2003) also highlights the importance of giving young children think time to allow them to fully develop and express their ideas. Research found that when examining the answers given by young children, any fragments that deem disjointed to a question were actually relevant to previous questions or conversations (Medcalf Davenport, 2003). Therefore, this suggests that think time should be given to allow the pupils to convey their ideas, but also the need to be aware of the answers appearing later on within the lesson. The ideas discussed from this author are all important elements that need to be considered within my research project.

Explanation of Lesson Study Design

The project used the Lesson Study research methodology, which is a form of action research. It originates from Japan and was first introduced to the United Kingdom by Dudley (2014). The Lesson Study approach aims to improve practice within the classroom through teachers collaboratively developing their teaching, pedagogical knowledge and the learning of their pupils (Dudley, 2014).

The first step of the Lesson Study methodology is for the research group to decide on a specific focus to improve. In this particular project, the focus was pupils' think time and how can it be used to enhance the pupil's response. Leading on from the selected focus, the next stage is to collaboratively plan a lesson aimed to depict this focus and allow for observations to be carried out. The whole class participates providing they have given their assent and parental consent has been gained, but there are also three case pupils that are observed in more detail. After the lesson, the three case pupils participate in a group focus interview, where their thoughts and feelings about the lesson are gathered. Following the focused group interview, the teachers reflect on their observations and findings and then re-plan the lesson, making small adaptations to improve it, before repeating the Lesson (Dudley, 2014).

A key value that Lesson Study incorporates is that it is based in real life classroom and based on real pupils (Dudley, 2014). "Classroom life is full of habits and routines that pass unnoticed" (Stepanek et al. 2006). It enables the teachers to examine their own and colleagues practice in a real-life context and provides concrete evidence from a natural environment (Chokshi and Fernandez, 2004). Dudley (2014) also suggests that classrooms are a complex working environment, where a large amount

of information is generated by learners engrossed in activities. Therefore, by carrying out the Lesson Study approach in a real-life context provides the researcher with an invaluable insight based on a natural setting. This gives strength to the methodology and creates the opportunity for natural data to be collated.

Chokshi and Fernandez (2004) also propose that the Lesson Study approach allows teachers to constantly modify their teaching to meet the individual needs of their pupils. They are continually gathering information through their observations and analysis, which enables them to create assessment portfolios. These provide a bank of concrete evidence and can be used to transform the learning and teaching within the classroom (Chokshi and Fernandez, 2004).

However, a challenge associated with the Lesson Study approach is that there is limited formal evidence between the relationship of teachers' involvement in Lesson Study and improved outcomes on standardised tests (Chokshi and Fernandez, 2004). Nonetheless, it can contribute greatly to the assessment portfolios mentioned previously, providing valuable assessment details, which will inform the progression steps for the pupils, which may be more beneficial to the individual's learning than the results of the standardised tests (Chokshi and Fernandez, 2004).

Lesson Study is conducted by teachers working in a collaborative manner through joint planning, observation and analysis (Dudley, 2014), which creates an environment for teachers to share each other's experiences and expertise (Chokshi and Fernandez, 2004). It also enables teachers to learn from one another; deepening their understanding about pedagogical content and subject knowledge, which can then be applied to their teaching and classroom manner straightaway (Chokshi and Fernandez, 2004). This notion of collaborative working accommodates the ideas of the new curriculum by Donaldson (2015). Donaldson (2015: 90) suggests that "the importance of working together both within school and across schools will be an important part of developing such expertise". Therefore, this advocates the use of the Lesson Study approach in the development of teacher practice.

Lesson Study is directed by the teachers, as they are responsible for determining the focus of the research and addressing their pupils' needs. Chokshi and Fernandez (2004) state that Lesson Study takes time, as a group of teachers work collaborative, which results them having to be absent in their class whilst they observe during the Lesson Study research. Nevertheless, whilst Chokshi and Fernandez (2004) identify the Lesson Study approach as being time consuming, they do highlight that it can be extremely rewarding and beneficial, once the commitment has been made. Also promoting this is Stepanek et al. (2006) who also suggest that if the commitment of the Lesson Study across the whole school is made, rather than individual classes, all of the teachers will develop their practice from building on each other's experiences and expertise.

As part of the Lesson Study, observations will be made by a non-participant observer using a semi-structured observational schedule. The non-participant observer will be responsible for watching the participants closely and making notes about their behaviour and responses to the questions. Using a semi-structured observational

schedule allowed the same questions to be answered within both Lesson Study 1 and Lesson Study 2, but also enabled the observer to make additional notes. This provided some consistency without limiting the observer. The non-participant observer was available at all times throughout the Lesson Study to make notes, which allowed them to record details as they were happening, rather than relying on memory after they had occurred.

Whilst this method allowed us to gather detailed information during Lesson Study 1 and Lesson Study 2, it may have opened up the potential to miss other details, during the recording of a previous detail (Hobart and Frankel, 2004). Hence, we cannot be completely sure that every detail was recorded.

Another limitation to this non-participant observer method, is that it may have had an effect on the pupils' behaviour. To accommodate for the ethical considerations, we explained to the pupils before starting, who the observer was and how the Lesson Study would work. With this open manner about the study and highlighting to the pupils that they were being watched may have caused them to behave differently to if the researcher was not present. This is known as the 'Hawthorne Effect', where researchers accommodate for unforeseen outcomes that they may believe have been influenced by the participants being aware that they were being observed for research purposes (Merrett, 2006). Therefore, as this questions the accuracy of the pupils' behaviour during the observations, this could open up the opportunity for criticism and impact the validity and reliability of the results.

Following each Lesson Study, a focused group interview was conducted with three case pupils in each class. All the pupils who had given assent and had parental consent were sorted into three groups based on their suggested attainment by the class teacher (high, middle or low). One pupil was then selected at random from each group to give us our three focus pupils. Davie and Galloway (1996: 51) portray that "listening to children is a fundamental component of good teaching, irrespective of the age of the pupils". The focused group interview was the ideal opportunity to give us an insight into the pupils' thoughts and feelings about think time; whether they felt that they were given long enough or felt rushed and to suggest any methods they would like to use in order to help them.

However, like all other methodologies, this focused group interview is not short of the criticisms either. One limitation is the "interviewer effect", where the participants respond differently depending on how they perceive the person facilitating the interview (Denscombe, 2007). In this particular research project, the pupils were familiar with at least one researcher at all times and had established a relationship previously during the Professional Teaching Experiences placement (PTE). With this in mind, the pupils may not have shared their true thoughts and feelings, as they did not want to upset the researcher, they were familiar with. To prevent this from happening, we aimed to ask open questions and to be non-judgemental throughout the interview process. We also encouraged honesty throughout. Although Denscombe (2007: 200) states that "there is no absolute way of verifying what someone tells you about their thoughts and feelings".

Another limitation to the focused group interview is that the effect of the interviewer and research context is unique to the specific context and individuals involved in the research. Thus, this makes the consistency and objectivity difficult to achieve, which in turn makes it challenging to generalise the results. However, in the typical Lesson Study approach, it could be argued that the practice is completed within the same class structure, so conducted in the same context with specific individuals, which maintains this consistency.

The last methodology to mention is the use of reflection throughout the whole research project and in particular after each Lesson Study. The reflection will be based on Kolb's (1984) Learning Cycle, which is a process comprising of four stages. The cycle begins with an incident being identified, then reflecting upon it, followed by learning from the incident and making generalisations and then planning and trying out what has been learnt (Bassot, 2016). Whilst small changes could be made throughout the Lesson Study, the main reflection took place as a group after the lesson, and small adaptation were made in relation to our individual reflections but also those that were brought up in the focused group interview.

The methods discussed above are aimed to investigate the think time by collecting qualitative data. Through the data collection, our intention is to investigate how this idea of extending think time will stimulate the pupils into giving a more detailed and better-quality answer when responding to teacher questioning.

Ethical Considerations

Like all research, there were ethical considerations that needed to be addressed before commencing with the research. Before starting the research, an ethics form, which can be seen in Appendix A, was submitted to the University's Ethics Committee, seeking approval for the research to go ahead. One consideration within the ethics form was the gaining of consent and assent from participants and parents or guardians (British Education Research Association, 2011). After seeking approval from the Ethics Committee, a letter, see Appendix B was sent out to parents and guardians explaining the overall research project and asking them for consent for their child to participate in the research (University of Wales Trinity Saint David (UWTSD) Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Practice, 2017).

Article 12 of The United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child (Unicef, 1989) highlights that children have the right to communicate their opinion and to have it considered seriously. With this in mind, before the lesson study began, all pupils were briefed about the project, by the teacher reading out the explanatory statements, which can be seen in Appendix C for School 1 and Appendix D for School 2. The explanatory statement explained to the pupils the manner in which the research would be conducted and their rights to withdraw from the project at any point. This explanatory statement was signed by the class teacher to confirm that it had been read to the pupils, before beginning. The pupils were then asked to put their thumbs up to give their assent. If they were unsure of what we were asking them to do, we asked them to put their finger on their nose. This allowed for the observer to confirm whether the pupil was giving assent or not. We recorded the assent from the pupils in a table, see Appendix E for Lesson Study 1 and Appendix F

for Lesson Study 2. Only those pupils who had given their assent and had parental consent were involved in the research.

Another consideration within the ethics form was confidentiality and anonymity. Following guidelines set out in Section 19.6 Anonymity and Confidentiality of the UWTSD Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Practice (2017), no school names, teacher or pupil names will be identified or disclosed within any areas of the research.

Analysis of Lesson Study 1 and Lesson Study 2

The Lesson Study was planned with a literacy theme. After gaining assent the lesson began with reading a book to the pupils. The book we selected was 'Back to Earth with a Bump' and we chose this on the basis that it would generally be unknown by the pupils, so that previous readings would not scaffold their responses and they would need to think about their replies.

The Lesson Study being based on a book was due to research found by Sipe (2008), who commented that children who are familiar to engaging and discussing stories relay some incredible responses. Therefore, we chose a literacy lesson and the use of storytime, in the hope it would give the pupils plenty of opportunities to share their ideas. Also, having observed my class during my PTE placement, they would always enjoy and engage with story.

Throughout the book reading, the pupils were asked questions, which was our opportunity to utilise the think time. The questions involved pupils making prediction and giving their own opinions, see examples of questions in the lesson plan in Appendix G. Whilst a lot of the questions were prepared, we did allow for additional questions to be asked if appropriate to the response from the pupils. All questions asked during both lessons were given a minimum of 3 seconds and for as long as the pupils needed to respond. Following the story, the pupils were asked to draw a picture about a place that they would go to on their rocket. Once they had completed their picture, we asked them to write a sentence to accompany their drawing.

Lesson Study 1 was conducted in School 1 with the Year One class. All pupils appeared to enjoy and engage with the lesson and the lesson outcome was met. All pupils participated in the questioning, completed the drawing of their picture, but a small minority completed their sentence as well. Throughout the questioning of the story, the observer watched for how the pupils responded and in particular the three focus pupils. When I was asking the questions, I encouraged the pupils to think about their answer before saying it. I did this by asking them to put their 'thinking hats' on and to visualise this by placing their hand on their head. I then waited a minimum of three seconds before asking a pupil to respond (see Appendix H). Anning and Ring (2004) suggest that children use visual resources to aid meanings and representations of something. Bearing this in mind, as this was a new concept for the pupils we were incorporating, we felt it was important to adopt a visual gesture to use with it.

Throughout the Lesson Study, the three focus pupils appeared to respond differently to the think time. Pupil 1, who was identified by the class teacher as the higher

attaining pupil, was very talkative and was always keen to share ideas. Pupil 1 did not respond to the idea of think time straight away and was very quick to respond to questions. However, when she used the think time, she produced reasonable answers to the questions, using full sentences and conveying her ideas audibly and relatively clearly. Although Pupil 1 did not use the think time straight away, she was very clear with the visual gesture, placing her hand on her head when asked to put her thinking hat on.

Pupil 2, who was identified by the class teacher as the middle attaining pupil, did not appear to engage with the think time given. Pupil 2 seemed slightly distracted but was still able to respond to the questions asked. Although answers were mostly relevant, they were not always constructed using full sentences or with length. Pupil 2 would use the thinking hat visual gesture at times, but not very consistently.

Pupil 3, who was identified by the class teacher as the lower attaining pupil, struggled to sit still on the carpet and during the think time would often try to talk to the person next to him. However, he did consistently use the thinking hat visual gesture, even though he did not seem to use his think time. Pupil 3's responses to questions were short, often giving one/two-word answers.

The group focused interview conducted straight after the lesson was informative and provided us an interesting insight into the thoughts of the three focus pupils. All three focus pupils commented that they enjoyed the lesson, by putting their thumbs up to respond. Interestingly, Pupil 1 and 3, when asked what helped them with our thinking, referred to the thinking hat visual gesture; Pupil 1 referred to it verbally and Pupil 3 responded by performing the action. Pupil 3 later on in the group focused interview went on to tell us how he would like an actual thinking hat.

Using Kolb's (1984) Learning Cycle, the encounter was the impact of the thinking hats visual gesture. This seemed to be remembered by the pupils and a gesture that they connected with. This supports the ideas communicated by Anning and Ring (2004), but also that of Robson (2006) that visual representation is key within the development of understanding and meanings by young children. This led us to reflect that the visual gesture was a successful element added to the Lesson Study, however, we could make more of it, which was suggested by Pupil 3 in terms of an actual hat. Moving forward with the idea of a thinking hat, we thought about whether we should have one hat that we passed around, or a hat for every pupil. As the Lesson Study was based on the whole class and we were asking questions to the whole class and wanted everyone to indulge in think time, we felt it was important that everyone had access to their own thinking hat. Therefore, this idea was then developed and thinking hats were created for all children (see Appendix I). This was then incorporated into the lesson plan for Lesson Study 2 and would be begin by explaining to the pupils that we were going to be doing some thinking and that the hats were there to help us with our thinking.

It was interesting to observe the overall engagement across the questioning during think time. The majority of pupils appeared to engage with the concept of think time, however, a small minority of pupils did disengage and became distracted and fidgety on the carpet. This could be due to the fact that the pace was slower because of the

increased think time given. As mentioned already, Pupil 2 from time to time was slightly distracted during the questioning. In the group focus interview, he did not respond with much detail to any of the questions as can be seen in the observational schedule in Appendix H but commented that he found it easy and would have liked harder questions. This could suggest a lack of interest to some parts of the lesson or reflect the impact of the slower pace.

Returning to Kolb's (1984) Learning Cycle the next incident identified was the slower pace. When thinking back to what might have caused this, as well as the increased think time, we looked at the amount of questions that were included. Having reflected on this with my partner, it was agreed that Lesson Study 1 contained too many questions, which could have resulted in the story taking too much time, thus slowing down the pace. I was particularly interested to see if reducing the questioning minimised the fidgeting on the carpet that I encountered in Lesson Study 1. With this in mind, the prepared questions in the lesson plan were condensed, as shown in the lesson plan for Lesson Study 2 in Appendix J.

Having reflected on the first Lesson Study, we were ready to commence with the second Lesson Study. Lesson Study 2 was conducted on a Reception class and the lesson was taught by my research partner. After gaining assent from the pupils in this class, the lesson began with the pupils being issued with their thinking hat to wear and the teacher highlighted that it was going to help with the thinking. The hat received a positive response from all the pupils and this was demonstrated through their enthusiasm to put their hats on quickly. The lesson then followed the same format as Lesson Study 1, but with reduced questioning, which meant that the pupils got on to the drawing task a lot quicker.

Pupil A, who was identified by the class teacher as the higher attaining pupil, was engaged throughout the whole lesson. She was fully immersed within the thinking hat prop and her comments can be seen in the observational schedule in Appendix K. It would seem that Pupil A used her think time according and was able to answer questions clearly with a reasonable, thoughtful answer.

Pupil B, who was identified by the class teacher as the middle attaining pupil, was quite quiet throughout the lesson, but he did not appear to be distracted. Pupil B answered questions when asked specifically but did not shout out at all. I observed him engaging with the hat and following instructions from the teacher, for example, when asked to rub it to make it work.

Pupil C, who was identified by the class teacher as the lower attaining pupil, engaged with the lessons at time, however, he was distracted with the hat and would often take it off and play with it. Thus, the thinking hat prop in this case, may have hindered his think time, rather than benefit it. Pupil C responded to a couple of the questions, but his responses were limited. This could suggest that he did not fully engage with the think time and that the thinking hat prop may have influenced this. Although, it could be argued that the thinking hat prop was a new experience and if it was an item that was embedded into daily school life, maybe over time this would reduce, and the benefits may be seen.

All pupils seemed to enjoy and engage with the lesson and they were all successful in meeting the learning outcome. Being the observer for this lesson, allowed me to watch how the pupils responded to the thinking hat prop throughout. The majority of the pupils wore the hat and used it to support their thinking and only a small minority were distracted away from the task by playing with the hat. It was interesting to see how the pupils used the thinking hat prop to help them. For example, Pupil A commented how good the hats were. Later, when the pupils were asked a question and appeared unsure of what to say, the teacher encouraged the pupils to give their hat a little rub, which reminded them to think. The imagination of the pupils was incredible, with all pupils rubbing their hat to 'switch on' their thinking. The pupils were captivated with the thinking hats prop, which helped to stimulate the idea of thinking.

When interviewing the three focused pupils after the lesson, it was evident in the pupils' responses that they liked the thinking hats prop and felt that it had benefitted their thinking and concentration (see Appendix K). Whilst, we can only assume and hope that the pupils were using think time appropriately, we can be sure that they had established a relationship with their thinking hats prop.

Having reflected on the thinking hat visual gesture in Lesson Study 1, it was important to reflect the overall performance of the thinking hat prop in lesson two. As discussed above the thinking hats prop had a positive impact to the lesson on a whole. If think time was not used to its full potential, then the thinking hat prop made pupils aware of the idea of the use of think time that we were trying to introduce. Therefore, for future lessons, I would definitely use this idea of think hats to support the notion of think time.

Discussion of Research Findings

The research demonstrates support to the literature previously discussed. The think time given within my research was a minimum of three seconds, which was the recommended in research from Rowe (1974). Allowing for this extended think time, did give the pupils more opportunity to think about their response and this was demonstrated in the responses received by the higher attaining pupils. It was observed that they gave reasonable answers, responding in sentences rather than one word or shorter answers.

However, the research, particularly in Lesson Study 1, showed that extending the think time did have the potential to slow down the pace of the lesson. Therefore, this provided the opportunity for some pupils to become distracted and potentially bored and indirectly discouraged engagement at times. This gives validity to Ingram and Elliott (2016) who identified that extended think time could offer the potential for pupils to display undesirable behaviour.

Finally, the findings promote the use of visual representation within the Foundation Phase, which coincides with Anning and Ring (2004). The thinking hat visual gesture and prop played a key role within the Lesson Study. All pupils related to the visual representation that they were subject to and gave positive feedback in the focus group interview. The Lesson Study did demonstrate that props have the potential to distract the pupils, however, it is important to consider that this was the first time that

the pupils had come across the thinking hat prop and therefore, were excited by this new experience. It could be suggested that if the thinking hats were incorporated into lessons on a more regular basis, the pupils would become familiar, which could reduce the amount of time some pupils spend playing with the hat. The Department for Children, Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills (2008: 9) suggest that “by repeating a learning experience they develop schema or patterns of thought that are strengthened until they are able to make connections”. Therefore, this suggests that incorporating the thinking hat prop into other lessons may be more beneficial to think time, rather than a one-off lesson. It may also demonstrate correlations to the research by Black et al. (2003) which proposes that by giving a longer think time, pupils will recognise the need for a better-quality answer to be given.

An anomaly within the results appears within School 1’s observational record from Pupil 1. Pupil 1, when asked how the lesson could be improved, indicated that she would have liked to have shared her think time with a partner, so that they could share ideas and help each other. This was interesting outcome as it could suggest that she embraced the think time given and has offered her own solution to improve it.

One element that was observed throughout the Lesson Study was the teacher’s body language. Having looked into this area, I found that Miller (2005: 29) conveys that “body movements can support or reject the spoken word. They should...confirm the verbal messages the teacher is giving”. Therefore, we felt it was important to monitor the body language of the teacher because although we were giving an extended think time, our body language may have given a different signal to the pupils, which could have indirectly reduced the think time for the pupils. However, given that the majority of pupils commented that they felt that they had had enough time to think, the body language of the teacher must have been inviting and positive.

Conclusion

Having conducted this Lesson Study, I have increased my knowledge and understanding around the use of think time. Whilst the research has demonstrated correlations to the relevant literature and provided me with a first-hand experience into the impact of think time, it does have limitations and can be criticised.

Firstly, the research can be criticised for its inconsistency and for not entirely following the ideal Lesson Study format set out by Dudley (2014). Primarily, Lesson Study 1 and Lesson Study 2 were based on two different classes in two different schools. This resulted in the two lessons being delivered to different ages pupils from different background contexts and in a different setting. Therefore, the reflection and adaptations made after the first Lesson Study may not have been completely relevant to the pupils involved in Lesson Study 2, thus not a true representation of Lesson Study 1.

Secondly, the two lessons were taught by different teachers. Lesson one was taught by myself and lesson two was taught by my research partner, so our teaching styles are individual and different to each other. Consequently, this is a factor that could have impacted the research indirectly and is another inconsistency to note.

Thirdly, as this Lesson Study research was a one-off lesson, it can only provide us with an initial insight into the focus area and would require further investigation to validate the results of this particular research. If this research was investigated further, it has the potential to generate a deeper understanding of think time, as the pupils would have had more time to engage with it and a better understanding of it themselves. The research could also be transferred to other classes and lessons to widen the analysis and provide a broader evidence base.

Recommendations

Conducting this lesson study has given me the opportunity to think about the think time that I provide the pupils with after posing a question and how I use my body language during that think time. With incorporating an extended think time in future lessons, I will prepare questions in my planning, as well as be conscious of the time I spend questioning in the lessons. The research showed that some pupils became restless during the questioning, which has highlighted to me the importance of monitoring and assessing whilst teaching. This is a standard which I hope to develop on my next placement.

If I did Lesson Study again, I would try to use the same class to reduce some of the inconsistencies within this research. By conducting the lesson study with a partner has been a very effective way of sharing good practice. It allowed me to reflect personally as well as with my partner, who pointed out strengths and limitations that I may have missed when I was teaching.

Overall, the Lesson Study has demonstrated the influence of extended think time and has shown to have a positive impact to pupils' responses when extended and thus answering the research question. It has also identified that it needs to be continually monitored by the teacher, so ensure that pupils do not lose interest and show signs of undesirable behaviour.

References

Alexander, R. (2004) *Towards Dialogic Teaching: Rethinking Classroom Talk*. York: Dialogos.

Anning, A. and Ring, K. (2004) *Making Sense of Children's Drawings*. Berkshire: Open University Press.

Bassot, B. (2016) *The Reflective Practice Guide: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Critical Reflection*. Oxon: Routledge.

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

British Education Research Association (2011) 'Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research' Available at: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/resources-for-researchers> [Accessed: 5 April 2018]

Carlsen, W. S. (1991) 'Questioning in Classrooms: A Sociolinguistic Perspective', *Review of Educational Research*, 61, 2, Summer 1991, pp.157-178, [Online] Available at: <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/stable/pdf/1170533.pdf?refreqid=excelsior:9ae28806baa22eeda20694a389239993> [Accessed: 6 April 2018]

Chokshi, S. and Fernandez, C. (2004) 'Challenges to Importing Japanese Lesson Study: Concerns, Misconceptions, and Nuances', *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85, 7, 1st March, pp. 520-525, [Online] Available at: <http://journals.sagepub.com.ezproxy.uwtsd.ac.uk/doi/abs/10.1177/003172170408500710> [Accessed: 7 April 2018]

Davie, R. and Galloway, D. (1996) *Listening to Children in Education*. London: David Fulton Publishers Ltd.

Denscombe, M. (2007) *The Good Research Guide for Small-Scale Social Research Projects*. (3rd ed) Berkshire: Open University Press

Donaldson, G. (2015) *Successful Futures: Independent Review of Curriculum and Assessment Arrangements in Wales*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.

Dudley, P. (2014) 'Lesson Study: A Handbook' Available at: <http://lessonstudy.co.uk/2015/11/download-a-free-copy-of-the-lesson-study-handbook/> [Accessed: 5 April 2018]

Dudley, P. (2014) 'Lesson Study: A Handbook, Early Years Edition' Available at: <http://lessonstudy.co.uk/2015/11/download-a-free-copy-of-the-lesson-study-handbook/> [Accessed: 5 April 2018]

Estyn (2014) 'A Report on [REDACTED] Primary School' Available at: [https://www.estyn.gov.wales/sites/default/files/documents/Inspection%20report%20\[REDACTED\]](https://www.estyn.gov.wales/sites/default/files/documents/Inspection%20report%20[REDACTED])

Rowe, M. B. (1974) 'Wait-time and Rewards as Instructional Variables, Their Influence on Language, Logic and Fate Control. Part One. Wait Time' *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 11, pp.81-94.

Sipe, L. R. (2008) *Storytime: Young Children's Literacy Understanding in the Classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Stahl, R. J. (1990) 'Using 'Think-Time' Behaviors to Promote Students' Information Processing, Learning and On-Task Participation: An Instructional Module', *Tempe*, AZ: Arizona State University.

Stepanek, J., Appel, G., Leong, M., Turner Mangan, M., and Mitchell, M. (2006) *Leading Lesson Study: A Practical Guide for Teachers and Facilitators*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Unicef (1989) 'The United Nations Convention of the Rights of the Child' Available at: https://downloads.unicef.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/05/UNCRC_united_nations_convention_on_the_rights_of_the_child.pdf [Accessed: 5 April 2018]

University of Wales Trinity Saint David (2017) *University of Wales Trinity Saint David Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Practice*. Swansea: University of Wales Trinity Saint David. [Online] Available at: <http://www.uwtsd.ac.uk/media/uwtsd-website/content-assets/documents/research/research-ethics-integrity-code-practice.pdf> [Accessed: 7 April 2018]

Wales: Department for Children, Education, Lifelong Learning and Skills (2008) *Learning and Teaching Pedagogy*. Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government. [Online] Available at: <http://learning.gov.wales/docs/learningwales/publications/130212ltpedagogyen.pdf> [Accessed: 8 April 2018]

Appendices

Appendix A

Ethics Form submitted to the University of Wales Trinity Saint David's Ethics Committee for approval.



PG2 / E1 FORM

APPLICATION FOR ETHICAL APPROVAL

In order for research to result in benefit and minimise risk of harm, it must be conducted ethically. A researcher may not be covered by the University's insurance if ethical approval has not been obtained prior to commencement.

The University follows the OECD Frascati manual definition of **research activity**: "creative work undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of man, culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications". As such this covers activities undertaken by members of staff, postgraduate research students, and both taught postgraduate and undergraduate students working on dissertations/projects.

The individual undertaking the research activity is known as the "principal researcher".

Ethical approval is not required for routine audits, performance reviews, quality assurance studies, testing within normal educational requirements, and literary or artistic criticism.

Please read the notes for guidance before completing ALL sections of the form.

This form must be completed and approved prior to undertaking any research activity. Please see Checklist for details of process for different categories of application.

SECTION A: About You (Principal Researcher)

Full Name:			
Tick all boxes which apply:			
Member of staff:	☐	Student:	☒
Honorary research fellow:	☐		
Faculty/School/Centre:	Yr Athrofa		
Campus:	Townhill		
E-mail address:	1701011@student.uwtsd.ac.uk		
Contact Telephone Number:			
For students:			
Student Number:	1701011	Undergraduate	☐
Programme of Study:	PGCE Primary	Taught Postgraduate	☒
Director of Studies/Supervisor:		Research	☐

SECTION B: Approval for Research Activity

Has the research activity received approval in principle? (please check the Guidance Notes as to the appropriate approval process for different levels of research by different categories of individual)	YES	☒	NO	☐
Date				
If Yes, please indicate source of approval (and date where known):	Research Degrees Committee	☐		
	Faculty Research Committee	☐		
	Other (write in) [redacted]	☒	28/02/18	

Approval in principle **must** be obtained from the relevant source prior to seeking ethical approval.



PG2 / E1 FORM

SECTION C: External Ethical Guidance Materials

Please list the core ethical guidance documents that have been referred to during the completion of this form (including any discipline-specific codes of research ethics, and also any specific ethical guidance relating to the proposed methodology). Please tick to confirm that your research proposal adheres to these codes and guidelines.	
BERA Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research (2011)	☒
University of Wales Trinity Saint David (UWTSD) Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Conduct (2017 - 2020)	☒
EWC Code of Practice (2017)	☒

SECTION D: External Collaborative Research Activity

Does the research activity involve collaborators outside of the University?	YES	☐	NO	☒
If Yes, please provide the name of the external organisation and name and contact details for the main contact person:				
Institution				
Contact person name				
Contact person e-mail address				

Where research activity is carried out in collaboration with an external organisation

Does this organisation have its own ethics approval system?	YES	☐	NO	☐
If Yes, please attach a copy of any final approval (or interim approval) from the organisation				

SECTION E: Details of Research Activity

Indicative title:	How can thinking time enhance pupil response to the learning outcome?		
Proposed start date:	March 2018	Proposed end date:	April 2018
Purpose of research activity (including aims and objectives) Outline the purpose, aims and objectives of the research activity, including key research questions. Show briefly how existing research has informed the proposed activity and explain what the research activity will add and how it addresses an area of importance. (Maximum 300 words)			
The purpose of the research is to investigate how giving pupils' thinking time enhances the pupils' response to the teacher. In order to investigate this research question, I am going to consider three aspects.			
Firstly, I am going to explore whether increasing the thinking time encourages a better-quality pupil response. Research has shown that teachers on average give pupils 0.9 seconds to respond to a question before intervening if they have not received a response (Black et al., 2003). Therefore, this very short interval does not allow pupils to think about their response before responding or the teacher intervening.			
Secondly, I am going to consider how the teacher's body language can impact the pupils' thinking time and response. Yang (2016) suggests that body language plays an important role within communication. Consequently, if the thinking time is incorporated, can the teachers body language hinder or support the pupils thinking time indirectly?			
Thirdly, I am going to observe at how visual gestures can be used to engage pupils in the thinking time process? Edwards and Willis (2000) identified that for early years children bringing together gestures and oracy is a very natural process and that they prefer an integrated approach. Therefore,			

when encouraging pupils to use thinking time, will bringing in a visual gesture support the technique?

By introducing visual gestures, increasing thinking time and teacher body language, I hope to observe how these three aspects could benefit my assessment for learning strategies in my teaching practices. I also hope to observe the benefits it could have to my pupils' responses to questions.

Proposed methods

Provide a brief summary of all the methods that may be used in the research activity, making it clear what specific techniques may be used. If methods other than those listed in this section are deemed appropriate later, additional ethical approval for those methods will be needed. (Maximum 600 words)

The research will follow the Lesson Study model, which focuses on the learning and progress made by the pupils as I, the teacher focuses on developing specific pedagogical techniques designed to improve a particular aspect of teaching. The aim of the Lesson Study model is to work with a partner to develop our teaching practice collaboratively. During the course of the Lesson Study model, I will engage in a cycle, where I plan a lesson with my research partner, which focuses on the thinking time strategy. I will then deliver the jointly planned lesson with my partner observing the whole class and in particular the three focus pupils. After the lesson, I will then conduct an interview with the three focus pupils. Taking into account the observations and the responses from the three focus pupils, I will then reflect on my practice, referring to my initial thoughts and then with my partner re-plan and deliver a similar lesson, considering any responses from the observation and focus interview (Department for Education, 2010).

As mentioned above, the lesson will follow with a focus group interview. The aim of this interview is to gain the pupils perspectives on what they thought worked for them and what they felt that they had learned. It also offers the pupils an opportunity to think how the lesson could be changed in order to make it work even better (Dudley, 2014). This particular interview will take place with all three focus pupils together.

During the lesson a non-participant observation will take place. This will enable the observer to watch the pupils closely and take relevant notes in a semi-structured observation. Whilst this observational method will allow the observer to observe without actively getting involved, it can be scrutinised for the Hawthorne effect and may open up opportunity for the pupils to behave differently (Scott and Marshall, 2009). Therefore, with this in mind, the location of the observer will be strongly considered to attempt to minimise this effect.

Throughout the research process, I will continually reflect on the process and the teaching and learning taking place. A reflection with my partner will follow on from the first lesson and group focus interview, as well as after the second lesson study. These two reflections will influence where we take the second lesson and where the research could make recommendations beyond this research project.

In regard to a focus pupil being absent on the day the research is due to be carried out, a second random selection will take place from the ability group that is required.

Location of research activity

Identify all locations where research activity will take place.

School 1 a primary school situated in the centre of Bridgend. There are 437 pupils on roll, including 58 in the school's nursery class. Pupils are organised into 15 classes. Around 8% of pupils are eligible for free school meals, which is lower than the national average of 21%. A very few pupils are looked after by the local authority. A very few pupils speak Welsh at home. A few pupils speak English as an additional language, and many of these pupils have only very recently joined the school (Estyn, 2017).

School 2 is a primary school in the east of Swansea local authority. There are 353 pupils



PG2 / E1 FORM

ages three to eleven years on roll. This includes around 53 pupils in the two part-time nursery classes. The school has 12 full-time classes. Two classes have pupils from mixed age groups. Around 35% of pupils are eligible for free school meals and there are a very few children who are looked after by the local authority (Estyn, 2014).

Research activity outside of the UK

If research activity will take place overseas, you are responsible for ensuring that local ethical considerations are complied with and that the relevant permissions are sought. Specify any local guidelines (e.g. from local professional associations/learned societies/universities) that exist and whether these involve any ethical stipulations beyond those usual in the UK (provide details of any licenses or permissions required). Also specify whether there are any specific ethical issues raised by the local context in which the research activity is taking place, for example, particular cultural sensitivities or vulnerabilities of participants.

N/A



PG2 / E1 FORM

SECTION F: Scope of Research Activity

Will the research activity include:	YES	NO
Use of a questionnaire or similar research instrument?	☐	☒
Use of interviews?	☒	☐
Use of diaries?	☐	☒
Participant observation with their knowledge?	☒	☐
Participant observation without their knowledge?	☐	☒
Use of video or audio recording?	☒	☐
Access to personal or confidential information without the participants' specific consent?	☐	☒
Administration of any questions, test stimuli, presentation that may be experienced as physically, mentally or emotionally harmful / offensive?	☐	☒
Performance of any acts which may cause embarrassment or affect self-esteem?	☐	☒
Investigation of participants involved in illegal activities?	☐	☒
Use of procedures that involve deception?	☐	☒
Administration of any substance, agent or placebo?	☐	☒
Working with live vertebrate animals?	☐	☒
Other primary data collection methods, please explain in this box	☐	☒

If NO to every question, then the research activity is (ethically) low risk and **may** be exempt from some of the following sections (please refer to Guidance Notes).

If YES to any question, then no research activity should be undertaken until full ethical approval has been obtained.



PG2 / E1 FORM

SECTION G: Intended Participants

Who are the intended participants:	YES	NO
Students or staff at the University?	☐	☒
Adults (over the age of 18 and competent to give consent)?	☐	☒
Vulnerable adults?	☐	☒
Children under 18?	☒	☐
Prisoners?	☐	☒
Young offenders?	☐	☒
Those who could be considered to have a particularly dependent relationship with the investigator or a gatekeeper?	☐	☒
People engaged in illegal activities?	☐	☒
Others (please identify):	☐	☒

Participant numbers and source

Provide an estimate of the expected number of participants. How will you identify participants and how will they be recruited?

Both classes are mixed gender and consist of 29 pupils each. School 1 will be based on a Year 1 class with pupils aged between 5 - 6 years old and School 2 will be based on a Reception class where pupils are 4 - 5 years old.

Three focused pupils from each class will be selected randomly from high, middle and low ability groups. Please note that only pupils who have given assent and have parental consent will be in the selection that I am drawing from.

In the event of the selected focused pupils being absent, a new name will be drawn randomly from the ability group required.

Information for participants:	YES	NO	N/A
Will you describe the main research procedures to participants in advance, so that they are informed about what to expect?	☒	☐	☐
Will you tell participants that their participation is voluntary?	☒	☐	☐
Will you obtain written consent for participation?	☒	☐	☐
Will you explain to participants that refusal to participate in the research will not affect their treatment or education (if relevant)?	☒	☐	☐
If the research is observational, will you ask participants for their consent to being observed?	☒	☐	☐
Will you tell participants that they may withdraw from the research at any time and for any reason?	☒	☐	☐
With questionnaires, will you give participants the option of omitting questions they do not want to answer?	☐	☐	☒
Will you tell participants that their data will be treated with full confidentiality and that, if published, it will not be identifiable as theirs?	☒	☐	☐
Will you debrief participants at the end of their participation, in a way appropriate to the type of research undertaken?	☒	☐	☐
If NO to any of above questions, please give an explanation			



PG2 / E1 FORM

(this box should expand as you type)

Information for participants:	YES	NO	N/A
Will participants be paid?	☐	☒	☐
Is specialist electrical or other equipment to be used with participants?	☐	☒	☐
Are there any financial or other interests to the investigator or University arising from this study?	☐	☒	☐
Will the research activity involve deliberately misleading participants in any way, or the partial or full concealment of the specific study aims?	☐	☒	☐
If YES to any question, please provide full details			
(this box should expand as you type)			



PG2 / E1 FORM

SECTION H: Anticipated Risks

Outline any anticipated risks that may adversely affect any of the participants, the researchers and/or the University, and the steps that will be taken to address them. If you have completed a full risk assessment (for example as required by a laboratory, or external research collaborator) you may append that to this form. Full risk assessment completed and appended? Yes ☐ No ☒	
Risks to participants For example: emotional distress, financial disclosure, physical harm, transfer of personal data, sensitive organisational information I will adhere to School 1 and School 2's Safeguarding policies, which are available on the School's website if requested. Guidelines set out in Section 7 Research Degrees and Section 9 Safeguarding Children of the UWTSD Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Conduct (2017-2020) will also be adhered to. No pupil will be treated differently if they do not want to take part or withdraw from the research.	
If research activity may include sensitive, embarrassing or upsetting topics (e.g. sexual activity, drug use) or issues likely to disclose information requiring further action (e.g. criminal activity), give details of the procedures to deal with these issues, including any support/advice (e.g. helpline numbers) to be offered to participants. Note that where applicable, consent procedures should make it clear that if something potentially or actually illegal is discovered in the course of a project, it may need to be disclosed to the proper authorities N/A	
Risks to investigator For example: personal safety, physical harm, emotional distress, risk of accusation of harm/impropriety, conflict of interest The observation will take place in School 1 and School 2's usual classrooms. The class teacher and any additional adults normally in the class will be present, as well as my research partner, who will be the non-participant observer. The requirement of child to adult ratio will be followed to at all times. During the focused group interview, myself, research partner and a member of school staff will be present. The interview will take place in a quieter area located outside the classroom. With these measures in place, the possible risk of accusation of treating pupils differently will be minimised.	
University/institutional risks For example: adverse publicity, financial loss, data protection Throughout the research project, both researchers will show complete professionalism, adhering to University guidelines, Data Protection Act and QTS standards. The reputation of the University will be upheld at all times. Myself and my research partner will hold a valid DBS certificate, which will be on our person and can be viewed on request.	
Adverse outcomes List measures put in place to limit any adverse effects or outcomes of research activity where appropriate. Include any emergency protocols. School 1 and School 2's Safeguarding and Health and Safety policies will be accessed before the research commences and adhered to during the research process. Fire routes, exits and protocol will be established on arrival at the school, so that the research partner is aware. The University's guidelines in Section 7 will be adhered to at all times (UWTSD Research Ethics	



PG2 / E1 FORM

and Integrity Code of Practice, 2017-2020).

Disclosure and Barring Service			
If the research activity involves children or vulnerable adults, a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) certificate must be obtained before any contact with such participants.	YES	NO	N/A
Has a DBS certificate been obtained?	☒	☐	☐



PG2 / E1 FORM

SECTION I: Feedback, Consent and Confidentiality

Feedback What feedback will be provided to participants, how will this be done and when? The completed assignment will be shared with the Head Teachers of both schools on request. Feedback will also be shared with participants throughout the research.
Informed consent Describe the arrangements to inform potential participants, before providing consent, of what is involved in participating. Describe the arrangements for participants to provide full consent before data collection begins. If gaining consent in this way is inappropriate, explain how consent will be obtained and recorded. Before commencing with the research, an Yr Athrofa explanatory letter requesting parental consent will be sent out (Section 19.4 Informed Consent of UWTSD Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Conduct, 2017 – 2020). At the beginning of the observation, researchers will share an explanatory statement to access their consent and pupils will give assent if they wish to commence with the research project. Ongoing assent will be reinforced throughout the research project. Researchers will monitor the pupils body language and actions closely for the duration of the observation and interview. All pupils in the observation and the focused interview pupils will be informed of their right. United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child Article 12 indicates that children should have a say in matters that affect them. Therefore, all pupils involved will be made aware that they have the right to: • Refuse to participate without adverse consequences • Not to answer specific questions without having to give a reason • Withdrawn from the research at any point without adverse consequences.
Confidentiality / Anonymity Set out how anonymity of participants and confidentiality will be ensured in any outputs. If anonymity is not being offered, explain why this is the case. No pupils' names or school names will be mentioned within the research project, including by the observer on the observational schedule. Pupils will not be able to be identified on any documentation relating to the research. Guidelines in Section 19.6 Anonymity and Confidentiality of the UWTSD Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Practice will be adhered to at all times during the research project.



PG2 / E1 FORM

SECTION J: Data Protection and Storage

In completing this section refer to the University's Research Data Management Policy and the extensive resources on the University's Research Data Management web pages (<http://uwtsd.ac.uk/library/research-data-management/>).

	YES	NO
Does the research activity involve personal data (as defined by the Data Protection Act)? <i>"personal data" means data which relate to a living individual who can be identified—</i> <i>(a) from those data, or</i> <i>(b) from those data and other information which is in the possession of, or is likely to come into the possession of, the data controller, and includes any expression of opinion about the individual and any indication of the intentions of the data controller or any other person in respect of the individual.</i>	☐	☒
If YES, provide a description of the data and explain why this data needs to be collected: (this box should expand as you type)		
Does it involve sensitive personal data (as defined by the Data Protection Act)? <i>"Sensitive personal data" means personal data consisting of information as to –</i> <i>(a) the racial or ethnic origin of the data subject,</i> <i>(b) his political opinions,</i> <i>(c) his religious beliefs or other beliefs of a similar nature,</i> <i>(d) whether he is a member of a trade union (within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992),</i> <i>(e) his physical or mental health or condition,</i> <i>(f) his sexual life,</i> <i>(g) the commission or alleged commission by him of any offence, or</i> <i>(h) any proceedings for any offence committed or alleged to have been committed by him, the disposal of such proceedings or the sentence of any court in such proceedings.</i>	☐	☒
If YES, provide a description of the data and explain why this data needs to be collected: (this box should expand as you type)		
Will the research activity involve storing personal data on one of the following:	YES	NO
Manual files (i.e. in paper form)?	☐	☒
University computers?	☐	☒
Private company computers?	☐	☒
Home or other personal computers?	☐	☒
Laptop computers/ CDs/ Portable disk-drives/ memory sticks?	☐	☒
"Cloud" storage or websites?	☐	☒
Other – specify:	☐	☒
For all stored data, explain the measures in place to ensure data confidentiality, including details of password protection, encryption and anonymisation: Data will not be stored, and University guidelines have been considered in this area (Section 13 Research Data Management – UWTSd Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Practice, 2017-2020).		
Will the research activity involve any of the following activities:	YES	NO



PG2 / E1 FORM

Electronic transfer of data in any form?	☒	☐
Sharing of data with others at the University?	☒	☐
Sharing of data with other organisations?	☐	☒
Export of data outside the European Union or importing of data from outside the UK?	☐	☒
Use of personal addresses, postcodes, faxes, emails or telephone numbers?	☐	☒
Publication of data that might allow identification of individuals?	☐	☒
Use of data management system?	☐	☒
Data archiving?	☐	☒
If YES to any question, please provide full details, explaining how this will be conducted in accordance with the Data Protection Act (and/or any international equivalent):		
Data will be archived on completion of this assignment. Any data and assignments from this research project will be encrypted and password protected. I will adhere to the Data Protection Act at all times.		

List all who will have access to the data generated by the research activity:
Myself – [REDACTED]
Research Partner – [REDACTED]
List who will have control of, and act as custodian(s) for, data generated by the research activity:
Myself - [REDACTED]
Give details of data storage arrangements, including where data will be stored, how long for, and in what form. Will data be archived – if so how and if not why not.
All data will be backed up and encrypted and password protected on a memory stick. On completion of the assignment, data will be archived.



PG2 / E1 FORM

SECTION K: Declaration

The information which I have provided is correct and complete to the best of my knowledge. I have attempted to identify any risks and issues related to the research activity and acknowledge my obligations and the rights of the participants.

In submitting this application I hereby confirm that I undertake to ensure that the above named research activity will meet the University's [Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Practice](#)

Signature of applicant:

Date: 28/02/2018

For students:

Teacher / Senior Mentor:	
Signature:	
Date:	26/02/2018

Supervisor:	
Signature:	
Date:	28/02/2018

Checklist: Please complete the checklist below to ensure that you have completed the form according to the guidelines and attached any required documentation:

☒	I have read the guidance notes supplied before completing the form.
☒	I have completed ALL RELEVANT sections of the form in full.
☒	I confirm that the research activity has received approval in principle
☐	I have attached a copy of final/interim approval from external organisation (where appropriate)
☐	I have attached a full risk assessment (and have NOT completed Section H of this form) (where appropriate)
☒	I understand that it is my responsibility to ensure that the above named research activity will meet the University's Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Practice.
☒	I understand that before commencing data collection all documents aimed at respondents (including information sheets, consent forms, questionnaires, interview schedules etc.) must be confirmed by the DoS/Supervisor, module tutor or Head of School.

RESEARCH STUDENTS AND STAFF ONLY

All communications relating to this application during its processing must be in writing and emailed to pgresearch@uwtsd.ac.uk, with the title 'Ethical Approval' followed by your name. You will be informed of the outcome of your claim by email; therefore it is important that you check your University and personal email accounts regularly.

STUDENTS ON UNDERGRADUATE OR TAUGHT MASTERS PROGRAMMES should submit this form (and receive the outcome) via systems explained to you by the supervisor/module leader.

Appendix B

A blank copy of the letter sent out to parents/guardians to gain their consent for the research to take place.



Dear Parent/Guardian,

Your child's school is a partner with Yr Athrofa at University of Wales Trinity Saint David in Carmarthen and Swansea. This school offers placements to students who are learning to be teachers.

The student-teacher in your child's class has been given the task of planning, teaching and evaluating one lesson so that he/she can develop specific strategies to improve their own teaching. As part of this, student-teachers will be observing the children's responses and asking some pupils their views on parts of the lesson. This is designed to inform students' own practice and support children's learning.

Any information collected would remain confidential, and both the school and the children would remain anonymous in work produced. The work undertaken would be in line with the University's ethical guidelines. If, at any time, your child does not want to share ideas, they would not be required to do so.

If you are happy for your child to contribute to the project, please complete the parental consent form below and return directly to the school as soon as possible. If you are interested in the outcome of this project or if you have any questions, please contact the University Partnership Office - partnership@uwtsd.ac.uk.

Yours faithfully,

Catherine Morgan
Module lead – The Enquiring Teacher

As Parent/Guardian of..... (pupil name), I do / do not give consent (please delete) for my child to take part in this project.

Signed.....(Parent/Guardian).

Date.....

Appendix C

Explanatory Statement read out to the pupils in School 1 and signed by the teacher confirming this. All names have been blanked out to adhere to guidelines set out by UWTSD Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Conduct (2017).

Explanatory Statement

School 1

Today, you may have noticed that there is another adult in the room who you have not met before. This is [redacted] and she has heard that you are such good learners with excellent behaviour, so she has come to watch our learning today.

[redacted] has a special research mission and is going to be making some notes whilst watching and will be chatting to children who have shown her good learning. This is going help make our learning even better than it is already.

To help [redacted] with her mission today, we are going to be thinking about how we think. We have got some fun activities for us to take part in.

Nobody's names will be mentioned after this lesson and [redacted] will be able to look at the results of the mission.

Everybody is coming on our mission, but before we start, I would like to see who is willing to be involved. If you're ready for take-off, close your eyes and put your thumbs up. If you are unsure, put your finger on your nose and we can have a little chat. If at any point during [redacted]'s mission, you're worried or upset, please make sure you tell a teacher.

Witness Statement

I can confirm that this explanatory statement was read out to the class and assent was gained and recorded from the pupils before the research commenced.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

[redacted]

27.3.18

Appendix D

Explanatory Statement read out to the pupils in School 2 and signed by the teacher confirming this. All names have been blanked out to adhere to guidelines set out by UWTSD Research Ethics and Integrity Code of Conduct (2017).

Explanatory Statement School 2

Today, you may have noticed that there is another adult in the room who you have not met before. This is [REDACTED] and she has heard that you are such good learners with excellent behaviour, so she has come to watch our learning today.

[REDACTED] has a special research mission and is going to be making some notes whilst watching and will be chatting to children who have shown her good learning. This is going help make our learning even better than it is already.

To help [REDACTED] with her mission today, we are going to be thinking about how we think. We have got some fun activities for us to take part in.

Nobody's names will be mentioned after this lesson and [REDACTED] will be able to look at the results of the mission.

Everybody is coming on our mission, but before we start, I would like to see who is willing to be involved. If you're ready for take-off, close your eyes and put your thumbs up. If you are unsure, put your finger on your nose and we can have a little chat. If at any point during [REDACTED]'s mission, you're worried or upset, please make sure you tell a teacher.

Witness Statement

I can confirm that this explanatory statement was read out to the class and assent was gained and recorded from the pupils before the research commenced.

Signature: [REDACTED]

Date: 28.3.18

Appendix E

Table showing assent gained for the pupils in School 1.

School 1 Assent				
Pupil Reference	Name of Pupil	Parental Consent	Assent (Thumbs up)	Ongoing Assent
1A	████	✓	✓	
1B	████	✓	✓	
1C	████	✓		ABSENT FOR RESEARCH
1D	████	✓	✓	
1E	████	✓	✓	
1F	████	✓	✓	
1G	████	✓	✓	
1H	████	✓	✓	
1I	████	✓	✓	
1J	████	✓	✓	
1K	████	✓	✓	
1L	████	✓	✓	
1M	████	✓	✓	
1N	████	✓	✓	
1O	████	✓	✓	
1P	████	✓	✓	
1Q	████	✓	✓	
1R	████	✓		ABSENT FOR RESEARCH
1S	████	x		
1T	████	✓	✓	
1U	████	✓	✓	
1V	████	✓	✓	
1W	████	✓		ABSENT FOR RESEARCH
1X	████	✓	✓	
1Y	████	✓	✓	
1Z	████	✓	✓	
1AA	████	✓	✓	
1AB	████	✓	✓	
1AC	████	✓		ABSENT FOR RESEARCH

(Names Anonymised)

Appendix F

Table showing assent gained for the pupils in School 2.

School 2 Assent				
Pupil Reference	Name of Pupil	Parental Consent	Assent (Thumbs up)	Ongoing Assent
2A		✓	✓	
2B		✓		Absent for research
2C		✓	✓	
2D		✓	✓	
2E		✓	✓	
2F		X		
2G		✓	✓	
2H		✓	✓	
2I		✓	✓	
2J		✓	✓	
2K		✓	✓	
2L		✓		Absent for research
2M		✓		Absent for research
2N		✓	✓	
2O		✓	✓	
2P		✓	✓	
2Q		✓	✓	
2R		✓	✓	
2S		✓	✓	
2T		✓	✓	
2U		✓	✓	
2V		✓	✓	
2W		✓	✓	
2X		✓	✓	
2Y		✓	✓	
2Z		✓	✓	
2AA		✓	✓	
2AB		✓	✓	
2AC		X		

(Names Anonymised)

Appendix G

Lesson Plan for Lesson Study 1, which was conducted in School

Name of Trainee: [REDACTED]	Session ref: TET – School 1 – Lesson Study	Date: 27/03/2018	Class: [REDACTED]	Foundation Phase Focus Plan 2d  Canolfan Addysg Athrawon De-Orllewin Cymru The South West Wales Centre of Teacher Education
Personal Training Target(s):		Number of Learners: 29	Age: 5- 6 year olds	
Learning objectives/intentions: To think critically and ask questions in relation to a story.		Success Criteria: I can retell elements of the story. I can answer questions about the story and give reasons for my answers. I can make a prediction about the story. I can ask a question about the story.		Meeting learners' needs: Child 1AC / Child 1U / Child 1E – EAL – visual aids and additional support from adults Child 1AB / Child 1L – SEN – additional support from adults
Introduction/plenary tasks	Main activities		Resources/Key Vocabulary	Assessment for Learning (strategies and opportunities)
Introduction Read Explanatory statement to children and gain assent. Record assent. Read through the story. Explain task and send children to sit on their handwriting tables. Plenary Celebrate the children's work. What have they drawn and written about their mission? Why did they choose to go there on their mission? Focus group interview to follow after the lesson.	Whole Class Activity (Supporting adults to be spread out across all of the tables to support the children) Children to draw a picture to represent a place they would like to go on a mission. HA – To write a sentence about where they are going and what they can see? Grwp Gwyrdd / Grwp Melyn MA – To add some words/sentences to their drawing. Grwp Glas LA – draw a picture of a place they would go and label it with some words Grwp Coch		Resources Back to Earth with a Bump PowerPoint Plain A4 paper Pencils Rubber Colouring pencils	Questioning Before reading: What do you think this story could be about? After Slide 4: Where do you think Hal could be going? After Slide 7: Where do we think the Sun might have disappeared to? After Slide 10: What's our Planet called again? After Slide 12: What do you think Hal can see? After the book: If you had your own rocket, where would you go on your mission? What would you see?
				Look for the language children are using when creating their own picture of where they would like to go? Can the children convey where they would like to go and why?
Curriculum Coverage (range and skills) STRAND: Oracy, ELEMENT: Developing and presenting information and ideas, ASPECT: Speaking Speak audibly, conveying meaning to listeners beyond their friendship. Include some details and some relevant vocabulary to extend their ideas or accounts. STRAND: Oracy, ELEMENT: Developing and presenting information and ideas, ASPECT: Listening Listen to others, with growing attention, usually responding appropriately, e.g. <i>carrying out instructions</i> . Show understanding of what they have heard by asking questions to find out more information.				
Literacy (LNF) STRAND: Oracy, ELEMENT: Developing and presenting information and ideas, ASPECT: Speaking Speak audibly, conveying meaning to listeners beyond their friendship. Include some details and some relevant vocabulary to extend their ideas or accounts. STRAND: Oracy, ELEMENT: Developing and presenting information and ideas, ASPECT: Listening Listen to others, with growing attention, usually responding appropriately, e.g. <i>carrying out instructions</i> . Show understanding of what they have heard by asking questions to find out more information.		Numeracy (LNF) N/A		
DCF Story on PowerPoint on IWB. Pupils to follow text, illustrations.		Thinking Asking Questions – ask relevant questions and begin to link questions into sequences. Give reasons for choice of questions. Generating and Developing Ideas – generate imaginative ideas and possibilities.	ESDGC Understanding our relation on Earth Where we are in the Solar System	YCC NASA Control in North Wales

Appendix H

Observational Schedule from Lesson Study 1.

Observational Schedule School 1



Date of Observation:	Tuesday 27 March 2018
Lesson / Subject:	Literacy – Back to Earth with a Bump
Time:	10:30am – 11:45am
What are the learners expected to do?	Listen to the story, answering questions throughout and predicting events. Draw a picture of a place they would like to go to on their mission. Think about where they would go and what would they see. Opportunity to write a sentence to accompany their picture.
Think time given:	Thinking time – a minimum of 3 seconds given. Teacher responded to individual needs and selected a mixture of children with their hands up and down. Most pupils at times (all three focus pupils) placed their hand on their head to visualise their thinking time.
Learners' response to task:	All participants drew a picture – everyone was engaged and excited to complete the task. HA – took more time with their pictures and made good and mostly accurate predictions during the story. They thought of more interesting places and used their imagination. MA – more prompts needed when discussing their picture LA – their pictures were more based on elements from the story.
Teacher's body language:	Consistent, open, Facing the class with interested expression. Encouraging but not rushing when giving participants their thinking time.
Additional Comments	Pupil 3 – more fussing on the carpet. Not necessarily using thinking time appropriately. Pace was slower because of increased thinking time. More prompting for LA during thinking time. Pupil 1 – applied prior knowledge and concepts of the world they knew to the story. More advanced and imaginative ideas. Pupil 2 and Pupil 3 – more book based and isolated prior knowledge and concepts. Not understanding or making links between concepts. Took a couple of times for pupils to use the idea of think time.

+ Focused Pupils

Pupil 1 – Child 10 – Identified by teacher as higher attaining

Very talkative

Didn't always use thinking time, quick to respond to questions.

Keen to respond to all questions

Gave reasonable answers to questions – used sentences to give opinions and to share ideas and not one-word answers

Enjoyed the task and gave thumbs up

Audible and clear when responding

Always used the thinking hat visual gesture

Pupil 2 – Child 1Q – Identified by teacher as middle attaining

Enjoyed the task – would have liked more specific questioning

Didn't look like he engaged with thinking time as much as he could.

Sometimes used the thinking hat visual gesture

Answers did not always relay using full sentences

Pupil 3 – Child 1AA – Identified by teacher as lower attaining

Would have liked more thinking time and would have like a prop to visualise the thinking time. A prop like a hat.

Fussed on the carpet

Visualised thinking hat, but often chatted during the think time

Responses were short – often one/two word answers.

Interview

1. What did you think about our learning today?

Pupil 1/Pupil 2/Pupil 3 all responded by putting their thumbs up.

Teacher: *"Why?"*

Pupil 1: *"liked listening to the story and drawing our places where we would go"*

Pupil 2: *"easy"*

Pupil 3: *"challenging"*

2. Think back to the lesson, what do you remember that helped us with our thinking?

Pupil 1: *"we put our hand on our head when it was time to think"*

Pupil 2: *"the story"*

Pupil 3: demonstrated the action of putting his hand on his head

3. Do you think I did good listening? Why?

Pupil 1: *"Yes, you did"*

Pupil 2: *"Yes"*

Pupil 3: *"Yes"*

4. Did you have enough time to think?

Pupil 1: *"Yes"*

Pupil 2: *"Yes"*

Pupil 3: *"More time"*

5. What could I do to make it better?

Pupil 1: *"I would like to have talked to my partner, so that we could share ideas and help each other"*

Pupil 2: *"harder questions"*

Pupil 3: *"I would like a thinking hat"*

Pupil 1, 2 and 3 all commented that they would have liked to have shared their thinking time with a partner.

Appendix I

Picture of the thinking hat prop that was introduced into Lesson Study 2.



Appendix J

Lesson Plan for Lesson Study 2, which was conducted in School 2.

Name of Trainee: [REDACTED]	Session ref: TET – School 2 – Lesson Study	Date: 28/03/2018	Class: [REDACTED]	Foundation Phase Focus Plan 2d  Canolfan Addyg Athrawon De-Ollewin Cymru The South West Wales Centre of Teacher Education
Personal Training Target(s):		Number of Learners: 29	Age: 4–5 year olds	
Learning objectives/intentions: To think critically and ask questions in relation to a story.		Success Criteria: I can retell elements of the story. I can answer questions about the story and give reasons for my answers. I can make a prediction about the story. I can ask a question about the story.		Meeting learners' needs: Child 2Y – EAL – visual aids and additional support from adults Child 2J, 2U, 2W, 2AB – SEN – additional support from adults
Introduction/plenary tasks	Main activities		Resources/Key Vocabulary	Assessment for Learning (strategies and opportunities)
Introduction Read Explanatory statement to children and gain assent. Record assent Introduce thinking hats Read through the story and ask questions. Explain task and send children to sit on their handwriting tables. Plenary Celebrate the children's work. What have they drawn and written about their mission? Why did they choose to go there on their mission? Focus group interview to follow after the lesson.	Whole Class Activity (Supporting adults to be spread out across all of the tables to support the children) Children to draw a picture to represent a place they would like to go on a mission. Discussion and asking questions while they are drawing HA – To write a sentence about where they are going and what they can see? Green Group MA – To add some words/sentences to their drawing. Orange Group and Yellow Group LA – draw a picture of a place they would go and label it with some words Red Group		Resources Back to Earth with a Bump PowerPoint Plain A4 paper Pencils Rubber Colouring pencils Thinking Hats	Questioning Before reading: What do you think this story could be about? Asking questions where appropriate and extend-follow on from their answers. After the book: If you had your own rocket, where would you go on your mission? What would you see? Look for the language children are using when creating their own picture of where they would like to go? Can the children convey where they would like to go and why ?

Curriculum Coverage (range and skills) STRAND: Oracy, ELEMENT: Developing and presenting information and ideas, ASPECT: Speaking Speak audibly, conveying meaning to listeners beyond their friendship. Include some details and some relevant vocabulary to extend their ideas or accounts. STRAND: Oracy, ELEMENT: Developing and presenting information and ideas, ASPECT: Listening Listen to others, with growing attention, usually responding appropriately, e.g. <i>carrying out instructions</i> . Show understanding of what they have heard by asking questions to find out more information.			
Literacy (LNF) STRAND: Oracy, ELEMENT: Developing and presenting information and ideas, ASPECT: Speaking Speak audibly, conveying meaning to listeners beyond their friendship. Include some details and some relevant vocabulary to extend their ideas or accounts. STRAND: Oracy, ELEMENT: Developing and presenting information and ideas, ASPECT: Listening Listen to others, with growing attention, usually responding appropriately, e.g. <i>carrying out instructions</i> . Show understanding of what they have heard by asking questions to find out more information.	Numeracy (LNF) N/A		
DCF Story on PowerPoint on IWB. Pupils to follow text, illustrations.	Thinking Asking Questions – ask relevant questions and begin to link questions into sequences. Give reasons for choice of questions. Generating and Developing Ideas – generate imaginative ideas and possibilities. Reviewing the Process / Method – show or describe some of what has been done; identify, in response to questions, what worked and what didn't.	ESDGC Understanding our relation on Earth Where we are in the Solar System	YCC NASA Control in North Wales

Appendix K

Observational Schedule from Lesson Study 2.

Observational Schedule
School 2

Date of Observation:	Wednesday 28 March 2018
Lesson / Subject:	Literacy – Back to Earth with a Bump
Time:	1.30pm – 2.30pm
What are the learners expected to do?	Listen to the story, answering questions throughout and predicting events. Draw a picture of a place they would like to go to on their mission. Think about where they would go and what would they see. Opportunity to write a sentence to accompany their picture. Use the thinking caps prop to enhance their thinking time.
Think time given:	Thinking time – a minimum of 3 seconds given. Teacher responded to individual needs and selected a mixture of children with their hands up and down.
Learners' response to task:	All participants drew a picture – everyone was engaged and excited to complete the task. Answered questions and "played" along with the thinking cap prop. Seemed to like the prop. Used their imagination. Activated prior knowledge to help answer the questions around the book. Enthusiastic to put the thinking hat prop on.
Teacher's body language:	Consistent, open, Facing the class with interested expression and good use of voice.
Additional Comments	Treated the prop as an "on/off" switch. One believed that it wasn't working so rubbed it to make it work again. Good use of imagination. Pupil A – took more time with their pictures and made good and mostly accurate predictions during the story. Thinking cap did not distract them. Pupil B – engaged in task. Thinking cap did not distract them. Pupil C – distracted by thinking cap – spent a lot of time playing with it. Children were excited to see the teacher which meant they were quite distracted generally.

⊕ Focused Pupils

Pupil A – Child 2P – Identified by teacher as higher attaining

Very talkative to the teacher – engaged with the lesson and the thinking hats.

Keen to respond to all questions

Good imagination around the thinking hat prop.

Clear, reasonable answers given

Appears to be using think time

Pupil B – Child 2D – Identified by teacher as middle attaining

Very quiet throughout. Engaged within tasks and answered questions when asked. Seemed to engage with the thinking hat prop and used his imagination.

No shouting out.

Pupil C – Child 2K – Identified by teacher as lower attaining

Playing with hat at times outside of the think time given.

Limited responses given at times.

HA: *"These thinking hats are really good"*

Teacher: *"Give it a rub..."*

Pupil HA: *"That's why it is not working..."*

Teacher: *"Could you think better with the thinking hats on or off?"*

HA: *"Off"*

Teacher: *"Why?"*

HA: *"They were a bit distracting"*

Teacher: *"Do you think the thinking hats helped you to concentrate?"*

HA: *"Yes..."*

MA: *"Yes..."*

LA: *"Yes..."*

Interview

1. What did you think about our learning today?

Pupil C: *"Awesome, made us think about Mexico..."*

Pupil B: *"Good, I liked my thinking hat..."*

Pupil A: *"I liked writing and the thinking hat helped me to concentrate"*

2. Think back to the lesson, what do you remember that helped us with our thinking?

Pupil C: *"Hats!"*

Pupil B: *"Hats!"*

Pupil A: *"Hats!"*

3. Do you think I did good listening?

All: *"Yes"*

4. Did you have enough time to think?

Pupil A: *"Yes"*

Pupil B: *"Yes"*

Pupil C: *"More time"*

5. What could I do to make it better?

Pupil A: *"Make a hat, you [teacher] put one on too!"*

Pupil B: *"It was good"*