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Abstract

*Mantle of the Expert* is a dramatic approach to teaching and learning. Learning is transformed as children no longer learn about subjects, but learn by completing tasks and challenges as if they were workers in a fictitious company or scenario. The children are given jobs and roles to fulfil and learning is subconscious, as the tasks they are set are enjoyable. When the teacher allows the children to decide how they are going to solve a problem and does not dictate to them how to complete it, there becomes a shift in leadership. This is known as a devolved leadership.

The effects of this devolved leadership is something that this dissertation aimed to discover. Do children, especially boys, have a better attitude towards school when they are unaware that they are learning, and are given choices within their curriculum?

The need for this devolved leadership was researched in the literature, with our current education system being reviewed. The literature then looked at how boys learned and whether these devolved leadership strategies would suit their learning styles.

Research was then undertaken in two schools. One was branded as using *Mantle of the Expert*, whilst the other used a different style of devolved leadership strategies that was still relevant to the study. The research showed that the boys’ attitudes to school were positive in these two schools. However it was unreasonable to assume this was of a direct result of *Mantle of the Expert* as the sample research was small.
1. Introduction

In recent years, research has suggested that our current education system is failing boys (King et al., 2010a; DfES, 2007; Gurain & Stevens, 2006). Literature has suggested that boys and girls learn differently, and the education system in which they are taught should acknowledge these differences (King et al., 2010a; Skelton, 2001).

Being introduced to a teaching approach named Mantle of the Expert inspired me to undertake this research. The idea of giving children ownership of their curriculum, giving them choices in how and what they learn is something that I believe to be very important. The notion of a devolved leadership is something that Mantle of the Expert encompasses. Children are given the illusion that they are in control of their curriculum. They are given choices concerning how to solve problems and when completing tasks, they are allowed to select resources and strategies that are personalised towards their learning needs. The literature will unpick the Mantle of the Expert in order to examine how it is best suited to the way in which boys learn.

While reading this dissertation, there will be words and phrases that may be unfamiliar, being very specific to the Mantle of the Expert teaching strategy. The glossary of terms (Appendix 6) aims to provide meaning to these terms, in order to aid the reader in understanding this complex strategy for teaching and learning. All words formatted in italics within the text can be found in this glossary.
2. Mantle of the Expert

For the purposes of this study, and to begin to recognise how this strategy can have an impact upon boys, it is important to be clear what the term Mantle of the Expert means. It will be assumed that Mantle of the Expert is used as a strategy to involve all lessons and that it features elements that will be discussed in this chapter. The literature surrounding the specific details of this teaching strategy is limited. As a result the following two books have been used predominantly in this chapter.


Heathcote’s expertise in the field of drama led her to imagine a learning style and approach to teaching that would allow children to make links with the community and to take responsibility for the learning they were involved in (Bolton, 2003). This work during the mid 1970s manifested into the Mantle of the Expert.

The strategy largely relies on the classroom being viewed as fictitious scenario (Or company as it is sometimes referred to). The classroom, rather than the children, takes on a role (Bolton, 2003) and rather than seen as actors in a drama, the children have roles with collective values, relevant to the scenario. Derived from the title, they are seen as the experts in the given scenario (Allern, 2008). The teaching and learning undertaken is indirect as everything is delivered through the role of the
children and the class. Although this could be viewed as role-play, O'Neill (1995 in Heathcote and Bolton, 1995) suggests this term is inadequate. The students inhabit their roles as experts and they grow into these as they undertake the tasks and challenges required of them. As Heathcote states ‘the children are not in role in any obvious sense, but the leaders of the Mantle of the Expert’ (Heathcote, cited in Bolton, 2003:129).

All children and adults are involved in the scenario or company. The scenario is carefully selected by the teacher to allow different avenues of the curriculum to flow into the Mantle. This is best explained through the case study undertaken by Heathcote and Pennington (cited in Bolton, 2003). The classroom in this instance was seen as a paper factory and both adults in the classroom spent a lot of time demonstrating to the children their ‘inexpertness’ with aspects of the scenario. This is of great importance as it places a requirement on the children to discover how to solve certain challenges and activities within the scenario, thus steering the source of answers away from the adults in the class (Bolton, 2003:129). Already within the scenario everyone is seen as equal and the children are now learning with, rather than from the teacher (Freire, 1972).

When teaching through Mantle of the Expert, it is necessary to clearly define when tasks or lessons should occur outside of the scenario. Heathcote and Pennington state that when the fiction or scenario requires a task or skill that the children have not yet learned, then this learning of said skill must happen outside the scenario. (Heathcote and Pennington, cited in Bolton, 2003). In the fiction, both children and adults know how to make paper, however in reality this skill may not have been
acquired by the children. This must therefore be taught before the scenario requires it as failure to do so would break the illusion of the children as ‘experts’ (Heathcote and Pennington, cited in Bolton, 2003).

The tasks that the scenario demands must have a clear purpose. The teacher stimulates learning and investigation by providing the children with someone to report to. This higher figure, called a client (normally another adult in role), will set tasks and challenges for the children, giving them a purpose and a deadline for the work they do (Bolton, 2003:131). More importantly, it allows for the teacher to carefully plan how different aspects of the set curriculum are to be implemented in the scenario (Bolton, 2003).

It is clear already that Mantle of the Expert is far more than a ‘drama’. There is a thin line between that of a role-play and the scenario used in the Mantle of the Expert. Figure 1 demonstrates how a typical Mantle of the Expert scenario aims to provide children with the sense of leadership. As the company is revealed to the children, the client introduces tasks and problems. As the scenario evolves, this progression allows for choice to be given to the children. The teacher is still actively steering the scenario with carefully planned lessons, however the children are engaged and believe they are leading the scenario. As the choice moves towards the work phase, the teacher has opportunities to teach the children skills that have not been acquired yet. The cycle can continue with further avenues becoming available for the teacher to steer the learning down. In addition, the teacher is able to keep the children under the illusion that they are controlling what takes place in the Mantle.
Figure 1: A teachers’ compass: The cycle of involving children in the Mantle.

(Webb, d.u.)
3. Our Education System: Are Children Involved?

To teach using *Mantle of the Expert* strategies places a great emphasis on child centered learning. The involvement of the children is key to establishing a devolved leadership (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995). To further understand the need for children to be involved in their learning, a review of our current education system is necessary.

‘At the heart of the educational process lies the child’

(DES, 1967:7)

The change in the education system over the past forty years may have shifted from the view above. Formal test scores have heavily driven the focus within schools to academic achievement at the end of Key Stage 2 (Warrington & Younger, 2006) and the way Britain assesses educational performance in schools, is largely propelled by test performances in literacy and numeracy (Alexander, 2000) rather than the quality of the education and curriculum. This test driven curriculum has implications for the attainment of boys, with national tests in the 1990s showing girls catching up and overtaking the boys in the tested subject areas (Mayard, 2002). By the mid 1990s, the underachieving boy and their attitudes held towards school was described as ‘one of the biggest challenges facing society’ (Wragg, 1997, cited in Maynard, 2002:1).

The view of the Plowden Report (DES, 1967) placed the child very much so at the centre of the educational process with learning directed around the needs of the child. In recent years education could be seen to have lost sight of this view with children having very little input in what they learn and how they might achieve goals.
set out for them (Rubin & Schoenefeld, 2009). However, the notion of the test driven curriculum has shifted again in recent years.

Warrington & Younger (2005:5) suggest the publication ‘Excellence and Enjoyment’ may have been an attempt to ‘redress the balance’; allowing teachers more freedom with the way they taught, and were urged to ‘take ownership of the curriculum, shaping it and making it their own’ (DfES, 2003:4).

Yet still, studies show that by the time boys start school, on average they may be ‘developmentally two years behind the girls in reading and writing’. Despite this fact, strategies used in school are not dissimilar in redressing the balance (Conlin, 2003:Online). Primary school teachers see motivating boys to engage in school a challenge, and their attitudes towards school is often poor (Maynard, 2002).

This heavily prescribed, test-driven curriculum may be a cause for the demotivation of boys (Courcier, 2007). Studies show that teachers have difficulty in initiating the personalisation and ownership of the curriculum that boys need (Courcier, 2007).

It is clear that the motivation of boys is an issue. Without personalisation strategies, attitudes towards school can be poor. It is important to understand how boys learn, in order to effectively discuss the benefits that Mantle of the Expert may have upon boys’ attitudes towards school.
4. How Boys’ Learn

Both boys and girls ‘fall along a wide spectrum of learning preferences and styles’ (King et al, 2010a:40). It is not uncommon for a teacher to encounter boys and girls who display the same behaviours and react well to specific learning styles. However, research suggests that boys learn differently to girls and classroom practice should reflect this. Boys often have a tendency to be graphic thinkers and kinaesthetic learners, who thrive within a competitive, practical and personalised learning structure (King et al, 2010a; Skelton, 2001). With Mantle of the Expert involving these learning styles, it could be assumed that boys would naturally be motivated and learn well when taught through this strategy.

Physical differences can also have a result on boys’ attitudes. Studies have indicated a trend in the neural rest states within the male brain (De Munck, 2008 cited in King et al, 2010b), causing pupils who aren’t engaged in a lesson, to switch off. If the classroom and the curriculum fail to provide an engaging experience for boys then there is a tendency for the pupils to become disengaged with a lesson. Attempts to combat these rest states can result in boys becoming wrongly active. They may engage in activities such as ‘tapping their pencils or poking at [their] classmates’ (King et al, 2010b).

In addition, the pre-five boost of testosterone boys receive can have an affect on classroom behaviour (Ford, 2009). Like combating neural rest states, the need to be active is physically demanding. When activities in class do not provide hands on learning, boys can switch off and attitudes will become negative (Ford, 2009). These
differences in boys place huge responsibility on the schools that are educating them. The need for a curriculum that takes into account these differences is evident.

Rubin and Schoenefeld (2009) have suggested that when boys are given leadership opportunities within a class, this can have a positive impact upon their attitudes. Furthermore, the curriculum can adapt around these gender differences when leadership opportunities and personalisation is at the heart of the curriculum (Rubin & Schoenefeld, 2009). This lack of opportunity for children to become involved in their curriculum has recently become apparent (Conway, 2011). Literature suggests that children who are refused such opportunities for involvement in their learning may respond negatively towards school (Rubin & Schoenefeld, 2009; Conway, 2011). This lack of self-determination can manifest in children, resulting in misbehaviour and a negative attitude towards school. The strategies *Mantle of the Expert* employs can directly involve children in the choices and decisions made in the classroom.

Joint decision-making in the class gives the children a voice, but can also allow the teacher to plan and deliver lessons that revolve around the children’s interests and learning styles (DCSF, 2008). This ownership and empowerment is suggested to motivate children, causing their academic achievements to be higher. As a result, this can reduce the misconduct they may display towards school rules (Lamborn *et al* 1996, cited in Rubin and Schoenefeld, 2009).

Simply giving children direct control over the classroom is not what *Mantle of the Expert* involves. Empowering children with the ownership over their curriculum should be structured and controlled; but still the children should feel they are
contributing to the classroom. The careful planning of the activities and instructions will ensure the children understand what they are being asked to do (Rubin and Schoenefeld, 2009).

Boys often lack the confidence and ability to take control of their own learning and therefore, require direction and purpose when given decision making tasks (DfES, 2007; Ofsted, 2003). Learning that involves research and discovery is suggested to motivate boys best. This project-based learning is successful because there is an equal balance between direction from adults and decision making from children (Ford, 2009).

Although these project based learning strategies are successful, it is suggested that they should be implemented on a short-term basis. They fail as a strategy to engage boys’ when implemented over a long period of time, largely due to the ‘purpose’ of the project becoming lost (Ford, 2009). A Mantle of the Expert scenario must therefore retain a purpose. The fictitious client is constantly setting challenges for the children thus ensuring the work undertaken is viewed as meaningful.

The project work, or Mantle scenario, does not necessarily engage boys; however the leadership the boys have over their own task can be extremely beneficial to their attitudes and attainment. Leeson (2007) suggests that children benefit from this leadership and decision-making type of curriculum as it allows them the opportunity to practice making decisions in turn building their confidence.
**Leadership**

‘Should we keep trying to change our boys, or should we change the educational system in which they are not taught?’

Gurian & Stevens, 2006:88

A rigid, subject based curriculum does not accommodate for the difference in gender and learning styles both boys and girls possess (Mawson, 2010). This view is that the teacher has always directed the leadership within the classroom. Tasks that require peer collaboration are frequently adult set (Mawson, 2010). The lack of leadership children have over their curriculum is worrying and as Mawson (2010) notes, the literature lacks examples of children’s leadership.

A devolved leadership can flourish when children and adults collaborate on learning tasks (Freire, 1972). The classroom should be an environment that involves learners in exploratory ideas, learning ‘with the teacher rather than from them’ (Pound, 2005:55). Children therefore, should be seen as leaders in their own learning allowed to explore avenues and interests with guidance, rather than dictation from the teacher. Mawson (2010) suggested, the leadership and empowerment that this gives children, has a positive impact upon the attitudes that boys hold towards school.

Although this leadership strategy has been viewed as beneficial, it was seen earlier in the literature that children needed to be clear of their role within the project, task or lesson. Boys especially lacked the self proficiency to manage and direct their own learning and thus needed a clear structure from the teacher (Rubin and Schoenefeld,
A disadvantage to this strategy can manifest when adults become over controlling, reverting back to dictating what the children should be learning, rather than letting them research and discover, but with closely set guidelines (Rubin and Schoenefeld, 2009).

The reality of this leadership strategy is that all learning is closely linked to the curriculum and has been planned by the teacher beforehand. It brings us back to the view that the children may think they are in control of what they are learning, however the reality is the teacher has carefully planned all learning opportunities. This study will therefore look closely at how this ‘devolved leadership’ is used as one of many strategies to engage boys in school and its impacts (whether positive or negative) upon their attitudes towards school.
5. Devolved Leadership: What is it?

The thinking behind a devolved leadership is central to the strategies that *Mantle of the Expert* uses in teaching children. For the purposes of this research project it is necessary to assume a devolved leadership comprises of the features detailed in this section.

As the curriculum is delivered through a *scenario*, leadership is a core part of this. It is viewed that this strategy follows closely with some of the values held in the *Plowden Report* (DES, 1967) regarding child centred learning. Research has highlighted the benefits to this devolved leadership. As children become naturally motivated to learn and as they are encouraged to make choices for themselves, they are said to become agents of their own learning (Wagner, 2009; James, 2007; Hasley and Sylva, 1987 *cited in* Hartley, 2009).

**Working for a Client: Children as Adults Working for a Company.**

Chapter two introduced the idea of child ownership and leadership over their curriculum through the use of a *scenario*. This *scenario* devolves responsibility and leadership to the children in the form of *jobs and roles* in which they are viewed as ‘experts’ in the context of the drama (Heathcote & Bolton, 1995). Lessons relate directly to the scenario with the teacher initiating specific tasks that provoke learning, which covers different aspects of the curriculum.
Figure 2: The intersection of three aspects to Mantle of the Expert.

(Bunting, M. d.u)

Figure 2 explains how this devolved leadership can successfully come about. The three sections represented above are central to Mantle of the Expert. The content refers to the areas of the curriculum that the scenario will cover as it is developed. The teacher has carefully planned for this. As before, it is important that the teacher is not seen as the main source of knowledge in the classroom. The client is therefore introduced to give the children a purpose for their work. All learning is done under instructions from the client (O’Neill in Heathcote & Bolton, 1995: viii). The children are now working for a purpose and this is where they are seen as the experts. When all three sections are combined, the drama, or Mantle of the Expert, lies at the heart of this.
The devolved leadership therefore comes from this ownership of the task or *scenario* given to the children. They are then engaged in critical dialogue with the teacher and are seen as co-investigators in the classroom (Freire, 1972). In the eyes of the children they are taking control over the learning methods within their curriculum, however as Figure 1, along with Bolton (2003), highlight to us, careful planning and preparation have been put into the *scenario* to ensure aspects of the curriculum have been covered (Bolton, 2003). From the perspective of the children they are leading the *company* and are in control.

This tackles the issue in addressing the statutory goals of the National Curriculum (QCA, 1999). When taught in a more traditional way the current curriculum may seem ‘pre-determined and pre-packaged’ (Crick, 2009: 79). Mandatory requirements (such as assessment of learning) that the curriculum, can, as Crick states, govern what is taught to children, but more importantly ‘how, it is learned’ (Crick, 2009:79).

However, the teaching style of *Mantle of the Expert* opposes this pre packaged and narrow approach to education. The knowledge or perception that the children have leadership over their learning stimulates boys’ learning styles. It is this that motivates them and may promote positive attitudes towards school (Freire, 1972).
A Multiple Intelligences Approach to Learning.

*Mantle of the Expert* involves the use of a variety of learning theories. When devolved leadership strategies are employed, a multiple intelligences approach is most commonly used. Based on the work of Gardner (1993) the theory identifies strengths and weaknesses in pupils and aims to nurture these strengths and develop the weaknesses through different areas of learning (Gardner, 1993). The way in which a devolved leadership is implemented lends itself to the development of these ‘intelligences’, as the *jobs* in the company are shared out based on the strengths of the pupils.

As research has shown, it is thoughtless to ignore learning styles within the curriculum and to base a child’s education on the hope of ‘altering [their] brain’s inherent method of self development’ (Gurian & Stevens, 2006:92). It has shown that to do so, boys could experience ‘suppression’ and ‘disengagement’ from school, resulting in negative attitudes in class (Gurian & Stevens, 2006:92).

To prevent this, the *company* presents the curriculum to the children exploring different subjects and ‘intelligences’ through the tasks they are set by the *client* (Gardner, 2011). The *company* can be of great importance in the classroom as it provides an agent for developing formative and constructive talk in young children (Warrington and Younger, 2006). When the *company* is taken seriously by the children and adults involved then the dialogue engaged in is constructive and for a purpose. Dialogue between adults, their pupils and pupils in groups will relate to problems and tasks set by the *client*. The pupils are involved in reasoning and
problem solving and the dialogue involved is constructive, but it can be used as an agent to develop the different areas of learning (Hall, 2005).

As the company requires children to actively seek solutions to tasks and problems it is important that pupils are motivated and can begin to self-regulate their own learning. If pupils decide how they are going to learn something and decide upon the ways in which they are going to solve a problem, then their academic performance is said to increase because of this self-regulatory process (Zimmerman, 2002).

Children as experts are being encouraged to think about ways in which to solve the problems they are faced with by the client. To some extent there is a balance in a Mantle of the Expert classroom between the idea of a devolved leadership and that of an inquiry based approach to learning.

**Strategies for Child Enquiry: Learning How to Learn.**

Because the ownership of their learning is shifted, children are being asked to think of solutions to problems given by the client. Adults encourage the children to decide how to undertake a task, as these are skills that the children will use later in life (Bolton, 2003; Heathcote & Bolton, 1995; Crick, 2009). Rather than being taught this pre-packaged curriculum, the children are learning through enquiry (Crick, 2009; Harste, 2001). Harste (2001) states that we don’t have the answers to problems that will arise in the future, it is important to equip children with the skills to be able to solve problems and devolved leadership strategies may encourage this.
When *Mantle of the Expert* is used, subjects are not split up and the focus for learning relies heavily on learning how to learn (Harste, 2001). Situations and problems that are given to the children by the *client* are not split into subject areas, but are carefully analysed ensuring that the knowledge and skills needed to confront the challenge are addressed (Bunting, d.u.).

*Figure 3: The Underlying Process of Enquiry*

(Harste, 2001:7)

Figure 3 shows the process involved in embedding enquiry into a curriculum. The difference between children learning through a *Mantle* lesson and those in a more typical enquiry based classroom is that the teacher prescribes avenues that the children are required to peruse. Like Figure 1 therefore, the learning processes and content of the curriculum is seen to be owned by the children when in fact there is a degree of shared responsibility for this learning in the classroom.
This idea of a shared responsibility for learning is evident in the literature. It encourages children to become active learners, motivating learning through the inquiry nature that the Mantle offers (Black et al, 2006). The way that teachers plan for a series of Mantle lessons is ridged and structured. Often, when children are given the choice in how to resolve a problem, inquiry approaches towards this can fail (Hammond, 2011). This is common when a task set by the client poses problems that may seem too great. In turn children’s motivation levels drop resulting in a loss of interest in the activity (Hammond, 2011). Children therefore need a clear structure to their task.

Summary

It has been hard to define what Mantle of the Expert as a teaching strategy involves and the literature has revealed this. The picture of a typical Mantle of the Expert classroom is becoming clearer. Devolved leadership almost comes naturally with the style of teaching that the Mantle involves the children in. The nature of inquiry that children are encouraged to follow is a clear tool for motivation and the strategies that are involved certainly seem to conform to the ways in which boys learn best.

The view that the classroom is a company lends itself to an informal atmosphere in lessons. Sharp et al (2002) found in their research that this in itself was a strong motivator for pupils. The ‘informal atmosphere’ can allow teachers to become spontaneous when responding to pupil’s questions and suggestions (Sharp et al, 2002). The drama, scenario or company, however it is phrased, allows teachers to do this, ensuring that children are engaged in high quality curriculum that is centred
around their interests and ideas. In turn, this theoretically acts as a strong motivator for boys as it caters for the learning styles and preferences highlighted in chapter 4, but still allows for a structured curriculum that is required by teachers.
6. Methodology

Introduction

The study aimed to research the attitudes boys displayed towards school when devolved leadership strategies were used. Measuring attitudes of children can be problematic (West et al., 1997) as there are many factors that could have been included in the research. It was therefore necessary to be clear about the methods that would be used prior to beginning the research. Without this clear definition of an attitude, problems may have occurred when collecting the data. Quantitative research strategies made measuring attitudes difficult (West et al., 1997), however, by using research methods such as observations, allowed for a qualitative set of data. Observations alone would not have provided sufficient evidence to draw conclusions or comparisons from (Simons, 2009). It was therefore necessary to combine more than one research method to deliver analysable data. It is for this reason that a case study approach was chosen as the prime research strategy in this investigation.

Case Studies

By using case studies, it was possible to get a perspective into the attitudes of boys. The small number of schools teaching through Mantle of the Expert meant that it was not possible to gain a large sample of case studies. Because of this, the research was undertaken in two contrasting schools. By researching a relatively small sample, the study was able to gain an overview of these devolved leadership strategies,
aiming to highlight common practice that may happen in schools that teach through *Mantle of the Expert* (Denscombe, 2007).

Using case studies allowed for a detailed analysis of the two schools. As issues from the literature arose, it was possible to explain these and their relevance to the case studies. It would have not been possible to analyse in this interpretivist way if other research methods were used (Denscombe, 2007; Yin, 2009; Simons, 2009).

Although detailed explanations and analysis could be made, it was vital to ensure the credibility of the research. Because the sample of schools was small, generalisations regarding the effectiveness of the devolved leadership strategies, could not made (Denscombe, 2007; Simons 1996 cited in Bassey, 1999). It was important that all reflections or reasons made about discoveries, related back to the published literature to ensure the case studies were valid (Stake, 1995).

**Selecting the Schools.**

The case studies in this research were used as an exemplification of the ideas of *Mantle of the Expert* and devolved leadership strategies in practice. It was necessary to provide more than one school for the research and not to base any ‘understanding on any one set of data’ (Gillham, 2000:13). The Schools that were chosen for this study were selected on the basis of their engagement with *Mantle of the Expert* (Denscombe, 2007). A publically accessible list was used, detailing schools who were, at present, or had in the past, used *Mantle of the Expert* as a strategy for teaching and learning.
These two schools varied in the extent to which they followed the recommended structure of a *Mantle of the Expert* curriculum. As a result of this, aspects of the research had to be altered. This ensured the research reflected the current practice within the school, while keeping the intention of the research the same across both schools.

Although the case study approach only allowed for a small research sample, it did allow for the use of multiple research methods (Denscombe, 2007; Bassey, 1999; Stake, 1995; Bell, 2010). The two methods that were chosen for this study were observations and interviews.

**Observations**

Observations were used to form part of the case study. This allowed for observations into influences that the *Mantle of the Expert* had over boys’ attitudes at first hand. Observing the children in school allowed for accurate results that could be used to draw conclusions and comparisons with the literature review (Denscombe, 2007).

**Considerations for Observations**

It was important that the impact of the researcher was kept to a minimum, so observations in the classroom were chosen. These did not pose ethical issues, as the conditions in the classroom had not been artificially created (Denscombe, 2007). Validity issues could have arisen if the observer had disrupted the setting (Denscombe, 2007; Wilson, 2009; Simpson & Tuson, 1995) and contributed to what
researchers have highlighted as the ‘observer effect’ (Zegioh et al., 1975; Gillham, 2000; Denscombe, 2007). When participants are aware they are being observed, there is a tendency to alter their behaviour, displaying characteristics the observer may be looking for (Zegioh et al., 1975). In addition to this, participants have been discovered to display more positive behaviour towards observers, and in turn giving a false view of the intended study focus (Patterson and Reid 1970, cited in Zegioh et al. 1975). When observing, it was important that I did not disturb the classrooms I was in. To ensure the ‘observer effect’ did not impact the research, I tried to be seen as another adult in the class, partaking in aspects of the lesson whilst making notes. If I were to have sat in the class without interacting, taking a formal approach to the observation process this may have affected the reliability of any results gathered and it was crucial to avoid this (Wilson, 2009; Simons, 2009).

**Observation Schedules**

To further minimise the ‘observer effect’ upon the study, the type of observation was carefully selected. As an observer it is hard to become objective when researching. Without a clear structure or definite purpose for observation it is easy to ‘filter’ specific behaviours and make interpretations (Darlington and Scott, 2002 cited in Bell, 2010:192). By taking a structured approach to observation it eliminated the risk of producing subjective, biased results. For this to happen, an observation schedule was made (Appendix 3) which allowed for predetermined aspects of each lesson to be observed. This ensured that only these relevant aspects of the lessons were detailed, and insignificant information was not recorded. Since the style of the observations was structured, the children needed to be involved in lessons that followed their everyday sequence (Gillham, 2000; Denscombe, 2007).
Without this clear aim regarding the desired outcomes of the observation, the focus could have been lost. The observation could have turned from an accurate representation of the *Mantle of the Expert* classroom, to becoming a ‘highly selective’ and unfocused observation (Gillham, 2000: 47).

Although the observation schedule gave a clear structure to the research, measuring attitudes within the lessons still presented a problem (West *et al.*, 1997). Bell (2010) suggests a Flanders system may be observed when following systematic observations of behaviour and attitudes. Certain behaviours are categorised and when observed, can simply be entered into a predetermined chart (Bell, 2010). Aspects of the Flanders system were observed when making the observation schedule (Appendix 3), such as the reaction to aspects of the lesson input, however in this type of research it would have been impossible to be specific about types of behaviour. As the study aimed to view the children’s attitudes it would have been wrong to simply record behaviour, thus providing data that would not have been valid to the study (Bell, 2010).

**Rejected Methods for Observation**

Due to it being planned correctly and in advance, the observation schedule did aim to provide an overview of the lessons observed. One hindrance to this was that it did require specific focus areas to be decided before researching. This was however taken note of prior to committing to this research method. Taking an alternative approach to observation may have allowed the focus to emerge through research (Bell, 2010; Punch, 2005; Simpson & Tuson, 1995) and this may have provided for
better results. However, in this instance the focus was simply to observe a normal lesson and this structured approach to observation was deemed the most relevant.

Despite this, Gillham (2000) suggests that an unstructured participant observation could have been the basis for first hand research, with a more structured approach coming after when ‘research issues [are] well in focus’ (Gillham, 2000: 46). However, due to the time given to undertake this research it was unachievable to partake in both types of observation. The focus for research was clear from the beginning, with research issues having already been discovered through literature based study. It was therefore viable to partake in a structured approach to observe boys’ attitudes towards school.

**Observations Summary**

The intentions for this research project were not to prove or disprove a theory. Through the use of the case study, the research aimed to illuminate the issues and recommendations from the literature. It therefore does not have a specific outcome (Punch, 2005). Rather than taking an open-ended approach to observations, the research focused on specific structured ways to measure the boys’ attitudes. As there was no intended outcome from the research project, the observations were not ‘imposed’ by suggested methods of analysis and were free to portray an overview of the effects *Mantle of the Expert* had upon the boys’ attitudes (Punch, 2005: 180).
Interviews

In addition to observations, interviews were chosen as a second research method. Interviews with Headteachers and senior teachers were held in both schools. These were used to gain an insight into their opinions, over the extent Mantle of the Expert strategies had on the attitudes of boys. The intention of the research was to provide two qualitative case studies, so in the instance of interviews, a semi-structured approach was chosen.

Semi-structured Interviews

A semi-structured interview allowed for a flexible approach to the process. The teachers were able to speak and develop ideas more freely when they were asked questions by the researcher (Denscombe, 2007). This did produce accurate results in the form of natural and accurate responses (Wilson, 2009; Denscombe, 2007). However, to deliver a successful semi-structured interview may have taken time to develop (Bell, 2010). Being inexperienced to this research method, it was important to provide questions that allowed for unstructured and open answers (Appendix 2), but ensured the researcher did not stray away from the focus of the question. A failure to do this may have resulted in leading questions that would have produced invalid results (Gillham, 2000).

Another consideration with this informal approach to interview is the rapport with the teachers. This rapport was necessary in order for them to engage in the naturally occurring conversation that comes with semi-structured interviews. This rapport often
needs to be earned and if the interviewee is unknown to the researcher, results gained may not be their full opinion (Gillham, 2000). In the case of this research, initial contact was made with both schools by way of a letter (Appendix 1) and in one school a preliminary visit was made to discuss the research intentions. The contact made here ensured that I was familiar to the schools, building up a rapport before the research commenced.

**Considerations for Interviews**

It was important to factor in ethical considerations when deciding to use an interview method for this research project. A time of no more than twenty minutes was stated in the original letter of request to schools (Appendix 1). It was important that any interview that was conducted stayed true to this as failure to do so may have delayed the teachers from their work (Bell, 2010). In addition this would have broken one of the ethical codes for professional social research, making the field of research more difficult for future researchers (Bell, 2010; Social Research Association, 2003).

The way devolved leadership was delivered in school B differed to that of school A’s typical *Mantle of the Expert* approach. It was therefore necessary to alter the interview questions as a result of this. Appendix 2.1 only slightly differs to Appendix 2.2. The wording of certain questions was altered to ensure they best reflected the practice of the school. The intention of the changed questions, did however, remain the same.
Rejected Methods for Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were a relevant method for the project and other interview methods would not have suited. Using a method such as structured interviews would have involved tight control over the types of questions and answers given in the interview (Denscombe, 2007). As the purpose of the interview was to gain an insight in the use of these devolved leadership strategies, teachers would have needed to elaborate and give examples to questions raised by the interviewer (Simons, 2009). A tightly structured interview would not have allowed for this and subsequently this method was not selected.

The results gained from the semi-structured interview would need to provide honest answers. The balance between making the teachers feel at ease and complete objectivity was challenged here (Bell, 2010). This required questions that needed to be sensitive but focused in order to gain a precise answer. Therefore, it was important to structure questions that were reasonable, did not pry and offered the interviewee a chance to elaborate (Appendix 2).

To take an unstructured approach to interview would have allowed for elaboration. Similar to a conversation, but with a purpose (Dexter, 1970, cited in Bell, 2010), it would also have allowed for opinions to be truly expressed. However, without the use of an interview schedule to direct conversation, it would have been easy to drift off subject, resulting in a lengthy interview and an invalid set of results.
Interviews Summary

The semi-structured approach chosen was successful when interviewing teachers. The conversational style made for a very informal atmosphere, which enabled the participants to answer the questions truthfully (Newby, 2010). In addition questions asked were open ended, designed so that they were not leading, but allowed the teachers to elaborate (Appendix 2; Wilson, 2009; Newby, 2010).
7. Case Study A

The school chosen for case study A was a village primary school situated in the West Midlands. The school was small in size with three classes. It was evident from the school’s public relations that they were engaged with Mantle of the Expert in some form. A proportion of their website was focused on the work the school undertook with this strategy. An interview with the Headteacher confirmed this engagement with the strategy and their high level of public relations surrounding Mantle of the Expert for the school’s brand (Appendix 4.1, line 299).

The Presentation of Mantle of the Expert in School A.

The school’s teaching through Mantle of the Expert followed very closely to the view in the literature. Lessons that were taught through Mantle did employ the use of a fictitious company (Bolton, 2003) and teachers and the children in this company held a shared responsibility for the learning in the class (Appendix 4.1, line 16). The children were given a degree of choice in the way the company operated and were able to offer suggestions as to how to solve problems and challenges set to them by the client (Appendix 4.1, line 42). However, it became apparent that many of the children’s choices were selected and steered by the teachers (Appendix 4.1, line 48) and that the ownership they had over their contents and methods were limited. Supposing this was common in these classes, it could have a negative impact on the boys’ because they are being denied the freedom and control over their own learning (Hammond, 2011).
School A chose the *scenarios* and *companies* for the children to ensure all areas of the curriculum were covered by the end of the year (Appendix 4.1, line 83). Furthermore it was discovered that the degree of flexibility within the *company* was limited. Planning the *Mantle* did not seem to be dissimilar to the planning done in a more typical school. Weekly plans were said to include problems the *client* would introduce and how they were going to be assessed (Appendix 4.1, line 274). When children offered suggestions about how to solve a problem, the teacher would steer this and select certain answers from children to best suit the proposed outcome.

In contrast to the literature’s view on this strategy, school A treated the teaching using *Mantle of the Expert* as a subject rather than an approach to the whole curriculum. The way in which this functioned led to *Mantle* becoming taught as a stand alone lesson, viewed more as a thematic unit of work rather than an approach to teaching. Although the research involved only seeing a snapshot of the lessons taught, supposing this was a true reflection of the schools methods for teaching, it is unclear as to whether this would have a positive impact upon boys’ attitudes because they are not fully involved with joint decision making (Lamborn *et al* 1996, cited in Rubin and Schoenefeld, 2009).

**Devolved Leadership and Attitudes.**

The devolved leadership was evident in the classroom that was observed (Appendix 4.2). The children were given freedom in the way in which they worked and the resources they used to solve tasks (Appendix 4.2). However, the snapshot of this lesson revealed that the teacher had carefully planned the session and that it had not
in fact come entirely from the children. Although all children were enthused by the task and knew why it related to the company, the teacher presented the learning objective and activity to them. The lesson (detailed in Appendix 4.2) was therefore no different to a lesson in a more typical classroom.

The interview with the Headteacher revealed that on the whole, the choices they did receive, along with the shared responsibility for their learning, was seen to motivate the children in school A (Appendix 4.1, lines 15 – 24). When the focus for the lesson was relevant to the children’s company, it was clear that the children were more engaged in the learning task (James, 2007).

Furthermore it became apparent that the strategies used to teach through Mantle were perceived by the Headteacher to have an impact upon the children’s attitudes towards school. Subjects that didn’t provoke interest were taught within the context of the company and this knowledge that they were applying the skills for a purpose became a motivating factor (Appendix 4.1, line 120).
8. Case Study B

In contrast to case study A, case study B was undertaken at a larger primary school in the South Devon area. The school was selected using the same criteria as school A and it was believed to be using Mantle of the Expert as a strategy for teaching and learning. However, a preliminary meeting with a teacher from the school revealed that Mantle of the Expert was not used in its traditional sense.

The Presentation of Mantle of the Expert in School B

The term Mantle of the Expert was not used in school B to describe their curriculum. Learning through Mantle of the Expert had been experimented with in the past but through discussions it became apparent that the term had not been used in a long time (Appendix 5.1, line 46; Appendix 5.2, line 15). However, the curriculum this school had developed followed very closely to the ethos of Mantle of the Expert placing a focus on a skills based curriculum where children were taught skills and reasoning to enable them to become independent learners (Appendix 5.2, lines 5 – 14).

Although the learning was not presented through a company, it was found that the children were given a choice in the curriculum as it revolved around a theme. Choice was not provided through the decisions and actions of the company, instead children were given a range of possibilities to explore their interests within the theme. Teachers would keep the teaching objective intact but lessons and planning would focus on the interests of the pupils (Appendix 5.1, lines 64 – 71).
Much like the curriculum in school A, core subjects were taught separately with the thematic units providing teaching for the foundation subjects. However, in contrast to school A the whole curriculum was developed to allow choice and decision to run throughout. From both observations (Appendix 5.3; Appendix 5.4) it was clear that the children’s application to subject based learning was not negative. In addition, discussions with the school’s curriculum leader revealed that the strategy for devolving leadership was taken as an approach to all subjects taught (Appendix 5.1, lines 205 – 208). The unique strategy for devolving the leadership in school B promoted a positive attitude towards all curriculum subjects.

**Devolved Leadership and Attitudes.**

School B provided children with a *toolkit* for learning, allowing children to select resources that were appropriate to the learning task. The way in which boys and girls learn differs, with both genders having a proven preferential learning style (King *et al*, 2010b; Skelton, 2001). Rather than telling the children which resources they should use, they were empowered with the responsibility to choose their own *tool* from the *toolkit* to solve the problems they were faced with (Appendix 5.1, lines 73 – 80).

It was apparent that School B displayed a positive balance between adult led learning and child initiated learning. Children were encouraged to make choices and decisions themselves as to how to solve a problem (Appendix 5.1, lines 197 – 200), subsequently engaging the children, especially the boys. Because the children were allowed involvement in their curriculum and the way they worked, the boys displayed positive attitudes towards tasks and activities (Rubin & Schoenfeld, 2009).
The devolved leadership in School B largely came from the choices that the children were given in relation to their learning. The devolved leadership therefore came from the children taking responsibility for the way in which they learn and having the responsibilities that come with that (Appendix 5.2, lines 61 – 63). As pupils in school B were taught from an early age how to assess their learning needs their attitudes as well as academic performance was enhanced (Zimmerman, 2002).

Mawson (2010) sees decision-making and group tasks within the primary classroom as something that is frequently set by adults. In school B this view was true with the tasks set directly by the teacher (Appendix 5.3; Appendix 5.4). Although these two appendices reflect this, the context of the themes was however heavily influenced and directed by the children (Bolton, 2003; Appendix 5.1, lines 68 – 71, 124). As school B shows us (Appendix 5.1, line 94) boys are motivated by this involvement and engage with their learning.

Although school B did not teach through Mantle of the Expert, the children were still given a degree of choice over the content and methods of their learning. The illusion given to the children over controlling the content of their curriculum differs from school A to school B (Webb, d.u). School A taught through Mantle of the Expert thus allowing children to make decisions over how they solved the client’s problem (Appendix 4.1, line 41). However, Mantle of the Expert in school A was seen as a separate lesson with subjects that did not fit into the Mantle of the Expert being taught outside the scenario (Appendix 4.1, line 105). An observation in a discrete subject lesson was not possible but supposing this happened frequently, the refusal of involvement in their learning could potentially have a negative impact upon the boys’ attitudes (Rubin and Schoenfeld, 2009).

In contrast to this, school B’s toolkit approach to devolved leadership provided boys with the opportunity to select tools that suited their learning styles. The learning culture that this provided is said to engage boys and enable them to thrive (King et al, 2010; Skelton, 2001). As this strategy was adopted across the whole curriculum,
(regardless of thematic or core subjects) then it is conceivable to suggest that boys are motivated and display positive attitudes towards school as a result of this strategy (Appendix 5.1, line 85).

Ford (2009) suggests enquiry and research based project work can promote positive attitudes towards school in boys. Through the use of fictitious companies as a basis for learning, school A provided the children with this platform for inquiry and discovery through structured project based work.

Although this may be true, Ford (2009) further states that to become successful, projects should only be used over a short period of time. The Mantle of the Expert in school A was taught over a whole term. Because of the length of the Mantle children may lose motivation in the topic (Ford, 2009) and attitudes towards this type of learning may shift to become negative. To avoid this, teachers in school A would steer the scenario so that it was suited to their planned outcomes (Appendix 4.1, lines 47 – 61). But the ownership here is minimal as the curriculum was clearly prescribed by the teacher. Supposing this was to happen frequently, the lack of joint decision-making may cause boys to display negative attitudes, resulting in misconduct to school rules (Lamborn et al, 1996, cited in Rubin and Schoenefeld, 2009).

Although steered by the teachers, to an extent, the illusion of a devolved leadership existed in school A. As the children were involved in the decision making process for the company, the teacher was no longer seen as the main source of knowledge in the classroom (Heathcote & Bolton, 1997; Appendix 4.1, lines 93 – 98). As a result
the children viewed the teacher as a lead learner (Teachers TV, 2006) and activities flourished from the ideas of the class. As stated in chapter 4 (page 12) the teacher carefully determined the outcome of the discussion, by steering the suggestions of the children (Appendix 4.1, line 66). However, in this instance, the children still felt they were in control, in turn, successfully creating the illusion of a devolved leadership.

Nevertheless, many subjects that did not fit into the Mantle were taught separately in school A. It was revealed that the attitudes of boys towards these stand-alone subjects did in fact shift to a negative one.

‘If it’s their Mantle work then they will be more motivated to do it’

(Appendix 4.1, line 132)

As the Mantle of the Expert was taught as a separate subject and not, as Heathcote and Bolton (2003) suggest, taken as an approach to the whole curriculum, then it would seem reasonable to query the effectiveness of this strategy in promoting positive attitudes in boys, if this case study was an example of common practice in Mantle of the Expert teaching.

On the other hand, school B’s toolkit allowed for choice and involvement across the whole curriculum and not just during a set of lessons. The children were not told what to do by the teachers (Appendix 5.1, line 87). Instead they were trained and encouraged to make decisions for themselves, with regards to the resources and methods involved in completing a task (James, 2007). As Zimmerman (2002) suggests, this opportunity to self regulate and assess their own learning needs, can increase boys’ academic performance and their attitudes. Supposing the strategies
employed by school B were typical in schools teaching through *Mantle of the Expert*, it would seem reasonable to think that boys’ attitudes towards school would become positive.

School B recognised these differences in the way children learn, resulting in their devolved leadership strategies becoming focused around personalised learning styles. Gurian & Stevens (2006) state that to ignore these different learning styles is thoughtless. In school A’s typical *Mantle of the Expert* lesson (Appendix 4.2), the children are said to be given choice in the way they solve a task from the client. The devolved leadership in this case comes from this choice, but whilst on the task the children were given little choice in the methods used to complete it (Appendix 4.2). If this were common among lessons taught through *Mantle*, then it would conflict with the view of Gurain & Stevens (2006). This in turn, could potentially have a negative reflection on the boys’ engagement with school. Although this was the case in the observed lesson (Appendix 4.2), there was insufficient evidence in this example to draw conclusions on the extent to which personalised learning strategies were employed throughout the *Mantle*.

The children in school B were not seen as experts in a chosen company. Despite this, the school still successfully devolved leadership through the choices and decisions involving the classroom theme.

‘The whole devolved bit is not just having your say, but having your say with some idea of entitlement, and responsibilities’

(Appendix 5.2, line 61)
In this case study, the devolved leadership strategies were embedded into the ethos of the school and wherever possible, incorporated into all lessons taught (Appendix 5.1, line 205). It could be conceivable to assume that boys’ attitudes would be more positive in case study B as the devolved leadership strategies were in all lessons taught. Personalised learning strategies were embedded in school B’s curriculum. Positive behaviour towards school was displayed from the boys as the toolkits enabled them to select resources specific to their learning needs (Gurian & Stevens, 2006).

The evidence gathered in school A suggested that Mantle of the Expert was taught in a subject slot rather than an approach to the curriculum. Although this seemed to be the case it was clear that this benefitted the school. School A had tried to teach the whole curriculum through the Mantle but discovered that practical limitations made it impossible (Appendix 4.1, lines 131 – 136). Although this was not typical of the prescribed way of delivering Mantle of the Expert, in similarity with school B, developing and adapting the strategy specifically for their school had benefits for the children. When taught within the Mantle subjects are not split up, thus the focus shifts from learning information to reasoning, discussion and learning how to learn (Harste, 2001).

Despite all of the above findings, both schools had structured themselves a curriculum that was very focused on skills teaching. In school A certain lessons and skills had to be taught outside the Mantle, much like in School B children had to learn new skills to add to their toolkits (Appendix 5.1, lines 208 – 210). However, the children had the knowledge that the skills learnt would be applied to their company
and this knowledge became a motivating factor (Appendix 4.1, lines 118 – 120). Devolved leadership came about in both schools, regardless of the extent to which *Mantle of the Expert* was used. The shared responsibility the children and teacher had over the learning was a motivating factor towards the boys’ engagement in both schools (Black *et al.*, 2006).

**Reflective Thoughts.**

This enquiry has shown that *Mantle of the Expert* was adapted by both schools to best suit their particular needs. Contrasting to the view of the literature, the two schools approach to *Mantle of the Expert* differed. Although school B did not label their school in the way that school A did, it was clear however that in both schools the devolved leadership strategies were used effectively and had made a positive impact upon the boys.

Reflecting back on this enquiry, it was clear that the research methods used were successful in highlighting the issues that were to be explored. Interviews with Headteachers did provide an insight into the structure of the school’s curriculum and the extent to which *Mantle of the Expert* strategies were employed. In addition, the observations taken were able to give an insight into the extent to which these strategies had an impact upon the boys in the school.

Although observations were undertaken, the sample was relatively low. This provided for good qualitative data to analyse the enquiry, however it did not provide a broad range of evidence to be able to make firm conclusions. Recommendations for future
research have been made in the following chapter. However, the purpose of this research was to provide an enquiry comparing the strategies used in two schools. Despite not being a huge sample, the data gathered allowed for a critical discussion surrounding the findings in both schools.
7. Final Thoughts

In both school’s devolved leadership strategies were used throughout their curriculum. It is hard to find a definitive answer to the title as it was found that attitudes from the boys were positive within both these schools. As the children were trained in the way of a devolved leadership (Appendix 5.1, line 153), they were unaware of teaching methods other than the devolved leadership strategies. The boys’ attitudes were positive, but due to the circumstances surrounding the way they were taught, it would be unreasonable to assume that this was as a direct result of the devolved leadership strategies that Mantle of the Expert encompassed.

The branding of Mantle of the Expert in School A may also have had an impact upon the attitudes of the children. It was found in both schools that attitudes were positive as a result of these strategies. However, in school A especially, the branding of the school placed a heavy focus on the use of Mantle of the Expert (Appendix 4.1, lines 299 – 301). The known attributes of the teaching strategy may have had an underlying affect on the attitudes of the children, especially the boys. Some parents of children at the school viewed the strategy in a negative way (Appendix 4.1, line 303). This negativity towards the strategy may affect a parent's decision about whether to send their child to the school. As a result the children attending the school may have had parents who supported the strategy. Although this was not proven in this study, it may be conceivable to wonder if this could have had an impact upon the children attitudes, but further research would need to be undertaken to establish this.

However, as this was the only Mantle branded school that was visited as part of this research, it would be unreasonable to assume this. The children in school B
displayed positive attitudes towards school as well and this school did not place any emphasis on the brand *Mantle of the Expert*.

It is interesting to consider to what extent branding a school as *Mantle of the Expert* has upon the attitudes of children. The intake of children based upon the known attributes of a style would also make for future research.

A more conclusive study could be undertaken in schools that did not employ devolved leadership strategies. A wider range of observations and interviews could make up a bigger study. If the curriculum was then changed to include devolved leadership strategies, attitudes of the children could be measured after this. It would be interesting to discover whether the shift to a devolved leadership has an impact upon attitudes.

The study did highlight that the attitudes of boys towards school was positive. Both schools followed closely to the ethos of a devolved leadership, providing the children with choice and empowerment over some aspects, or the whole curriculum. The strategies used in both schools followed closely to the literature’s recommendation of how boys learn best. Each school involved the children in practical activities, stimulating the natural urge for boys to be active (Skelton, 2001; King *et al*, 2010a; Ford, 2009). The children in both schools were taught skills that enabled them to decide how to solve problems (Harste, 2001; Black *et al*, 2006) and these positive attitudes may be as a result of the devolved leadership.
Despite this, the study cannot make these firm conclusions. To include more Mantle of the Expert branded schools in a repeat enquiry may offer further results. However, this research has shown that despite being branded as using Mantle of the Expert, it does not guarantee that the strategy will be used as an approach to the whole curriculum, like the literature suggested it should.
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Appendix 1 – Letter to Schools Asking Gatekeeper for Permission to Observe and Interview.

Edward Parkinson
10 Southern Terrace
Mutley
Plymouth
Pl4 7LS
20019839@marjon.ac.uk
Mob – 07965 203 195

Address Removed to Keep
Anonymity

RE: Dissertation Research Project

Dear Mrs __________,

I am in my final year of an initial teacher-training course and am currently working on my dissertation project.

After being introduced to the work of your school, I was inspired to write my dissertation on the impact learning through Mantle of the Expert has upon boys’ attitudes towards school.

It would be extremely helpful to my research if I were able to come and observe some classes within the school. I would like to observe the strategies your school uses to implement Mantle of the Expert within the classroom and the way the boys’ react to this.

I would be very grateful if I were also able to interview yourself and some of the class teachers about the way you feel Mantle of the Expert has contributed to the children’s enjoyment of school. These would take up no longer than 20 minutes of your time.

Obviously anonymity would be taken into account when writing up my research and I would not be naming the school, staff or children in my project.

I would really appreciate the opportunity to come and visit and very much look forward to hearing from you,

Yours Sincerely,

Edward Parkinson
B.Ed Hons Primary Education Student - University College Plymouth, St Mark and St John
Appendix 2 – Interview Questions

Appendix 2.1 – Interview Questions for School A

Overview of Mantle of the Expert Strategies Used.

1. Why was Mantle of the Expert chosen as a strategy for teaching within your school?

2. How does it affect the children’s attitudes towards learning and school?

3. To what extent do the children have ownership over the content & methods of their learning?

4. How are they given choices concerning the scenario?

5. Do you think that the devolved leadership strategies have a distinctive impact on boys? How?

6. How are subjects managed when they lie outside of the mantle of the expert and the scenario?

Behaviour

7. In a Mantle of the Expert classroom, does behaviour management differ from that in a more typical classroom?

8. Do the children alter their behaviour as a result of being ‘in role’?

Motivation

9. Does the nature of children’s application to a subject-based learning task differ when immersed in a scenario?

10. Regarding children’s expectations of learning with the Mantle of the Expert strategies, how do they react to non-Mantle of the Expert teaching and learning?

Strategies

11. What have been the training implications for staff to enable them to teach through Mantle of the Expert?

12. What are the main differences in the way the school plans, delivers and assesses learning as a result of this initiative?

13. What impact has Mantle of the Expert had on the school’s brand and public relation?
Appendix 2.2 – Interview Questions for School B

Overview of Delegation Strategies Used.

1 - Why was a teaching strategy involving devolved responsibility chosen for the teaching within your school?

1a – This devolved leadership strategy has been called Mantle of the Expert. Has the school ever discussed the devolved responsibility under this name?

2 - How does it affect the children’s attitudes towards learning and school?

3 - To what extent do the children have ownership over the content & methods of their learning?

4 - How are they given choices concerning the curriculum they are studying?

5 - Do you think that the devolved leadership strategies have a distinctive impact on boys? How?

6 – In the Mantle of the Expert version of this strategy, there is a recommended method based on a ‘scenario’ or ‘company’. Do you use an equivalent structure as a foundation for your planning?

Behaviour.

7 - When children are given choices over how they learn in the classroom, does behavior management differ from that in a more typical classroom?

8 - Do the children alter their behaviour as a result of being given this responsibility for their learning?

Motivation.

9 - Does the nature of children’s application to a subject-based learning task differ when immersed in a unit of work they have ownership over?

10 - Regarding children’s expectations of learning when an explicit delegation strategy is used, how do they react to teaching and learning at other times when these strategies are not employed?

Strategies.

11 - What have been the training implications for staff to enable them to hand over responsibility of the learning to the children?
12 - What are the main differences in the way the school plans, delivers and assesses learning as a result of this initiative?

13 - What impact has an emphasis on delegation strategies had on the school’s brand and public relations?
## Appendix 3 – Observation Schedule for School Visits

### Observation Checklist / Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Lesson/Scenario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of the learning objective (including differentiation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing of the criteria for success within the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of the lesson activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisation of the classroom (desk setup, how the children are grouped).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plenary and summary of learning methods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment tools and methods used within the lesson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s initial response to the learning task.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children’s application during the lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour of the children and the noise within the classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children’s responses to plenary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour management strategies used within the classroom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix 4 – Case Study A

Appendix 4.1 – Interview with the Headteacher of case study school A.

Why was *Mantle of the Expert* chosen as a strategy for teaching within your school?

Initially we had a satisfactory Ofsted, and they pointed out that the children lacked autonomy, independent strategies for learning… …and we wanted to give them that but we also wanted something that was engaging and we kind of felt that the use of drama. Because we tried bits of drama here and there… …would it engage them? And would they like the idea? And it would be fun and exciting for the teaching staff planning that way.

So, by teaching through drama as you are now, how does it affect the children’s attitudes towards learning and school?

Well I think the main difference is that the teacher isn’t… (Pause) …Well they have more of a shared responsibility in the class and they hand over some of the power and the responsibility to the children, and I think that's one of the things… so the children can feel… I mean, presumably you’ve read all about the *mantle* so you know how it works?

Yeah
The children can then feel responsible and it’s very clear that their company is an *ethical company* with values, and that they are taking it seriously and so that motivates the children. I mean I can tell you that when we first started doing it… …we were going to do it initially for two weeks but the children all wanted to carry on learning like it so we carried on and we thought ‘well this works’ so then we developed it from there. First and foremost we had a trial in year 5/6 where we were sea life rescuers and we were rescuing dolphins, and they really really enjoyed it. So yeah over the years we’ve developed all sorts of different companies, and you talk to the children they’ll tell you all about the companies.

You say that the children have a shared responsibility with the teacher, but to what extent do the children get ownership over the content and methods of their learning. Do they get a say in how they learn things?

It varies; I think the whole crux of the *mantle* really is having a tension, a problem that they have to solve that’s bought in by the *client*.

Right ok,

And so then they will decide, how they are going to address that problem.
That sort of answers my next question, so if they are given this choice and they are given this problem, do they get the choice completely of how they are going to solve it?

Well its done on a discussion basis, so the company can agree… So what you would do is… I mean there’s a certain amount of steering from the teacher in that if they were coming up with ideas that weren’t going to challenge them for example,

Yeah I see.

But they don’t generally do that to be honest

(Both Laugh)

umm they tend to come up with mad solutions to things! But you would, you know, you might say ‘well that’s an interesting idea but lets listen to what other people have got to say’ and they might come up with something that’s completely different.

So most of it comes from the children but with a directing and picking from the teacher over whose idea follows closest to the company?

Definitely, they are sort of steering the ship! Because you want to ensure that they… well have a look a teachers just given me this,
She points to a grid with curriculum subjects and corresponding NC targets.

The grid has been highlighted to show which areas of the curriculum have been covered in the current company or scenario used in their Mantle of the Expert.]

This is their curriculum coverage from last term; you can see that yeah they have covered quite a lot of the curriculum. And we also have skills curriculum sheets that they plan from, and ‘these are the skills that I’m going to address…’ so kind of planning the Mantle, it is more complex than a lot of other teaching. You plan the Mantle in that you’ve got your company and you’ve got your client. The client is going to demand certain things from the children and they’re going to have very specific success criteria that of course it’s linked to high quality teaching and high quality outcomes. So then those children can strive for that high level but you know the teacher has always got to be having an eye on the curriculum areas. I’ll give you an example… I used to teach in KS1 and we had a safari park, and we took the children to a safari park in role and we said ‘We’re a rival safari park coming to find out about you’ and they spoke to the real keepers and they played along with it, it was really good! So then they came up with, I’m going to setup our safari park.

We set it up and we did all of the work towards that, and you can imagine how much the company can bring into that. We got the tigers in the classroom you know and of course it’s all signs and symbols, we don’t have a real safari park! But one day, there was absolute bedlam because the lions had got out!
So what are we going to do? And then they said we need to get electric fences, but we don’t know how too! Does anybody on the team know how to make an electric fence?

‘Well ooo we don’t know’ so we had to go on some training, we worked out how to do electric circuits and how to put it around the tigers, so you know.

So to me that’s the kind of thinking that you’re doing as a teacher

So obviously things like that your going down different avenues and if they don’t know something they would need to find out how to do it to be able to use it in the company. But what happens when a subject, or something that you have to cover, lies outside the Mantle how would you manage that?

Oo that’s a good question! Well I think if something doesn’t fit, you shouldn’t force it because it will just be naff for the children. So I would say, as an example this Thursday we are having an RE day, and quite often RE, its very possible to do an RE based Mantle, but quite often it might not fit so we just have a whole day doing RE.
So regarding the children's expectations of the learning within the Mantle of the Expert, when something like your RE day doesn’t lie within the Mantle of the Expert how do they react to that teaching and learning?

Well I think it's still really important to ensure it's high quality. (Long Pause) I think, for example we have a Maths skills and a Writing skills lesson every day, and then they are applied within Mantle, but I think the fact that they are going to apply it is motivating.

Ok great, well that leads me onto my other question because does the nature of their application to a subject based task differ when it’s immersed within the scenario? So the writing they do, if it's not, like you said, within the scenario do their attitudes change because they know they aren’t writing for a purpose as appose to when they are writing in the scenario or company?

Umm, I think that…

(Pause) …Yeah, I think it depends on your group and all sort of different variables, but I think yeah definitely with some children, if it’s their Mantle work they will be more motivated to do it. Having said that, we did try initially doing everything through Mantle and it didn’t work just for the practical sort of reasons like you couldn’t put calculation skills into the Mantle so we just decided that ‘yeah we
were going to separate that’. But I think that in an ideal world, and I’m not saying that it happens 100% of the time, even here, in an ideal world, things you do in the skills the skills lessons are then applied in *Mantle*.

140 **So like you mentioned, with the days, if something didn't fit would you just put it into a day of non-*Mantle* teaching?**

No it depends on the subject, or you know you might just have an afternoon of science. I mean I have an expectation that things are still covered and if… …

145 **The other thing to say is that if it’s not covered this term…**

This curriculum coverage, the skills as well that i’ve got…

*She refers back to the curriculum coverage sheet shown earlier*

150 …can then be looked at and used when planning the next *Mantle*, because you’ve got the whole year to do it you know. We tend to have a history based one [*Mantle*], a Geography based on and a Sciences based one, so your getting all the different areas of learning

155 **So by the end of the year you’ve covered most…**

Yeah most foundation subjects! And of course Music is taught separately and some aspects of English and Maths, but obviously there are loads of skills that are coming through *Mantle* that you can use.
So in a typical *Mantle of the Expert* classroom would the behaviour management differ from that in a more typical classroom?

I think it does, and I think that the fact that we have very few behavioural issues is partly because the children are engaged you know. If I have any behavioural problems, they’re very few and far between first of all, but if I have any little skirmishes or whatever, that will be a lunchtime break time thing, It won’t be in lessons!

So would you say, the children almost alter their behaviour as a result of being in this role?

Definitely! Because I think that the children are… …well ones about the expectations of them because they’re *Experts*, there’s this boost to their self-esteem, and the other thing is that they are more engaged. You can… …it’s a really good flexible tool, because you can give certain children who might struggle with things certain roles within their company, and that really supports them and helps their self esteem. Because of course a lot of behaviour issues are linked with self-esteem and with issues like that, and also the key thing is that the children values are embedded within their company ‘and we need to make sure that the company is an ethical company, and in our company we behave in a certain way!’

‘If you were in your company, you would be getting the sack if you were to do that!’ do you see what I mean?
Yeah

So that’s the sort of thing. And one of the big rules is that we do take this seriously. And then they all know that we say ‘oh this isn’t real’. We don’t get that now but when we first started, we used to get the ‘oh its not real’ and you used to think uuurh ok ‘well we’ll just have to plug on and say right we are taking this seriously’.

So the genuinely think that when they go in they are doing their task?

We act out… …well they know that its not real, but they act if it is. Because that’s just how we learn, so we are acting, It’s called ‘as if’ and we always try to use the language, because it is such a complex way of teaching, but the language is; Lets agree that we are a… whatever company. And it's always an inclusive language not ‘I’m telling you to do’ and the teachers must be so practiced at it… …you know If you come to a study day you’ll sort of see that, that its quite a few different layers of teaching and I think it's a tough job but to be honest when student come here it is quite different and they do find it harder to do the teaching in that way.
I mean, I'm not sure how long you've been running it here, but what have been the training implications for staff then?

It's been going for 4 years, over 4 years now. Training implications for staff... ...well we would have, well we still have one of the national trainers support staff and she comes in now really now because we're so far down the line, she comes in and helps with planning days

Is that someone representing Mantle of the Expert?

Yeah from the national trainers, she's one of our governor's, she comes in and supports planning and also anything... ...you know if people are doing training in other schools that we've been asked to do, she might look through their workshops and things that they're doing in other schools. So we've had that, but initially we went to the national conferences, Jenny and I went on a umm... ... training to be a national trainer... what else have we done?

We are part of the West Midlands Mantle of the Expert network as well and they put on events at Newman University, as we also... ...when we first started doing it we had a guy called Luke Abbott, he's like the lead teacher for national trainer, and he came in and did Mantles in each class to get people started. So we did that and he did a quality check on the work in school, he gave us like an Ofsted inspection, so he did that for us, and he was quizzing us like 'What role are you in now?' What else have we done, oh we had issues with parents saying 'ok it's all good but isn't it a bit airy fairy nonsense, I want the children to do reading, writing', so we tackled that last year we had,
It’s gone but we had creative partnership money, so one of the national trainers came in and did a workshop with all the parents and we were really pleased because we had over 40 parents. That led onto a project where parents came in and observed they came in actually a small group of them, It was about 10 parents, came in in role and worked within the classes. I’d love to get that started again!

It sounds like so much fun!

Yeah, Yeah it was fun, I mean this last term we’ve has lots of building work so we haven’t been able to get the parents in, but I must get that up and running again!

So that was an implication really getting the parents involved, but that’s always going to be on going. But when we have our new parents, one of the key things we do is we talk to them about Mantle and we keep them informed about what’s going on. I mean we send out parent questionnaires so I might put one in about Mantle of the Expert.

So what are the main differences in the way that the schools plans, delivers and assesses the learning as a result of Mantle of the Expert compared to that of a more typical school?

I’m just looking to see if I can find an example that would be helpful. Some of it’s not different at all really. So we have a planning sheet that has got the client, the values, the company and its ‘what’s the problem going to be with
your company’ and you can download all those of the Mantle of the Expert website.

Yes I’ve had a look at planning examples on the site.

Yeah so we start with that, then we do something similar to this,

She shows me a typical thematic planning mind map, with the company and the problem written out in the middle with all the different curriculum areas around the edge and all they ways those curriculum areas can be linked to the scenario.

Yes, I’ve seen this type of planning before, almost like a thematic plan mind map?

Yeah, basically a bit of a plan, and we take that and we look at all the skills. Your going to look at what you’ve covered, then your going to look at where the children are in terms of their levels for all the subjects, what we want to cover and use all that knowledge to plan the Mantle, so it’s a very complicated way. And then we’ve got a weekly planning sheet for the Mantle, so they do a weekly plan as well, and that’s got ‘what’s going to happen?’ the clients, assessment for learning. So a lot of it is similar but it’s a different style of learning. And also, we’ve generated our own plan as a school, It’s got things like what drama conventions are we using, what role conventions, so it’s got all those Mantle of the Expert tools in there as well. How are we going to know
what the children have learned and what they’ve understood, where you are going to move the learning onto and how are you going to do it. So some of it’s similar and some of it’s slightly more complicated I suppose, but I think it’s work it.

Oh yeah, I mean I’ve seen those planning sheets before…

Points to the thematic planning mind map

…and it doesn’t look to dissimilar to other types of thematic planning, where the theme is in the middle rather than the company, and well its pretty much the same as that.

I mean I’ve got a ton of planning but I’ve put it all away. I'll have to find it at some point.

Finally really what impact has Mantle of the Expert had on your school’s brand and it’s public relations?

Interesting, well I think we are known as doing Mantle of the Expert in the county and further a field, and we do a study day every term and that’s useful for us in terms of sharing practice. So I suppose that’s what our school is known for, and I know that it can be misinterpreted because I know that it works but you get some parents who go ‘oh well it’s very creative’ and see it as a sort of negative thing.
## Appendix 4.2 – Observation of a year 1/2 class within school A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Scenario/Company – Space Explorers.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1/2</td>
<td>11:00 – 12:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lesson/Scenario
- Measuring objects to put in a lunchbox for the spaceman.

### Assessment tools and methods used within the lesson
- The teacher gives the children the learning objective at the beginning of the lesson. She is able to see from the work whether the children had understood the task.

### Lesson/Scenario
- Presentation of the learning objective (including differentiation).
- Sharing of the criteria for success within the lesson.

### Introduction
- The teacher gives the children the learning objective at the beginning of the lesson.
- Assessment tools and methods used within the lesson.

### Children’s initial response to the learning task.
- The children were engaged and on task. They enjoyed the lesson activity and were given independence in the way they worked. Children were allowed to choose which equipment they used to draw the objects with and resources were found by the children as and when they needed them.

### Organisation of the classroom (desk setup, how the children are grouped)
- Behaviour was typical of a year 1/2 class. Noise levels were high but dialogue was about the task they were working on. There were no signs of silly behaviour especially from the boys who were very sensible and on task.

### Children’s responses to plenary
- There was a large carpet area in this KS1 classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson/Scenario</th>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson</td>
<td>Year 1/2</td>
<td>11:00 – 12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the learning objective (including differentiation).</td>
<td>Year 1/2</td>
<td>11:00 – 12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of the criteria for success within the lesson.</td>
<td>Year 1/2</td>
<td>11:00 – 12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s initial response to the learning task.</td>
<td>Year 1/2</td>
<td>11:00 – 12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the lesson activity.</td>
<td>Year 1/2</td>
<td>11:00 – 12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation of the classroom (desk setup, how the children are grouped).</td>
<td>Year 1/2</td>
<td>11:00 – 12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s responses to plenary</td>
<td>Year 1/2</td>
<td>11:00 – 12:00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Behaviour management strategies used within the classroom.

The teacher obviously had behaviour management strategies in place, however it was evident that she didn’t have to use them as frequently as expected. The children responded very well to the task at hand and no adults had to raise their voice to get the attention of the class. The children packed up promptly at the end of the lesson with the teacher counting down from 10.
Appendix 5 – Case Study B

Appendix 5.1 - Interview with the Deputy Head and year 1 teacher of case study school B

Why was a teaching strategy involving devolved responsibility chosen for the teaching within your school?

Well the main idea with it was creating lifelong learners, learning for life. Giving the children… …well developing their skills, attitudes and knowledge that will enable them to go into the work place and continue the learning journey. So to do that they need to have the skills to be able to; solve problems, think creatively, critically, emotionally, you know, that whole package of well being if you like to basically be lifelong learners and to contribute to the community. It’s that whole thing about contribution to society, so I mean we’ve gone for a four core values approach, and these lead our learning, some people call them learning families, it’s a mixture of learning and ethos.

[She holds up the core values cards, with the name of the core value in big lettering with broken down criteria to achieve these on the cards]
So we are endeavoring to create; Aspiring learners, that whole idea that there is not a ceiling on learning! ‘So what am I going to do next?’, that’s the whole idea of the aspiration learners.

Creativeness. It’s not about painting, art, music. It’s that whole idea about solving problems, looking at things from different viewpoints. So if one strategy doesn’t work, what can I try next? Rather than waiting for someone to tell them. It’s that whole idea of independently thinking around a problem, and asking ‘what if?’, ‘well you know, I could try that!’ ‘what if this happens?’.

Contribution is very much about looking at the contribution that they make, but also the contribution that they make to others. That’s the whole thing about recognising strengths, looking at the outcome, if your working in a group you know ‘who am I going to need to help me achieve this?’ Rather than just about ‘I contributed to this…’. It’s around that, helping others, the leadership of others. But you can see how it relates to the workplace.

And then finally, respecting. Because obviously everything that we do involves a high level of respect for themselves, for others, for the communities, cultural diversity, working co-operatively. In it’s wider sense it’s that whole thing about being empathetic, not making judgments until you have got evidence and you have collected information. It’s not jumping to conclusions. So through those, that is how we teach out curriculum, through that so we are developing children who are thinkers and are self sustaining. That’s our reasoning. Lifelong learners, 21st Century learners.
Well this is the avenue I’ve taken with my project. I know the devolved leadership strategy has been called *Mantle of the Expert*. Has the school ever discussed the devolved responsibility under this name?

We have done, a very long time ago. Not for a long time, and I mean a lot of the staff members probably won’t remember that. But we’re a school that never just follows, we always, innovate, and we’ve taken that really and moved on, and created something that suits us as a... well an academy now, but suits us as a separate unit rather than just a generic.

**How does it affect the children’s attitudes towards learning and school?**

Well obviously I’m talking broadly. I mean generally speaking... well (pause) I hate that word ownership really because, well what does it mean. I think the children do feel very much involved with the learning, and we generally find they are more open to getting on with doing things. And before we plan the unit of work we take the children’s views, opinions and likes into account so that they help us to plan.

**Ok I see, well I know you don’t like this work, but to what extent do the children have ownership over the content & methods of their learning?**

I mean the way I like to look at it, for example you’ve got a historical objective so obviously looking at historical enquiry. I mean a couple of years ago we were looking at Neil Armstrong as our historical figure in year 2. Now we barely touched Neil Armstrong by the time we got to the end of it, because
they wanted to look at the rockets, the this, that and the other. Now as far as
I’m concerned, as long as the history objective, in terms of the enquiry, has
been covered, the context didn’t matter, the subject didn’t matter, as long as
the historical element was being covered. So in that respect, we’ve not
relaxed a little bit, but we’ve let go to the constraints of the subject. I mean it’s
the same with the maths this morning (see appendix 5.3) you know; they are
choosing the tools to help them. It’s not me in a lesson telling them ‘right
today you’re all going to use a number line!’ It’s actually given them the tools
to help them, ‘this is the problem I’m faced with, I need to try and solve it, how
am I going to do it?’ Now if you make every child use the same tool, well for
some children it doesn’t work, so what are you going to do? You’re going to
switch them off to learning. But if they can pick a tool that they are familiar
with, they like and they understand, then they are going to make progress.

Do you think that the devolved leadership strategies have a distinctive
impact on boys?

I think it motivates boys. Absolutely. I mean a couple of children in that class,
very much at the beginning of the year, laid back attitude, couldn’t be
bothered with much at all. But because I don’t dictate wholly to them what
they’re doing, there’s that flexibility, obviously there’s an outcome, but they
know that how they get to that outcome is entirely up to them. It’s like fencing
children, if you bring the goalposts in and force them into a narrow space,
then you’re going to get them kicking and screaming. But if you open it up
then they’re going to run, and that’s what we’re trying to do, a little metaphor
there. And we just think they are more motivated, and they’re more likely to talk about their learning too. I mean we talk a lot, the plenary you saw this morning is very much linking it back to the learning, ‘what have you been doing which has helped you towards this?’, so the children are getting that language of learning a lot more. And what we find is that they are talking about their learning more, they understand it more, they want to do more of it because motivation really is the key.

In the Mantle of the Expert version of this strategy, there is a recommended method based on a ‘scenario’ or ‘company’. Do you use an equivalent structure as a foundation for your planning?

No, what we do is we have themes, which can be… …well the next one is going to be 4 weeks long, the last one was 8 weeks long, they could be half a term, they could be a term. And it links to other interests, or local area and for example next term it’s a whole term on the Olympics. So national interests as well and we stretch that out to the global.

So then your curriculum is based around the theme?

Yeah so it’s around a theme. But we always have a hook day into our theme, so there’s always a launch day and it literally hooks the children in. So for our Roman one we’ve just finished… …It was party in the past, so in year 2 and year 3 we’ve done the Romans. And the hook day was, we sent a letter home to the children, ‘please come in with your willies and your hard hats because
something specials happening’. And that’s all you say. So everyone’s like ‘what’s going on?’, so it builds up the excitement. And they came and they did an archaeological dig down at the bottom of the bank. Obviously we had planted the bits of pottery, and coins and some modern stuff as well. But as far as the children are concerned, they’re finding bits of mosaic, ‘what’s this, what’s that’, and they are asking questions. And from that they create a questions board, and that then will lead us into the planning. So we take the children’s interests, and like I said what we do is we make sure that we are covering the skills based objectives. So they need to know about secondary sources, primary sources and for the slightly older children, they need to recognise the fact that what you read on the Internet is not always the truth, you need to find lots of different sources to triangulate your information. But what the information is, what they’re focusing on doesn’t matter. So from their questions, that is what we plan into our learning. And then we have an outcome at the end, so tomorrow we are having a big party, where the parents are invited, and they are performing their songs, their dancing, the parents can come back to the classroom and taste some Roman food.

So it’s a big practical afternoon of fun to bring the theme to an end. But there is that full circle then where the children can then review their learning. Part of that has been through literacy, we’ve been writing newspaper reports from a reporter’s point of view. So they began talking about their hook day and what’s going on since in the school. So it’s all centred on the theme. But we plan the hook and the outcome, but how it goes in between…

...It’s up to them.
Yes, and it can change week on week depending on where it takes them. But we never let go of the objective; it’s always at the back of your mind. But that’s how we approach everything. Hook, lots of learning around their questions, and then into an outcome.

So talking about work in the classroom, when children are given choices over how they learn in the classroom, does behavior management differ from that in a more typical classroom?

Well as long as they’re trained, and I said earlier on you have to train them to work in that way because it does take a lot of independence. At the beginning of the year when new children come in, I trust them implicitly. The only thing that they can do is lose my trust, they don’t have to gain it they’ve already got it. But if they lose it they have to gain it back. So that’s the idea that you have to paint to them to start with, ‘I’m sort of trusting you to do this, this is the way I’d like you to work, you choose who to sit with as long as they will help you learn, they won’t distract you and you won’t distract them’, and that’s always been my way. ‘But if you need me to help you do that I will, if you don’t make a good choice’. Because at the end of the day I need to make sure that they’re learning and they’re learning well. And they all understand that, so setting those ground rules at the beginning of the year. But then it’s training them up. So initially, I would setup a load of independent activities, I wouldn’t timetable myself with a group, I would be moving around those independent activities, talking to the children about... ...you know ‘oh you’ve
only been working on this one for one minute and then you moved off, lets come back, how about we get the timer out and see if you can be here for three minutes’.

So you train them to get to this point where I can set them off with a range of activities they can choose from, I’m with a group and we’ve got that quick turnover where they are independent, then back to me, and I give them an activity and they’re back to somebody else, then they can choose again. So generally speaking when you get to that point, behaviour management, you don’t have to do as much of it. Because they are independent on their learning! The more you narrow it down and try to pin them down you are not going to get all the children in your class who like to work in that way, so then your going to have people who are distracting, not doing the activity and then you have to keep intervening. But generally speaking they know that if I’m with a group they don’t disturb me. The only thing is that if they need to go to the toilet or something they come and ask. And the noise level is obviously very quite in there too, so I think it helps behaviour management because of the freedom they’ve got, they know that, as I said, whatever they are doing independently I’m going to catch up with them on it. So if they chose not to do it, I will know about it and they will have to do it in their own time. So we’ve gone through that pain.

So do the children alter their behvaiour as a result of being given this responsibility for their learning?
Well I think that most children really appreciate it to be honest. I mean not every day is a good day, sometimes you have a blip, and you say ‘I’ve got six activities here that you can choose from, if your struggling with that, I’ll choose one for you, would you like me to choose, or you to choose?’ You paint the picture black and white and of course what are they going to go for? Oh we’ll choose. ‘Great I’m go glad about that’. I don’t like directly telling them, it’s all about them making that decision for themselves. That’s all that thing about being independent thinkers. I’m not solving the problems for you, I’m asking you questions to think it through.

Does the nature of children’s application to a subject-based learning task differ when immersed in a unit of work they have ownership over?

I mean it shouldn’t do really. Because if as a school, that is our policy and way of working and our ethos, and this was decided by the whole school, it was a corporate decision. Then you should work in that way for anything you are doing. I mean there are times, the maths for example, where you have to explicitly teach them a tool or a strategy, but they know it’s in order to widen their repertoire of you the tool box. And at the beginning of the year, that only had a couple of things in it that they had bought up from year 1. And then it grown, and it will be passed on to year 3 and it will grow again. So they know that if I am explicitly teaching them something, and they don’t have that choice then it’s to give them another tool for their toolkit. And we have a literacy toolkit and a generic toolkit as well, so there’s always a reason for it. And I think it’s important to always explain to the children why they are learning
what they are learning. There’s always a reason, it’s not just because I’m telling you to.

Ok so regarding children’s expectations of learning when an explicit delegation strategy is used, how do they react to teaching and learning at other times when these strategies are not employed?

Well I still think there’s still a choice to be had it’s just that the teaching activity tends to be more directed, rather than two way. So it might be the case that it is a little bit more me demonstrating them, showing them, but it leads on to ‘I need to go and see you practice that particular skill’. So my teaching strategies in the classroom don’t really change, It’s just that sometimes I’ll be talking or showing them more.

So the choice is always there essentially?

Yeah because you can’t work with all the children all the time, so along side that going on there is some choice to be had, whether it’s practicing something that we’ve already done. I mean we tend to keep it quite fluid, so today on the laptops they could choose the addition or subtraction games. Now that’s something we did two weeks ago, but they need to keep revisiting it, so it’s not always linked to that objective for the week, but the children always know that it links back to something that we’ve already done.

So next week I might throw a couple of time activities in just to bring back time into the maths as well. But they know that because at the beginning of the
week when I introduce them to the whole week, I’ll say to them ‘I’ve chucked a
couple of activities in, why do you think I’ve done that?’ and they’ll say ‘oh
because we need to practice it’. But again it goes back to that explaining why
am I asking you to do what your doing? I never ask them to do anything
without explaining why. I think it’s rude really.

So with the curriculum that you have reached now in your school, what
have been the training implications for staff to enable them to hand over
responsibility of the learning to the children?

Interesting, because we’ve had a huge turnover of staff in the last three, four
years. I mean last year we had five new members of teaching staff start in
September. So of course if you’ve been here, and gone through out core
values at the beginning, you’ve grown with it. So I generally introduced all the
tools to the school, from the research I’ve done. So generally speaking it has
had a lot of training implications, especially for newly qualified teachers
who’ve come from teacher training. They generally have a set model that
they have seen, because at the end of the day they need to deliver a good
lesson with a mental oral, lesson activities and a plenary. You know very
much standard, whereas we’ve obviously moved on from that, so we do a lot
of induction. We have induction mentors for all new members of staff where
we go through basic policies, and tick off boxes, ‘have you seen that?’ and
‘have you read that?’… …and then we have just started a personal coaching
team. So for example our year one teacher, just started with us, I’m their
personal coach. So a part of my job is to observe them, do a bit of hand
holding, identify some areas, not for improvement or development, but for knowledge. So for example they have been watching me teach and do this whole ‘no class teaching’ more of the group teaching, and then I’ll go and plan with them to do a session in year one, I’ll go and observe them and we will do it that way. I also, as curriculum leader for the school, setup a program, open it up to all staff, so this month I’m focusing on thinking cubes, success ladders, and introducing core values at the beginning of the lesson. There are five opportunities this month to come and see me, sign up.

And then staff come, I mean last month I had 10 members of staff come and see me do those three things and I come back and visit them, see their planning and give them a bit of feedback. It’s all very informal and very much handholding. This month it is group teaching, so I’ve got 8 so far coming to see me. After that it’s the use of tent cards, which is another tool to get children thinking about the values they are using not just the subject content. So that’s another method we use as well, so throughout the year staff can come and see, at the moment it’s me, but it can be other colleagues that have strengths as well. So we set that up, and of course we’ve got the INSET, and last week I led an inset on a story telling project which was again another tool to help children improve their reading and writing, well more writing. So huge implications but we’ve got things in place to support that. I mean for all I know some members of staff will leave again, and you’ve got to completely redo the cycle. But the teaching never stays the same, it changes all the time and we just have to be prepared for that.
What are the main differences in the way the school plans, delivers and assesses learning as a result of this initiative?

I think, we do a bit push on the assessment. So it’s not seen as… …I mean we often update all out data at the end of a term. So we upload the changed in levels, but you can see from my planning in the lesson that it informs tomorrow, and it builds, and builds, and builds. So everything I’m teaching I know is next steps for my children, its not a case of these are year 2 objectives, I know exactly where they are at any point. I think the children are much more involved in assessment, we’ve had a big push on peer and self-assessment. But it gets the children questioning, what they’ve learnt, why they’ve learnt it, what the next steps might be and how they are learning it. So it’s not just us assessing them, they’re assessing themselves all the time. And often it’s a case of, especially with the more able half of the year group, ‘Right so we’ve ticked those off this week, what do you want to do next week, what will be the next step?’ and ill say ‘Well what about if we…’ and I’ll try and build it in. So they’re thinking of the same sort of objectives, but we’re thinking what could we try next, what would the next challenge be. So it’s not just me saying ‘oh I’ll tell you what your doing on Monday’, I try and involve them the whole time. So I think the children are much more aware of what learning looks like and feels like. They talk the language of learning more. We’ve had people come from other schools and say ‘my god your children know words that I didn’t expect them to know’, like succeed and challenge and expectations and next steps, all these sorts of phrases that we talk about as teachers.
I mean my planning this morning; I said ‘oh could you pass that, because planning is a really useful tool isn’t it’. I talk about my planning all the time, and I say to them ‘I need to go home now and plan what we’re going to do tomorrow’, and I show them, not in detail, but I show them my plans. Because I expect them to plan their writing, use different planning tools and I can’t expect them to do something if they don’t know I’m doing it myself. So they know I plan, so it actually inspires them to plan themselves. And often with children they often want to please their teacher, but I say to them, ‘don’t just do it for me, do it for yourselves. I want you to do it because it feels good for you’. And that’s on our aspiration core values, that persisting; complete activities because it feels good. We often talk about that good feeling inside when you’ve completed something, and they say ‘it feels great’. Well brilliant, hold onto it because we feel that everyday.

What impact has an emphasis on delegation strategies had on the school’s ‘brand’ and public relations?

An interesting one, well we had a lot of feedback from parents about children being more motivated at home. I mean we’ve had out hook day and we’ve got a couple of weeks we’ve got out hook day into our tell me a story theme which is very much creating stories. And for some parents its like ‘oh god I’ve got to find another costume for my four children at this school’, which we know can have a bit of an impact. But generally speaking, parents commented on the enthusiasm of their children. And some of the themes we’ve done, the
stuff they have bought in from home, where they have continued the learning at home can fill books. The parents have said ‘my god, if I have to sit at the dinner table again and hear’, ‘what’s a blue whale, and did you know the difference between a blue whale and a…’

and they’re like can you just move on now because I’ve had enough about whales, and my husband didn’t think there was anything else left to know but they’ve come home yesterday with yet another fact. So we get that sort of thing from parents, and one of the hooks we did into our space theme, we setup the area down in the school where we setup a whole blacked out space for the Apollo 11. We had lights, a real bubble machine, you we setup this thing of ‘something exciting’s happening, please bring your children to the hall at the beginning of the day’ and we left it over a holiday. Then the parents would say ‘thank god it’s the end of the holiday, all we’ve had is’ ‘what’s going on?’… And that’s that carrot dangling and I mean the parents have all said that it has really enthused and engaged their children. And I’m talking from my year 2 experience rather than what’s happening all over, but some parents have just commented on the language of their children, and they are coming home from school and talking about their learning. Before it was what did you do today, well nothing. But not its more regular conversations about what’s happening. So there’s a lot more discussion to be had. And our home learning has changed, so rather than just be maths and literacy based, and obviously the children have to practise their skills and the parents want that, but now and again we create a ‘create it’ or an ‘action it’ homework where it might be ‘take a walk along the beach, collect five things’, and it’s a way of
showing what you've found. Some children took photographs, some made a book and it's that choice that creativeness again, opening it out because children learn in different ways. I mean we set them the task of creating an aquarium, because we did aquariums back in the autumn, and some of these aquariums were tiny ones, some were massive big tanks, with things dangling, bits in paper mache, we had real shells. And the range was brilliant and it inspired the children because they came in then with theirs, very proud, but they saw the others and were like ‘oh I didn’t think of that, I'll do that next time’. And the parents have said it's been a very nice approach to home learning, linked to the theme, but very much opening it up more. And what we're finding is that dads are doing homework with children, they're getting out one weekend for a walk, and parents are coming to us saying 'we haven't been out on Dartmoor for years'. And the amount of models that came in and children have written, ‘I made this with my dad’, and you know we lost that for a while. That has been a big impact I think, you know this whole idea of making children more aware of their learning.
Appendix 5.2 – Interview with a senior class teacher of year 6 in case study school B

**Bold:** Me the Interviewer

**Normal:** Senior Class teacher in School

**Why was a teaching strategy involving devolved responsibility chosen for the teaching within your school?**

Well the thing was, we wanted to make it very clear that one of our key principles, about learning is that it should be learning for life. And to just always having teacher led learning was just not going to encourage that, learning is for life, and we always say to the children, ‘we’re still learning’. We have students in and that further reminds them that we are all embracing that journey at some point.

Well this devolved leadership strategy that I’ve been looking into has been called *Mantle of the Expert*. Has the school ever discussed the devolved responsibility under this name?

Well yes, but as you know, there are staff changed and developments. So at the time it was current and fresh, and we took it on board in this school, and what happened in the school was, well it would be part of an INSET, breaking into groups coming back with ideas you know, so the whole thing was student embedded and adopted by everybody, and at the time it would be everybody who was currently in that place.
To what extent do the children have ownership over the content &
methods of their learning?

Well content first, so at the end of each unit of work, say World War 2 is the
25 overarching theme, the children are always consulted about... ...through their
evaluations, were there enough variety of choices within World War 2. And I
mean some of them came up with things like ‘it wasn’t reasonable to
resource’, and so you would try your best to create some common sense out
of that, and then look at the evaluations. ‘Did this make sense to you? Did
you enjoy your learning?’; questions like that, so there’s an evaluation sheet
30 and one of the questions is ‘would you keep this unit of work in for next years
yr 6?’.

And then the methods then, if they’re doing research for that unit, they can
use the tools in their toolkits, so books, the internet they can use adults to talk
to, so sometimes we have experts in who can give an assembly or come and
talk to the class. So to a certain extent, that comes through the evaluations
whether that all worked. But when planning it you can take into account the
different kinds of learners so; Kinesthetic, Visual etc. and provide a range of
resources that they then can choose from.
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40 So obviously these are choices that can be made in the lesson, but how are they given choices concerning the curriculum they are studying?

Well, what our head has done, is explain to the children when we developed this whole approach, is that we need to keep literacy and maths. And maths of course is discrete, and they’re set. And the skills for language and writing and so on can be taught in booster groups. So the two core subjects were out of the equation, because we have standards to meet. But within that, English and any Mathematics that come into the creative side of the curriculum is planned with the children in mind and what elements of that overarching theme they want to explore. So say it was building in the UK, somebody could do St Paul’s Cathedral etc. and then they could talk to each other and share their ideas, they put on a display at the end of it all. And that is to share with the parents and to other peers.

55 So do you think that the devolved leadership strategies have a distinctive impact on boys?

I do. I do, but… …I think it’s how you do it. I mean this afternoon was a perfect example of reluctant boys who didn’t want to come in and do some writing, but within the terminology of giving them ownership and everything, you have got to give them an attitude that is not always no or negative. So the whole devolved bit is not just having your say, but having your say with some idea of entitlement, and responsibilities and so on and so forth.
When children are given choices over how they learn in the classroom, does behavior management differ from that in a more typical classroom?

Well I think that the more that you can involve children in using a whole range of learning that suits the specific needs, the more that they feel included to give you their best. Because really it's about capturing your audience.

Do you think then that the children alter their behaviour as a result of being given this responsibility for their learning?

I think they do at best. I think in the beginning when ICT as a tool was one of the options, everybody ran for it and there wasn’t much evaluation done as to what was the right tool or whatever. But what we’re finding, a little bit down the road, is that children do use it wisely and the results can be stunning. And boys’ who were reluctant to write of paper, will create things using a whole range of storyboard ideas or whatever in ICT and do it really well!

Does the nature of children’s application to a subject-based learning task differ when immersed in a unit of work they have ownership over?

I think in a cross-curricular and thematic approach it has a context and it’s exciting. And we create a hook day, where people dress up, or we have a scientific dig or we excavate with hats on and you know you. And in one we went on a journey to the rainforest and the teachers all dressed up as
airhostesses and we all went into assembly and it was like the inside of a plane, and we tried to create that journey for them. So everybody takes part in that. And what happens is that where you can weave the best quality of language that have been taught outside that creative unit, into the creative unit because by then they’ve got the skills. And I think that it really enhances learning. But if you’ve got boys who are underachieving going in to that…

…the creativity, excited and encourages and enthuses them, but it doesn’t give them any more skills. However, seeing that you write for a purpose within that creative context, has a good effect and I think that ultimately once you’ve taught the skills, they can then go on to use it for a different purpose.

Regarding children’s expectations of learning when an explicit delegation strategy is used, how do they react to teaching and learning at other times when these strategies are not employed?

Well, conversely what we found with ICT is that you can sit all afternoon looking at a website. And there are children that do that, and they achieve nothing. So I think that in good teaching in any category, you have to be explicit about the learning objective, and the timescale and that if you want to use ICT and they need some help, that is the role of the teacher as the facilitator and other adults. So as long as they admit to the fact that they’re getting no where and they need the help, then may be the help they need can be ICT skills orientation.
What have been the training implications for staff to enable them to hand over responsibility of the learning to the children?

Well, first of all our Deputy Head worked very closely with the QCDA, which no longer exists, but it was a government department that came out to schools who trained regional groups of lead teachers, who then disseminated it back into their own schools practice, and networked every now and again to see how that was going. Within the school then she disseminated that to her team and other teams, and this creative approach of children's choice and how they would go about their learning... ...that's been around for about 2 or 3 years now, QCDA has gone defunct but we have gone so far down the line that we thought we would continue with it because then we can make our own changes and evaluations even though that particular model no longer exists.

And we saw a lot of benefits, but we are beginning to think that we need to have a lot more skills teaching, which can then drop into the creative, independent work. But then other schools might report differently, I mean if you've got bright clientele who's got bright kiddies from private school then they don't need the skills. But we have got to look at our standards and say 'if getting the basic skills in place is a priority' then we will do that, and then they will feel more able to achieve within the creative side of it rather than sit there. I mean if you don't have the skills to create a sentence then ICT isn't going to do it for you. It's just the way in which, you know it can help them to their handwriting, help them with a nice creative approach, help with them information and how you actually put the thing on the page in a more innovative way. But it doesn't actually craft the sentence for you. But there
are lots of nice ICT ways to learn interactively, with voice regulated ‘right’ or ‘you’ve done well’ I mean lots of these programs are very much skills packages, but are presented in a way which appeals to children. Where we’re at at the moment is, we have got to see ICT as a tool in our toolkit that gives value added to just doing it on paper. So just writing is just transferring the skills to a different medium. You’ve got to say, ‘this enriches the writing because, they might be able to call up previous writing which they then re-read and they can continue with it’. And you can’t really do that in the same way with paper because it’s an ICT… ...umm extra. So we are being encouraged at the moment to look at everything we do in ICT, it’s got to have a real purpose and it can’t just be done in any other way. Not just saying we will use ICT for the sake of it. And I think that’s true, and it’s quite a challenge for some of us. It’s got us thinking, I mean we are a well-developed ICT school, but are we just transferring paper and pencil to ICT. And that’s where we are in that debate.

**What are the main differences in the way the school plans, delivers and assesses learning as a result of this initiative?**

Well, we have had to develop assessment materials that suit that different criteria. And a small example of that is, in any one lesson if you are assessing what they can do, part of that assessment is what tools did they choose to support their learning. Or whether they are using the choices to use ICT wisely. So for the teacher model, you’re looking at did they just choose it for choosing its sake, or did they choose it for purpose. And then
one of the other questions to success is, once they’ve chosen that program, have they got the skills to orientate themselves to use it well and effectively as a tool. So in terms of assessment, it’s the outcome, the process and a handle on the choices the children make. And I went into KS1 and it was a lovely lesson, it was art. The teacher wanted the children to mix colours and textures to enrich their art, both if they did it electronically and with paint. And to set them off, she tried paint, and the other group used coloured pencils, and they sort of practiced the odd blending and shading and toning, piling one on top and adding sanding and shavings to it. The toolkit had all these things out, so it was highly experimental, and what the teacher did was look at the finished results, so they could feed back to the children as part of their assessment, why one picture looked that way and what maybe they could try next time. And I suppose then that carried on into when they were doing it with ICT. They said ‘well how can you blend your colours using ICT’. So I mean some school haven’t even gone down that road, but I think what we are trying to do is, give the children some honest reasons to make choices. And sometimes the choices have an extension potential into other medium, and that was an art example but it could be science. Like in science we want to do Sc1 experiments where you actually got your hands on something. But if you wanted to embrace the next level, and say how do you consolidate that, you’ve only had one opportunity to grow a bulb in this way and see if it flourishes. But on an ICT program you could call up a virtual experiment and say, ‘ok in the timescale I can see this range and see that...’ ...but you must have had first hand experience, then you can relate that to what the virtual lab can show you, because you know why. And then you can evaluate at the end...
of it, I know that that didn’t happen for mine, but I can do it differently… …and
there’s always for science and history, what did I know to start with? What do
I want to find out? And what did I find out?
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So a KWL

Yes a KWL. I mean that’s another area that informs what you want to teach.
To be honest though, with a common sense hat on, you can’t choose 36
individuals, but if enough people want to do this we will make a group of it but
if only one person wants to do it then the chances are we will fall off the end of
the possibility. And that something that the children might decide to do at
home or we can bank it for another occasion, but sometimes they are allowed
to do some quite interesting stuff, and setup with the teaching assistant even
if it needs the playground to go it. I mean one year we were doing changing
materials, and in class we had taken film canisters and shaken them up with
vinegar and baking soda and shaken them up and made volcano’s that had
erupted, I mean it was the same process you know. And someone said ‘I
read in a book that you could do this with peppermint sweets and a fizzy drink
in a bottle’. So we did a bit of research and we all went out on the playing
field and we put about 8 peppermints into a fizzy drinks and it explodes like
fury!!! It was lovely, and it went all over the place. And they just loved it, so
although they couldn’t do it, there was a health and safely issue, we got on
the white coats and the goggles and we did it with them. I mean that’s the
kind of flavors of learning, so sometimes it’s modeled, sometimes it’s
experiences and sometimes it’s consolidated and enriched.
Appendix 5.3 – Observation of a year 2 class within school B.

The whole year was grouped into two streams, a high and a lower. The children then moved classes according to which stream they were in for maths. Within this lower stream the children were grouped. The tables were laid out in clusters but no table was specific to a group. Children were allowed to work with who they wanted when given the choice of activity and groups where then called as a whole to work with the teacher.

### Lesson domain
- Numeracy – (Discrete subject teaching)
- Divisions, halving numbers.

### Lesson summary

#### Presentation of the learning objective (including differentiation)

The teacher reminded the children of the success criteria and asked the children (using a pot of names) which activities they had done. She always questioned them as to which skills they were using when completing each of these activities so the children knew why they were doing what they were doing.

The skills focus for the lesson was ‘creativity’ and the children were told they needed to use their skills to find out how to solve something. The objective for the lesson was told to the children and they were reminded of the division lessons that they had been taught previously this week.

The children had a success ladder in which they self assessed on. The teacher and the TA assessed the children they worked with to inform the next days planning.

#### Organising the classroom

The teacher had prepared a success ladder for the week. The children understood this criteria and addressed this in their self assessment strategy of traffic lights. The children could choose a task to complete within the lesson and were free to come up to the ‘toolbox’ (a box containing resources for that subject. In maths these were number lines, number squares etc…) to choose the tools they wanted to use to complete that task. Children responded very well to this and could choose the resources that would help their learning.

#### Children’s initial response to the learning task

The mental oral was very short with children engaged in a recap of how to divide and find half. The teacher then sets the expectations for the children and tells them, which groups are working where, and the choices in activities they can choose. The children were told a task and positive many children used their resources closely to the learning objective. The teacher then called each group individually to do some teacher led work with her on the carpet.

A traffic light challenge was one activity. There were questions with division sums on categorised into red, orange and green (green being the easiest…) the children then challenged themselves and decided which level of questions they thought they were at and could manage.
The behaviour of the children was positive. Children were sat on the carpet at the beginning of the lesson. Some children were fidgeting and the teacher responded to these children by moving them etc. The behaviour and noise in the classroom was fairly typical of a KS1 class. However talk was related to the task at hand and there was a large amount of discussion from the children.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children’s responses to plenary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children responded well. They name the skills they had used on the success ladder. The teacher says they will use the activities tomorrow to complete the success ladder for the week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviour management strategies used within the classroom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The teacher’s behaviour management during the group activities was minimal. Children were on task and there were no arguments from children. They were very independent in their learning. The teacher used a timer at the end of the lesson to get children to return to the carpet.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 5.4 – Observation of a year 6 class within school B.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Boys creative writing catch up group. Class size of 10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The classroom was small with three desks in clusters. Some children were sat on their own and others around a table. The children were allowed a choice in where they sat within a group. They were grouped by ability.

**Presentation of the learning objective (including differentiation).**

The learning objective was made clear to children at the beginning of the lesson. The differentiation was clear as this was a separate class for children who needed help improving their creative writing. The boys in this group were all working around the same level.

**Sharing of the criteria for success within the lesson.**

The teacher shared with the children a checklist for their writing. The children had this and could refer to it, knowing what to include in their writing.

**Presentation of the lesson activity.**

The teacher sets up the lesson by reading some examples of writing from a previous group to the children. She specifies the time scale for the children to complete each section of their writing. The children first have to plan their story using the beginning, middle and end sections. The lesson was presented in many parts with the children moving around to the carpet to give examples of sentence structures that they can then include in their writing.

The children were all positive towards this task. They were writing their own stories and they were given free choice in what they were about.
### Behaviour of the children and the noise within the classroom

The children behaviour was very positive. Although reluctant to engage at the start of the lesson the boys were motivated when they were read stories from other groups. They were told that the content of the story could be adapted and come from them and this motivated the children through the lesson. The noise levels in the class were very low and the children understood that they had to be quite when writing as the were practising for SATS.

### Children's responses to plenary

The children responded well, ticking off the elements they had included in their creative writing.

### Behaviour management strategies used within the classroom

As before the teacher’s behaviour management during the group activities was minimal. The children were trained to be sensible when using the resources and when the teacher wanted to gain the classes attention she would use the wind chimes that were hung in the class to signal for quiet.
Appendix 6 - Glossary of Terms Used

*Mantle of the Expert* – A teaching strategy whereby the children are central to the learning process. Much of the learning is inquiry based and the children are given leadership and ownership over the content and methods of their curriculum.

*Scenario/Company* – The theme in which learning revolves around in a *Mantle of the Expert* classroom. The company or scenario resembles that of a workplace environment (such as a paper factory) and the children are given roles and jobs within this *company*.

*Role/Job* – The *role* or *job* which the children take on within the *scenario/company*. Being given a *job* in the company within the *scenario* allows the children to be viewed as an *expert* (derived from the title) in their *role*.

*Client* – The client is a fictional character within the chosen *scenario / company*. The client will set the children tasks and provide the children with a purpose for the work they are carrying out. The children are required to report back to the client when tasks are completed. This ensures teachers are able to direct the children to specific tasks that relate to the statutory curriculum, yet still keep work and lessons revolved around their fictional *scenario / company*. 
*Toolkit* – A box of subject specific resources. Children can assess their own learning needs and choose which ‘tools’ they want to use to complete their work or solve a problem.