

LEVEL 7 ASSESSMENT SPECIFICATION

Student name:	Elen Vaughan	Student ID number:	1803203
Programme:	Secondary PGCE		
Module:	Curriculum Development and Enhancement		
Module code:	ECSP7002	Contribution to Overall Module Assessment (%):	100%
Lecturer:	Helen Denny	Internal Verifier:	
Assignment Title:	Research Study including Ethics Form	Word count (or equivalent):	10.000 words in total including an Ethics form (to be given in on January 11 th 2019)
Submission deadline:	May 13 th 2019	Return date of provisional marks & written feedback:	June 10 th 2019
Submission method:	All written assessments, where practical and possible, must be submitted via Turnitin unless otherwise instructed by the Lecturer. (Please DO NOT put this assessment specification into Turnitin or it will match many similarities with other students' submissions.) Alternative submission method (if applicable): Late submission of the assessment will result in a late penalty mark. Penalties for late submission: Up to one week late, maximum mark of 50%. Over one week late, 0%. Only the Extenuating Circumstances Panel may approve a change to submission dates.		
Academic honesty / referencing:	Academic honesty is required. In the main body of your submission you must give credit to authors on whose research and ideas your work is based. Append to your submission a reference list that indicates the books, articles, etc. that you have used, cited or quoted in order to complete this assessment.		

Curriculum Development and Enhancement (ECSP7002)

The Impact of Think-Pair-Share on Participants' Historical Source Work Quality.

Introduction

‘So, Miss, why does it matter if it was written for a newspaper or not?’ (A year 9 pupil in School X).

Reminiscing back to my experience as a history pupil in secondary school, my recollections are merged into memories of note taking, independent learning and perpetual textbook questions asking what a source could tell me about a historical issue. Shamefully, the genuine worth (and pure excitement) of using sources to build our understanding of the past did not become overly apparent to me until embarking upon my History degree; here, we were given lengthy seminars to discuss the various evidence and interpretations of the past whilst hearing differing standpoints about them from our peers. For me, this is what brought history ‘back to life’.

The chosen research area also developed after teaching a lesson to a year 9 class. Upon asking the pupils to consider the reliability of a source, I was confronted with blank faces and a plethora of ‘what is reliability?’ and ‘why does it matter?’ type questions. As the lesson progressed, I soon noticed that, with no support, the quality and extent of their answers were limited to superficial claims about the source type or date. I was shocked. The week before, following appropriate guidance and modelling, my year 8 classes had offered much more sophisticated responses – had I been setting my expectations too high? Thus, I chose to research into a much-praised classroom strategy, Think-Pair-Share, and investigate its impact on the quality (and enthusiasm) of using sources in history lessons.

School X is a bilingual secondary school in South Wales with around 1200 pupils. For this research, I decided to use an English-medium class to ensure that language difficulties would not affect results as around 70% of pupils come from non-Welsh speaking homes. Class X is a Year 8 mixed ability class with a range of abilities, behaviours and learning needs. Furthermore, the class consisted of two pupils with Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) and their results have added great value to this research.

Literature Review

Cooperative learning

The importance of establishing effective group work was placed as a leading area for development in the Welsh Government’s review of Assessment for Learning (AfL) in the classroom (WAG, 2010). Johnson and Johnson (1989) claimed that one of the major strategies responsible for the shift of pupils’ role from passive to active learners is that of Cooperative Learning (CL). A host of studies in the 1970s

demonstrated that using CL helped children thrive as they facilitated in each other's learning, developed communication skills, helped motivate underachieving pupils and improved interpersonal attitudes (Brown et al, 1971; Allen, 1976). The evidenced success of CL has since led to it being commended as one of the greatest educational innovations of recent times (Slavin, 1996). Researchers into the field identify its crucial aspects as: positive interdependence – the mentality that success is only achieved with the success of each group member – and individual accountability – where each member must be accountable for their own share of the work (Kagan, 2001). It is apparent that Both aspects are balanced with two of Wiliam's key focuses of AFL: that pupils are instructional learners for each other and are activated as owners of their own learning (Wiliam, 2017).

Many researchers have chosen to focus on the deeper knowledge acquired using CL, evidencing that it helps to develop pupils' high-level reasoning and criticality as well as adopting the ability to consider differing perspectives (McKeachie and Svinicki, 2010). However, others have placed a greater focus and significance on the promotive interaction developed using CL. Pupils assist, motivate and challenge each other as they all strive in achieving mutual goals; they learn to listen to one another and provide constructive feedback to improve performance whilst developing a genuine willingness to help. As pupils interact more, they get to know each other better and develop a basis for committed and caring relationships (Johnson and Johnson, 1990).

The resistance to cooperative learning largely revolves around the authority of the classroom; several academics specify that by allowing pupils to 'talk to each other' allows an area of 'potential pupil power' to be exposed (Dunn, Rudduck, and Cowie, 1989: 186). Although such criticism may correspond to the 'old school' traditional approach of the past, scholars continue to find fault in the practicalities of CL, with many arguing that it is used as nothing more than a way to keep pupils busy, tick the boxes of inspections and to keep superiors happy (Kaminski, 2017). Nonetheless, as reading further into Kaminski's academic blog it becomes clear that his disregard for CL stems from his own personal dislike of the approach during his school years; we use such statements with care and consider how individual differences are carefully taken into account in today's implementation of CL (Stenlund, Jönsson and Jonsson, 2017). Further resistance towards CL also comes from inside the classroom; pupils may dispute that others in their group are holding them back or lower ability pupils often feel as if they are being ignored or mocked by the more assertive pupils (Shimazoe and Aldrich, 2010). Furthermore, although the model holds extensive evidence regarding its impact on pupil learning and on teachers' willingness to utilise it, there remain to be many challenges in sustaining and adapting cooperative learning (Goodyear, 2017). Jolliffe (2015) highlighted that the implementation of CL has been limited in the United Kingdom and promotes a staged and collective approach for its effective implementation. She argued that the lack of a collaborative culture between teachers is the most significant barrier in 'bridging the gap between the potential and the reality of cooperative learning' in pupils (Jolliffe, 2015: 79). Her five-year study placed a firm focus on the

benefits of teachers working together to support professional development; it demonstrated that the support and coaching by in-house experts were crucial to the increase in teacher confidence and competence in using CL.

Donaldson's (2015) *Successful Futures* appears promising in its objective of a more cooperative learning environment across the curriculum of our schools. He places emphasis on the ability to work effectively in a team as a key skill cited by employers and boasts a range of evidence demonstrating the positive effects of peer learning on achievement. The report proposes that better teacher planning and collaboration would allow for a more structured context for CL to occur constructively - complementing the recommendations proposed by Jolliffe (2015). This cross-curricular purpose proves a move away from the dominant focus of independent learning which appears apparent in the 2008 curriculum for history (WAG, 2008a).

Think-Pair-Share

Lyman (1981) first proposed Think-Pair-Share (TPS) in 1981 as a cooperative learning technique and an advantageous pedagogical practice. Since then, it has been adopted by many writers in the field of CL. The technique firstly involves presenting a task or question to the pupils and allowing them time to think individually (Lyman, 1981). Next, they work in pairs to discuss their own thoughts and refine their individual work (if appropriate) to identify a consensus or any obvious differences (Sampsel, 2013). The third step invites pupils to share their responses with the whole class, allowing the class teacher to contribute and organise a wider discussion (Millis, 2012). At this stage, pupils are provided with feedback which will move them forward in their learning, integral to AFL (William, 2017). From the outset, we notice how TPS is underpinned by the key principles of CL and, with this, attempts to eliminate many of its main weaknesses and criticisms. By allowing pupils to think individually first, the feeling of individual accountability and personal responsibility for their own learning is increased further (Reinhart, 2000). Then, having had the opportunity to practice voicing their views with a partner, pupils become more confident and willing to share with the class – as well as the responsibility, and its pressures, being shared with their partner (Sampsel, 2013). Due to this staged process of involvement, the strategy is often identified as the most effective and low-risk cooperative learning strategy in its ability to actively involve most (if not all) pupils in discussions in a class of any size (Ledlow, 2001). This tackles one of the main criticisms of CL – the quieter pupils can discuss the topic without feeling like they're standing out in front of the class (Marzano and Pickering, 2005).

Amongst its research, a constant advantage of TPS is its inherent ability to increase the waiting time after a question or task has been posed to pupils (Tighe and Lyman, 1988). Rowe (1986) suggests that this makes more pupils likely to participate, therefore leading to a better discussion and increasing pupils' sense of involvement. Lyman (1981) himself focused on the benefits of this 'wait time' on the quality of

responses; he asserts that teachers can concentrate on asking higher-order questions and observing the reactions of other pupils. This wait time eliminates the pressured urgency of traditional questioning, enhancing pupils' learning experience and allowing the process to become more enjoyable for all (Woloshyn et al, 1992). This supports the findings of Sampsel's (2013) study which concluded that TPS increased his mathematics pupils' participation levels, extended their answers given and increased their comfort when sharing their thoughts. Despite being conducted on mathematics pupils – a subject starkly different to history – its processes of exploration can be compared; similar to the formulations of mathematics, historical knowledge also emerges from a process of inquiry and therefore Sampsel's recommendations are applicable across the curriculum. Similarly, Kaddoura's (2013) study on nurses' critical thinking suggested that the strategy significantly correlated with behaviours such as analytical tendencies, inquisitiveness, truth-seeking, and cognitive maturity. Such skills are integral to historical source inquiry and therefore, as Kaddoura himself maintains, his findings have important implications for education in all contexts.

Cooperative Learning and Autism

Lindsay et al (2013) note that educators have described a significant increase in pupils with autism over recent years; with this, more pupils with ASD are entering mainstream classes and educators are expected to uphold an inclusive classroom environment but are provided with insufficient guidance (Horrocks, White and Roberts, 2008). Two of the main characteristics of ASD are problems in communication and social development, and thus, group work or discussion can be a difficult and daunting task (American Psychiatric Association, 2012). Unfortunately, this had led to reduced expectations for pupils with ASD in group learning (Wing and Gould, 1979). Rose and Howley (2003) researched into structured approaches, including 'jigsawing', and found that pupils with ASD participated and performed better in groupwork when they had a clear role to play within the group and had limited interaction with a peer. Moreno and O'Neal (1996) also encouraged this structured teaching, explaining how teachers should use arbitrary means of pairing in the mainstream classroom as it is often the pupils with ASD that are left on their own yet it is them who most benefit from working with a pair. Both these studies, along with Lindsay et al (2013), concluded that training, resources and research need to show an extended focus on how to successfully involve pupils with ASD into groupwork in a mainstream classroom rather than exclusively in schools specialising in such learning needs.

Source Analysis

The development of the Schools Council History Project's 'new history' during the 1970s saw significant changes occur in the common practices of the subject (SCHP, 1976). There was a shift away from a lengthy chronological syllabus and incessant notetaking to more of a focus on thematic learning and

encouraging skills to think like a historian. The project also sought to ensure that pupils were 'actively' learning by taking part in fair and structured discussions – linking both of our areas of interest (SCHP, 1976). Further, the introduction of the new GCSE in 1985 saw a significant increase in the use of sources within examination papers (Department of Education and Science, 1985).

Since, source-based questions have become central to the GCSE, AS and A2 WJEC examination papers, with many questions relying on the analysis and evaluation of both primary and/or contemporary sources within their historical context (WJEC, 2017). Although not explicitly mentioned in Donaldson's (2015) review of the curriculum, the Humanities Area of Learning Experience states that pupils ought to be able to 'recognise and apply appropriate tests of the validity and reliability of evidence used to support arguments' (p. 47). This suggests that the objective laid out by the SCHP in the 1970s remains a priority and continues to encourage higher order thinking skills in history teaching. Throughout this progression, the incorporation of source-work has been met with several barriers, with Smith (2001) claiming that it is too often included as an afterthought and Le Cocq (2000) arguing that teachers are often prone to covering evidential work much too quickly for pupils to develop skills meaningfully.

In response to my initial concerns regarding my Year 9's seemingly systematic and insincere responses, I decided to focus on action researchers who placed pupils' genuine methods of enquiry and interpretation at their centre. Le Cocq (2000) is a history teacher who has focused on the lack of meaningfulness in source tasks – resulting in formulaic and unmotivated responses from pupils. Smith (2001) offers a similar encouragement by prescribing a shift away from the textbook style source tasks due to a lack of relevance and engagement shown by pupils, describing them as 'just some unfathomable parlour game with funny rules' (p.12). Le Cocq (2000) suggests a strategy of Comprehension-Analysis-Evaluation to ensure that pupils don't do sources a disservice by merely branding them bias and subsequently unworthy of use, I will refer to this structure during my questioning in the intervention phase. This key issue of 'historical defeatism' is also exemplified by Lee and Shemilt (2003), who claim that the biggest barrier in achieving successful source-work is ensuring pupils understand that historical accounts do not have a one-to-one relationship with the past but this does not automatically render them problematic. Byrom (1998: 32) raised similar concerns, voicing that pupils' 'healthy skepticism' about historical accounts too often leads to a 'lazy cynicism'; his structured strategy, which focused on lower attainers, sought to lead his pupils away from a limited concentration on unexplained unreliability and a realisation there are no monopolies of the truth. Firstly, he claimed that it is effective when sources follow a broadly similar pattern and are centred on the same, or a similar topic. With this, the pupils being to 'feel at home' with the task, becoming more likely to recognise the contradictions and similarities between them. Next, a strategy must be used to build momentum and absorb pupils into the tasks by building their determination to work the 'puzzle' out (Byrom, 1998). It could be suggested that a cooperative learning task could build this determination by boosting the individual and group accountability as proposed by

Kagan (2000) and Reinhart (2000). Thirdly, the analysis process becomes transparent for pupils – they are actively aware of the transformation of the data, constructing their own accounts which they believe are fair and legitimate because they have been part of the process (Byrom, 1998). Indeed, it's clear that the key purposes of TPS and its three stages easily complement Byrom's proposed objectives.

Although both are effective in establishing an informed structure of enquiry, Byrom (1998) and LeCocq (2000) overlook an aspect which Lee and Shemilt (2003) claim is integral to mapping successful evidential progression – to gain a thorough grasp of pupils' prior conceptions of historical accounts. They argue that by attending to the preconceptions that pupils bring to the classroom, teachers can refer to these in their planning to support their pupils assimilate deeper and more imaginative ideas of their own (Lee and Shemilt, 2003). This will inform the consideration of this research's pre-test and how the potential conceptions can be discussed during the intervention stage to promote progression in the post-test.

Counsell (2000, p.62) reminds teachers to strongly consider the stark difference in results of evidential work from 'sloppy, vague discussion' and a 'thorough, contextualised, searching discussion' – reaffirming the importance of structure in evidential activities, as expressed by Le Cocq (2000). Her recommendations focus on the progression in evidential work from Year 7 to Year 9 – a phase integral to this research. She argues that the sole importance of the process should not be placed on the practical activities alone but also on accessing prior learning; advocating a 'backwards planning', she believes that placing an activity in its knowledge context after the task can help pupils to question sources further (Counsell, 2000). Her viewpoint advocates that teachers should not be afraid of repeating the same source-based activities about the same topics throughout KS3, suggesting that this helps build a more thorough knowledge whilst fostering pupils' critical thinking skills further. Since 2000, Counsell has become a member of Ofsted's Curriculum Advisory Panel as well the Director of Education at a Multi-Academy Trust and continues to advocate a knowledge-rich curriculum which embraces the notion of skills and dismisses the knowledge-skills dichotomy (Murray, 2017). Affiliated with both the standards of Ofsted and the independence of English Academies, she has varied observations and experience of what works effectively in history teaching and therefore her standpoint is valuable to curriculum development. Her preference for a knowledge-led curriculum somewhat reflects Wales' move away from the focused emphasis on skills demonstrated in the 2008 'Skills Framework', with Donaldson's (2015) new curriculum re-emphasising the importance of providing pupils with the knowledge necessary to develop as skilled individuals (WAG, 2008b).

Williams and Davies (1998) recognised the major pedagogical issue in source analysis as the lack of consistency shown between departments; they argue that there is little guidance given to teachers on what exactly to emphasise and encourage discussion on a systematic and explicit basis. Despite writing over two decades ago, such concerns have been echoed by Harris (2018) whose research implied that

history teachers' willingness to share ideas helped with pupils' development of higher order thinking in the history classroom.

Pickles (2010) argues that an empathetic understanding is integral to effective source analysis. This resonates back with the specific focus on the ASD pupils of the class; Wellman et al (2002) noted that due to their delayed cognitive abilities and social impairments many children with ASD do not develop a Theory of Mind (ToM). This is the way in which young children develop a theory about their own and others' mental state, including the consideration of how they may be feeling or what they might be thinking based on their behaviour (Baron-Cohen, 1995). Thus, those without a functional ToM will have difficulty understanding the concept of a false belief – the understanding that another's belief may contrast with their own (Mitchell and Lewis, 1994). A key element of successful evidential work is putting one's self in the mind of the authors and therefore, according to this theory, this would be a difficult task for those with ASD. Nonetheless, Begeer et al. (2011) conducted a study which implied that using various tasks, including second-order belief reasoning, children with ASD could show improvement in their conceptual ToM skills.

School Policy and Practice

School X is in its early stages of introducing the new curriculum; this year (2018/2019) the Humanities department have trialled their first Humanities unit with Year 8 pupils and, following a positive response from pupils, staff show great enthusiasm in continuing its implementation. The unit applied higher-order thinking skills to a variety of topics, including the current immigration crisis. During a discussion with a pupil, it was expressed how she felt it easier to evaluate a situation when it felt relevant rather than an event hundreds of years ago – supporting Donaldson's objectives to raise standards and engagement with a more 'sound and relevant education' (Donaldson, 2015: p.5).

Regarding CL at School X, practice is very dependent on the individual teachers' preferences; following observations in the history department, it was noticeable that two of the teachers preferred to set a more cooperative environment in their classrooms – using unstructured group work and discussions consistently. However, one teacher maintained a very traditional approach across the year groups – his lessons were dominated by teacher exposition and pupil notetaking. Discussion with the Head of Department revealed that all in the department are encouraged to incorporate CL strategies as much as possible – showing a particular interest towards its benefits for critical thinking and widening perspectives – agreeing with the work of Kaddoura (2013). However, he expressed that as it is no longer necessary to give pupils an oracy level within the subject, there has been a significant decrease in structured and assessed group work. Within the Department's Improvement Plan, it is evident that oral work has become overshadowed by the heavy focus on the literacy and numeracy framework (Welsh Government, 2014).

The use of sources is introduced to pupils in School X from the first unit in Year 7, titled 'Historical Skills'; this unit introduces useful terms for evidential work and discusses how a historian may use 'evidence' to build up their own case of the past. The school continued to use one of the SCHP's first source work tasks from the 1970s – the Tollund Man 'detective work'. This task seeks to bring excitement to source investigation by creating a 'crime scene' and allowing the historical sources to become 'police evidence'. Although this task could be considered 'ancient' for more reasons than one, it may have overcome the test of time due to its ability to capture pupils – indeed, the excitement of the task lends itself to Byrom's (1998) second recommendation which argues that source tasks need to build a momentum to succeed with pupils. As a trainee teacher at the school, I was encouraged to develop my own tasks for all Key Stage 3 classes and attempted to bring sources into most lessons – varying from simple inference tasks to a detailed evaluation of more complex sources. Nonetheless, on review of the department's schemes of work for both Year 7 and 8, it became apparent that most lessons are very content heavy and very little opportunity is given to the development of source skills. One of the department's main assessments for Year 8 is an extended writing task which asks pupils to use sources to answer whether they believe Richard III was guilty of the murder of the Princes in the Tower; upon observation, the sources used were appropriate and accessible for the age group and descriptions were given to prompt thorough evaluation of their authorship. The success criteria centred on gathering information to create a two-sided argument, however, on discussion with the class teachers it was mentioned that the highest marks could only be awarded to those who had provided a critique of the sources' authorship. It is arguable that most of the lessons' focus was given to the inferable content material of the sources and little guidance was given on how to evaluate the usefulness or reliability of the source. It could be suggested that this task was, therefore, a missed opportunity for fostering valuable source skills and that higher ability pupils did not benefit fully by undertaking this task – confirming Smith (2001) and Le Cocq's (2000) fears that evidential work is not used to its best advantage in many history classrooms. This also explains the lack of understanding demonstrated by my Year 9 class and exemplifies that School X do not follow recommendations by the likes of Counsell (2000) who recognise the progression between Year 7 and 9 as the most vital in fostering critical thinking skills.

Methodology and Ethics

The underpinning principle of any teacher's professional development is the positive impact it has on their classroom teaching and subsequent pupil learning (Mertler, 2013). Traditional Professional Development takes the form of an 'outside-in process', within which the information needed for improvement is received from external authorities (Helm, 2007). However, McNiff (2002) advocates a turn away from this training pathway, and instead advocates a learning approach where the educator

reflects on how their own practice could be improved using action research. This approach is praised because it allows the teachers themselves to set the research questions and assess and trial the most effective solutions for their own teaching practice and pupils (Oliver, 1980). The main advantage of action research is that it examines 'real classroom and real schools' and therefore produces more genuine, applicable and meaningful results and recommendations (Manfra, 2009: p.2). It shares the monopoly of educational research between the academics and the everyday teacher, re-recognising their expertise on practices of the everyday classroom (Merter, 2006). Further, by utilising their own knowledge, educators can help also help improve educational practices overall (Craig, 2009). Evidently, a major barrier in action research is time; as both full-time teachers and researchers, there are very often delays in the completion of the research, taking much longer than expected (Mills, 2011). Due to a restricted time at the school, this was not a problem for this research. As a trainee teacher, this action research will be integral in informing my future practice in the history classroom and in using CL to develop pupils' higher order thinking across the curriculum.

As part of this action research, a quasi-experimental design was used to collect and analyse qualitative and quantitative data. Many suggest this is the most appropriate design when researching the impact of educational interventions (Veenman et al, 1996). An imperative element to this design is pre and post-testing and this method is often praised as a valuable diagnostic tool for effective teaching; within the classroom, the pre-test can identify the weakest and strongest pupils and show what pupils know and do not know (Kuehn, 2019). However, Kelly (2019) exhibits caution towards poorly written pre-tests and their impact on gathering the information necessary for the targeted instruction. To avoid this, Wiggins and McTighe's (1990) process of backwards design was followed, keeping the final objective in mind throughout to make the expectations of both tests clear to pupils. The pre and post-tests were devised simultaneously to ensure that the questions and sources used in the post-test were not influenced by the responses and results of the pre-test. Further, as comparative tools, both tests used the same formatting and the same procedures were used when delivering the post-test as were used in the pre-test – as recommended by Kelly (2019). Nonetheless, Cook and Campbell (1979) note how a quasi-experimental design is not true experimental research as, although the independent variable is manipulated, it is essential to consider that participants are not randomly assigned to conditions and therefore the problem of confounding variables is not eliminated. We must consider that the pre and post-test had to take place in separate lessons, with a gap of eight days in between; Cambell and Stanley (1963) argued nearly 60 years ago that this method was a very poor choice to test the effect of an independent variable – identifying history (the time between tests) as the biggest threat to its validity. We must think carefully what may have changed between the two tests and the confounding variables which may have also impacted the participants' quality of work, work ethic and behaviour by the post-test. Muijis (2010) emphasises the major advantage of this design however, explaining how they take place in natural

educational settings and are therefore a valuable method for evaluating new initiatives in education. Further, Harris (2001) claims that taking account of the specific context of the school and the specific class of pupils is highly beneficial for the effectiveness of the intervention being implemented. I had completed the 'Princes in the Tower' source-based task (mentioned above) with this class before setting this research objective, thus, I was already aware of their source evaluation quality, reoccurring critiques and common misconceptions. Furthermore, I was mindful of the way they worked together in pairs and in groups, this was the class that had previously been taught by the more traditional teacher mentioned earlier. This was all considered when setting tasks, writing resources and during the practice of the research.

The Ethical Guidelines devised by the British Educational Research Association (BERA, 2018) have been adhered to throughout this action research – an imperative constant in educational research of all levels (Mauthner et al, 2012). Nonetheless, when using human participants (especially children), researchers often find the ethics procedure time consuming, complicated and limiting to results (Bell and Nutt, 2012). For this research, all ethical guidelines and decisions can be found in the accompanying Ethical Approval Application. As the research was carried out as everyday teaching practice, the central principles were protecting privacy and respecting autonomy – after thorough explanation and opportunities to withdraw, informed consent was received from all participants present at the pre-test lesson (BERA, 2018).

Gaining informed consent from children and young people with disabilities or learning difficulties has been a significant concern between educational researchers (Brooks, Riele and Maguire, 2014). Cuskelly (2005) explains the difficulties in ensuring the level of understanding and subsequent capacity to consent when working with those with learning difficulties, a concern which often leads to their exclusion in educational research. Intent on including both pupils of the class with ASD within my overall research, Cuskelly's (2005) recommendations were adhered to in ensuring their informed consent was received before both assessments. She suggests that some young people with learning difficulties may be more likely to acquiesce when asked if they are willing to consent, thus, it would be integral to carefully consider the phrasing of questions and to not hastily accept their initial agreement as an indication of understanding (Cuskelly, 2005). With this, I discreetly spoke to both pupils one-to-one before collecting the pre-tests to allow them to gain a greater understanding but most importantly to give them the opportunity to withdraw (if they wanted to) without feeling any unnecessary attention. Other than this single procedure to gain consent, all participants in the research were treated equally, ensuring no one was 'unjustly favoured or discriminated against' (Hammersley and Traianou, 2012: 2).

Evaluation

In line with Counsell's (2000) focus on the progression of source skills and critical thinking during KS3, it was decided that a test for Year 8 pupils would be the most appropriate for gaining an insight into the development of these skills. The pupils had been learning about Henry VIII, his wives and the dissolution of the monasteries and, in an effort to create a task which naturally fitted into their scheme of work, all sources were based on the topic; accessing prior learning would help with confidence and further their understanding of a rather complex topic. Eight sources were chosen, varying from primary reports and letters, portraits and secondary historian accounts. Both tests consisted of such variety, allowing pupils to experience the extent of differing viewpoints and accounts and easily recognise the 'different worlds' of the respective authors (Pickles, 2010). For example, test A included a portrait of a young Henry painted by an unknown Anglo-Netherlandish painter who was not the king's official painter whilst test B included Hans Holbein's iconic portrait depicting a powerful Henry VIII. Due to this similar pattern, it could be argued that the pupils would evidently be better versed in analysing the portrait by the second test due to this opportunity to 'practice'; however, as Byrom (1998) stated, such practices are significant to the development of source skills by allowing pupils to recognise and appreciate the similarities and differences between two seemingly similar sources. Further, a source was included in both tests which used old English; Musbach (2001) argued that it is the unfamiliar and often obscure language that can take the joy out of using primary sources for younger pupils, stating that such sources should be rephrased to become more accessible for specific age groups. However, Smith (2001) argues that getting pupils to interpret sources in their original form is crucial to engagement and in allowing them to construct their own understandings of their contents. It would also be of interest to see the impact of group discussion on pupils' comprehension of such texts. All sources were provided with detailed descriptions, stating their authorship and prompting an analysis without guidance, for example, 'The French ambassador to England writing to the King of France in 1540. The King of France was a rival of Henry VIII'. Such explicit prompts were deemed appropriate for the ability of the class, as discussed with the class teacher.

The same two questions were given for each source throughout both tests. Firstly, the test simply asked, 'Using your own words, what do you learn from this source?' (Q1). By allowing the pupils to firstly infer and summarise the content, this allows for greater comprehension in order to progress to an analysis – a step considered integral to Counsell (2000). Further, many questions of the GCSE papers continue to ask for content inference when asking for the usefulness of sources (WJEC, 2017). This is often deemed too simple a task/skill and its development is given little time in lessons, leading to many pupils merely copying

out sentences from the text itself; the quality of summarising information can vary greatly and is an area which needs more of a focus in KS3 learning. The second question for each source asked: 'Looking at both the content and its authorship, what are the strengths and weaknesses of this source?' (Q2). The intention was that this would avoid the 'historical defeatism' discussed by Lee and Shemilt (2003), encouraging them to appreciate the usefulness of a source and avoiding the cynicism of quickly rendering them bias (Le Cocq, 2000). Further, by asking for a weakness, this would initiate a higher-order consideration of the complex processes of sources and encourage a critique (Lee and Shemilt, 2003).

At the same time, a mark scheme was created to use for both tests – a requirement outlined by Ofqual et al (2011). As both questions were very open and arguably subjective, this was imperative to results and providing consistency and reliability within the data. A review of standardisation methods stated that, in the fear of having to make difficult decisions whilst marking, the temptation to devise highly detailed mark schemes should be resisted' (AlphaPlus, 2014: p.2). With this, it was decided that each question would be marked out of four and a criterion was set for each mark. An overall grade would correspond to a level; however, this will not be discussed in the context of this research.

	Question 1	Question 2
0	No reference to relevant information.	No source evaluation evidenced.
1	Very brief description of content/ copying out of text.	Repeat of source's description without any analysis, i.e. 'it is from 1520'.
2	Brief description, one key point discussed.	One point has been justified weakly.
3	Detailed description, most key points discussed.	At least one point/critique has been justified appropriately.
4	Very detailed description using own words to summarise all key points.	All relevant points given are justified extensively, identified all major prompts from description.

Further to this, attending to recommendations by Child, Munro and Benton (2015) on marking reliability, a set of key/expected phrases, words and critiques were listed for each source. Suto and Nadas (2008) claimed that answers which require examiners to scrutinise unexpected responses, such as question 2, are more likely to result in lower reliability; it is suggested that markers have a tendency to compare the answers to their own personal representation of an ideal response (Crisp, 2010). This is highly relevant when marking source evaluation responses as correct answers could vary greatly but a marker could show

a preference for what they deem to be the most significant and impactful. Indeed, despite following a strict mark scheme, only having a single marker will have been a threat to the validity of results. Multiple markers following the same standardised mark scheme would have provided inter-rater reliability, examining the consensus and decreasing the risks of this subjective marking (Wolfe, Matthews and Vickers, 2010).

Pre-test (Test A)

Pupils were informed that the task would take place 'exam conditions' and that the teacher could not give any guidance during the task. With confirmation that each pupil understood what was necessary, a timer of twenty minutes was set. As the sources and questions had been placed in context with the current scheme of work (recent source-based task and several lessons on Henry VIII), pupils did not query its purpose at all. Further, in brief discussion following the pre-test, the pupils expressed that they felt a familiarity with the sources from the outset which helped motivate them to extend their answers; this is consistent with Byrom's (1998) recommendations that pupils' engagement in source-work will improve if they sense a pre-awareness with the content. An agreement was made between teacher and pupils that an additional ten minutes were needed to complete all questions for all sources – this was noted to ensure consistency in the post-test.

Results of pre-test

Of the 24 participants who successfully completed both tests, the mean average score in the first test was 17.5 out of a total of 32. Marks for Question 1 were surprisingly high, with 65% of answers gaining a 3 or above. It could be suggested that this is due to the pupils' pre-awareness of the subject; they were able to pick out key points and summarise the information well as they had developed a greater understanding of the context in previous lessons. However, responses to Q2 were much lower, with 72% of questions receiving a 2 or below. It was quickly observed that many pupils had only inferred the positives and negatives of the content, for example:

'Strengths are that Henry and Catherine were a loving couple, married for nearly 20 years. Weaknesses are that Henry went on to get multiple wives afterwards.'

Indeed, with such a high number of responses demonstrating this approach, this could instead suggest a flaw in the question itself. With hindsight, the rephrasing of 'What are the strengths and weaknesses of using this source?' would have been a better choice in encouraging pupils to consider its usefulness and reliability to a historian.

Nonetheless, those that offered an analysis either repeated the prompts provided in the description and extended no explanation of its significance or exemplified Byrom's (1998) lazy cynicism of,

for example, rejecting the usefulness of a primary source because it was 'written a long time ago' or classifying the work of a historian as unreliable because 'they weren't there at the time' (Pupils in Class X).

Despite gaining higher marks for Q1, both ASD pupils received 1 or 0 marks for Q2 and gained overall marks of 14 and 12 – below the class average. Both proved susceptible to merely repeating the prompts without explaining why the authors may have such predispositions and the impact of this on the content – supporting Baron-Cohen's (1995) Theory of Mind for ASD children. Both pupils' interim levels for history had positioned them amongst the higher abilities of the class, however, their marks for these specific source analysis questions had placed them in the lowest quarter of the group.

Post-test (Test B)

Eight days later (the next timetabled lesson), test B was introduced to the class with the addition of a Think-Pair-Share activity. Five minutes was given for the 'Think' phase and ten minutes given to discuss their views with a partner. Pupils were kept in the seating plan which had been constructed specifically for them; staying with their fixed learning partners of the past few months would assess Johnson and Johnson's (1990) claims that a greater sense of a relationship would increase confidence in sharing ideas and improve learning. A continuous (and relevant) discussion was maintained throughout the allocated time, suggestive of this sense of familiarity and subsequent ease in communication. Both ASD pupils had been placed with partners deemed appropriate by the previous class teacher; on observation, the discussion between both pairs was of a significantly slower pace with little contribution from both pupils. Next, ten minutes was allocated to have a group discussion as a whole class. Firstly, pupils appeared uneasy, unclear of their role and reliant on the teacher to hold, or even present, the whole discussion; it was firmly stated that they were to direct the discussion and that I would establish the role of moderator - avoiding the criticism of unruly 'pupil power' laid out by Dunn, Rudduck and Cowie (1989). Contributions became increasingly eager and examples of analytical thinking were demonstrated as pupils began extending and challenging each other's ideas. Turning to Wooley's (2013) advice on evaluative questioning, instead of providing analysis points to the pupils, I used Lyman's (1981) 'wait time' effectively and intervened with questions such as 'Do historians need to be careful when using this source?' to prompt more evaluative responses. Nevertheless, with such a question, a few pupils began to express an obvious defeatism towards the sources; techniques were used to steer the class away from Le Cocq's (2000) fears surrounding 'bias' as I encouraged the pupils to think of questions to ask each other about the sources' author, purpose and implications on the content but also their continuing usefulness to a historian of the period. Soon, much deeper evaluative questions arose which accessed their prior knowledge of the topic, i.e. 'But, why do you think Henry would want to be portrayed as an overly powerful individual during this time?'. By listening to their preconceptions firstly, I was able to shape my questioning accordingly to build momentum during the task – successfully supporting and combining Lee and Shemilt's (2003)

recommendations for evidential progression and Byrom's (1998) study on successful cooperative learning. This questioning was targeted at specific pupils throughout, ensuring that all pairs had an opportunity to share, boasting Ledlow's (2001) praise for TPS as a highly inclusive strategy. Pupils then undertook Test B within the same conditions as Test A.

In brief discussion after the test, pupils appeared significantly more confident and positive; they expressed that they had never been encouraged to question a source in such detail before but had enjoyed being part of the transformation of the evidence into a set of new questions. One of the ASD pupils expressed how the task had introduced him to unfamiliar viewpoints but also encouraged him to think critically about his peers' inputs. When asked how the ASD pupils found the group activity, they both agreed that the structured approach helped significantly, they had a clear understanding of their role (Rose and Howley, 2003) which ultimately helped them feel more inclined to contribute as the pressure was shared with a partner - supporting Kagan's (2001) claims of a collective accountability.

Post-test results

The mean average score in Test B was 24 out of 32, an increase of 8 marks from Test A with all but one of the pupils showing an improvement. More notably, the mode average raised from 17 to 30 proving a higher occurrence of a significantly higher mark; lower ability pupils showed an increase of approximately 4 to 6 marks whilst improvements in higher ability pupils proved equally significant. The three More Able and Talented (MAT) pupils in the class showed percentage increases of 25%, 12% and 11%; in response to fears that higher ability pupils were not given the opportunity to extend their thinking in everyday classroom tasks, these improvements suggest that it is possible to construct tasks which benefit all abilities simultaneously. Responses for Q2 improved to 67% gaining a 3 or above, with all these responses providing a relevant justification for each claim. Furthermore, the 'threat of bias' had decreased significantly from Test A, with many pupils contextualising their claims; for example, many used their prior knowledge of the dissolution of the monasteries. Answers proved a heightened maturity and criticality, suggesting that the opportunity to share and hear differing perspectives had encouraged increased inquisitiveness – (supporting Kaddoura: 2013, McKeachie and Svinicki, 2010).

Notably, the overall results for the ASD pupils raised by 25% and 32%, with the latter being the greatest increase of all pupils in the research. These increases mainly occurred in their Q2 responses, with both pupils achieving 3 marks or above in each. Their responses showed a much greater awareness for the varying mindsets and intentions of the authors, with both providing a detailed critique of how Anne Boleyn's letter would be highly influenced by her extreme desperation to cease her scheduled execution.

Conclusion

As Pickles (2010) stated, 'the effective use of sources as evidence requires recognition that they were produced in a different world of ideas from our own' (p.46). Such contention outlines that source work is underlined by the ability to appreciate and evaluate varying perspectives and objectives; thus, it seems imperative that such skill should inherently be accompanied by tasks which foster this ability in an everyday form. This research has implied that without exposure to the opinions and criticalities of their peers, pupils of all levels tend to consider sources on a more superficial level. With such an obvious increase demonstrated in the higher-ability pupils also, it suggests that the opportunity to voice and explain their opinions to their peers helped to extend their own analytical tendencies and improve their cognitive maturity (Kaddoura, 2013). Undoubtedly, TPS is an intervention which is highly beneficial for pupils, but equally for teachers as an effective and inclusive AfL strategy (Shimazoe and Aldrich, 2010).

The results have suggested that imperative to effective source work is a meaningful structure (Le Cocq, 2000). Providing the pupils with sufficient time and constructive foundations, they intuitively became more cautious of critiquing a source's reliability without hastily disregarding their usefulness. The constructive momentum built up using the strategy's different stages lends itself perfectly to Byrom's (1998) recommendations of allowing source work to feel like a puzzle. By actively and explicitly bringing pupils into the process of their own learning they gained a heightened sense of clarity towards the use and relevance of TPS, and with this, they became more eager to contribute and ultimately prouder of their own individual outcome. As Rose and Howley (2003) suggested, this structural strategy was also of benefit to our ASD pupils who conveyed a more positive response to TPS than usual group work and whose results clearly evidenced a more open-minded approach. In line with Begeer et al (2011), these results demonstrate that such targeted strategies in mainstream lessons can allow for better and more comfortable learning for all pupils – evidenced in both their results and follow-up discussions.

An imperative observation of this research is that this age group, Year 8, had been overlooked as an important opportunity to develop skills of criticality. Between the tasks of Year 7's Tollund Man and the higher expectations of Year 9, only one task had focused on source work skills. However, this task had been a 'missed opportunity' where genuine evaluative thinking had been overshadowed by the objective to show a two-sided argument. After the research, the class teacher asked for the resources to be able to complete the tasks with his other Year 8 classes; he expressed that he had been surprised by the ability of many pupils to independently offer mature criticalities of the sources – an expectation he had not set for

this class. The tasks have since been placed in the department's scheme of work for Year 8, bolstering the advantages of structured evaluative tasks alongside structured cooperative tasks such as TPS.

The main recommendation to School X and other history departments is to include the effective use of cooperative learning and evidential work into their Departmental Improvement Plans. With this will come greater consistency between teachers, allowing pupils to clearly recognise their role and understand the expectations of the task from the outset; this collaborative approach which encourages uniformity was deemed integral by Jolliffe (2015). Likewise, the school's DIP did not mention the development of source skills throughout KS3; once more, placing this as an objective across the department could provide more systematic learning, as encouraged by Williams and Davies (1998) and Harris (2018). Providing accessible sources accompanied by appropriate prompts is crucial to engaging pupils, whilst evaluative questioning is imperative to the development of such a vital historical skill. Inconsistencies within a department could deprive many pupils of the skills and motivation to improve.

Indeed, historical source work is a journey of inquisitiveness and therefore allowing pupils to lead such a journey alone is fundamentally unfair. It is our responsibility as teachers to ensure that young people are exposed to a vast range of standpoints, backgrounds and histories in order to develop as evaluative, broadminded and inquisitive thinkers and individuals.

Limitations and future development

Due to the constraints of a PGCE course, little time was given for the consideration of a research question; with this, as a researcher, it was difficult to avoid Cordingley's (2000) major criticism of action research which states that teachers are too often attracted to the most relevant practical problems; instead, more consideration should be given to structural problems – topics often considered too uncomfortable to investigate as staff members of the school. With more time, greater preliminary research could have allowed for a greater inquisitiveness into the structural obstacles of AfL. Further, the opportunity to research further into ASD pupils in mainstream classrooms could have helped to shape tasks and questioning more effectively to their needs.

A major limitation of the study and its findings is its apparent lack of applicability in its current form. It was only possible to dedicate a few lessons to the experiment due to the school's schemes of work and our limited time at the placement. Thus, although the intervention proved an improvement between both tests, the impact is arguably short term. There would have to be a series of similar tests over a much longer time scale in order to observe a long term impact of the intervention on their source work; with this, the teacher's role would become less active to assess each individual's development due to cooperative learning. Further, this research was administered on a very small convenience group comprised of a rather homogenous group of pupils at a rural and high achieving secondary school in South

Wales. Therefore, the findings should be used with caution when generalizing on a larger population, different age group, abilities and backgrounds. It should only be used as a case study to examine the effectiveness of incorporating cooperative learning to improve evidential work. Despite being a major positive of educational action research, the realities of everyday school and classroom settings can produce limitations to findings. Firstly, despite being a class of 32, only 24 pupils of the class successfully completed both tests; practices for the school Eisteddfod were ongoing during the time of the research and therefore, along with other absences, many pupils were not present at either one or both of the lessons – removing them from the final sample. Two additional MAT pupils were absent from the second lesson, pupils who may have added great value to the group discussion and subsequent results. Further, as mentioned, there are a host of confounding variables which could have affected the pupils' engagement and performance in both tests. Due to timetabling, Test A was taken in Lesson 6 whereas Test B was taken in Lesson 2; any teacher would agree that the last lesson of the day can be a considerable challenge, with heightened behaviour problems and difficulties in meaningfully engaging pupils (Aslin, 2019). As Test A was taken in the last lesson, pupils may have been generally less inclined to engage with the task – possibly lowering results in the pre-test and instrumental to the significant increase in post-test results. For higher validity, future research should complete both tests at the same time in the school day; nevertheless, this would not eliminate all confounding variables of working with young people in an everyday school setting. As both teacher and researcher, it proved difficult to 'observe' the reality of the 'experiment' whilst also being a part of the everyday lesson – questioning and supporting pupils whilst attempting to formally take note of their responses; Brown and Jones (2001) recognise this as a continually unacknowledged implication of action research.

A combination design would have provided more thorough and comparable findings. This is when one treatment group is given a pre-test then receive an intervention followed by a post-test whilst, concurrently, another control group is given a pre-test, do not receive the intervention and are then given a post-test (Knight, 2010). With this, our findings would not have relied solely on whether the intervention helped participants improve between both tests, but whether they improved more than the participants who did not undergo the intervention. Nonetheless, although the research cannot qualify as an experimental study, its findings suggest a positive correlation between Think-Pair-Share and academic performance in historical source work and therefore validates extended consideration and application on a larger scale. Within my future development and practice as a history teacher, I will continue to trial cooperative interventions which are most appropriate for a range of learning styles and needs and assess their impact on pupils' critical thinking and evaluation skills.

Reference List

Allen, V., (1976), 'Children helping children: Psychological processes in tutoring', in J. Levin and V. Allen (Ed.), *Cognitive learning in children: Theories and strategies*, New York: Academic Press.

AlphaPlus., (2014), *Standardisation methods, mark schemes, and their impact on marking reliability*, Available at:
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/605660/2014-02-14-standardisation-methods-mark-schemes-and-their-impact-on-marking-reliability.pdf
(Accessed on 08/04/19).

American Psychiatric Association., (2012), *Autism spectrum disorders*. Retrieved from www.psychiatry.org/autism

Aslin, E., (2019), 'How to Engage Students in Last Lessons of the Day', *School News* [blog]. Available at: <https://www.school-news.com.au/news/engaging-students-in-last-lessons-of-the-day/>

Baron-Cohen, S., (1995),. *Mindblindness: An Essay on Autism and Theory of Mind*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Begeer, S., Gevers, C., Clifford, P., Verhoeve, M., Kat, K., Hoddenbach, E. and Boer, F. (2011), 'Theory of mind training in children with autism: a randomized controlled trial', *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 41, pp. 997-1006.

Bejar, I. I., (2012), 'Rater cognition: Implications for validity', *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 31(3), 2-9.

Bell, L, & Nutt, L., (2012), 'Divided loyalties, divided expectations: research ethics, professional and occupational responsibilities' (ed.) *Ethics in Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

British Educational Research Association (BERA) (2018) *Ethical guidelines for educational research*. Available at: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/publications/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2011> (Accessed on 14/04/19)

Brooks, R., Riele, K., and Maguire, M., (2014), *Ethics and Education Research*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Brown T., Jones L. (2001), *Action research and postmodernism: Congruence and critique*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Brown, L., Fenwick, N., & Klemme, H. (1971), 'Trainable pupils learn to teach each other', *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 4, pp. 36–49.

- Byrom, B. (1998), 'Working with sources: scepticism or cynicism? Putting the story back together again', *Teaching History*, 91
- Campbell D. T., Stanley J. C. (1963), 'Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research on teaching', in Gage N. L. (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 171-246). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Child, S., Munro, J., & Benton, T. (2015), *An experimental investigation of the effects of mark scheme features on marking reliability: Cambridge Assessment Research Report*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Assessment.
- Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979), *Quasi-experimentation: Design & analysis issues in field settings*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cordingley P. (2000), 'Teacher perspectives on the accessibility and usability of research outputs', *BERA Annual Conference*. University of Cardiff, United Kingdom. Available at: <http://www.ncsl.org.uk/mediastore/image2/randd-engaged-cordingley-perspectives.pdf>, (Accessed on: 06/04/19).
- Counsell, C. (2000) 'Historical knowledge and historical skills: the distracting dichotomy' in J. Arthur and R. Phillips (eds) *Issues in History Teaching*, London: Routledge
- Craig, D. V. (2009). *Action research essentials (1st Ed.)*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Pp. 248.
- Crisp, V. (2010), 'Towards a model of the judgement processes involved in examination marking', *Oxford Review of Education*, 36(1), 1-21.
- Cuskelly, M. (2005), 'Ethical inclusion of children with disabilities in research', in A. Farrell (ed.), *Ethical Research with Children*, Maidenhead: Open University Press, pp.97-111.
- Department of Education and Science (1985), *Better Schools – A Summary*, London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Donaldson, G., (2015), *Successful Futures: Independent Review of Curriculum and Assessment Arrangements in Wales*, Cardiff: Welsh Assembly Government.
- Dunn, K., J. Rudduck, and H. Cowie., (1989), 'Cooperation and the ideology of individualism in the schools' In C. Harber and R. Meighan (ed.), *The Democratic School*, Tickwell, England: Education NOW Books.
- Goodyear, V., (2017), 'Sustained Professional Development on Cooperative Learning: Impact on Six Teachers' Practices and Students' Learning', *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, Vol.88(1), p.83-94
- Hammersley, M. and Traianou, A. (2012), *Ethics and Educational Research*, *British Educational Research Association*. Available at: <https://www.bera.ac.uk/researchers-resources/publications/ethics-and-educational-research> (Accessed 09/03/19).
- Harris, A. (2001), 'Department Improvement and School Improvement: A Missing Link?', *British Journal of Educational Research*, 27(4), pp. 477-486.
- Harris, K., (2018), 'It's Critical in the Classroom' [blog], Available at: <https://theroguehistorian.com/keith-harris-history/2018/7/10/its-critical>. (Accessed on: 15/04/19).
- Helm, J. H. 2007, 'Energize your professional development by connecting with a purpose: Building

communities of practice', *Young Children*, 62: 12–16.

Horrocks, J., White, G., & Roberts, L. (2008), 'Principals' attitudes regarding inclusion of children with autism in Pennsylvania public schools', *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 38, 1462–1473. doi: 10.1007/s10803-007-0522-x.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1990), 'Cooperative learning and achievement' In S. Sharan (Ed.), *Cooperative learning: Theory and research* (pp. 23-37). New York: Praeger.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (2002), 'Learning together and alone: Overview and meta-analysis', *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 22, 95-105. doi: 10.1080/0218879020220110.

Johnson, D.W., and Johnson, R. T. (1989), *Cooperation and competition: Theory and research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Jolliffe, W., (2015), 'Bridging the gap: teachers cooperating together to implement cooperative learning', *Education 3-13*, 43:1, 70-82, DOI: 10.1080/03004279.2015.961719.

Kagan, S. (2001), 'Kagan Structures for emotional Intelligence', *Kagan Online Magazine*, 4(4), 1.

Kaminski, J., (2017), 'Kaganistic Rituals of Modern Education: A Criticism on Cooperative Learning', *History, Sociology, & More* [blog], Available at: <https://josephkaminski.org/2017/08/15/kaganistic-rituals-modern-education-cooperative-learning/>, (Accessed on 14/02/19).

Kelly, M., (2019), 'Pretests Effective Tools to Target Instruction', *ThoughtCo* [blog], Available at: <https://www.thoughtco.com/importance-and-uses-of-pretests-7674> (Accessed on: 14/03/19).

Knight, K., (2010), 'Study/Experimental/Research Design: Much More Than Statistics', *Journal of Athletic Training*, 45(1), doi: 10.4085/1062-6050-45.1.98.

Kuehn, P., (2019), 'Function and Importance Pre and Post-Tests', *Owlcation* [blog], Available at: <https://owlcation.com/academia/PrePost-Test-A-Diagnostic-Tool-For-More-Effective-Teaching-of-EFL-Students>, (Accessed on: 19/03/19).

Le Cocq. H., (2000), 'Beyond Bias: making source evaluation meaningful to Year 7', *Teaching History*, 99.

Ledlow, S., (2001). 'Using think-pair-share in the college classroom', *Arizona State University* [blog], Available at: <https://education.asu.edu/> (Accessed 20/02/19)

Lee, P., and Shemilt, D., (2003) 'A scaffold, not a cage: progression and progression models in history', *Teaching History*, 113 pp. 13-23.

Lindsay, S., Proulx, M., Thomson, N., & Scott, H (2013), 'Educators' Challenges of Including Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder in Mainstream Classrooms', *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*, 60:4, 347-362

Lyman, F. (1981), 'The Responsive Classroom Discussion: The Inclusion of All Students' *Mainstreaming Digest*. University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Manfara, M. (2009), 'Action Research: Exploring the Theoretical Divide between Practical and Critical Approaches', *Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 3 (1).

- Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D. J. (2005), *Building academic vocabulary: Teacher's manual*. Alexandria, Va: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Mauthner, M., Miller, T., Birch, M., & Jessop, J. (2012), *Ethics in qualitative research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd doi: 10.4135/9781473913912
- McKeachie W. & Svinicki, M. (2010), *McKeachie's teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for college and university teachers*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- McNiff, J. (2002), Action research for professional development: Concise advice for new action researchers, *Studies in Continuing Education*, 35:1.
- Mertler, C. A. (2006)., *Action Research: Teachers as Researchers in the Classroom*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mertler, C., (2013), *Action Research: Improving Schools and Empowering Educators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Millis, B., (2012), 'Active Learning Strategies in Face-to-Face courses' , IDEA paper 53 . Manhattan, KS : IDEA Center. The University of Texas, San Antonio, Available at: http://IDEAedu.org/sites/default/files/paperidea_53.pdf, (Accessed on: 03/03/19).
- Mills, G. E. (2011) *Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Mitchell, P. and Lewis C. (1994), 'Critical issues in children's early understanding of mind', In C. Lewis and P. Mitchell, (Eds.), *Children's Early Understanding of Mind: Origins and Development*, , London: Psychology Press.
- Moreno, S., & O'Neal, C. (1996), 'Tips for teaching high functioning people with autism', *Online Asperger Syndrome Information and Support (OASIS)*, Available at: <http://www.udel.edu/bkirby/Asperger>, (Accessed on 08/03/19).
- Muijs, D., *Doing Quantitative Research in Education with SPSS*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Murray, C., (2017), 'Christine Counsell: Director of Education, Inspiration Trust [blog], 28 Nov. Available at: <https://schoolsweek.co.uk/christine-counsell-director-of-education-inspiration-trust/> (Accessed 15/03/19).
- Musbach, J. (2001), 'Using Primary Sources in the Secondary Classroom', *OAH Magazine of History*, 16(1), pp.30-32.
- Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual) (2011), 'Welsh government and Council for the Curriculum, Examinations & Assessment', *GCSE, GCE, Principal Learning and Project Code of Practice*, Available at: <http://ofqual.gov.uk/files/2011-05-27-code-of-practice-2011.pdf>, (Accessed on 07/03/19).
- Oliver, B. (1980), 'Action research for in-service training'. *Educational Leadership*, 37(5), 394-395.
- Pickles, E., (2010), 'How can students' use of historical evidence be enhanced? A research study of the role of knowledge in Year 8 to Year 13 students' interpretations of historical sources', *Teaching History*, 139, pp.41-52.
- Reinhart, S.C. (2000), 'Never say anything a kid can say!', *Mathematics teaching in the middle school*, 5(8), 478.

Rose, R & Howley, M, (2003) 'Structured approaches to the inclusion of pupils with autistic spectrum disorder in group work', *European Conference on Educational Research*, University of Hamburg, 17-20 September 2003. Available at: <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00003313.htm>. (Accessed on: 06/03/19).

Rowe, M. B. (1986) 'Wait Time: Slowing Down May Be A Way of Speeding Up!', *Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(1), pp. 43–50. doi: 10.1177/002248718603700110.

Sampsel, A., (2013), 'Finding the Effects of Think-Pair-Share on Student Confidence and Participation' *Honors Projects*. 28.

School Council History Project (1976), *A New Look at History*, Edinburgh: Homes McDougall Ltd.

Shimazoe, J., & Aldrich, H. (2010)., 'Group work can be gratifying: Understanding and overcoming resistance to cooperative learning', *College Teaching*, 58, 52-57.

Slavin, R. (1996), 'Research on cooperative learning and achievement: What we know, what we need to know', *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 21, 43-69.

Smith, P., (2001), Why Gerry now likes evidential work. *Teaching History*, 102, pp. 8-13.

Suto, I. & Nadas, R. (2008), 'What determines GCSE marking accuracy? An exploration of expertise among maths and physics markers', *Research Papers in Education*, 23(4), 477– 497.

Tighe, J., and Lyman F. T., 'Cueing Thinking in the Classroom: The Promise of Theory- Embedded Tools', *Educational Leadership*, 1988, Vol. 45, pp. 18-24.

Tova Stenlund, Fredrik U. Jönsson & Bert Jonsson (2017), 'Group discussions and test-enhanced learning: individual learning outcomes and personality characteristics', *Educational Psychology*, 37:2, 145-156, DOI: 10.1080/01443410.2016.1143087

Veenman, S., Bakermans, J., Franzen, Y. and Van Hoof, M. (1996), 'Implementation Effects of a Pre-Service Training Course for Secondary Education Teachers', *Educational Studies*, 22 (2), 225-243.

Wellman, H. M., Baron-Cohen, S., Caswell, R., Gomez, J. C., Swettenham, J., Toye, E., & Lagattuta, K., (2002), 'Thought-bubbles help children with autism acquire an alternative to a theory of mind', *Autism*, 6(4), 343–363

Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) (2008a), *History in the National Curriculum for Wales*. Available at: <https://s3-eu-west-1.amazonaws.com/hwb-live-storage/b0/fc/09/ba/29244972b0f62a9f7ecbca49/history-in-the-national-curriculum-for-wales.pdf>. (Accessed 04/02/19).

Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) (2008b), *Skills framework for 3 to 19-year-olds in Wales*. Available at: <https://learning.gov.wales/docs/learningwales/publications/140626-skills-framework-for-3-19-year-olds-en.pdf> (Accessed on 07/04/19).

Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) (2010), *How to develop thinking and assessment for learning in the classroom*. Available at: <https://learning.gov.wales/docs/learningwales/publications/130429how-to-develop-thinking-en.pdf> (Accessed 07/03/19).

Welsh Government (2014), *National Literacy and Numeracy Framework*. Available at: <https://learning.gov.wales/docs/learningwales/publications/130415-Inf-guidance-en.pdf> (Accessed on: 15/03/19).

Wiggins, G., and McTighe, J., (1990), *Understanding By Design*, New York: Assn. for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Wiliam, D., (2017), *Embedded Formative Assessment: (Strategies for Classroom Assessment That Drives Student Engagement and Learning)*, Bloomington: Solution Tree

Williams, R., & Davies, I., (1998), 'Interpretations of History: Issues for Teachers in the Development of Pupils' Understanding', *Teaching History*, 91, pp.36-40.

Wing, L, and Gould, J. (1979), 'Severe impairments of social interaction and associated abnormalities in children: epidemiology and classification', *Journal of Autism and Childhood Schizophrenia* 9 11 – 29

WJEC (2017), *Guidance for Teaching: WJEC GCSE in History*, Available at: <https://www.wjec.co.uk/qualifications/history/r-history-gcse-2017/WJEC%20GCSE%20History%20Guidance%20for%20Teaching%20Wales.pdf> (Accessed on 04/04/19).

Wolfe, E. W., Matthews, S. & Vickers, D. (2010), 'The effectiveness and efficiency of distributed online, regional online, and regional face-to-face training for writing assessment raters', *The Journal of Technology, Learning and Assessment*, 10(1).

Woloshyn, V. E., Pressley, M., & Schneider, W. (1992), 'Elaborative-interrogation and prior-knowledge effects on learning of facts', *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84(1), 115-124.

Wooley, M., (2003), 'Really weird and freaky: using a Thomas Hardy short story as a source of evidence in the Year 9 classroom', *Teaching History*, 111.

Year 8 Source Analysis test (A)

Name

Henry is so greedy that all the riches in the world would not satisfy him... to make himself rich he has impoverished (made them poor) his people. This King.... does not trust a single man... and will not cease to dip his hand in blood as long as he doubts the people.

The French ambassador to England writing to the King of France in 1540. The King of France was a rival of Henry VIII.

Using your own words, what do you learn from this source? (4)

I learn't from this source that Henry was very greedy. He was very rich but that didn't satisfy him so he made his people poorer. (3)

What are the strengths and weaknesses of this source? (4)

The strength in this source is that it was written close to the time Henry became king. The weaknesses were that Henry's rival was the one who sent a French ambassador to find out. (3)



Henry is shown wearing a jewelled cap, ermine robe and jewelled collar, with a inscription Latin around the edge reading 'Henry VIII, King of England, France and Ireland, defender of the faith, and under Christ, the supreme head on earth of the Church of England and Ireland'.

A gold medal from 1545 (during Henry's reign)

Using your own words, what do you learn from this source?

I learn't that Henry wore a jewelled cap, ermine robe and jewelled collar with inscription around the edge. It tells me that he was King of England, France and Ireland. (3)

Looking at both the content and its authorship, what are the strengths and weaknesses of this source?

A strength is that it was a gold medal from 1545 which was during Henry's reign. (2)

Henry and Catherine were a popular and loving couple. In 1513, whilst Henry was in France, Catherine ran the country for him. Her army even beat a Scottish army at the Battle of Flodden. Catherine brought Henry a present home from the battle...the dead King of Scotland's coat...still stained with his blood.

Henry and Catherine were happily married for nearly 20 years. Henry once said, 'If I were still free, I would choose her for a wife above all others.' What a romantic man! But the marriage didn't last. As we all know, he had five more wives after Catherine...

Extract taken from 'Renaissance, Revolution and Reformation' by Aaron Wilkes in 2014. This book was written for KS3 pupils and teachers.

Using your own words, what do you learn from this source?

I learnt that Catherine won a battle against the Scottish without Henry. Henry was romantic and they were happily married for almost 20 years.

Looking at both the content and its authorship, what are the strengths and weaknesses of this source? (3)

The strength is that there is no bias nothing that is bias but the weakness is that it was written in 2014 long after Henry's reign. (2)



A portrait of Henry from about 1520 when he was 28 years old and young and healthy.

This portrait was painted by an unknown Anglo-Netherlandish painter and NOT the king's own painter.

It is now kept in the National Portrait Gallery in London.

Using your own words, what do you learn from this source?

I've learnt that when Henry was 28 he was healthy and young. The painting was painted by an unknown artist not by his own painter. (3)

Looking at both the content and its authorship, what are the strengths and weaknesses of this source?

A strength is that the painting was painted during the time he was alive (1520). The weakness is that we don't know who the artist is. It's also kept in a Gallery in London. (3)

Year 8 Source Analysis Test (B)

Name: [REDACTED]

Please understand Sir, that I have made myself familiar with the monastery at Maiden Bradley. Rest assured that no mischief or wrongdoings can be hidden from me. I send you Holy relics taken from the monastery of Maiden Bradley which were used as indulgences to trick the good people of this parish. They include Christ's coat, Our Lady's smock and part of the Lord's Supper. In this monastery you will find that the Abbot has six children. His sons are all tall men who are servants to him. He thanks God that he never had relations with married women but only pure and innocent unmarried women, the fairest and purest he could get. The Pope has also given him special permission to keep a prostitute.

Extract from a report written by Richard Layton in 1535. Layton was one of Thomas Cromwell's commissioners who was sent to investigate the monastery of Maiden Bradley.

Using your own words, what do you learn from this source?

I learnt that Richard Layton was going to investigate the monastery of Maiden Bradley to shut it down. He was going to do this by investigating what the monks did wrong. (3)

Looking at both the content and its authorship, what are the strengths and weaknesses of this source?

~~Weakness~~ (Weakness)
The man who wrote this was working for the king so he could've lied in favour of the king. He was also exaggerating by sending them to the king. It's a primary source which means it was written during that time of Henry's reign. (4)
(Strength)



Portrait of Henry VIII by Hans Holbein the Younger, painted 1536-1537. It is one of the most iconic images of Henry and is one of the most famous portraits of any British monarch. Holbein was the official painter for the King and his painting of the royal family are a record of the years when Henry was claiming his power over the Church of England. The original painting was destroyed by fire in 1698 but is still well known through many copies.

Using your own words, what do you learn from this source?

In the photo Henry looks very powerful and is dressed properly like a king. He also looks very strong and has broad shoulders. This shows that Henry is a strong leader. (11)

Looking at both the content and its authorship, what are the strengths and weaknesses of this source?

A strength would be that it was painted by the official Royal painter. This means that he knew Henry's physique very well. A weakness is that the painter may have made Henry look better in the painting than in real life so make sure he doesn't get behind. The real painting was burnt in a fire but many copies were made. However, these copies may have changed over time. (3)

...Henry's scholarly interests included writing both books and music, and he was a lavish patron of the arts. He was an accomplished player of many instruments and a composer. Greensleeves, the popular melody frequently attributed to him is, however, almost certainly not one of his compositions. As the author of a best-selling book (it went through some 20 editions in England and Europe) attacking Martin Luther and supporting the Roman Catholic church, in 1521 Henry was given the title 'Defender of the Faith' by the Pope.

Extract from a biography of King Henry VIII - taken from www.royal.uk - 'the official web site of the British Royal Family. Written and managed by the Royal Household at Buckingham Palace, the site aims to provide an authoritative resource of information about the Monarchy and Royal Family, past and present'.

Using your own words, what do you learn from this source?

I learnt that Henry is a very smart and talented man. He could play many instruments and was the composer of 'Greensleeves'. He was the author of a best-selling book and was given the title 'Defender of the Faith' by the Pope. (4)

Looking at both the content and its authorship, what are the strengths and weaknesses of this source?

A weakness is that it is the official website of the royal family and could've been changed for them to have a better reputation. A strength would be that it's secondary but well researched by professionals but it depends on where they got the information from. (4)

You have chosen me, from a low Estate, to be your Queen and Companion, far beyond my Desert or Desire. If then you found me worthy of such Honour, Good your Grace, let not any light Fancy, or bad Counsel of mine Enemies, withdraw your Princely Favor from me; neither let that Stain, that unworthy Stain of a Disloyal Heart towards your good Grace, ever cast so foul a Blot on your most Dutiful Wife, and the Infant Princess your Daughter.

Extract from a letter believed to be written by Anne Boleyn to her husband King Henry VII whilst she was imprisoned the Tower. This was written roughly two weeks before her execution would take place; this letter is a controversial one as only one copy of it remains and some argue that Anne may not have written it herself.

Using your own words, what do you learn from this source?

I learnt from this source that Henry's wife is trying to save her life and be Queen again. She's also trying to protect her daughter Elizabeth from growing up without a Mum. (4)

Looking at both the content and its authorship, what are the strengths and weaknesses of this source?

The strength is that this evidence is primary and was wrote roughly two weeks before she got beheaded. The weaknesses is that it was written in old English and could've been translated in the wrong way. I.e. also says that Anne may not have written it herself. This means that a friend could've wrote it to save her life. (4)

30
32