

Does grouping lower ability children with higher ability children have an effect on the lower learner's motivation to engage with their learning?

Contents Page:

	Page Number
Section One – Introduction	
Introduction	1
Section Two – The Research Context	
The Research Context	2
Section Three - Literature Review	
Literature Review	3
Section Four – Methodology	
Methodology	6
Ethical Considerations	8
Section Five – Results and Analysis	
Results and Analysis	10
Section Six – Discussion	
Discussion	15
Section Seven – Conclusion	
Conclusion	17
Recommendations	18

Introduction

Introduction:

This research study aims to discover the effect pairing higher and lower learners has on the lower learners motivation to engage within learning. The topic was highlighted as it was deemed to be interesting to the classes involved in the study, as both have been challenged with engaging lower-ability learners over the previous weeks. Currently, the placement school use mixed ability groupings throughout the school. By allowing the children to sit in this arrangement, it was observed that the higher and middle ability children were often sitting in small clusters. As the groups were predominantly high and middle ability, this left the lower ability children to either try to complete the work individually, or one-to-one with an adult. Consequently, the lower learners in the class have often become disengaged from learning and behavioural issues have arisen in a minority of them.

Research Context

Research Context:

The schools catchment area is large and suggests that the pupils attending originated from these areas have a social or economic disadvantage, with thirty-two percent of the school being entitled to free school meals. This is slightly higher in comparison to the national and local averages (ref, no date). My year one class consists of sixteen girls and fourteen boys, seven of which have additional learning needs (ALN), with my research partners reception class having thirteen girls, seventeen boys, six of which are ALN children. Children are placed into pre-planned mixed-ability groups for the term, as they work in correspondence with the topic that is being followed. In total, there are four groups, with each having seven or eight children. Most of the children placed into these groups are of either a higher or middle ability, resulting in the lower learner either working individually or one-to-one with an adult. As a result, this led to a lack of engagement from the lower learners in the class. After discussing this with my research partner, we decided that we would research into the effects of pairing higher-ability with lower-ability children together, to observe the impact this had on the lower learners motivations to engage in an activity. This led to the research question, "Does grouping lower ability children with higher ability children have an effect on the lower learner's motivation to engage with their learning?" The research title was also interesting to my partners experiences, whose reception class also faced similar problems throughout the previous weeks. For my class this means that little needs to be done to the groupings as they are already of a mixed ability, but the teacher is required to plan the pairings beforehand as this will help them eradicate any disruptive behaviours during each lesson. It also requires the teacher to be able to observe the groups interactions, to indicate whether there are positive or negative effects to implementing this strategy on the lower learners motivation to engage in learning.

Literature Review

Literature Review:

Within modern-society, it is important that teachers can teach effectively within a diverse classroom and handle the various challenging situations that could potentially arise daily (Sleeter and Owuor, 2011). For this to be achieved it is important that teachers create the correct learning environment for children to flourish and to eradicate any issues within the classroom. However, managing the classroom has proven to be a difficult for most teachers, with this issue being major cause for stress and job dissatisfaction (Everston and Weinstein, 2006). To obtain effective classroom management it is important for the teacher to make difficult decisions daily. These decisions have the potential to promote the correct behaviours, engage children and allow them to interact by sharing ideas or thoughts (Emmer and Stough, 2001).

Classroom seating arrangements offers the teacher an opportunity to create the correct learning environment and develop student relationships (Gest and Rodkin 2011; McKeown et al, 2015). This point is reiterated by Denton (1992), who suggests that the correct classroom organisation aids the development of pupil's attitude towards learning. These points highlight the importance of classroom seating arrangements, as they allow the teacher to create a safe and comfortable space for children to engage within their learning. Many authors suggest that classroom seating arrangements are important for both student academic performance and social development within the classroom (Hastings & Schweiso, 1995; MacAulay, 2006; Marx et al,1999). This point is reiterated by Farmer et al, (2011) who highlights the importance classroom seating has on a child's motivation to participate, their social development, classroom relationships and self-confidence. In relation to our study, this is an important point to consider, as it suggests the correct classroom arrangement could potentially help manage challenging behaviours and engagement of the lower ability children.

In terms of social development, Zajonc (2001) argues that when two individuals work together over a long duration, a familiarity is created which has a positive effect on the learning of both children. This is explained further by the researcher, as it is suggested that a positive feeling is created without conscious cognition. Despite this being a popular opinion shared between many authors, others believe that as a direct result of the support network built between classmates, they are more competent in

completing activities individually (MacAuley, 2006). However, it has been proven to be difficult to implement into a classroom setting as children can often become too reliant on their partners or class mates, making them disengage from learning (Farmer et al, 2011). This again highlights the importance of the teacher's role as a facilitator of learning, rather than the leader, as it is important for the teacher to provide the children with challenging activities where they can access and improve key social skills.

Gremmen et al, (2016) suggests that the overall outcome of the task and behaviour management should steer thinking towards the correct seating arrangement to implement. This point is supported by Wannarka and Ruhl (2008), who's research suggests that the use of rows has a correlation to behaviour during activities, as the study showed the benefits it had particularly on the children with behavioural issues. As teachers are offered the choice of where children sit in the classroom, it allows them to pair or place children in a group who will be best suited to the behaviours of certain children. This means that the teacher is able to choose children who are able to behave and complete work together, as this will reduce distractions, aggression and allow the children to relax whilst learning (Trussell, 2008). The previous points state the importance of implementing the correct strategy for the class being taught, as one successful strategy elsewhere may not necessarily work in any classroom. The context of the behaviours, abilities and knowledge of each child in the class is vital (Baines et al, 2003).

It was also evident that small grouping arrangements helped to develop social and communication skills. This suggests that there are currently many effective strategies being used in classrooms, which are only successful when teachers have taken into consideration the children's needs and interests. The seating choices made by a teacher can potentially create the social environments where children can flourish and learn independently. This is important to consider, especially with curriculum changes and the Donaldson report being introduced in the next few years, as teachers will need to be more able to give children the responsibility of their own learning (Donaldson, 2015). By creating a more inclusive classroom where children can work together and share ideas, they are then able to enhance their key skills like adopting different roles, explaining answers, discussing thoughts, sharing resources and listening to other ideas.

Despite the vast amounts of research surrounding classroom layout and child groupings, there is still a gap in the research when looking into the effects of pairing higher ability with lower ability children together. Taking the research into consideration, pairing children together could offer the support in completing the work and allow the children to explain and share ideas. With the focus of this research process being the motivation of the lower ability child, it will be interesting to see how the children interact and help each other complete tasks, as well as observe the input of each child in the pairing. Also, the behaviours of the children will also be closely monitored, especially with those that have had previous behavioural issues, as this will highlight the effects the pairing system has had. This could in turn highlight the positive and negative effects on the motivation to complete work.

Methodology

Methodology:

A lesson study approach was adopted for the research process. Dudley's (2011) lesson study approach was created in Japan during the 1980s and is connected to the planning and observing of lessons, analysing results and working together creating a team environment (Dudley, 2011). The overall aim of this approach is to improve the teachers subject and pedagogical knowledge and continue to improve the children's educational progress. Despite Dudley (2011) being one of the main authors on this topic, many still believe that evidence is lacking in proving the method improves attainment levels of the children. However, the lesson study approach engages teachers in developing effective ways to enhance the learning of the focus children in the class (DCFS, 2009). Therefore, this model is proven to be effective in promoting high levels of teacher practice and aids in the teachers development over time (EEF, 2017). In this study, the focus children are of a lower ability in comparison to the national levelling. With this study in place, we wanted to discover if pairing higher and lower ability learners together has an impact on the engagement and motivation of the lower learner. The findings of the study will help to inform my future practice both in my current class or any class I may teach, as well as contributing to the full understanding of the pairing strategy. This has been highlighted by Cordingley et al, (2004) who suggest that one of the main strengths of Dudley's (2011) lesson study approach is the opportunity it offers to develop personal practice.

The main tools used to collect data during the lesson study were observations during the lessons and interviews with the lower learners. These helped us monitor the engagement of the children during the lesson and find out their thoughts and feelings towards the strategy in the interview process. The use of semi-structured interviews allowed us, as researchers to ask planned, open-ended questions, which gave children the opportunity to share their opinions . To make this process successful, we ensured that the questions weren't misleading to the children, as we wanted to develop their honest feelings towards the strategy. However, this approach, according to Wood and Smith (2016), may provide the research with irrelevant answers. This could also be perceived as a strength of the research method, as it allows the children to highlight areas the researcher may not have thought about before the interview process. The interviews were carried out by the class teacher for both lessons. This decision was made to ensure the children remained focussed on the interview and the answers they

were providing. Cohen et al, (2011) stresses the importance of keeping the children on task and states that the best way to achieve this is to interview the children using someone they are familiar with. Not only does this allow the class teacher to keep the children focussed but creates a level of student comfort when taking part in the interview. Gremmen et al, (2016) suggests that by creating student comfort in the interview process, the researcher is able to receive more in-depth discussions, resulting in higher quality data being collected.

An observational checklist was used to collect observational notes throughout the lesson (see appendix A or C). As the process was conducted using a schedule, it required the use of a structured observation. This decision helped the observer note the differences throughout the different stages of the lessons planned. The observational checklist also allows the researcher to make note of the six target children's work; ethic, collaboration, quality of work and body language. The primary tool for this research will be the body language of the focus children, as research suggests that it is the most effective way of assessing motivation and engagement in the classroom. The six target children will be made up of three lower-ability learners from each class observed. As the grid allows the researcher to make note of the positive and negative aspects of these areas over three different difficulties of work, it allows us to compare the differences in behaviours. This proves the reliability of the checklist, as each area will be observed in more depth (Bryman, 1988). D'Mello et al, (2007) reiterates this point, as a study they conducted found that the most engaged learner showed a constant positive body language when completing tasks. For example, sitting in an upright position and comfortable in competing tasks. The children possessing these traits showed a higher quality of work completed, with the disengaged learners who were slouching, fidgeting and constantly moving showed a lower level of engagement and quality of work.

To be able to reflect on the information obtained in research, interviews and observations, Brookfield's (2005) Four Lenses strategy will be used as a tool to change the readers perspective (see appendix E). The four lenses in this reflection strategy focusses on the autobiographical lens, the student's eyes, colleagues' experiences and theoretical literature. The autobiographical lens reflects upon the observation stage for the researcher. It is important to include thoughts and feelings regarding the live experience. The second lens is through the students eyes or perspective, again

thinking about the feelings of the children and how their past experiences affect them. The importance of this lens is implied here, as this stage could aid the researcher in discovering whether the pairing system was successful in motivating the lower learner to complete their work. This will be achieved by observing body language and discussions about their feelings during the observation stage. The third stage takes into consideration the colleagues views, in turn offering a different view point on the lesson and the observations made. The teachers experience is valuable to this study because of the knowledge they have on the class being taught. Considering their experience can lead to more informed observations and decisions, as they have a greater understanding of the children. The final lens is theoretical lens, which allows us to take into consideration the relevance of the data collected by making comparisons with the current literature. In other terms, it allows the researcher to analyse and summarise the findings of the research study. Furthermore, this reflection strategy allows us to make sense of the data collected and identify next steps for future research.

Ethical Considerations:

Prior to starting the research process, many ethical issues need to be considered. By planning for any issues that may arise, it becomes easier for the researcher to overcome these problems and have more reliable research. Some of the anticipated risks highlighted were the potential risks to the participants, as the research could cause the children to become embarrassed or emotional. It was highlighted that the pairing of higher and lower learners could also lose confidence or self-esteem, if they thought they had a lower ability than their partner. To ensure this wasn't an issue, we used the groups already in place for both classrooms to pair the children and only referred to the pairings as the group names. Also, to prevent distress in the interview stage, the children will be interviewed by the class teacher to make the children more comfortable.

As the interviews will be in private, many safe-guarding issues also need to be considered. To minimise these risks the interviews took place in an open space with a constant flow of people. If two or more children were to leave the study at any time, the research process will halt. Letters were given to parents of each child in the class, asking for permission to involve them in the study. Only those given permission were

included in the research study. In gaining the different perspectives needed for the reflection of our findings, the research partner had no knowledge of the focus children. This allowed the researcher to remain open and give more honest thoughts and opinions. The whole research process complied with three external ethics guides, these are BERA (2018), EWC (2017) and UWTSD (2017).

Alongside the handing out of consent letters, the children were also asked to use a thumbs up, thumbs down activity to communicate feelings towards taking part in the study. Throughout the analysis of the results, the names of the children will remain anonymous, with the children being referred to as the names selected by the researcher. For example, child 1A is the first child from the first class and 2C is the last child from the last class. All paper files will be stored in a locked cupboard and no personal data will be stored as it is deemed unnecessary for the research design. The computers used to store the electrical data were also locked with password protection. Only the researchers have had access to this anonymised data throughout the process.

Results and Analysis

In this section, the findings of the research from both lessons will be highlighted. The learning objective for both lessons were for the children to be able to work in pairs and complete several activities. After discussing the success criteria with the children, it is clear they have achieved the learning objective, as they were all able to share thoughts and ideas with little fuss or effort. This had been an issue with the class over the previous weeks, with many children often arguing over the answers they have given or even sharing the resources out between them. This issue often led to the lower learners becoming disengaged from the lesson, leading to the disruptive behaviour. Prior to the lesson, it was believed that our main area of concern were the challenging behaviours of some of the lower ability learners. However, this was important to the research process as we needed to observe the strategies effects on the motivation of the learner through observing behaviours. By creating the success criteria with the children, it allowed me to refer to it during the lesson for if any issues were to arise. This made the success criteria personal to the children in the class, as it was agreed upon, rather than something decided by the class teacher independently. At times, the higher learners would try to encourage the lower learners positive behaviours, often referring to the success criteria created at the start of the lesson. This was observed to help the class behave throughout the lesson, with behaviour not being mentioned in any of the observational notes. This could suggest that it was effective in promoting positive on task behaviour and engaging them in their work.

Lesson Study 1:

The first lesson study was undertaken in the reception class with my research partner leading the lesson. At the beginning of the lesson, all three focus children were observed to engage in the phonics lesson as they were keen to answer questions in the warm up and attempt sounding out the different words. The think, pair, share activity that followed allowed the children to share their ideas with peers. The activities set by the teacher allowed the children to practice different sounds and words, making them more difficult as the lesson progressed. For example, starting with simple phonetical words like cat, dog and hat and moving onto harder sounding words such as, book and food. As already stated, the children were fully engaged to begin with, which remained for the first activity as they were confident in talking to their peers and thinking of words together. This was evident in the observational checklist (see appendix A), as all three of the focus children were able to complete the activity

comfortably and were clearly sounding the correct words out. As the lesson became more difficult for the lower learners, it was clear that the engagement of the higher learner was able to motivate them to try sounding out more difficult words. Again, this was clear in the observation checklist, as I observed one of the higher learners teaching the lower learner the sounds of the lesson using mirroring. This suggests that the role of the higher learner was crucial throughout, as they offered constant help to their partners which required these children to explain their answers and practice key sounds and skills.

Despite the positive effects this strategy has on the lower learners, it was also clear that the higher children's progression with the activities was hindered, as more time was taken in helping and explaining thoughts and opinions towards the end of the lesson. The teacher decided when the activities progressed, this meant that the children could practice the skill until all children were ready to continue. This made it easier for lower learner to access and complete the work, but towards the end of the lesson it was becoming increasingly clear that some of the children were over-reliant on the higher learners in completing the activity. This was observed as children started to guess answers rather than using the sounding out which was successful previously in the lesson. It could be suggested that this was because the higher learners were also struggling to complete several of the more difficult words, emphasising the importance of the higher learner role.

The interview process that followed allowed us as researchers to discuss with the children what they enjoyed about the lesson and what they felt needed to be different next time. All three focus children stated that they enjoyed working in pairs with the higher learner (see appendix B). When questioned on the reasons why they believe this, child 1C said, "I enjoyed it because it was easier to do the work." This could suggest one or two things. The first being that the higher learner supported them in completing the work together, or the higher learner completed the work individually. This quote also offers a good summary of the lesson taught, as it shows the learner engagement throughout, starting confidently and ending less effectively due to the level of the work. This could suggest that this classroom layout is good for activities where children already have a good understanding of the topic and are using the lesson to practice the key skills. As this was a phonics lesson it was easier for the children to explain their reasoning at the beginning of the lesson, making them

motivated to take part in the activity as they were confident in completing the task. In contrast to this, towards the end of the lesson where difficult words were being practiced, children found it difficult to explain their answers, resulting in them becoming disengaged from the lesson. This could be because the initial interaction that was taking place before has now gone, leaving both children disinterested in completing the activity. When asked about the things that they would change in future lessons, the children agreed that they would like to try the pairing system in different lessons. I agree that this would be a good next step for this research process, as it would allow us to compare the effects this strategy has in different situations in the classroom.

Lesson study 2:

The second observed lesson took place in the year one classroom where I completed my placement. In the warm up to the phonics lesson (see appendix F), some of the lower learners seemed disengaged as they weren't responding to the flashcards. This could have been because some of the sounds on the flashcards were either too difficult for them to complete, or the activity was progressing too quickly. The three varied activities started with a simple match words to sounds suited to phase two phonics children. The matching activity required the children to think of words that had the sounds 's, a, t, p, i, n' within them. This activity was the easiest activity of the three. As the groups were of a higher and lower ability, the higher learner found it easier to access the work. This knowledge provided a solid base for the higher learners, as they were then more able to explain the answers to the lower learner and make the work more accessible. Consequently, it was observed that the focus children were very engaged and seemed interested in completing the task (see appendix C). This was identified by listening closely to the interactions between the pairings and observing body language. The second activity planned required the children to match words to pictures and were slightly more difficult to complete as it was of a phase three phonics difficulty. Unlike the previous lesson, the focus children were able to complete the task with ease from their own understanding and the support of their partners. I believe that the visual aids made the activity easier for the lower learners to access, as it allowed them to have more input into the conversations and decisions being made. Occasionally, when the lower learners struggled to complete the matching activity, they used the visual aids to identify the word and used their partners support to pair

them to the phonetical sounds. It is reiterated that the role of the higher learner is significant as it acts as a base to support their own and their partners learning.

In relation to this, the third activity was planned around the levelling of phase four phonics, with children needing to complete the words using difficult sounds. This activity proved very difficult for both learners to complete. As a result, we needed to finish the lesson earlier than planned. This information suggests that there are two important factors to consider whilst implementing this strategy, these are the understanding of the lower and higher ability child. As the children didn't have a full understanding of the activity, it led to both children becoming disengaged and simply guessing the answers. It was observed that many of the children were not discussing the answers anymore and led to the children feeling frustrated.

The interview process again highlighted the satisfaction felt from the children towards working with their partners (see appendix D). All three focus children felt that they enjoyed working with their partners, which was reflected in their engagement. Child 2A said, "My partner helped me to finish the work, but they tried to do most of it for me." This was in response to the end of the second and third activities, which was at the point where the lower learners were struggling to discuss the more difficult activities. It is suggested that before implementing this activity, the teacher must closely observe the interactions between the children to identify whether the children are sharing responsibilities. When asking the focus children on the strengths of working with their new partners, Child 2B said; "He helped me when I was getting the sounds wrong." When questioned about the weaknesses of the lesson, one of the children suggested that in future lessons we would only use this strategy for the easier activities, as it allowed them to get more involved in activities. This was one of the main findings from this lesson study.

As highlighted throughout this section, the main positive of implementing this strategy was the communication that was shared between the children. I believe this lay out helped the children to think for themselves on what they already know and then explain it to their partner, which are key skills for children of this age. As the children were working together, this eradicated any behavioural issues as they were enjoying the activities they were completing. In the future, I think that it is important to continue working towards gaining a full understanding of the children's abilities and interests,

as this allows the teacher to make a more informed decision on what seating strategy will get lower learners engaged.

Discussion

Discussion:

The research surrounding classroom arrangement and groupings has made me aware of all the aspects that need to be considered whilst planning for how to implement them into the classroom (Baines et al, 2003). Teachers need to consider the children most suited to work together, as this helps the learners focus and helps eradicate any behavioural issues faced in the classroom (Trussell, 2008). It was clear that these decisions have a direct impact on the lower ability learners motivation to participate. The findings suggested that the engagement of the higher ability learner supported the lower learner throughout the various activities in both classes. The difficulty of work also had a direct impact on this classroom grouping strategy, with the easier activities being highly effective in motivating the lower learner in completing an activity. During the difficult stages of the lessons, it was observed that children from both pairs disengaged. This stresses the importance of prior knowledge, as this supports the social interactions that took place in the earlier stages of the lesson. Research suggests that if these points are considered and implemented in the correct way, it can be progressive in the development of social skills and motivation to learn (Zajonc, 2001).

The research findings will help inform my future practice, as I now have a greater understanding of what needs to be considered when implementing new classroom groupings or arrangements. I think that this would work well in my class as many of the children currently possessing behavioural issues would benefit from the pairing of a higher learner they already have a good relationship with. Others that are of a low ability without behavioural issues would be able to access support from the other children in the class, in turn developing the higher learners ability to reason and explain thoughts. This would need to be closely monitored as some of the children in the class may become less focussed on their learning being in pairs. Furthermore, it is stressed that I continue to build rapport with each child in the class, as this will make all teaching decisions more informed. This will enable me to have a greater understanding of the methods that motivate different children and remain open to the everchanging primary school classroom.

The research process also highlighted many strengths and limitations in the methods demonstrated. One of the main strengths was the observational assessments positive

impact on the motivation of the lower learner. The grid provided helped us identify the factors that show the children are engaged and enjoying their learning. Another strength of the research methods was the three-tier difficulty lessons planned, as they allowed us as researchers the opportunity to compare the engagement the children showed throughout the different stages of the lesson. The interview process was useful in finding out the ideas of the children about the improvements they would like to make and allowed us to discover their thoughts towards working in pairs. By using these answers and the observational notes, we were able to reflect on what was observed during the lesson and compare it to the thoughts and opinions of the focus children. However, as the children were of a very young age, some of the more in-depth discussions needed were difficult to obtain.

Conclusion

Conclusion:

To conclude, there are various strengths and limitations to pairing higher ability and lower ability children together. These can be seen in the completed Brookfield's (2005) four lenses reflection (see appendix E). Considering the impact on the lower abilities engagement within the lessons, it was evident that the constant engagement of the higher learner aided the engagement of the lower learner. This role proved to be important during the earlier stages of the lesson. However, at the end of the lesson, when the tasks became more difficult to complete for the higher learner, it was evident that the communication between the two had broken down. The reason for this being there was no knowledge base for the children to interact from. To summarise, the findings suggest that higher learners engagement has a direct influence on the lower learners, as they provided constant support throughout the lessons. The methods used for collecting data were effective, as they allowed us to monitor the engagement of the learner effectively. The observation grid focussed on motivation, using body language, work ethic, collaboration and quality of work to identify whether the children were engaged in the lesson. Recent research proves that this method is reliable and valid, as it is suggested this to be the correct method of measuring a child's engagement within a lesson (Marx et al, 1999). The interview process was effective in finding out what the children had enjoyed and what they would like to change in the future. The main limitation to the semi-structured interview was that the children found it difficult to answer some of the questions, leading the conversation in an opposite direction. In the future, it is important that the questions are child friendly however this may make it difficult to gain in depth detail.

We made the decision not to pilot the methods. Reflecting on this decision, I now believe that the use of a pilot study would have helped to eradicate the problems we faced when considering the difficulty of the activities planned. It also would have been useful to see the initial reactions of the pilot participants, as this would have provided an insight into how engaging the activities were. Furthermore, in future research, I will conduct a pilot study as this helps the researcher gain a greater understanding of the proposed methods.

In my next school teaching experience, this knowledge will help me to make more informed decisions across all aspects of day-to-day teaching. Regarding classroom arrangement, I now understand the importance of thinking through decisions and

tailoring them to the specific needs of the class. For example, the children who are more suited to sit together, the children who have behavioural issues and what lessons to implement them within. The process has proved the effect this has had on my current classroom, especially during the easier activities where the higher learner could explain their answers. However, for this to be implemented into the new placement classroom, it is important that I build a rapport with each child in the class to discover what they find interesting and motivating. In turn, this will allow me to create a new strategy that is more suited to the class that I am teaching as my decision will be more informed and unique to the classes needs at that current time.

If I had the opportunity of repeating this lesson, there are several things that I would change. As mentioned earlier in this section, I would undertake a pilot study, allowing me to identify the limitations prior to completing the research process. I would also make amendments to the interview process, as some of the questions were difficult to answer or didn't provide enough detail for the research. This means that I would have to make the questions more child friendly. I would have also observed the strategy in a variety of subjects, as this may highlight further strengths and limitations to the implementation of this method. The final thing that I would change about the lesson was the difficulty of the final activities, as all learners were observed to disengage from the lesson. In summary this research process has been successful in widening my knowledge of the topic and will help me in making classroom decisions in the future.

Recommendations:

There is currently a lack of research into the effect of pairing higher and lower learners together and the effect this has on motivation to engage within an activity. This suggests that more research needs to be completed in the effect different classroom arrangements have on the engagement of the lower learner. Going forward, it could be important for this method to be tried in a variety of different subjects throughout the curriculum. As I have previously stated, this will be more conclusive, as it would allow both readers and researchers to understand how and when using this strategy can be useful to your class. Also, more needs to be done to think of new ways to motivate lower ability children, as the teacher needs to be flexible and open to change in arrangements. This would promote good practice, as currently teachers have no training in this area. Another recommendation is gaining the thoughts the higher ability

learners have on the pairing system. Again, this would indicate if this strategy is useful for all children in the class, not just the lower ability.

Word Count: 6090

References

Reference List:

- Baines, E., Blatchford, P., & Kutnick, P. (2003). Changes in grouping practices over primary and secondary school. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 39, 9–34.
- BERA. (2018). *Ethical guidelines for educational research*. Birmingham: British Educational Research Association.
- Brookfield, S. D. (2005). *The power of critical theory for adult learning and teaching*, Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Bryman, A. (1988). *Quantity and Quality in Social Research*. 1st ed. London: Taylor & Francis.
- D'Mello, S. K., Picard, R., & Graesser, A. C. (2007). Towards an Affect Sensitive AutoTutor, *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 22(4), 53-61.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education*. 8th ed. London: Routledge.
- Cordingley, P., Bell, M. and Rundell, B. (2004). How does CPD affect teaching and learning? *Paper presented at the British Education Research Conference*, UMIST, Manchester.
- DCFS (2009). *Learning, playing and interacting*. Annesley: DCSF Publications.
- Denton, P. (1992). Seating arrangements for better classroom management. *Adventist Education*, 54(5), 29–32.
- Donaldson, G. (2015) *Successful futures: Independent review of curriculum and assessment arrangements in Wales*.
- Dudley, P. (2011). *How Lesson Study orchestrates key features of teacher knowledge and teacher learning to create profound changes in professional practice*. Presented at the World Association of Lesson Studies Annual Conference, Tokyo.
- Emmer, E. T., & Stough, L. M. (2001). Classroom management: A critical part of educational psychology, with implications for teacher education. *Educational Psychologist*, 36(2), 103–112.

Evertson, C. M., & Weinstein, C. S. (Eds.). (2006). *Handbook of classroom management: Research, practice, and contemporary issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

EWC. (2017). *Code of Professional Conduct and Practice for Registrants with the Education Workforce Council*. Cardiff: Education Workforce Council.

Farmer, T. W., Lines, M. M., & Hamm, J. V. (2011). Revealing the invisible hand: The role of teachers in children's peer experiences. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 32, 247–256.

Gest, S. D., & Rodkin, P. C. (2011). Teaching practices and elementary classroom peer ecologies. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 32, 288–296.

Gremmen, M., van den Berg, Y., Segers, E. and Cillessen, A. (2016). Considerations for classroom seating arrangements and the role of teacher characteristics and beliefs. *Social Psychology of Education*, 19(4), pp.749-774.

Hastings, N. and Schwieso, J. (1995). Tasks and tables: the effects of seating arrangements on task engagement in primary classrooms. *Educational Research*, 37(3), pp.279-291.

MacAulay, D. J. (2006). Classroom environment: A literature review. *Educational Psychology*, 10, 239–253.

Marx, A., Fuhrer, U. & Hartig, T. *Learning Environments Research* (1999) 2: 249.

McKeown, S., Stringer, M., & Cairns, E. (2015). Classroom segregation: Where do students sit and how is this related to group relations? *British Educational Research Journal*, 42(1), 40–55.

Sleeter, C. E., & Owuor, J. (2011). Research on the impact of teacher preparation to teach diverse students: The research we have and the research we need. *Action in Teacher Education*, 33, 524–536.

Trussell, R. P. (2008). Classroom universals to prevent problem behaviors. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 43, 179–185.

UWTSD. (2017). *Research Ethics & Integrity Code of Practice*. Swansea: UWTSD.

Wannarka, R., & Ruhl, K. (2008). Seating arrangements that promote positive academic and behavioural outcomes: A review of empirical research. *Support for Learning*, 23, 89–93.

Wood, P. and Smith, J. (2016). *Educational research: taking the plunge*. 1st ed. Camarthen: Thinking Press.

Zajonc, R. B. (2001). Mere exposure: A gateway to the subliminal. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 10(6), 224-228.