

**'A PLACE BEHIND TIME'**  
**THE NEW HISTORY IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS IN ENGLAND**

Submitted by Robert Frederick Siebörger

to the University of Exeter  
as a dissertation for the degree of  
Master of Philosophy in Education  
in the Faculty of Education,

September 1991

"I certify that all material in this dissertation which is not my own work has been identified and that no material is included for which a degree has previously been conferred on me.

.....(signature)"

## CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <i>Preface and Acknowledgements</i>  | iii |
| <i>Summary</i>   | iv  |
| <br>   |     |
| <i>Chapter One</i> THE NEW HISTORY FOR YOUNG LEARNERS  |     |
| The new history described  | 1   |
| The new history in practice  | 5   |
| Objectives   | 5   |
| The methods of the historian   | 5   |
| Skills and concepts  | 6   |
| Drama and empathy  | 9   |
| Conclusion   | 10  |
| Notes  | 11  |
| <br>   |     |
| <i>Chapter Two</i> THE PRIMARY SCHOOL EXPERIENCE: CONTEXT AND DEBATE                         |     |
| Context  | 15  |
| For the child  | 15  |
| For the teacher  | 15  |
| Debate   | 16  |
| Child-centred  | 16  |
| Development  | 17  |
| Discovery and experience   | 19  |
| Integrated curriculum  | 21  |
| Conclusion   | 24  |
| Notes  | 24  |
| <br>   |     |
| <i>Chapter Three</i> A CURRICULUM FOR THE NEW HISTORY?                                       |     |
| The post-Plowden curriculum  | 26  |
| History as content   | 26  |
| History as development   | 28  |
| History as skills and concepts   | 31  |
| History as integrated study or topic work  | 32  |
| Social studies and humanities  | 33  |
| Environmental studies  | 33  |
| Topic work   | 34  |
| History in the National Curriculum   | 35  |
| History as content   | 35  |
| History as development   | 37  |
| History as skills and concepts   | 37  |
| History as integrated study or topic work  | 38  |
| Conclusion: History as process?  | 38  |
| Notes  | 40  |
| <br>   |     |
| <i>Chapter Four</i> CASE STUDIES: THE SCHOOLS  |     |
| Research design  | 44  |
| The schools  | 45  |
| Schools where local history predominated   | 45  |
| Schools where history was integrated with other subjects as part of a general topic approach | 48  |
| Schools where history was taught through specifically historical topics                      | 49  |
| History as a time-tabled subject   | 52  |

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Notes   | 53  |
| <i>Chapter Five</i> THE TEACHER INTERVIEWS                                      |     |
| The backgrounds of the teachers   | 56  |
| Inspiration in history teaching   | 56  |
| Integrated topic work and subject teaching                                      | 58  |
| Innovation and the new history  | 60  |
| Barriers to innovation  | 62  |
| The role of textbooks   | 63  |
| Television and radio  | 64  |
| Objectives for Pupil Progress in Historical Skills                              | 64  |
| Notes   | 65  |
| <i>Chapter Six</i> THE PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRES                                     |     |
| Design and purpose  | 68  |
| The sample  | 68  |
| The content of the questionnaire  | 69  |
| The administration of the questionnaire   | 70  |
| Limitations of the enquiry  | 71  |
| Statistical procedures and analysis   | 72  |
| Analysis of questionnaire responses   | 72  |
| Section 1: Attitudes  | 72  |
| Section 2: Comparison of subjects according to<br>a criterion of interest       | 75  |
| Section 3: Written responses  | 77  |
| Section 4: Statements about history and the past                                | 80  |
| Section 5: Areas of content in history  | 81  |
| Section 6: The work that historians do  | 83  |
| Section 7: The vocabulary test  | 84  |
| Conclusions   | 86  |
| Notes   | 88  |
| <i>Chapter Seven</i> SIX YEARS ON   |     |
| The new history   | 90  |
| Primary practice  | 92  |
| Curriculum concerns   | 93  |
| 'A place behind time'   | 95  |
| Notes   | 95  |
| <i>Appendices</i>   | 97  |
| 1. Objectives for Pupil Progress in Historical Skills                           | 98  |
| 2. School D: Critical analysis of History, Geography and<br>Social Science 8-13 | 100 |
| 3. School D: Humanities course  | 104 |
| 4. School F: Humanities guidelines  | 105 |
| 5. School G: Social studies content summary                                     | 108 |
| 6. School H: History planner  | 110 |
| 7. Interview schedule   | 111 |
| 8. Pupil questionnaire  | 112 |
| 9. Statistical tables   | 121 |
| <i>Bibliography and list of references</i>                                      | 124 |

## Preface

The research for this dissertation was conducted during a sabbatical year in 1984-1985. As an overseas visitor, I was intrigued by two questions regarding primary school history which occurred to me soon after my arrival: 'Why was it so difficult to find the good history teaching about which I had read before coming to England?' and 'Why did it seem that the innovations I knew about in secondary school history teaching weren't present in the primary school?' The dissertation is, in part, my attempt to find answers to these questions.

Ideally this study should have been completed within a year of doing the research. Conflicting priorities in South Africa, however, made it difficult to complete it at an earlier date. Viewed positively, the delay has added an extra dimension to the study by providing an opportunity to investigate aspects of the National Curriculum process in primary history against the background of primary practice in 1985.

Note: Although the dissertation is concerned with primary history generally, only pupils in the final two years were involved in the questionnaire enquiry.

Cape Town  
September 1991

## Acknowledgements

I have benefited enormously from the enthusiasm and experience of Dr Jon Nichol, who has supervised this research. His teaching and classroom-based approach to the study of history in the curriculum have had a significant influence on my thinking.

To the teachers, headteachers and advisors who very willingly and sometimes with quite considerable inconvenience to themselves assisted me in the research for this study, I owe a great debt of thanks. Their practice has considerably enriched my own. I have endeavoured to maintain their anonymity.

The University of Exeter Computer Unit assisted me in preparing the questionnaire data for analysis in a most helpful way.

To my children, David (who asked at seven years, "Has that happened yet?" when told that a house we were visiting had been built in 1655) and Kathy (who asked at four years while we were visiting the white horse at Uffington, "Daddy, was it here yesterday?"), I owe the inspiration for wanting to research primary school history. Six years later, I thank David for typing some of the tables and drafts of sections of this work on a word processor.

## SUMMARY

The dissertation is a study of history in the curriculum of the primary school. The concept of the "New History" is used as the means of investigating the kinds of history teaching and learning which were current in 1985.

The research was conducted by means of ten small case studies of schools where there was believed to be good practice in history. Information was gathered mainly by teacher interviews and the administration of a pupil questionnaire of to the top two years of each school. The questionnaire covered a range of aspects including attitudes towards school and history, interest in history, a survey of popular content areas, a test of understanding of the work that historians do and a vocabulary test.

It is argued that the new history represents certain identifiable practices in history teaching, the most conspicuous of which are the idea that the process of learning about the past is intrinsically more important than its content, that the methods of the historian are used to enable pupils to enquire into the past, that skills and concepts are used in lesson and curriculum planning and that pupils experience the past through imagination, empathy and drama. Primary practice, it was believed, would readily accept of some of these ideas (some had had their origin in the primary school) but not necessarily all of them. The study discusses the way in which the new history, beliefs about the primary school and the process of curriculum development culminating in the National Curriculum history have interacted with each other and has as its central concerns the place of pupils and teachers in these processes. It is optimistic about the possibilities of the new history in the primary school, provided that the "place behind time" that children uniquely experience should never be lost sight of in the attempt to involve them in the process of being able to construct their own understanding of the past through focussed activities involving both content and historical sources in creative and imaginative ways.

## THE NEW HISTORY FOR YOUNG LEARNERS

Since the early 1970s the term 'New History' has conveyed a distinct shift in the teaching and learning of history. Significant changes have involved re-conceptions of the nature of history as a school subject, curriculum planning and examinations, the resources used by teachers, and the activities, concepts and skills which are taught to pupils. Seminal has been the relationship of teaching history in schools to the processes involved in executing it within the context of an academic domain.

### The new history described

The impetus for a change in history teaching came after warnings that history was on the defensive in the classroom and under attack in the staffroom from those who challenged its relevance. A new approach was needed if the subject was to continue to justify its place in the secondary curriculum. Mary Price sounded a clarion call in an article entitled *History in Danger* (1968). She wrote that "a wind of change is blowing" which threatened history because of the widespread perception among young school leavers that it was dull and boring, that syllabuses were often irrelevant and that teaching methods were orientated to dates, notes and textbooks. The remedies she proposed for pupils were that history should be used to explain the world that they were about to enter and that it should stir their imagination and curiosity. For teachers, she put forward the spreading of information and ideas through an association and a periodical, as a means of self-help. Martin Booth added to the sense of urgency that something needed to be done to rescue the subject with his study of the history curriculum, *History Betrayed?* (1969). It contained the seeds of future change in its investigation of the interaction between the curriculum and the examination system and its analysis of the way that teachers and pupils could encounter history through a greater appreciation of historical thinking. It was the perception that children could share in the learning experiences which *doing* history provided, using methods such as documents and archives, local history and an awareness of the way historians themselves find out about the past<sup>1</sup>, which began the new movement in history.

Other influences soon came to bear on the new history, partly as an attempt to justify it educationally and partly because of the need to be able to explain what happened when pupils began to use the methods of the historian in learning history at school. When R. Ben Jones sought to describe the new history in 1973, therefore, he located the change in history teaching within the field of curriculum development. Specifically, he identified the skills and objectives approach based on Benjamin Bloom's *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (1956) and Jerome Bruner's principle "that any subject can be taught in some intellectually honest form to any child at any stage of development" (1960:33) as being the foundations of the thinking of the 'progressive' history teacher, who no longer stressed the importance of knowledge, but depended more on methodology than content.

The new approach to history as he described it involved three aspects: a syllabus based on identifiable skills, selected by educational objectives, to develop the methodology of an historian; an emphasis on the process of learning, rather than the content; and the use of the enquiry method.<sup>2</sup>

The child is thus taught the skills of the historian and comes to think historically, not merely to regurgitate data and ready made conclusions. The mental training and broadening of experience that this makes possible is not only an excellent basis for academic historians but

a fine education for young people because of the overflow of skills into other subject areas (1973:14).

Jones had very little more to say about the nature of history, concentrating on the other two aspects. The process of learning as he conceived it had everything to do with cognitive and affective skills, and nothing to do with the processes of the historian. The enquiry method, he commented, was no innovation, but what made it new was the structuring of material in terms of skills and educational objectives. This influence was due in no small part to Coltham and Fines' (1971) *Educational objectives for the study of History*.

In 1975 Brian Scott attempted a more extensive description of the new history. He also accorded an important place to what he called the 'Gospel according to St Jerome' (Bruner), but placed far more emphasis than Jones had on the nature of history and the process of doing it - a rigorous methodology and the historian's process of enquiry. History also involved more than enquiry. It presented children with "experiences to be lived through", in Collingwood's phrase<sup>3</sup>. These experiences together with the enquiry process made a synthesis which should be studied each year by students following a spiral curriculum<sup>4</sup>. Three recent publications drew attention to important new areas for the new history: a Schools Council *History, Geography and Social Science 8-13* project booklet on key concepts<sup>5</sup>, Fines and Verrier (1974) *The Drama of History*, which explored the use of role-play in investigating historical material, and a variety of simulation games in history<sup>6</sup>. A list of some of the features of the new history as Scott understood them was appended to his article. One of the features included was "Acquiring cognitive skills and developing attitudes towards the study of history", but beside this no mention was made of the objectives and skills which Jones had emphasised. Instead, his list included: working on primary evidence, the historian's art as a detective, imaginary experience, understanding essential concepts, and "Gaining through empathy... a deepening appreciation of people, places and events, and their interrelationships" (1975:22).

Scott made no reference to the Schools Council *History 13-16 project* which had begun its work under David Sylvester at Leeds in 1972<sup>7</sup>, and published *A New Look at History* in 1976. The success of the project with teachers and pupils and the widespread use of its materials, in particular the 'What is History?' unit<sup>8</sup>, meant that for many the new history was to become permanently identified with Schools Council history. Denis Shemilt's evaluation of the project, published in popular form in 1980, clarified, in John Fines' words "the meaning in curricular terms of History as enquiry, History as time and History as motive", and for the first time elucidated "the meaning of conceptual learning in history" (1980:iv). It did far more, for it provided evidence that the new history worked in practice<sup>10</sup>.

The *History 13-16* project introduced a number of new aspects to the new history. Its rationale was the fusion of two ideas: that history should answer the personal and social needs of adolescents<sup>11</sup>, as a "useful and necessary" subject, and that for historical knowledge to be grounded in reason, something of the perspectives, logic and methods of history needed to be understood by pupils. This "mesh of adolescent needs with what the subject has to offer" (Shemilt 1980:2) resulted in a novel attempt to teach pupils what history was (and how an historian worked), together with a content structured on a variety of different types of historical study. As the course was to be examined at CSE and O-level, it brought into being a new, and experimental, system of assessment, including an unseen source materials paper. In terms of a philosophical justification of the place of history in the curriculum, the project clearly based itself upon Paul Hirst's (1965) notion of forms of knowledge. History was regarded as a form of knowledge which needed to be approached in its own distinctive way, and as a separate subject, rather than a component of an integrated scheme.<sup>12</sup> The project also provided a definition of history which emphasised the 'three Es' associated with the new history: an activity of *enquiry* into the past with *evidence* as its raw material which seeks to understand change and causation in time, and an activity involving particular events and people,

with whom the historian tries to *empathise*. ("The facts of history cannot be seen, they can only be appreciated by imaginative experience" 1976:17-18.)

As important as the new definition of the purpose of history, was the project's view of the content of the history curriculum. "The coherence was to be provided by the approach and the conceptual aims, not by syllabus *content*" (Smallbone 1987:143). The traditional chronological syllabus which emphasised a body of factual knowledge was abandoned in favour of themes and patches of history studied in depth. The relationship between content and a source-based approach to teaching history, however, was not explored in any detail in *A New Look at History*. The project team was content to observe:

The most obvious thing about history is that it is not a structural subject like physics. There is no body of knowledge with a coherent structure in history.... To summarise, history is a subject which has an immense variety of content but which lacks any structure which can dictate how this content should be studied (1976:16,18).<sup>13</sup>

P.J. Rogers' Historical Association pamphlet *The New History: Theory into Practice* (1979) was the first<sup>14</sup> major attempt to analyse the new history in terms of a philosophy of history and to demonstrate how it could be consistently taught in the classroom by means of Bruner's principle of spiralling. He argued that as an area of knowledge gained its coherence from both its propositional ('know that'), and its procedural ('know how'), character, adequate teaching could not be based on propositional knowledge alone. For pupils to gain 'know how' knowledge, there was no substitute for frequent practice in appropriate activities. Historical knowledge could be similarly divided into concepts, propositions and procedures. Concepts in history, he suggested, were not distinct, but continuous with general human experience<sup>15</sup>; propositions were essentially of a narrative nature, involving explanation, selection, and reconstruction from evidence with empathy; and procedures involved the techniques of using sources. To comply with the nature of historical knowledge, therefore, teaching had to promote confidence in skills of enquiry, the handling of evidence and the creation of genuine hypotheses through reconstruction. This could be made possible by 'spiralling' in Bruner's terms and the use of his three modes of representation: enactive, iconic and symbolic.<sup>16</sup>

Drawing somewhat ironically on Elton (1967)<sup>17</sup>, Rogers showed how children could work with evidence when the notion of spiralling was employed. Four criteria were considered: (1) that historical research consists of a comprehensive review of all the sources available; (2) that the historian's task is to ask questions of this evidence, rather than seek answers in the sources; (3) that evidence requires careful evaluation; and (4) that the right questions must be asked of the evidence. He admitted that the first and second criteria could not be met, as evidence would always be heavily selected for children, and questions deriving from the evidence would be asked by a teacher to be answered by the pupil - a travesty of the genuine historical enquiry.<sup>18</sup> But Rogers distinguished between real and mature history, indicating that school teaching involved steps towards the genuine experience, which in turn required instruction. If it was also a common part of an historian's work to have to select from a selection of sources, why should this not be spiralled down for children? Children needed help to ask the right (or any) questions, but once it was granted that the only way to learn to do so was by practice, there was no reason why children should not master some of these skills of the historian. The third criterion was the least likely to be feasible for children. The professional historian had a knowledge of the contextual evidence which children could never have. The answer Rogers provided was that it was better that children attempt their incomplete study of the past through sources than that they did not attempt it at all. Using sources to provide reconstruction via empathy was a powerful way of supplying the very contextual frame which they lacked.

Using similar arguments, Rogers proposed that other key features of history (concepts, propositions and procedures) might also be spiralled. There was an underlying optimism about the ability of



children to engage in meaningful historical enquiry which was born of the fact that they approached the past without inhibition and expectation.

Their saving ignorance makes children capable of attempting Elton's programme, provided of course that they are confronted with materials that interest them. And similarly Carr's [1964] insistence that evidence cannot but be in some degree selective, indicates, ...that the admitted need for sources to be pre-selected for children by no means establishes (as it is often claimed) that therefore source-based enquiry is, for children, a fraud or a pretence, for all evidence is selected anyway (1979:15-16).

The case studies used by Rogers to support his arguments were accounts of detailed projects undertaken by top junior children, engaged in aspects of the history of their locality. What he did not discuss in his monograph was how the new history accommodated the published collections of source materials, simulations and worksheets which rapidly became its most visible presence in the classroom.

Jon Nichol, one of the pioneer writers of these materials, supplied some of the answers. He proposed three linked ideas (1980b:27). First, that pupils engaged in a *pattern* of historical study which was similar to that followed by professional historians. It involved relating one's work to a publicly accessible body of knowledge, using one's "second record"<sup>19</sup> to handle the evidence of the sources, asking questions and recreating the historical situation. Secondly, evidence in the classroom was usually edited, having been changed from a source into an educational resource. This might require one of four different levels of pupil involvement, ranging from the heavily modified, transcribed and edited, to the photocopied manuscript used in its archival context. Finally, using evidence in the classroom involved co-operative learning between teacher and pupil. The teacher provided the resources and a 'surrogate' second record to create guidelines for the pupils to enable them to engage meaningfully in the historical process.

Nichol's focus on the teacher's surrogate second record and the co-operative aspect of the study of history as important parts of the historian's concern, highlight a learning relationship which contrasts markedly with that of the familiar teacher-as-expert role. Viewing the teacher as a facilitator was a step towards the process model which the *History 13-16* project envisaged when it recommended that "classroom methods should be favoured which create an active learning situation for the pupil, rather than those which cast the teacher in the role of a transmitter of information" (1976:48).

The characteristics of the new history as described above had been identified by the early 1980s, though important debates about their relative significance still continue. They may be summarised for the purposes of this study as follows: (1) the process of learning about the past is intrinsically more important than its content, and can be guided by the use of educational objectives; (2) the methods of the historian are used to enable pupils to enquire into the past; (3) skills and concepts unique to history are used in lesson and curriculum planning; (4) pupils experience the past through imagination, empathy and drama; (5) content is studied in depth in themes, topics and patches; (6) teaching is resource based, using reproduced documents, artefacts, pictures, simulations and computer software to provide the materials for historical inquiry; (7) teachers are seen as facilitators rather than experts, and learning is often a collaborative experience.

The second part of this chapter considers the first four of these aspects in the context of the primary school. The curriculum is the theme of Chapter Three, while the case studies in Chapters Four to Six raise the issues of resource materials and pedagogy.

## The new history in practice

The ideas of the new history filtered gradually down to the primary school. While there have been few systematic attempts to teach the new history as such, aspects of it have become familiar in primary classrooms.

### *Objectives*

The educational objectives movement had much less impact on primary education than on secondary education. Though Coltham and Fines had not excluded younger children from the behaviours they described, their framework of objectives was mainly intended for more advanced learners. Despite this, primary teachers attending a course on educational objectives and curriculum planning led by Coltham in 1973, concluded,

...no objective was regarded as inappropriate. Even comparatively sophisticated skills like 'inference' could be achieved with carefully structured material and concepts like 'authority' could be made meaningful by role play or dramatic reconstruction.... The chief difficulty seemed to be the devising of materials which will encourage the achievement of particular objectives at specific levels of ability (Historical Association 1973:2).<sup>20</sup>

As Steele (1982:158) has noted, the major importance of the work of Coltham and Fines was in getting teachers to think carefully about what they were trying to achieve in their teaching, which "led to a heavy emphasis on the processes of deductive thought and skill acquisition." Fines (1981:8), in retrospect, acknowledged that by their nature behavioural objectives were best at describing skills, and had found that one of the ways in which he continued to use the framework was to relate a particular piece of teaching to the whole by means of allied activities and other learning skills (1981:9).

### *The methods of the historian*

The analogy of detective work has been used in primary schools to introduce the methods of the historian to children. Jamieson's (1985) book *History Detective* begins with "A murder mystery" which requires children to find clues in a drawing of a sitting room. The exercise ends as follows: "A history detective also gathers evidence after an event has taken place. Many of his methods are similar to those of the crime detector but his aims are different." Predictably, the next exercise in the book is based on the Schools Council *History 13-16* body in the bog activity. The "history detective" according to Jamieson, is "trained in special skills and makes sure of the facts" (1985:19). *Place, Time and Society* popularised a dustbin exercise, where pupils were asked what they could learn about their family by looking at the clues in their dustbins in Sherlock Holmes fashion (Waplington 1975:19). Thinking about the contents of the dustbin in this way was likened to the way in which an archaeologist thinks about his problems.

Using "evidence" in the classroom is probably the most obvious way in which the new history has influenced history teaching in the primary school, though the research studies<sup>21</sup> and debates which accompanied its introduction in secondary schools have been absent. The ILEA curriculum guidelines, *History in the Primary School* (1980), place "a concern for evidence" first in a list of the attitudes which history can develop.

Evidence may take the form of, for example, something in print, a landscape or a building, an artefact or a map, pictures (still or moving), or memories of people still alive. Children can learn to distinguish between different forms of evidence and their reliability. Through the study of a range of evidence they can learn that more than one point of view may be

expressed and that historical statements made about such evidence are, therefore, always tentative and provisional (ILEA 1980a:4).

Noble (1985:17), in an unacknowledged reference to the above description, comments that "All children need to appreciate that what we know about the past depends on evidence." They need to develop critical thinking, should be aware of how facts come to be known, and, "Opportunities should be taken to describe the skills a historian uses in relation to evidence" (1985:17). As has been the case with secondary teaching, there has often been very little distinction made between "evidence", "sources" and "clues".<sup>22</sup> An example of this confusion in a book for primary pupils is Hall (1989), *Evidence for Starters*. The book again begins with a clues / detective exercise, which leads to the introduction of sources. This section is followed by a sentence where "evidence" is evidently used as a synonym for "sources": "Having looked at different kinds or varieties of sources we are now going to look at some of the problems of using evidence" (1989:25). As Shawyer, Booth and Brown (1988:212-213) conclude from their survey of research on source-based work in schools it is not only the confusion over the purpose of using sources that has been problematic, but the fact that so little is known about how successfully children can handle sources and how they can progress from one level of understanding to another.

Using evidence in primary history has been closely allied to the use of concrete aids to teaching - handling artefacts from the past, visiting old buildings, sites and museums, handling pictures and documents. Children have been encouraged to observe, to talk about the historical source and to use it as a "clue" to finding out something about the past for themselves. In a study of how they could use artefacts obtained from the Bristol museum in history lessons, a group of Avon history teachers let pupils working in groups unwrap unknown artefacts, discuss them and try to identify their purpose. They would also try to date them, draw them and write a story about them (Johnson 1983).<sup>23</sup> A similar practical means for children to use evidence in primary history has been through oral history, often allied to the study of the locality. The benefits of the approach are enthusiastically acclaimed by Ross (1984:31):

By allowing children to take on a genuine investigation in this way, giving them access to real data, we encouraged them to act as historians. It seems that the best way to acquire the skills and attitudes that historians have is to practise them in a real enquiry. Oral history presents a rich field for such investigation, and one that is immediately and excitingly available to the young child.

### *Skills and concepts*

The focus on skills and abilities peculiar to history originally owed much to Coltham and Fines. They sought to describe the main cognitive behaviours involved in studying history "in terms of skills and abilities, which are necessary for the effective study of history" (1971:16). In doing so, they arranged the skills in a rough hierarchy of: vocabulary acquisition, reference skills, memorisation, comprehension, translation, analysis, extrapolation, synthesis, judgement and evaluation, and communication. The first three and the last categories described behaviours which they considered necessary at any age, while the others were arranged in the order in which they were likely to be encountered when doing history. Not all of them would be easy for younger learners, but some of them, such as the identification of component parts in *analysis*, would be. An important aspect of their list of categories of skills, unlike many others which are not specifically history based, is that practice in all the skills is required at all stages. They envisaged that it might be necessary in the beginning to practice a skill in isolation, but, as experience grew, they expected that skills would come to be used increasingly in combination with each other.

*Place, Time and Society 8-13* developed the idea of using skills as a framework for deriving objectives for teaching and curriculum planning in primary schools. The project distinguished

between intellectual, social and physical skills, many of which could be applied to primary school history, but were not intended specifically for it. The main skills relating to history were:

The ability to find information from a variety of sources, in a variety of ways [Intellectual 1];  
 the ability to evaluate information [Intellectual 4];  
 the ability to exercise empathy (i.e. the capacity to imagine accurately what it might be like to be someone else)[Social 4];  
 the ability to plan and execute expressive activities to communicate ideas and feelings [Physical 4]. (Blyth, W.A.L. et al 1975:10).

The project is probably best remembered, however, for its identification of "key concepts"<sup>24</sup>, "to help teachers choose, and organise, actual topics for work with children... which would help build up ideas relevant to one or more of the key concepts" (Blyth, W.A.L. et al 1975:11). The seven concepts could all be associated with history, though the three 'methodological' concepts, "Similarity/Difference; Continuity/Change; Causes and Consequences" have been regarded as being more specifically historical than the 'substantive' concepts of "Communication", "Power", "Values and Beliefs" and "Conflict and Consensus". While the key concepts drew attention to important aspects of the past, and became a standard part of the rhetoric of history guidelines, their use by teachers as a practical means of planning history lessons was far less widespread.<sup>25</sup>

Using a description of skills to identify what children could (or should) be doing in history at different age levels was explored by Sylvester (1980). He asked whether history teachers really knew what progress in history was, and offered a chart of skills which teachers could use "to give account of what their subject contributes to the education of the young" and to show pupils "what things they can do as a result of studying history" (1980:29). The table of "Objectives for pupil progress in historical skills" listed skills in seven different areas at five age levels, each two years apart, beginning at eight years. The skills included "Reference and Information finding; Chronology; Language and historical ideas; Use and analysis of evidence; Empathetic understanding; Asking historical questions; Synthesis; and Communication using basic ideas".<sup>26</sup> As a summary of the skills of the new history and as a non-content based description of a 5 - 16 curriculum in history, the chart was very influential. It directed teachers to the use of skills as criteria for assessment and was a forerunner of later profiles and records of achievement in history.

A well-known project which employed primary source material and skills and concepts together to investigate children's "ability to understand the concept of historical evidence and apply it to a sense of time" was John West's *Dudley Project*, "Children's Awareness of the Past"<sup>27</sup>. At the end of the research stage of the project, he was able to identify five main concepts and five main skills to be developed by historical studies in the primary school. The concepts were: evidence (its availability, accessibility and nature); authenticity of evidence (with possibilities of falsification or error); change and difference over time; time-placing (sequencing) of events; and contemporaneity of evidence with event. The skills included: research and book skills; close observation and awareness of clues; deduction from the clues; linguistic expression of findings; and mathematical calculation of time (West 1981b:5). He found that the children's conceptual or reasoning ability had not fundamentally changed, nor had they gained a significantly better sense of time as a result of his research programme. But what had changed remarkably was the "development of skills of linguistic expression, of specialized vocabulary and ability to sequence recognizable items, most particularly in picture form" (West 1982:34).

The Dudley children, at seven to eleven years of age, had convincingly proved that they could confidently reflect upon the problems of first-hand evidence and test the implications of its authenticity and its contemporary, first- or second-hand nature. These children had

grown to meet a new range of historical experience; our high expectations of their eventual success in handling primary sources was fully justified by their performance (1982:35).

The value of these conclusions<sup>28</sup> was two-fold. West provided evidence similar to Shemilt's with adolescents that primary pupils could work meaningfully with source material in history, and that there were historical skills, however they were described, which could be developed by young children, and employed by teachers as a basis for their history teaching.

As these examples have shown, it is difficult to distinguish an approach to history teaching which is based on specific historical skills from one which uses a general skills approach across the primary curriculum. Knight (1985) has pointed out that the language of skills is often ambiguous and that there is no common agreement about which skills are which, whether they can be arranged in taxonomic form, or whether it is valuable to consider them without reference to content. In history, he argues, skills are means to achieve ends, but they lead to studies being valued for their means, not for their ends.

Moreover, it leads to planning taking place in isolation from questions about the ends of studying history... On the one hand this is inefficient. To be of worth 'know how' has to be gained by working on real, not out of context and artificial problems. On the other hand it saps a study's distinctiveness. If a form of knowledge is no more than a vehicle for skills, then it is to a greater or lesser extent replaceable, according to how distinctive its load of skills is (Knight 1985:38).

Jenkins and Brickley (1986), in an article on A-level history, go further, to question the whole foundation of the skills emphasis in the new history. They assert that skills-based approaches to history cannot do what they claim, that they will not produce young historians, and that they prevent a real understanding of how histories are made. Much of the blame for this situation is placed on Coltham and Fines<sup>29</sup>, for having perpetrated two errors. The first was to concentrate on specific skills in isolation from the social context and the structures which gave rise to the writing of history; the second, that the skills which they identified were not history skills per se, but rather more general educational skills, which stopped short of introducing children to historical methodology (Jenkins and Brickley 1986:5). Lee had previously written of the danger of the position that anything might be taught as long as it exemplified the "skills" of history, because a choice would still need to be made about what was important, and that, given the nature of a discipline, there were criteria of importance in history which had to be learned (Lee 1984:16).<sup>30</sup>

The dangers which they perceive at the top end of the school are even more apparent in the primary school. Non-specialist teachers teaching history<sup>31</sup> in close association with other areas of the curriculum will be inclined to want to teach using broad categories of skills, which are not necessarily historical, nor consider the context in which history is written.<sup>32</sup> In essence, the training of primary teachers has not involved them exercising their skills within the context of historical investigation. They are given no real insights into the modus operandi of the historian, elements of which can inform their working with children. A contrast to this is the approach illustrated by Rogers (1979) as an example of the new history in practice. It is not based on skills, but depends rather on the notion of spiralling procedural and conceptual understanding to determine what is appropriate knowledge for the pupils. His procedure is one with which many teachers would feel comfortable, i.e. that skills are derived from the experience of the history, rather than the history being prescribed by the skills. Classroom practice, then, is likely to differ substantially from what the theory of "skillology"<sup>33</sup> determines in history. An example of how history can be defined as a process in which skills are learning outcomes can be seen in the context of drama.

## *Drama and empathy*

It is questionable whether the use of drama to teach history ought to be considered an aspect of the new history or not. Unlike the teaching of empathy, it is not a method or set of ideas which has developed from a consideration of the work of the historian. The links between drama and empathy in history for young learners are, however, very strong, as Fines and Verrier (1974:89) pointed out, and as teachers of drama have eagerly endorsed.<sup>34</sup>

Fines and Verrier (1974) wrote *The Drama of History* as a manual of "co-operative teaching" by a drama specialist and a history specialist, who had spent a good deal of time together working with primary pupils. Their experience showed them that there was a close relationship between history and drama, particularly when history was no longer regarded as a mere accumulation of facts. They believed that,

This new history curriculum is more active than passive, and in it the children are taught the skills of the historian and given exercises in which they may practice them. The objectives become more and more precise in such a curriculum, and much more closely related to the practice of the craft than to the acquisition of knowledge (Fines and Verrier 1974:83).

As an example of what they meant, they provided a list of ten objectives, "to describe the activities of the historian that the children must undertake if they are to achieve a full understanding of the work we were to do with them." The objectives included, recognising that people's views would have been different from those of today; searching out evidence, processing and comparing it; and producing an account which was as fair as possible to all the sources (1974:84) Their unique contribution to history teaching was to incorporate the idea of working with documents or producing documents in the drama teaching situation.

Drama in history, Little (1983a:12) asserts, is "invaluable in convincing children of the reality of the past, in offering opportunities for historical thinking and the controlled use of the imagination". She argues the case for drama in the primary school on the basis that much of a teacher's work is concerned with presenting history to children, and the dramatic narrative captures the essence of history; that drama introduces an element of action and conversation; that simulations and role-play provoke historical thinking skills; and that "problem-solving" drama forces children to see historical situations in three dimensions and work out the implications of the facts they discover. Involvement in drama also stimulates research, which is both precise and can "sometimes bring a deepening of awareness, a penetration at the subjective level, which may not have occurred at the preparation stage" (1983:16). Children learn most effectively through personal involvement, Wilson (quoted by Klein 1990:30) believes, and "Drama is the best means of enabling children to come to terms with alternative views and interpretations."

The use of history to experience empathy with people in the past has been widely debated since the new history popularised "empathy" as an objective<sup>35</sup>. While issues of determining levels of empathetic understanding and the assessment of empathy are of central concern in the secondary school, in the primary school the issues are more likely to have been whether what is implied by empathy is any different from imagination or creativity<sup>36</sup>, and what it was that made it a distinctively historical activity. For younger learners it has also had a very important practical aspect, as Reeves (1980:29) indicated:

...history as the experience of standing in other people's shoes instead of our own is relevant in the sense that it provides experiences which, because they are, or can become, enjoyable, are taken into the imagination and enrich the whole personality. ...my main contention is that the young can enjoy historical worlds other than their own and that we deny this nourishment to their imaginations at our peril.

Empathy in the primary school has been variously described as "a capacity to imagine what it might be like to be someone else in a past age" (ILEA 1980a:5); "close identification with another person, so close that the child who empathises steps into the clogs of the millworker..." (Thompson 1983:22, with reference to *Place, Time and Society 8-13*); and "a chance to imagine what it was like to live in the past and... to develop an active sympathy with and curiosity about the past" (West 1986:7). Empathy thus described falls far short of what the HMI envisaged in their (1985) description:

Historical empathy is the ability to enter into some informed appreciation of the predicaments or points of view of other people in the past. It depends on an imaginative interpretation of evidence and in particular, on an ability to be aware of anachronism and to imagine historical circumstances the outcome of which could not be known at the time. Empathizing is not the same as identifying with, still less sympathising with, people in the past; it is simply a word used to describe the imagination working on evidence, attempting to enter into a past experience while at the same time remaining outside it (DES 1985:3).

Likewise, if one were to consider the three obstacles which Cairns (1989:17) identifies as impediments to pupils achieving "a significant level of empathy", namely, a distinct self-awareness, a lack of self-other discrimination and a limited set of experiences to set against the events and situations of another age, it is obvious that young children are unlikely to achieve much empathetic understanding in history.

The problem of uncontrolled imagination is countered by what Rogers (1987b:35) refers to as "enabling knowledge", which provides insights into what was possible and probable from sources. Without this knowledge there can be no empathy, but with it young children may be in a fortunate position, for "they are shielded from the possible distorting effect of hindsight by their ignorance" (Rogers, P. 1987b:36), as they do not know what the outcome of an event was. Cooper (1984:36) has shown that, while in the beginning young children might not even be able to achieve "everyday empathy"<sup>37</sup>, history teaching can be planned to enable a progressive development of empathy from the point where it is "difficult to put self in another's place" to being able "to see a situation from several viewpoints, both sides... or different interpretations of a personality."<sup>38</sup>

Knight (1989c) has, with the benefit of hindsight, comprehensively reviewed the literature on the use of concept of empathy in history teaching. His opinion has changed from what it was in 1984, when he commended empathy warmly as marking "another of the discipline's contributions to the curriculum" (1984:28) to that of believing that it is "a profoundly unhelpful term, particularly in history" (1989c:49). Clearly, however, empathy, in whatever confused or ambiguous way it is defined, has served a different and less prominent purpose as an objective in the primary school from that which was suggested for it in the secondary school, one which is closely related to the developmental level of the child.

## **Conclusion**

The new history covers a range of beliefs and practices polarised between the skills and process schools. They share certain emphases, however, including the pupils' active involvement with source material and the development of skills and historical knowledge of both a conceptual and procedural kind. The formative influence of the Schools Council *History 13-16* project meant that the new history was associated initially with the secondary school, but, as has been shown, key aspects of the new history were employed at primary school level from an early stage.

While it has been possible to document some of the ways in which the new history has been introduced to young learners, the primary school context raises two important issues for the new history. The first is the extent to which it can be accommodated within the philosophy of the primary school; the second is what curriculum provisions can be made for the new history, in schools and nationally. These issues are the subjects of the following two chapters.

---

## Notes

1. Jones, G.E. (1970:64). An article on 'Archives in School' (Fines 1968) had been published alongside Price's article in *History* and Douch had published a detailed monograph on the teaching of local history in 1967. Gosden and Sylvester (1968:48) suggested among many practical ideas for doing history with average children that "the first and main method of teaching history is to teach it as it is known to historians as a way of finding out, of selecting and writing about events in the past."
2. Aldrich (1984:210) used this description as a working definition of the new history in his study of the history curriculum since 1910. His thesis was that the new history was a response to the problems of a particular age, characterised by comprehensivisation and the new CSE examinations in 1965. Inquiry methods, the use of sources, historical skills, educational objectives and learning 'how', he argued, were not in themselves new. See also Aldrich and Dean (1991:103-104).
3. Quoted by Gosden and Sylvester (1968:17).
4. The notion of a spiral curriculum is that basic ideas are taught in an intellectually honest way to young children and are revisited, built upon and redeveloped during later schooling (Bruner 1960:13, 53).
5. Waplington (1975). The project was later known as *Place, Time and Society 8-13*.
6. Longmans (1973). Nichol (1974),(1980a) and Birt and Nichol (1975) provided the rationale for simulation in history.
7. See Sylvester (1973) for an early statement of the project's goals.
8. *What is History?* introduced pupils to history about individuals in the past, history as detective work, historical evidence, problems of evidence and asking questions of the past. The detective analogy [employed by Collingwood (1946:266f)] became popular, especially for younger pupils. Its usefulness was challenged by Plowright (1983) on the basis that it obscured the task of the historian and reduced history to the solving of detective puzzles.
9. In Slater's (1989:3) words, the project "sums up what is often called the new history." It is ironical in a sense that this should be so, for Price had considered "a Nuffield" as a remedy for history and had concluded that: "Salvation for history does not lie that way...." (1968:346).
10. The most significant conclusion of the evaluation was probably that, "...*History 13-16* on the basis of the trials phase, presages nothing less than a revolution in history teaching. Examination stream children can be taught to think, come to understand something about 'what history is really about and what historians do', and can do all this within the context of a viable examination course" (Shemilt 1980:38).



11. Little (1990:323) refers to this as a "learner-led" as opposed to a "content-led" curriculum.
12. Shemilt (1980:4). I find no reference to Hirst in *A New Look at History*, though the project philosophy is obviously influenced by Hirst's forms of rational knowledge (amongst them history) which have their own central concepts, have a distinctive logical, structure, are testable against experience and have developed their own particular techniques and skills for exploring experience (1965:129). Shemilt makes no mention of the fact that Hirst later removed history from the seven forms of knowledge, its place being taken by "our awareness and understanding of our own and other people's minds" (1970:63 and see 1974:86).
13. Rogers (1987:34) refers to the 'enabling knowledge' needed in order to put the right questions to sources. The National Curriculum History Working Group found it useful to distinguish between knowledge as information, knowledge as understanding and knowledge as content, and argued that in history the essential objective was the acquisition of knowledge as understanding. Knowledge as understanding could not be achieved without information, but the learning of facts alone was not in itself sufficient for understanding (DES 1990a:7).
14. His chapter on the nature of history in Dixon (1972) is an earlier version of some of his arguments.
15. This view corresponds with that of *History 13-16* (1976:16). Hallam (1982:135), in a reference to Rogers (1979), quotes Scott (1981:14) in support of the opposite view, viz. that there are organising concepts, such as cause, effect and motive in history.
16. Rogers examines in some detail four prevalent approaches to teaching history (the chronological, line of development, free enquiry and 'patch') and the work of writers such as Coltham and Fines, and finds each inadequate ultimately because it lacks the combination of source methods together with spiralling.
17. Elton in a much discussed essay wrote that "the whole concept of historical study in schools is distorted by being assimilated to a concept proper to quite another compartment of historical studies, namely that rightly prevalent at the universities" (1970:221).
18. De Marco (1989) strengthens Rogers' argument by suggesting that though the sources are selected, the evidence is not selected by the teacher. "The nature of the evidence which emerges from the sources will only be determined by the pupils"(1989:25).
19. The term coined by Hexter (1971). The second record is "everything that historians bring to their confrontation with the record of the past." "Potentially... it embraces his skills, the range of his knowledge, the set of his mind, the substance, quality, and character of his experience - his total consciousness" (1971:103,104). Dickinson, Gard and Lee (1978:10) discuss the relationship of the second record to the objectivity of the historian, both in providing subjectivity and in shared public understanding.
20. Interestingly, it was a group of secondary teachers on this occasion who questioned the desirability of seeing history as a separate discipline, which was implicit in the objectives approach.
21. Notably Dickinson, Gard and Lee (1978) and Shemilt (1987). Shemilt proposes four stages of development in adolescents' understanding of sources and what historians do: Knowledge

of the past is taken-for-granted; Evidence = privileged information about the past; Evidence as a basis for inference about the past; Awareness of the historicity of evidence.

22. See, for example, Portal (1990:6-7). Hinton (1990a) makes the distinction clear for children. He states, "Historians use historical *evidence* to construct a picture of the past. They find the evidence they need to do this in *sources*. A source is anything which survives from the past or tells us about the past" and, "A source is not the same thing as evidence. A source becomes evidence if it is used to answer a question about the past" (1990a:4,5). In the accompanying resource book for teachers, Hinton explains: "The distinction between evidence and sources is an important one because sources are merely the raw material of an historian; only when they are appropriately interrogated will they yield evidence" (1990b:7).
23. See also Davis (1986) and (1987), and Hodgkinson (1986) for descriptions of children engaging in historical enquiry using sample artefacts.
24. Elliott (1977:15) in a project publication on concepts explained, "In selecting a set of key concepts we tried to dovetail them with objectives relating to the development of skills, and the fostering of attitudes and values. Teachers found key concepts useful in developing with children the skill of being able 'to organise information through concepts and generalisations' and also in developing the skill of 'setting up hypotheses which children could question and test.'"
25. See, for instance, the testimony of the teacher at School D in Chapter 5.
26. See Appendix 1. The initial version of the chart (Sylvester 1980) covered the ages 12 to 18, and contained a category for historiographical skills, which were only regarded as appropriate at 18. The chart was subsequently published in DES (1985:16-19), where the authors commented that "these skills will serve pupils as well as adults in weighing evidence, making informed judgements and deriving pleasure and added interest from the events and environments that surround them."
27. West (1984:32), which is in part a reply to Rogers, G. (1984). In this article West explains that the Dudley Project involved three phases: the research investigation, an LEA in-service exercise in curriculum development in history and the publication of a teachers' guide and guidelines for history planning (reviewed by Fines (1982:38). A more recent publication is the Timelines history scheme (West 1986), which used pictures to organise children's experiences of the past. See Chapter 3 for the curriculum implications.
28. Based on his PhD thesis, West (1981a). See Knight (1989b) for a fresh assessment of the ability of junior school children to "have a sufficient, essentially untutored understanding of people in the past".
29. They do, however, recognise the value of Coltham and Fines' work in introducing to the classroom the idea that the content of history was not unproblematic, and that history was something which was constructed by historians (Jenkins and Brickley 1986:4-5).
30. See also Lee (1991:48f).
31. Sudworth (1982:16), in an article analysing primary history teaching since 1960, commented:
 

The non-specialist primary school 'history' teacher is still subject, perhaps even more so, to the arguments of various approaches to the subject which have not enabled

teachers and those responsible for organising schools to focus in any concentrated way.

32. The importance of context is discussed by Rogers, P. (1987b:35f). Noble (1985:21) suggests that the way to treat skills in primary history is "to talk of developing , extending and practicing skills that already exist rather than of teaching new skills", by using historical material.
33. Jenkins and Brickley's (1986) term.
34. May and Williams (1987) and Wilson and Woodhouse (1987), (1990) for example.
35. Coltham and Fines (1971:7) used the term "imagining" as the objective to describe the behaviour which they regard as one of the attitudes towards the study of history. An aspect of imagining is empathy, which they defined as "'the power of entering into another person's personality' and 'imaginatively experiencing his experience'". For summaries of the debate about empathy, see Slater (1989:7f), Jenkins and Brickley (1989) and Knight (1989c).
36. Jenkins and Brickley (1989:19) argue that primary school pedagogy largely explains how empathy became part of the curriculum: "We are thinking here of those imaginative leaps demanded of children in order to imagine that they are (say) a fox, a snowflake... such appeals are to make children feel involved, to personalise teaching and learning." Low Beer (1989:11) makes clear the distinction between empathy in history and imaginative exercises in the following statement: "In the end empathy exercises are ways of making sense of... historical evidence and coming to see that at other times, in other contexts, things were different. The experience of role-play and dramatisation may well be useful in this learning process."
37. The first of the three levels of empathy identified by a Southern Regional Examinations Board working party (SREB 1986:11). The second and third are stereotype and differentiated historical empathy.
38. Compare Sylvester's objectives for empathy in Appendix 1, which show a similar progression.

**THE PRIMARY SCHOOL EXPERIENCE: CONTEXT AND DEBATE****Context**

History in primary schools takes a variety of forms of classroom organisation and activity. At the two extremes are the traditional and the progressive classrooms. The traditional classroom relies upon patterns of teaching handed down from generation to generation of teachers through their own experience as children. The progressive classroom draws upon a tradition of its own, based on the Plowden Report, which in turn relies upon the findings of twentieth century psychologists. The accounts below are based on observation in two different English classrooms.<sup>1</sup>

*For the child*

Two schools, two worlds. In the first, rows of individual tables neatly arranged facing the front, pupils working from textbooks, a buzz of conversation. The second, pupils everywhere, busy doing things, talking to each other, writing, painting, arranging. Both classes were engaged in history.

History, it seemed to the children in rows, was something which was written down and could be read about. The teacher was needed to help one understand it and the information was organised in a particular way. Doing it involved some difficult words and understanding pictures of old times. It was a subject, and there were times set aside to do it, just as there were for maths. What one might do with it in the end was not clear - there was nothing on the walls of the room to tell.

To the pupils walking about, history was something one wrote or made after one had found out about it. There was enjoyment in it and one shared with other children what one was doing. It was easy to explain to a visitor what you had done and to show how it was going to be displayed, but one didn't know everything about what the other groups in the room were doing. For some, clearly, history was more interesting than for others - it involved much more reading and more things to make. History on this day was all day. It was near the end of term and what had been done in 'topic' time was going to be shown to parents.

*For the teacher*

The teacher in the formal classroom seemed satisfied with what his pupils were doing. He wasn't a history person, but the textbook was a widely used one, and the information it provided gave his pupils a good outline of English history in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Teaching history in this way meant that each pupil knew what was expected and that he had the opportunity of explaining things to the class as a whole. History was not a very important part of the school's curriculum, but there was a carefully worked out guideline for it and a set time of the week for teaching it.

In the open classroom the teacher was difficult to find. She disappeared from view every couple of minutes as pupils came to her to ask for help with what they were doing. Except to dismiss the class, she never spoke to the whole group. There was no board to face and even chairs were in short supply. Her activity was to encourage, to monitor, to provide materials and help interpret information, sometimes to individuals, but usually to small groups. There was a strong sense of her overall plan in what the children were doing, perhaps more obvious to an adult than to one of them.

But for her enthusiasm and planning very little of the activity would have taken place. The day itself did not appear to be following any particular design, but the activities were.

## Debate

The two situations have in common that they are both in primary schools within classes where a teacher has responsibility for 'teaching history' - and seemingly little else. What then of the shared ground which lies at the heart of primary school practice? The child is said to have a pivotal place in what Alan Blyth has described as a "balanced interaction between development and experience" (1985:43), there is a belief in learning for its own sake, a far less differentiated, more integrated, approach to the curriculum than is found in secondary schools, and the teachers are acknowledged as experts not in specialised subject knowledge, but in their knowledge of and concern for their pupils. The two classrooms highlight the fact that despite the discourse of a commonly accepted philosophy of primary education, the reality may be different.

The *context* of the classes shows how the primary school curriculum can accommodate very different types of history teaching. The *debate* is to what extent the new history has a place in primary schools such as these. Four of the central tenets of primary practice: child-centredness, developmentalism, learning by discovery and experience and the integrated curriculum are considered separately to explore the implications which teaching aspects of the new history hold for pupils and their teachers.

### *Child-centred*

"At the heart of the educational process lies the child", was the carefully chosen opening sentence of the Plowden report (DES 1967:7). Education should be "in harmony with the nature of the child" and "fundamentally acceptable to him", the paragraph continued. Beginning with the child means in principle that children are given wide freedom of choice within an arranged environment, they are allowed to follow the natural course of their interests without arbitrary interruption, they learn by discovery rather than by instruction and they are allowed a considerable measure of self-expression (Dearden 1976:51). Alexander (1984:15-19) demonstrates how child-centredness has developed within its tradition a language and style of its own. It speaks of children not subjects<sup>2</sup>, experience not curriculum, learning not teaching, understanding not knowledge - going so far, he avers, as to place the experience of the primary school at variance with what are basic educational concepts. These beliefs are apparently widely accepted by primary school teachers, an orthodoxy of theory which dare not be challenged.

It is in the translation of ideology into practice that the false dichotomy between child and teacher-centred education becomes apparent. Teachers are responsible for classes of children, not individuals alone and they need to make generalised assumptions about what the interests of their pupils are, and how they should arrange their learning experiences. They need to be able to anticipate needs before they are expressed in order to provide resources; they desire to stimulate curiosity to allow for a kindling of interest; they are concerned about social interaction within groups which needs to be carefully structured at times; and they find a tension between teaching what they enjoy and listening to what their pupils want.

To cope with these dilemmas teachers have attempted to individualise their teaching, use group work, and plan curricula which create opportunities for children to explore their own areas of interest. Topic work which integrates knowledge from many different areas is used to facilitate the range and depth of children's interests. The difficulty is to promote learning which is child-centered and yet seen to relate to the overall educational needs of society. Boyd (1985:19) suggests the reality is that "teachers are more likely to provide for certain learning activities through the materials and equipment they make available and that children will be guided towards suitable

choices" (my emphases). If this is the case, then much child-centred education has depended not so much on understanding children and their interests, but on teachers' perceptions of how they can be child-centred in their teaching. Every teacher responds to the dilemmas in a different way, and for this reason it is not easy to classify the teaching styles employed by primary teachers with any sense of certainty<sup>3</sup> In summarising what has been learned about teachers and their teaching since the Plowden report, Galton (1987) suggests that the changes which have occurred have mainly concerned the organisational structure of the classroom and far less the curriculum content and teaching and learning processes. It is in this crucial area that there is considerable discontinuity because of the ways in which different schools interpret ideas about informal approaches to learning, as teachers "try to find a balance between the imposition of authority at one extreme and pupil autonomy at the other" (1987:81).

The new history conflicts with aspects of the ideology of child-centredness in two important ways. It is an attempt to learn about the past by using a variety of learning activities which reflect the underlying patterns of thinking involved in "doing" history. These patterns of thinking are, at a primitive level, those of the adult academic historian.<sup>4</sup> Secondly, it relies on the mediation of the teacher for such learning to occur - to train pupils in using the basic techniques of the historian, and to provide and explain the evidence.<sup>5</sup> Teachers whose teaching styles do not admit this intervention will find the new history unacceptable in the primary school. If it is accepted that the emphasis is shifted to the child as an active agent in its own learning, participating in a range of thinking and learning activities which are traditionally associated with adults, then working with sources from the past can make history come to life.

For pupils, working with sources provides the opportunity to participate in a whole range of recreative activities from spontaneous drama through the production of chronicles, collages, models and pieces of written work. It allows exploration, coming to conclusions - which may be just as valid as the ones which adults make - and using one's imagination to make guesses about the many areas for which evidence is missing. For teachers, there is a great variety of historical content available, which can be approached at different 'depths', there is a range of different classroom activities, and the focus, if not child-centred, is person-centred, encouraging understanding about ourselves and others. If, as Pring (1978:25) suggests, the process of solving problems by inquiry is the root of all subject matter, the new history enables the teacher to present children with suitable resources to help them with their own inquiries into what they find of value. Whether some types of inquiry are more suitable for children at different stages than at others, leads to the consideration of the child's development.

### *Development*

A belief in individual development has been central to the philosophy of progressive primary education. It has been traced by Blyth (1965-II, 1985) from Rousseau, through Pestalozzi, Froebel and Montessori to Kieran Egan's *Education Development* (1979). At the most elementary level, development is a biological metaphor, the child growing and being nurtured as a plant is. In its more complex manifestations development is an important aspect of the theories of Piaget and Bruner. The Plowden report accepted dogmatically that "teachers must rely... on their general knowledge of child development" (DES 1967:196). This implied the use of a concept of readiness and, the "detailed observation of individual children for matching their demands to children's stages of development" (ibid). Primary teaching has been strongly influenced by this belief and many teachers have come to accept that there is a naturally ordered sequence of development which varies from child to child but follows similar stages throughout. The child's capacity to learn is determined by the stage which has been reached.

Key aspects of the belief in development have been challenged in the past two decades. It has tended to discount social influences on children by stressing 'inner ripening' (Peters 1969:10) and

since sociology of knowledge theorists have demonstrated the social construction of knowledge, developmentalism has become less popular. The role of peer interaction as a facilitator of learning is now increasingly stressed, with the emphasis on children learning as groups instead of merely working as individuals within groups. The reliance on Piaget's theories<sup>6</sup> of cognitive development has been strongly criticised, as many studies have led psychologists to decide "that Piaget's notion of step-wise stages is wrong", Sylva (1987:9) concludes in a survey of post-Plowden research. Also, the practice of 'readiness' in schools has been questioned. Bruner has called readiness "a mischievous half-truth" which impedes the potential progress of a child through artificially holding him or her back, because it turns out that one teaches readiness or provides opportunities for its nurture, one does not simply wait for it. Readiness in these terms consists of the mastering of those simple skills that permit one to reach higher skills (1967:29).

The complexity of making decisions based on 'readiness' is highlighted by Dearden (1968). He queries whether the conditions of readiness are necessary or only desirable, whether they can be actively brought about or must be waited for, and by which values the conditions of readiness are held to be desirable.

After these challenges have been faced what remains of the theories of development which have guided primary teachers? Despite his reservations about readiness, Dearden holds on to a belief in the growth of an "ideal of personal autonomy based on reason" (1968:46). Growth in the child is from within, in contrast to moulding from without, and as children progress, they begin to make considered choices and accept responsibility for them. In his concept of an 'enabling curriculum', Alan Blyth (1985) sees a balanced interaction between development and experience, where experience describes the sum of all the events which make up an individual's world. In such a curriculum, development and experience interact together in the lives of children in at least six elements. They are, growth, health and movement; communication; interpretation of the world; vision and imagination; expression and appreciation; and values and abilities. It is the dynamic relationship between development and experience which makes possible Blyth's approach to the curriculum, which "cannot be left entirely to an arbitrary process of discovery which, in practice is often devoid of purposive sequence or structure, or of the expertise needed to guide, interpret and stimulate that discovery" (Blyth, W.A.L. 1985:48).

In contrast to this view of developmentalism and readiness that sees great danger in a lack of sequence or structure, it is as likely that there are teachers who are inclined to over-categorise in terms of predetermined developmental stages, a view which has become enshrined in the prescriptions of the National Curriculum. Alexander (1984:27) states that in practice an acceptance of developmental stages can become not a way of understanding children, but a way of defining childhood which excludes alternative perceptions and understandings. Classifications based on an implicit acceptance of a child's development are popular: lists of concepts and skills, matrices, and profiles. For Alexander the classification itself is problematic, and the use of the word development "at best misleading and at worst evidence of self-deception on a large scale" (1984:27). The relationship between developmental psychology as a science and primary school pedagogy is explored by Walkerdine (1984). She exposes the process by which developmentalism has provided the system of classification and observation monitoring which is used extensively in primary classrooms. Even where teaching is not child-centred, she argues that the parameters of practice "are given by the common sense of child development which is everywhere, in apparatuses from teacher-training to work-cards, to classroom layout" (1984:162).<sup>7</sup>

If what matters most is what primary teachers practice, rather than what they are said to believe, there are many ways in which the new history can be, and has been, utilised within a framework which recognises development as part of the educational experience of children. Objectives, frameworks for pupil progress and the spiral curriculum<sup>8</sup> are all applications of developmental principles.

The emphasis on sources and evidence may additionally provide the rational basis for the development of the personal autonomy which Dearden seeks, and a growth in conceptual thinking, which Rogers (1979:56) describes as

a capability hastened by, and firmly grounded in that constant use of (simple) sources and broaching of (simple) conceptual issues (... ) which has characterised their [the pupils] earlier studies - the more limited and concrete aspects of which gradually drop out as the study proceeds.

There is a link between development and child-centred teaching which Margaret Donaldson finds in the guidance which a child receives towards tasks which can be done well but not too easily, where creative solutions need to be found, such as those which the new history posits:

...human children are plants with only one 'natural' way of growing. They are beings of richly varied possibilities, and they are beings with potential for guiding their own growth in the end. They can learn to be conscious of the powers of their own minds and decide to what ends they will use them. However, they cannot do this without help - or at least it would be a long slow business and few would make much headway (1978:122).

The fostering of this pedagogical relationship relies heavily upon the notion of the child as discoverer.

### *Discovery and experience*

Edith Moorhouse, in one of a collection of essays eulogising primary practice in England edited by an American academic, described the principle "that children learn from experience, from exploration, and from active participation in discovery" (1970:4) as underlying the teacher-pupil relationship. The following essay in the collection was devoted to how children took responsibility for such learning. Its key thoughts were characteristic of progressive teachers at the time:

...what matters is not what we learn but how we learn it

...children themselves are good judges of what they need to learn

Primary-school teachers no longer think that basic skills have to be learned first and then used to acquire knowledge or develop understanding. They find that children learn these skills more easily and effectively in... investigating... and trying to find answers to the problems they encounter from time to time....

...children can be responsible only for what is in their capacity... Teachers must retain responsibility for determining the areas within which children's decisions are desirable and effective (Muir 1970).

Primary teachers had been taught similar beliefs since the Hadow report (1931) stated that "curriculum is to be thought of in terms of activity and experience rather than of knowledge to be acquired and facts to be stored". Plowden elaborated:

The sense of personal discovery influences the intensity of a child's experience, the vividness of his memory and the probability of effective transfer of learning. At the same time it is true that trivial ideas and inefficient methods may be "discovered". Furthermore, time does not allow children to find their way by discovery to all that they have to learn. In



this matter, as in all education, the teacher is responsible for encouraging inquiries which lead to discovery and for asking leading questions (DES 1967:201).

This view has been regarded as being oversimplistic, and not reflective of the complexities of the social milieu which makes up the classroom environment. Dearden (1967, 1968, 1976) has set forth reasons for criticising a doctrinaire belief in discovery and experience. He distinguishes between three kinds of discovery: the spontaneous discovery of pre-school children intent on exploring their environment, abstraction by means of which children are taught to conceive of their environment in specific scientific ways, and the kind of discovery learning prevalent in primary schooling, when the teacher "questions, discusses, hints, suggests, and instructs what to do to find out" (1967:154). For the third type of discovery, he can find little apart from the stress on first-hand experience and greater adaptability to individual differences to set it above "intelligent instruction". The grounds he offers are that children need to be provided with theoretical concepts in order to make sense of, and expand their inquiry; that children do not usually develop their own abstract concepts even when given structured environments; and that any theoretical study of mathematics, history, and science is dependent on "developing the appropriate forms of understanding" through instruction (1968:128). Dearden concedes, however, that motivation is a crucial element of discovery learning when combined with the aim of being able to learn independently. In his less analytic later book, he acknowledges that if a teacher is successful in achieving this, then discovery learning is a valid method amongst others (1976:83).

The notion of experience as a wider concept embracing discovery has been part of the mainstream of progressive primary philosophy since Dewey. Seen as the sum of the subjective influences which impinge upon a child's life at school, it is also viewed as the beginning of a lifelong process of learning. Blenkin and Kelly (1981) incorporate development with experience in a process model of curriculum planning for the primary school. If children develop by structuring their own knowledge and learning how to go on doing so, then "knowledge cannot be acquired by imposition from outside but only by experience; truth can only be discovered by successful experimentation and problem solving" (1981:100). The teacher's planning should take this process into account. By a knowledge of her children and a warm relationship with them, she will be able to support their interests, foster enquiry, through themes and topics, and provide a context for learning. The approach, they suggest, is diagnostic of various processes, rather than prescriptive of end results.

While he accepts the necessity of combining development and experience in the primary curriculum, Blyth (1985) fears that the process framework requires too much of the teacher, who must be both a curricular analyst and a social analyst, an expert in both curriculum and in children.<sup>9</sup> Process is accorded an important place in his enabling curriculum, but he would like to go further. The curriculum would enable development and experience to take place, would enable children to become people with individual values, and enable choices to be made based on the emerging values and ideals.

What place is there for the approach of the new history within the traditional primary paradigm of discovery learning, and a curriculum based on experience together with development? The principal objection to using the new history in both contexts is that it is too rigorous for children's interests and abilities. At its most stark, history expects an accuracy and correspondence to evidence which is beyond primary children. The argument runs that to attempt to introduce it would be to destroy the spontaneity and motivation which are an intrinsic part of the moment of discovery or creation, for Dearden is correct in his insistence that certain concepts need to be the subject of instruction as well as exploration, and detailed planning and teacher-knowledge can easily be seen as "impositions on children, constraining their drive to find out through discovery" (Boyd 1984:71).

Studies of primary teaching styles and curriculum practice have, however, consistently shown that only a minority of teachers implement progressive, Plowden-style discovery methods. Campbell

(1985:28) summarises the evidence available, and concludes with the observation that the studies have also unintentionally shown that progressive practice is only operable by the most talented and industrious teachers. Barker Lunn's estimate in 1984 was that,

...the most recently available evidence shows that the vast majority of junior school teachers are firmly in control of their classrooms. They determine what activities their pupils will undertake; they prefer a didactic approach rather than a reliance on discovery methods; they are making increasing use of class teaching; and there is no need to exhort them to go back to basics (Barker Lunn 1984:187).

The majority of teachers, then, would appear to have no practical objection to adopting a modified style of discovery learning, which allows pupils choice and initiative, but is dependent on a teacher's guidance and structuring. To those who operate within the process model, the new history offers a very wide choice of chronological and thematic content, and many opportunities for integration with other activities. Indeed, the possibilities of integrated work are considered by some to be the main contribution which history can make to the primary curriculum.

### *Integrated curriculum*

The Plowden report appears to be somewhat ambiguous<sup>10</sup> about what has since become one of the most important characteristics of primary practice: the integrated curriculum. The ideology behind it is clear, however, as Morrison (1989:99) indicates. If the development of a child's autonomy is important, should the child's world be structured in terms of subjects? Unlike other aspects of child-centred education, teachers have been largely successful at abolishing traditional subject classifications and replacing them with a variety of topic and integrated approaches.<sup>11</sup> Schools Council Working paper 75 sets out a typical justification.

Young children have little experience and limited ability to generalize. The range and depth of their generalizations increase with experience, and they acquire the ability to handle more complex ideas and form concepts only as they reach the later stages of their primary education. Young children need many varied experiences and the opportunity to explore and learn from these experiences in ways which lead them gradually to understand how adults usually organize knowledge (1983:25).<sup>12</sup>

Topic or project-centred teaching which is used most commonly to integrate areas of teaching in history, geography and science is typically described as having the following amongst its aims: It develops an all-round education and encourages children to work harder and to participate more actively in the learning process; the work, rather than the subject becomes important; knowledge is brought together in an integrated way which more nearly resembles everyday experience and it can be pursued in a wide variety of child-directed ways; and by doing topic work, children learn to inquire and to learn for themselves (Stewart 1986).

There are generally recognised problems associated with topic work. The first is the lack of agreement about what it is and how it can be identified, together with a lack of clarity about the terminology employed. Tann (1988:25) discusses the mismatch between children's and teacher's perceptions. For children topic work seems to be knowledge orientated (finding out), done individually, using books to do writing, which is then placed in a folder. Teachers, on the other hand, see it as process orientated (how to learn), collaborative group work, done as part of the development of general study skills. It is difficult for teachers to know how much planning and guidance to give and how long a topic ought to run without unnecessary teacher interference. Trivialisation is a common danger, both when children use their own initiative, and when teachers seek to extend and integrate projects too widely. The description of Pat Kendall, written as a beginning teacher, has a very familiar ring to it:

I am dubious as to the value of the type of project where the child sets out to find all he or she can about a particular person or event. Unless one is very careful one simply ends up with a lot of neatly or not so neatly copied out information which obviously means very little to the child (1972:48).

Content, is perhaps the most obvious problem area: repetition of topics done in previous years, choices which are made to suit the teacher's interest or tied to a television programme. The question of standards and assessment is a hidden problem, which, according to Leith (1981), teachers seem reluctant to recognise. There is a basic enigma in the fact that teachers value the project highly as a teaching method, but are not prepared to assess it as a measure of pupil progress. Morrison (1988) argues that this attitude has led teachers into the dangerous position of seeking to serve two masters, by adopting the skills-based approach in the hopes that it would satisfy both their child-centred views and the necessity for assessment in the National Curriculum. He warns that the consequences could, however, be to render teachers to become disempowered managers of children.

A comparison of a topic-based curriculum with a subject-based curriculum reveals important differences in learner perceptions and experiences. Topics will give more individual freedom and scope, a wide range of areas to explore, and less teacher control in all phases. Subjects will give more unified content, structures within which to work, and place far more reliance upon the teacher. The central issue, as Alexander (1984:27) states, is which is more in the educational interest of children, a structure for defining childhood, or a structure for conceptualising ways of knowing and understanding? In seeking a possible reconciliation between the two approaches, he examines the inconsistency which exists in the view of teachers that there is no link between a child's cognition and an adult's knowledge. The connection, he believes, lies in a full understanding of the psychology of child-development.<sup>13</sup> What is needed is an approach which combines the strengths of both methods. This may be found in the creative work of curriculum projects such as Place, Time and Society 8-13, in its attempts to explore curriculum experiences "which are meaningful and valid by both 'adult' and 'child-centred' criteria" (1984:29).

The change in the title of the project from History, Geography and Social Science 8-13 is, as much as anything else, an indication of how earnestly Blyth and his project team attempted to find the middle way between a topic-based and a subject-based curriculum in the middle school years. An early article sets forth the relationship which the project explored: formal education had consisted of subjects which were "pumped full of the findings of research and then sprayed over the children" (Blyth, W.A.L. 1973:70), but some had always felt that children ought to be more like discoverers, and the suggestion had now been made that children should actually be the discoverers. Real discovery depended on a thorough prior acquaintance with the accumulated achievements of mankind, particularly in the areas of history, geography and social science, where the data was society itself.

For here, in a very special sense, children have to find their own personal location and here in particular, their approach is poles apart from the skills and concepts and motivations of the scholar; yet they depend on the outcome of his scholarship for the success of their own adjustment. (Blyth, W.A.L. 1973:70)<sup>14</sup>

For this reason the project distinguished between disciplines and subjects, disciplines being the repository of high-level knowledge and skill, and subjects being the areas associated with them studied at school. Disciplines were resources of the curriculum (whether taught by subjects or in an integrated way), though they were not the only resources. The project was sensitive both to the fact that the disciplines of social science were of a relatively recent origin, and that disciplines themselves were social constructs. Concentrating on disciplines rather than subjects, however,

would assist with the abandonment of the view of subjects as fixed, essential bodies of content, would make the project accessible to a wide audience of teachers, and would help them to interrelate rather than integrate areas of knowledge. Such an approach would respect the distinctiveness of each discipline without considering it in isolation. Confirmation that the project tended to lean more to the 'adult' than the 'child-centred' approach is found in the insistence that the additional resources used by children which lay outside the disciplines needed to be interpreted through the disciplines, for " ...without the structure and skills and methodologies of those disciplines, the significance of such supplementary personal information would be largely overlooked" (Blyth et al 1976:34).

Blyth and his team did not attempt to discuss the nature of curriculum knowledge in terms of Hirst's 'forms of knowledge' analysis. Their use of the word 'discipline' bears some relation to a form of knowledge, but it is not closely defined, nor governed by its own logic and specific characteristics.<sup>15</sup> While, as Dearden (1968) shows, the debate about forms and fields of knowledge has relevance to the primary school, it is not as important as it has been to the secondary curriculum. The debate at primary level is about whether one ought to teach in a way which acknowledges adult classifications of knowledge and introduces children to them, or not. Alternatively, whether there is a middle way whereby children engage in meaningful activity which originates from teacher planning and can ultimately be placed within an existing discipline, but retain significant control over their own inquiry.

Alexander's detailed discussion<sup>16</sup> of the factors involved in an integrated vs. subject approach may be used alongside that of Place, Time and Society 8-13 to support the position of the new history in the primary school. He advances three grounds of argument: that generalising about an integrated environment does not necessarily imply an integrated approach to the curriculum, as the environment is only integrated if one chooses to view it that way; that the concepts and constructs which children use to make sense of the world are rooted in language and culture, and "A topic using an undifferentiated, common-sense mode of inquiry is no more 'natural', no less 'artificial' than a history lesson" (1984:71); and that, while the representation of subjects as collations of inert and meaningless facts deserves criticism, the concepts and frameworks they provide are fundamental ones.

A broader aspect of the integrated curriculum which Alexander was also anxious to expose was that it was not nearly as unified as it might first appear. There was a common cleavage throughout the primary school between the so-called basics (language and mathematics) which were treated in a subject-centred way and the rest of the curriculum which was not. This had important implications for time allocation (the basics can easily demand more); a coherent view of knowledge (the basics are closer to a 'received' perspective, the rest to a 'reflexive' perspective<sup>17</sup>); a child's view of the curriculum (work vs. 'topic work') and the status of the class teacher's professional knowledge (a need for greater specialist knowledge beyond the basics).

How can the new history be accommodated within this debate? Some observations can be made. First, the idea that 'we teach children, not subjects' is a gross over-simplification of what happens in the primary school curriculum. The fact that the new history may be perceived as discipline-bound and imported from the secondary school, is not reason enough per se for denying it a place in the primary school, particularly as aspects of the new history, such as drama, have their origin in primary practice.

Secondly, there are good reasons for holding that children need to be introduced to adult ways of classifying knowledge, particularly at the top end of primary school. If this is accepted, then it is impossible to ignore some of the advantages contained in teaching the new history. Hamlyn's comments with regard to mathematics, one of the basics, apply equally well to history: "the best person to say how the teaching of say, mathematics should proceed is the mathematician who has

reflected adequately, and perhaps philosophically on what is involved in his own subject" (1967:43).

Thirdly, history, as Blyth et al have shown, can be interrelated with other subjects, without losing its distinctiveness, though this is not easy, and might require a more specialist training and specific type of topic-work.

Fourthly, rather than being a threat to the ideal of an integrated view of the environment through a topic-based approach, the new history provides children's work with a structure and methodology which would help remove some of the problems associated with topics.

## Conclusion

Without the description of the contexts given at the beginning of this chapter, the debate it contains would be sterile. There is a sense in which all informed writing on the primary school needs to say "go out and look for it", for the experience of primary education is so varied that it is impossible to generalise. Where it is found, it can be described and analysed, as the case studies attempt to do in the succeeding chapters. The justification for the new history in the primary curriculum rests on the philosophical positions debated here, the types of history curriculum that may be encountered and the lived experiences of the pupils and teachers.

---

## Notes

1. The descriptions in the following four paragraphs are hypothetical, based on observation of classrooms at schools during the research for this study.
2. As an example of the pervasiveness of this belief among teachers, Knight (1991:130) found that a research sample of 28 primary teachers tended to see themselves as "teachers of children rather than teachers of a subject."
3. Richards (1982:16-17) summarises attempts to do so. The ORACLE researchers denied that any of the teaching styles they had identified could be matched with those of Bennett (1976)(Galton and Simon 1980:39). Their own classification of four styles of teaching, the fourth of which is called 'Style changers' (who fall into three sub-groups) illustrates the difficulty of classification.
4. The difficulty is exacerbated if teachers, as is so often the case, draw on their own experiences of studying history as adults and regard them as normative for children. "To assume that adult study easily translates into young children's learning is to misunderstand the qualitative differences between the two" (Morrison 1989:99).
5. Sources, the interpretation of evidence, the context of the past and frames of reference, for example, all require a teacher's assistance.
6. Sylva (1987:9) quotes Bryant's (1984) observation that it is very surprising that teachers should have paid so much attention to Piaget, for, at bottom he had little respect for teachers.
7. Young (1985:61), however, defends the study of child development by primary teachers in a period of decline, arguing that child development is not necessarily linked to child-centred education, as it is concerned with description and analysis, not pedagogy.

8. Modified in the form of a cone and helix by the National Curriculum History Working Group (DES 1990a:6), it was used to describe the relationship between a broadening accumulation of historical information and a growth in understanding and historical skills as the pupil moves from 5 to 16.
9. The problem was clearly apparent in the *Place, Time and Society 8-13* project (see Appendix 2).
10. "...we stress that children's learning does not fit into subject categories" (DES 1967:203) stands in contrast to Chapter 17 of the Plowden report, which treats subjects separately. "History may be studied in its own right or as a dimension of the many topics in which children are interested" (1967:230).
11. Barker Lunn found, for example, that about 15% of a sample of 2500 teachers taught history and geography as separate subjects, 30% taught them as part of a broader subject, such as environmental studies, and 50% combined both approaches (1984:184).
12. See Tann (1988) for full discussion of the rationale for topic work.
13. He argues that Piaget and Bruner did not postulate that the concrete-to-abstract sequences ended in childhood, but were recurrent in adulthood. Thus, the psychology of child development did not support an adult - child dichotomy in learning (Alexander 1984:29).
14. The same view echoes again in Blyth and Derricott (1985:21):  
 However gamely they [children] pursue their own explorations, they must come to a point of interest at which they begin to think like scientists or mathematicians or historians or artists or the protagonists or the many other ways of understanding that characterise the cumulative intellectual achievements of mankind.
15. See Boyd (1984:48-50) for a description within the primary school context; and Hirst (1965,1970,1974). The project's use of the term 'discipline' is probably closest to Hirst's second meaning, "If the term is defined as equivalent to a form or sub-form of knowledge in its widest sense, whereby all elements of human consciousness are locatable somewhere within the forms because of the concepts employed, then all education necessarily has objectives taken from the disciplines" (Hirst 1974:98).
16. Alexander (1984). The discussion is contained under the following chapter headings: 'Knowing and understanding children: From subjects to developmentalism: a new compartmentalism' 25 -27; 'The class teacher and the curriculum: The unified curriculum' 60-75; 'Change and the primary school: Expertise: specialists in a generalist culture' 186-193.
17. Eggleston's (1977) terminology.

## A CURRICULUM FOR THE NEW HISTORY?

This chapter surveys the attempts which have been made to justify the place of history in the primary school and describe a curriculum for it.<sup>1</sup> It considers post-Plowden curriculum developments and history in the National Curriculum within four curriculum types, providing the context for the analysis of the case studies in the following chapters.

### Between Plowden and the National Curriculum

#### *History as content*

In her review of the trends in history syllabus making in the primary school, Joan Blyth categorises the dominant approach of the method books of the 1950s as "structured and didactic, laying down one scheme for recommendation, and on the whole, adopting the chronological/English history content" (1989:14). This is the tradition of C.F. Strong<sup>2</sup> and R.J. Unstead<sup>3</sup>, whose books on history and the teaching of history in the primary school shaped the thinking of many teachers.<sup>4</sup> Strong especially favoured a syllabus filled with the stories of great men and women. His suggestions were so comprehensive that it is difficult to imagine that a teacher could have done justice to them. They stretched from Ancient Greece to the Commonwealth, with the majority of time being devoted to the history "of our own land" and the district. Unstead proposed what he called "a very simple and straightforward, even an obvious scheme" for juniors, as follows:

First Year:

...from Early Man in the Stone, Bronze and Iron Ages to the Ancient Britons, then the Roman Occupation and the Saxon and Danish invasions.

Second Year:

...the Middle Ages, from the Norman Conquest until the time of Caxton.

Third Year:

...the Tudor and Stuart period.

Fourth Year:

...certain aspects of the Georgian and Victorian eras, with some topics, such as cars and aeroplanes, that carry them to the present day (1956:15).

As he explained, the scheme had the merit of being amenable to a "topic" approach to history, and maintained a chronological design without "careering across the centuries" to pick out specific characters or follow the dictates of a particular "line of development". There was enough time in a term to allow in-depth activities, such as reading and model-making (1956:16). As such, it was a significant improvement on many previous syllabuses, because it combined activity with the content approach.

The content-based syllabus has remained influential with teachers, though it has gradually become less popular and, given a choice, the content is less likely to emphasise a chronological national history.<sup>5</sup> An example of a content-based approach adapted to include family and local history is found in Noble's (1981) guidelines for the lower and upper junior years. He justified his approach to content on the basis of a research study<sup>6</sup> which had shown that when teachers chose content they did not relate it to any particular curricular aims. While he rejected a narrow nationalistic selection of content, he believed that "The idea that 'content is simply a medium', a means to an end, not in other words to be valued for its own sake, is naive and simplistic" (1982:17). It was important to give teachers a content framework to work from to help them to avoid repetition and achieve

"balance", to give a child cultural referents and an understanding of his own position in time, and to create a useful basis for the skills and concepts to be learned. In order to rationalise content selection, he drew up the following list of criteria for the selection of content, by which he attempted to satisfy most of the common justifications for teaching history.<sup>7</sup>

- i. Content should be biased towards English history. [Working from 'where we are now']
- ii. At least one perspective that is not national should be included. [To avoid a nationalistic approach]
- iii. An attempt should be made to sample ancient, medieval and modern history. [A rule of thumb to avoid covering too much]
- iv. Some history that can be personally related to the child should be included. [Family or local history]
- v. Unprofitable repetition should be avoided.
- vi. The early secondary syllabus should be considered.
- vii. Fortuitous events which might give rise to valuable historical work should be utilised [The good teacher should be able to capitalise on the happy accident](1985:24-25).

Based on these criteria, Noble constructed a curriculum which included,

#### Years 1 and 2

Early Man; Ancient civilization (Egypt or Greece); Family history; Norman Conquest; Medieval village or town (local church); Voyages of discovery. [A minimum of four of the topics to be covered.]

#### Years 3 and 4

Local history - industrialisation; the American West; the Roman Empire; the Seventeenth Century; School study journey; Alfred the Great - story approach. [A minimum of five of the topics to be covered] (1985:37-38).

A considerably less Anglo-centric rationale for content selection is that which was employed by Fines (1981b). He used the concept of "fairness" as a key to giving "children a taste of history of all ages and all places, and of history of all types (economic as well as political, religious as well as social)". As an example, he provided the following syllabus:

#### Age 8-9 Topics from:

term one: Prehistoric Babylon, Egypt and Persia; term two: Greece, Israel and Rome; term three: China, India and Byzantium

#### Age 9-10 Topics from:

term one: Islam and Medieval Christianity; term two: Medieval England, Japan and Pre-colonial Africa; term three: Reformation; 16-17th century European sovereigns and pre-Columbian America

#### Age 10-11 Topics from:

term one: imperialist development; term two: the growth of industry; term three: French revolution

#### Age 11-12 Topics from:

term one: Russia in this century; term two: war and technology in the twentieth century; term three: Hitler's Germany (Fines 1981b:22).



One of the main ways in which the content-based curriculum has been perpetuated has been through schools television and radio<sup>8</sup>, as can be seen in Table 1, which summarises the broadcast curriculum between 1981 and 1985.

Table 1: Schools Programmes for 9-14 year olds 1981 - 1985

| SUBJECT                                  | BBC TV  | ITV                        | BBC Radio  |
|--|---|----------------------------|--|
| <b>LOCAL HISTORY and the environment</b> |   |                            |  |
|  | <i>History Around You</i>   |                            | <i>History Long Ago:<br/>History of London</i>   |
| <b>EARLY PEOPLE</b>                      |   |                            |  |
|  | <i>Out of the Past:<br/>The Iron Age</i>  |                            | <i>Man</i>   |
| <b>NATIONAL HISTORY</b>                  |   |                            |  |
| Romans                                   | <i>Resource Units History</i>   |                            | <i>Radio History:<br/>Romans in Britain</i>  |
| Saxons and Vikings                       |   |                            |  |
| Normans & Middle Ages                    | <i>The Middle Ages<br/>Zig-Zag: The Normans</i>   |                            | <i>History Long Ago: The<br/>Middle Ages<br/>Radio History: Medieval<br/>to Tudor</i>            |
| 17 <sup>th</sup> Century                 | <i>The History Trail:<br/>The Puritan Revolution</i>  |                            |  |
| Georgian times                           | <i>Out of the Past The<br/>History Trail:<br/>Hungry London</i>                                   |                            | <i>History Long Ago:\The<br/>18<sup>th</sup> Century<br/>The Napoleonic Wars</i>                 |
| Industrial Revolution                    | <i>The History Trail:<br/>Empire and industry 18<sup>th</sup><br/>Century<br/>Out of the Past</i> |                            |  |
| Victorian times                          | <i>Out of the Past</i>  |                            | <i>History Not So Long<br/>Ago:<br/>The Victorian City<br/>Victorian Children</i>                |
| 1 <sup>st</sup> World War                |   | <i>How we used to live</i> | <i>Early this century</i>  |
| Between the wars                         |   | <i>How we used to live</i> | <i>The Twenties and<br/>Thirties</i>   |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> World War                |   |                            | <i>World War II</i>  |
| Post-war                                 |   |                            | <i>Britain since the war</i>   |
| <b>WORLD HISTORY</b>                     |   |                            |  |
|  | <i>Resource Units History<br/>The Greeks (x2)</i>   |                            | <i>Radio History<br/>The American West<br/>America 19<sup>th</sup> Century</i>                   |
| <b>THEMES IN DEVELOPMENT</b>             |   |                            |  |
|  | <i>Merry Go Round:<br/>Roads</i>  |                            | <i>History Long Ago<br/>A History of Railways<br/>History Not so Long Ago:<br/>The Motor Car</i> |
| Sailing Ships                            | <i>Out of the Past: Brendan<br/>Voyage<br/>Merry Go Round:<br/>Sailing Ships</i>                  |                            |  |

Several features are discernible. It concentrated on national (particularly English) history, with an emphasis on the more recent past, as might be expected from the greater availability of audio and visual material for such programmes. There was very little world history, and, during the four years under review, there was very little ancient history. Though possible to construct further themes in development from individual programmes, there was not much emphasis on this approach. The way in which most of the series were compiled made it difficult to use the programmes as a focus for integrated topic or project teaching with a historical core, as opposed to subject teaching. With the exception of the Saxons and Vikings, the coverage of many of the popular content areas was thorough, and, provided that the teacher had access to copies of programmes broadcast in previous years, it would not have been difficult to draw up a syllabus using television and/or radio throughout as its basis, as was done with the *Oxford Junior History* (1980).<sup>9</sup>

Another source of information about the form which the primary history curriculum should take is the LEA guidelines for history. History as content was not a popular approach in the guidelines of the early 1980s. Although some guidelines mention examples of a chronological British history syllabus<sup>10</sup>, only one of them contains a syllabus model based on a chronological framework. The Hereford and Worcester guidelines<sup>11</sup> describe the content of the history curriculum in terms of seven periods, which "*should be kept in mind whatever approach is adopted in teaching history, since they show how civilisation has developed* [original italics]" (Hereford and Worcester n.d.:17). The seven periods are: Pre-History, the Ancient World, the Dark ages, the Age of Discovery, the Industrial Revolution and the Modern World. An example is given of the way the content framework may be used in a developmental sequence with topics such as housing, fortifications, transport and discovery, and local history.

The problematic nature of the choice of content for a primary history curriculum is well expressed in a review of DES (1985) *History in the Primary and Secondary Years* by the Lancaster Primary Humanities Group. The issue, as they see it, is not whether content is important or not, but rather that,

...children seem to retain a relatively small amount of the information they encounter, which must raise questions about the wisdom of teaching content deemed to be important in the expectation that it will be retained in the longer term (1986:59-60).

They also indicate that there is no agreement about which content is appropriate to children at different levels of development - it is this, they suggest that makes the process of discussion about the primary history curriculum different from that of the secondary school.

### *History as development*

There have been surprisingly few attempts to construct a primary history curriculum on a developmental basis, given the extent of the research which has been conducted into children's understanding of the past<sup>12</sup>, and the efforts which were made by Hallam and others to apply a Piagetian frame to history.<sup>13</sup> Coltham's (1971) *The Development of Thinking and the Learning of History*, while it influenced perceptions of what children were capable of understanding in history, also did not result in perceptible changes in the curriculum.

An exception to the norm is the work of Kieran Egan<sup>14</sup>. His identification of four "more or less distinct stages in the typical person's development of historical understanding" (1978:20), the mythic, romantic, philosophic and ironic, may be used as the basis for curriculum planning in history based on a knowledge of children's concepts of the past. The first two stages have application to the primary school. Summarising his suggestions, the following curriculum emerges:

Years 5-9/11: Mythic stage

- Children need to develop the basic concepts necessary for an historical understanding, as they lack concepts of time, place, causality and 'otherness'. They seek knowledge that provides intellectual security and helps them to establish their identity.
- Binary oppositions, absolute meaning and models of virtuous thought - Thomas More and Thomas Jefferson contrasted with Hitler and Stalin, heroes and villains.
- Children do not know concepts of homes and families best, but rather, love, hate, fear, joy, right and wrong.
- Knowledge should be presented in a story form - only stories can fix the meanings of and feelings about events.
- Examples: The story of civilization: Struggle of primitive peoples against hunger, disease, natural disasters and wars; stories of the struggle to preserve the light of knowledge against threats - St Francis, Pericles, Alfred, Charlemagne; the expanded knowledge and technology of the past two centuries.
- North American Indians: Conflict between survival and destruction.

#### Years 9-15: Romantic stage

- Serviceable but relatively unsophisticated concepts of time, place, causality and 'otherness'. A developing autonomy is threatened by the strange and limitless world and the response is to associate romantically with powerful and noble characters and forces.
- The bizarre, extreme, dramatic, the fantastic and the very detailed appeal. The 'otherness' of the past: styles, forms, feelings, places are the focus of the child's imagination and interest.
- Examples: The Industrial Revolution: Isambard Kingdom Brunel - confrontation between confidence and energy and fear of change and the unknown; contrast confidence with failures, destruction of life-style and ruthlessness; images of how the world was changed by it.
- The Glory that was Greece: A study based on Herodotus: liberty and tyranny; the contrast between Greece and Persia; the rise of the Athenian empire, conflict between order and strife, the fall of Athens (Egan 1978 and 1979).

Although Joan Blyth commends Egan's ideas, stating that "No scheme for the 7-11 age-range is appropriate without due recognition of the development of children and their interests and abilities at different stages" and "I believe that Kieran Egan's view of history at the romantic stage is true of all study of the past in the junior school" (1989:58-59), she does not provide a model based on them amongst her examples of schemes of work. The closest she comes is to suggest that 5-6 year olds spend a year on "From myth to artefact" (1989:20-22), where the first two terms are true to Egan's approach, but the third departs radically from it, by including artefacts and family history.

The developmental principle is also widely neglected in LEA history guidelines. The East Sussex guidelines distinguish between two stages of development, ages 7-9 and 9-11. Children at the first stage need stories, "with a beginning and an end about a variety of people of the past, good and bad, historical, legendary and mythical." A time chart is noted as being essential at this stage. At the second stage, children still need stories, "but ones displaying greater depths of emotion and sophistication". Also suggested are comparative studies of a number of periods, local history and the introduction of historical evidence (East Sussex n.d.:3). The Hertfordshire guidelines contain an outline syllabus based on the needs of children to understand chronology, to appreciate that history is real and to consider evidence of the past. At 7+ the topic 'Me - parents - grandparents' is given, together with classical stories from history. At 9+ the topic is 'Now - grandparents', a comparative study together with an appreciation of the difference in the way people lived in earlier periods. The 11+ topic is the sequence of change in homes and buildings, clothes, transport, work and recreation. More detailed suggestions are provided for how local history can be introduced to the 9+ and 11+ topics.<sup>15</sup> This approach owes perhaps as much to a skills approach as it does to a developmental one.

*History as skills and concepts*

The most significant attempt to derive a structure for history teaching based upon skills and concepts is that of John West, in his *History 7-13 (Guidelines, Structures and Resources)* (1981b). For West,

The content of the materials at ages 7-11 is relatively less important than the processes and structures by which the study and content is introduced and developed. Content and process are at every stage in balance; generally speaking, at the earliest stages content is of less importance in the equation than it later becomes (1981b:8).

The guidelines, are arranged in four levels (7-9; 8-10; 9-11; and 10-13 years), each of which covers the following areas:

Key Lessons on historical concepts: Examples: Beginning at the youngest level with earlier and later; including authenticity in pictures; the concepts of a period and a generation; and the authenticity of documents, in the top level.

Pictures and objects: Examples: Museum objects; the phonograph; pictures; newspapers and books.

Exercises with sequence cards

Timelines: Examples: Classroom timelines; family timelines; scale on a timeline.

Topics for class projects: Examples:

|                               |                          |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| <u>7-9</u>                    | <u>8-10</u>              |
| Grandfathers and grandmothers | Photography              |
| I remember                    | Classroom art gallery    |
| Dinosaurs                     | Great-grandparents       |
|                               | Royal family; Inventions |
| <u>9-11</u>                   | <u>10-13</u>             |
| Collections                   | Nativity                 |
| Communications                | Norman Conquest          |
| A local study                 | Joan of Arc              |
|                               | Custer's last stand      |

Vocabulary building: Examples: Stories; pictures.

Themes - story continuity: Examples: Courage against heavy odds; Courage in failure and adversity; Eye-witness accounts. (1981b)

Whether it is accurate to regard this outline as a "curriculum" is not clear. West describes it as a "syllabus" (1981b:11) and Fines, in a warmly approving review, refers to it as "this new curriculum" (1982:38). But when Graham Rogers (1984:22) criticised West for not having "fully reconciled the needlessly conflicting claims of developing skills and furthering an understanding of the past through the content of the subject", West replied by stating that misunderstanding arose when the project was seen as a curriculum, as it "was never intended to be a content-curriculum,

but a set of guidelines to the formation of a teacher's own scheme of work" (West 1984c:32). Plainly, if a curriculum is regarded in the most narrow sense as a course of study, the guidelines are not a curriculum - though West also defends them against the accusation of being content-free (1984c:33). Whatever they are described as, they represent an important attempt to alter the balance of the primary history curriculum from a content base to skills base. Their peculiar value lies in the fact that they are the product of extensive research, have been constructed upon a unique pattern of testing pupil progress in the understanding of historical concepts<sup>16</sup>, and attempt to provide a rationale for the selection of content based on a concepts approach.

Many of the LEA history guidelines incorporate skills as an organising principle for constructing a curriculum, though it is often unclear what is intended by this. The East Sussex working paper on primary history provides a detailed table of the skills are judged appropriate for each year and lists a range of skills in Observation; Locating information/reference; Comprehension and Translation; Synthesis; Communication and vocabulary acquisition; Memorisation; and Analysis, evaluation and judgement. This is supported by another East Sussex working paper<sup>17</sup> which details the skills and objectives appropriate to each age and gives examples of approaches which can be used to teach the skills. Though often unacknowledged, the influence of Coltham and Fines (1971), uncritically adopted, is apparent in many LEA guidelines. The section on skills in the Hertfordshire guidelines (1979:2-3), for example, is a summary of the relevant section of their pamphlet.

The Avon, Hereford and Worcester and West Sussex guidelines give examples of syllabus schemes which include a description of 'skills' alongside the content, giving an indication of how it may be taught (Avon 1982:13; Hereford and Worcester n.d.:32-39; West Sussex 1984:23). *History in the Primary and Secondary Years* (DES 1985:46-50) includes a very detailed seven year 8-14 (J1-S3) curriculum, which specifies broad content areas in each year along with notes on the general skills, the historic-specific skills to be inculcated and the sources for teaching them. The junior years of this curriculum are heavily oriented to family and local history.

These guidelines were, however, in many cases the exceptions to the rule. Teachers and schools who accepted that skills were an important aspect of history teaching often did so without a clear justification of their use and with very little curriculum planning.

#### *History as integrated study or topic work*

As the dominant mode of history teaching<sup>18</sup> in the primary school in the 1970s and 1980s, any discussion of the history curriculum needs to consider the diversity of integrated or topic approaches practiced by teachers.

One response to the fact that so much of the early integrated teaching was poorly planned, without much regard for either content or skills, was the launch of the History, Geography and Social Science 8-13 project (*Place, Time and Society*) by the Schools Council in 1972. A much stronger note of concern was expressed in the Primary Survey (DES 1978), which criticised in particular the fact that there were few schemes of work for history in the schools surveyed, that only 36% of schools possessed written guidelines and that few schools had teachers responsible for history. "Where history was taught through topics of general interest there was the danger of a fragmented approach. A framework is required to provide some ordering of the content taught" (DES 1978:73), was its comment.

The combined influence of *Place, Time and Society 8-13*, which provided a rationale for curriculum planning in social studies and the humanities<sup>19</sup>, and the continuing concern of the HMI for schemes of work that accorded a place to both a coherent content and the identification of appropriate concepts and skills<sup>20</sup>, led many schools and LEAs to develop their own guidelines for the integrated teaching of history. Joan Blyth (1989:27-59) has discussed in some detail the wide

range of curriculum planning options which have confronted teachers seeking to develop their personal or school-based schemes of work for history.<sup>21</sup> What is not explicit in her discussion, however, are the implications which integrated and topic schemes hold for the distinctive identity of history. Three of the principal methods of integration: Social studies and humanities, Environmental studies, and Topic work are briefly examined for the impact of each of these approaches on primary history teaching.

#### Social studies and humanities

Where history and geography are grouped as humanities or social studies they are usually described separately but taught together. This was the approach of *Place, Time and Society 8-13*, and it has been adopted in LEA guidelines such as those of Hereford and Worcester, which have separate aims for both, yet contain practical examples in which history and geography are completely integrated. The result can be that the two complement each other ideally, history providing a perspective in time and geography enabling children to have a sense of place and environment, which allows a dialectic between past and present to operate.¶ John Fines has shown how naturally this may operate with junior children in his account of teaching about the Domesday book, as part of the Domesday project (Fines and Nichol 1986).

When curriculum planning is not undertaken from an original subject description, but is based on skills or concepts, the position of history is less secure, particularly when teachers have the choice to teach the past or not. Davis (1984:7) suggested that there was a "downward spiral" whereby teachers who lacked historical knowledge or were without motivation because of the dullness of the history teaching they had encountered in their own school years, appeared to "forget" about history in their curriculum planning. "If the decline continues," he speculated, "history may well disappear as a subject entirely, or become so subsumed in environmental studies, in project or topical work that it loses all its distinctive identity." The ease with which this can occur may be illustrated from the ILEA (1980b) guidelines *Social Studies in the Primary School*. Its opening statements set the context for the rest of the booklet: "Social studies is about people and their relationships in society. It is concerned with how children learn about society rather than what they learn" [original emphasis]. Social studies conceived of in this way is a means of integrating work by providing a structure and conceptual framework, which will assist teachers to "select certain social concepts and teach to develop children's understanding of them" (1980:30). The aims and concepts are broadly sociological, and it is perhaps unfair to expect that history should feature prominently in such an approach - but, where children are to be encouraged to recognise the value of knowledge about their own society; to recognise the variety of social life and organisation; to develop an enquiring attitude towards how society works and come to an understanding of other people's views of society (1980:4), one would expect history to merit far more than simply a mention under the rubric of "Tradition", "Communication" or "an historical case study".

#### Environmental studies

Harris et al (1972:11) writing in the teacher's guide for the Schools Council Environmental Studies Project describe environmental studies in a way which presents history with similar problems to those above. Environmental studies, they argue, must approach the environment as an integrated whole, as "An environmental studies field sharply divided into subjects would pay little attention to the way in which children view their world." The fields of information and the concepts used are too broad to limit or define, but the method of enquiry, by observation and recording, is common to many subjects. The curriculum planning approach they favour is skills-based, built upon the following skills [in the junior school]: Mapping; Collecting and classifying; Experimenting; Construction and use of questionnaires; Use of documents and old photographs; Using reference books; Factual writing; Imaginative expression; Mathematics; Modelling; Discussions; Respect for the environment (1972:60).

As inviting as a work scheme based on these skills can be in exploring features of the environment of the school, it lacks some of the distinctive emphasis of local and oral history studies. It does not give the structure which chronology and working with historical sources provides and largely ignores the people of the past. Douch (1984:3) points out that "one does not have to examine many environmental studies programmes to discover that history receives far less attention than, say, natural history or geography". The reasons for this, he believes, are related to the slow recognition of local history as a field of study. As local history has grown, so it has popularised methods of enquiry and resources, such as industrial archaeology, vernacular architecture, inventories, tithe maps, census returns and folk museums, which have proved very rich sources for history teaching in primary schools, as numerous articles in *Teaching History*, and television programmes such as Alan Waplington's *Clues, clues, clues* attest. One of the earliest of these articles, Wheeler (1970), provides as strong a justification as any for local history:

This study of Bushey [Hertfordshire] originated from the [nine and ten year old] children's natural curiosity about the most modest survivals in the locality - the metal post near the original site of the toll gate; a fire mark on a cottage, a Victorian lamp post; a cattle trough and drinking fountain. Yet, the greatest stimulus to this work came from the documents. The children could handle these easily and used them to find out more features of the locality which were familiar to them. Alternatively, they could go into the village to investigate buildings and places for which they had documentary evidence.... We must aim to use their natural curiosity, to help them to discover how full of interest their environment is and to look at it more closely, to encourage them to ask questions about it, and show them how and where to find the answers (1970:187).

### Topic work

From the point of view of curriculum planning, non-specific topic or project work holds the danger that there might be very little historical continuity, or content, at all in a curriculum, as Joan Blyth (1989:44) acknowledges.

Further implications for history were identified by Trevorrow (1980) in a questionnaire survey of the difficulties experienced by teachers using the topic/project approach. He drew attention to the problems created when pupils were allowed to control the direction of their work according to their own interests (and remained unaware of other areas of study), to the fact that a structure for sequential learning was required to avoid repetition in subsequent years and to the difficulties which teachers found in resourcing topics (which was an important contributing factor to unsuccessful projects). Although he mentioned that some teachers had reported as a 'difficulty' that aspects such as cause and effect and continuity and change in history did not become apparent to children (1980:80), Trevorrow did not explore the origin of these problems in the commonly used 'topic-web' planning device, which isolates historical exploration and makes explanation all but impossible.

It is insufficient to consider the teacher's problems of planning work and finding resources alone when assessing the impact of topic approaches. Graham Rogers (1986) and Eggleston (1984) stress that the quality of children's learning should also be studied. For Rogers the danger is that children do not always know what their work means. Topic work needs to "capture the qualities of thinking that unfold when children are asked to apply skills in the direction of solving problems" and teachers need to know "how knowledge claims are arrived at" and how children can be engaged in "the experience of constructing and validating ideas for themselves" (1986:10,11). He demonstrated how they had been able to do this in a local history project, where the results were measured not by the quantity of work produced, nor the range of skills involved, but by the "way of knowing" and thinking which they had experienced in history. Eggleston considered the cognitive development of children and the need for teachers to know the constructions which pupils made of their learning

experiences. What was often lacking in topic work (and central to understanding history) was the process of generalisation by which facts were brought into relationship with each other (1984:32).

In reviewing four major curriculum types for history in the primary school, the disparities, contradictions and conflicting benefits of each have been explored. Anyone trying to preserve or advance any of them on its own would be bound to encounter criticism from advocates of another. The new history requires a subject-centred (though not necessarily subject-based) curriculum and aspects of all four types.

The second section of the chapter considers to what extent National Curriculum history has accommodated existing practice and to what extent it reflects the new history.

## **History in the National Curriculum - Key Stages 1 and 2**

### *History as Content*

The content chosen for key stages 1 (5-7 years) and 2 (7-11 years) is, as many have observed, a selection of some of the most popular themes in history teaching in the primary school, many of which will be found in the schools radio and television programmes in Table 1. There is little that is strange in the titles of the study units, though some of the detailed information provided for the Core Study Units (CSUs) in Key stage 2 will be for many teachers. Summarised, the curriculum content is as follows:

#### Key stage 1 (KS1)

Stories from the past: myths and legends, fiction, famous men and women

Historical sources: artefacts, pictures and photographs, buildings, music, oral sources

Everyday life: Clothes, houses, shops; changes in families and Britain since World War II

Anniversaries, festivals, local, national and international events.

#### Key stage 2 (KS2): Nine study units over four years

##### Core Study Units:

CSU 1 Invaders and settlers: Romans, Anglo-Saxons and Vikings in Britain

CSU 2 Tudor and Stuart times

Either, or both: CSU 3 Victorian Britain; CSU 4 Britain since 1930

CSU 5 Ancient Greece

CSU 6 Exploration and encounters 1450-1550 (Spanish and the Aztecs)

##### Supplementary Study Units:

One study unit from each category, and an additional one from any category if five CSUs are chosen.

Category A: Ships and seafarers; Food and farming; Houses and places of worship; Writing and printing; Land transport; Domestic life, families and childhood.

Category B: Local history - involving a community over a long period of time; or a community during a particular event; or a community at the time of one of the CSU periods. (If a second local history study unit is chosen it should cover a different type of history.)

Category C: One from: Ancient Egypt; Mesopotamia; Assyria; The Indus Valley; The Maya; Benin.

Applying Noble's (1985) criteria for the selection of content (the History Working Group's Final Report (DES 1990a) did not provide any), Key stage 2 satisfies almost all the requirements. It is



biased towards English history (a minimum of four study units, a maximum of six); there are at least three non-national study units; local history is included; repetition is avoided; and there is no direct overlap with the early secondary years, although similar content could be dealt with in the study units chosen in years six and seven. The only element missing completely is the "fortuitous event" giving rise to valuable historical work (which is present in KS1) - a significant omission, as it enabled a teacher to make a school visit a central aspect of a history teaching programme.

There is little wonder, then, that Noble appears satisfied with the content of the curriculum. Given the constraints under which the Working Group and National Curriculum Council operated, they have produced a set of study units which are likely to enjoy a wide measure of approval, despite the lingering sense of compromise about the national curriculum process. Unstead would surely also have approved, for formulation of the study unit themes (particularly KS1 and some of the supplementary study units) shows the long shadow of his influence. Perhaps, Lang's advice, "to look more carefully at the secret of his remarkable success" (1990a:26), has been taken with benefit in the content area, if, as Clare (1989:27) complained in the *Times Educational Supplement*, "it's a primary takeover" - all the topics his pupils found most interesting were then included in the 2nd Key stage. The negative side of Unstead's legacy is also present, however, for, as writers such as Blyth and Bish (1990:16), Slater (1991:16) and Collicott (1990b:9) point out, the multicultural emphasis of the curriculum is weak and is, at best, assimilationist.

Key stage 2 breaks with the traditional chronological approach at the planning level, as the British CSUs do not need to be taught in chronological order, a decision which makes it easier to do integrated teaching and provides for the needs of mixed-age classes. This removes some of the justification for not repeating themes, which appears to have been unnecessarily strictly applied in the formulation of the study units. The kind of work done in family history in Year 1 would be very different from what one could do in Years 3 or 4, as would, for example, be the primary version of "Life in the Middle Ages", when compared with a secondary counterpart. At the teaching-learning level, it is clear that chronology is still considered very important, as the line-of-development focus in Category A and Category B of the supplementary units reveals.

The device of specifying political, economic, technological and scientific, social and religious, cultural and aesthetic content (the PESC formula of the History Working Group), which appears in modified form in DES (1991), was one of the more innovative aspects regarding the content of the primary curriculum, and one of the more contentious. On one hand it can be seen as a means of straightjacketing the teachers and ensuring that pupils acquire a broad knowledge about a variety of events, people and customs, while on the other it has been welcomed (Slater 1991:23) as a means of drawing attention to cultural and aesthetic knowledge, often neglected in secondary schools but part of the rich texture of good primary practice. From a practical viewpoint, when it is combined with a prescribed content, it is likely to mean that teachers find there is never enough time to do proper justice to the formula in any study unit, as Nichol (1991:36) argues. Though Fines' (1982) suggestions do not include the specifically cultural and aesthetic, they show that there may be much simpler and more effective ways of obliging teachers to teach history of all types.

### *History as development*

Predictably in a curriculum which stresses content, there is little emphasis on development. Key stage 1 bears a strong resemblance to Joan Blyth's curriculum suggestions (1989:58-59; 1984; 1988), which are based on a view of children's development, but Key stage 2 has no such evidence of developmental thinking. Study units are not designated nor structured with either concrete operations or Egan's mythic or romantic stages in mind.

Noble, in what is almost an aside in an article giving advice to teachers preparing to teach National Curriculum history, refers to this deficiency. Without quoting Egan, he captures the sense of history teaching in the romantic stage very well, while questioning whether this was really what the curriculum makers had in mind.

Without disregarding the temporal or historic context of topics under study, teachers can, and in my opinion should, home in on the unique and the particular. Fire the children's imagination with particular evidence and particular stories. Go in deep and go for quality, ignore thumbnail sketch history. I do not think that this is subversive, but if it is, so be it (1991:28).

Teachers who are concerned that the framework provided by the curriculum is too detailed and too subject-based will draw encouragement from his comments.

Encouragement is not enough for the many who believe that it is not only a developmental structure which is missing from the curriculum, but a fundamental lack of focus on children and their needs. Lee states in an eloquent short sentence: "Pupils have ideas" (1991:47) and explains the research evidence for believing this. Dawson (1990:17-18) expresses doubt about whether the curriculum will enable children to empathise - understand themselves and others - by giving them the space they need for these activities, and Collicott minces no words about the fact that "Teachers know that the content of the history curriculum [Final Report] is old-fashioned and out of touch with many of the interests of young people today" (1990b:10). The Schools Council History 13-16 curriculum might not be an ideal model for primary curriculum development, but it is astonishing that one of its central lessons could be so completely neglected.

### *History as skills and concepts*

"The new curriculum has virtually abolished the primary school and all the hard won values of the primary method." West's (1990:6) condemnation of the History Working Group's Final Report is unsurprising when its curriculum principles are compared with his own. He claims that the report is mainly about knowledge and information, and insists that the exclusion of knowledge from the Attainment Targets is "an illusory advantage" - as it proved to be. But, what of Booth's impression that the Statements of Attainment in the Interim Report "take a genuinely progressive view of the development of children's historical understanding and skills.... ...there is a real sense of conceptual and skill progression across the age-range..." (1990:8)? Both views are justified, and their juxtaposition reveals an inherent paradox in the debate about skills.

The position represented by West is that if the curriculum is content-based it cannot be skills-based. As Oliver (1990:6) expresses it, "Skill-based teaching is informed by a different constellation of values, a different set of priorities and a different mind from content based teaching, and calls for substantially different modes of assessment." It was because primary schools had been set free from an examination at 11 plus, that teachers had been able to develop a curriculum based on their knowledge of children, broadly defined by methodological skills rather than subject content (Oliver 1990:6-7). There is also a more specific concern for skills-based history teaching, as the priority of content selection over the abilities and interests of pupils is seen to have the effect that many pupils will not be able to cope with some of the concepts (particularly chronology) at the age and in the way in which they will necessarily be introduced to them.¶

Skills in the curriculum, then, do not influence the selection of content or the approach to teaching and learning. If they are to do so within study units, another means of planning needs to be introduced, along the lines of that developed in a case study by Nichol. What he refers to as

"overarching issues" or themes and concepts are selected, to aid the choice of content, key questions and pedagogy (Nichol 1991).

Skills do influence assessment directly, by the Attainment Targets and Statements of Attainment. At this point National Curriculum history corresponds with existing practice, not of primary school discourse, but of the new history, within the tradition of skills progression of Sylvester and *Place, Time and Society 8-13*.

### *History as integrated study or topic work*

Though some of the supplementary study units have obvious potential for development as integrated subject topics and there are many ways in which the study units can be taught in combination with each other, as Guyver (1991:28) shows, it is plain that the curriculum has not been constructed with integrated or topic approaches in mind.

Rather than consider the influence of integrated work on history, one needs now to consider the influence of history on it. Planning will need to be more detailed; specific content will need to be included by the teacher; resources will need to fit the topic specification (not the reverse); Attainment Targets and statements of achievement will need to be carefully matched across subjects; repetition will need to be carefully controlled by school-based work schemes; and, most unfamiliar of all, assessment activities will need to be introduced. Teachers who attempt to apply the curriculum strictly are also likely to find that one of the most profitable purposes of history teaching, the comparison of the activities of people in the past with those of people in the present, has been limited by the emphasis of the prescribed content.

### **Conclusion: History as process?**

How far can elements of the post-Plowden history curriculum be reconciled with history in the National Curriculum and is it possible to unite aspects of the four curriculum types in a single curriculum? These are the key questions that remain to be considered.

The idea of a body of knowledge contained in a syllabus reflecting the patterns of secondary and university work in a watered down form was never popular in the post-Plowden primary school, but has never completely disappeared, being kept alive by a Junior - Prep school tradition, textbooks and, to some extent, television. The National Curriculum has revived this emphasis, but not reversed the previous practice completely. It has restored history-specific teaching to the primary school but it has not made content the only focus of the curriculum.

Although psychological views on the development of children have been an important influence on both the philosophy of primary education and the new history, they have never affected curriculum development in history strongly. The National Curriculum has ignored the influence there was in choosing to structure the syllabus around content, but has not excluded the possibility of incorporating an appreciation of children's understanding of the past in the teaching approaches which the Attainment Targets make possible.

"Skills" as a curriculum planning device appears, at first sight, to be a common factor between progressive primary practice (Morrison 1988) and the National Curriculum history. Differences in the way in which the term is interpreted and the seriousness with which the skills and concepts are pursued themselves, make it almost impossible to draw coherent parallels. The idea of planning with skills and concepts advocated by *Place, Time and Society 8-13* has never been popular in practice, yet those defending primary methodology against the subject orientation of the National Curriculum have appealed to skills in their arguments. John West's use of concept and skill development to encourage historical understanding among children to give them access to the

processes of history, is everywhere applauded. It has been recognised in Key stage 1 but apparently abandoned in Key stage 2.

The contested position of history within the tradition of integrated work is clarified by the National Curriculum to a certain extent. But, it needs to be recognised that some of the best primary practice in terms of the new history has been within history-centred topics. National curriculum history has also not encouraged the oral, extensive local history, empathy, and drama approaches to integrated teaching which have been so much a part of the new history in the primary school as much as it might have, partly, no doubt, as a result of the problems of using the concept of "empathy" as a curriculum planning device (Knight 1989c).

Guyver (1990:104) describes a dilemma which faced the History Working Group as it considered the responses it had received to Key stages 1 and 2 in the Final Report (DES 1990a) as: "how to reconcile the Unstead-style content [of Key stage 2] with the John West-style statements of achievement [of Key Stage 1]?" This is a central issue for a curriculum based on the new history, and it may be argued that in its final form (DES 1991) National Curriculum history has approached a solution to it.

History teaching on the basis of a national curriculum involves a broad consensus about the teachers' own content knowledge, their knowledge of classes and children and their pedagogic content knowledge of how to structure and teach the history (Shulman 1986, in Knight 1990:28). It is relatively easy to specify what content knowledge teachers and their pupils ought to acquire, and the teachers' knowledge of classes and children may be accepted as a constant factor as long as the curriculum does not envisage new understandings about classroom teaching. But it is no simple matter to describe a desired pedagogy of history teaching in a curriculum document, particularly when a model of assessment requiring Attainment Targets and Statements of Attainment has to be imposed upon a subject which teachers are unaccustomed to assess (Knight 1990, 1991). History in the National Curriculum has succeeded in conveying the content required. In doing so, opportunities have been lost to build the pedagogy (particularly in Key stage 2) into the content specification, as Egan and West had done. In place of this the Attainment Targets, Statements of Attainment and the Links with Attainment Targets have to convey the kind of history teaching envisaged. The approaches they represent are all consistent with ideas and manifestations of the new history.

The three Attainment Targets on their own,

AT 1 Knowledge and understanding history - The development of the ability to describe and explain historical change and cause, and analyse different features of historical situations.

AT 2 Interpretations of history - The development of the ability to understand interpretations of history.

AT 3 The use of historical sources - The development of pupils' ability to acquire evidence from historical sources, and form judgements about their reliability and value (DES 1991:3-10),

do not convey much more to the non-specialist teacher than something of the discourse of the new history. "Historical change and cause" are specific, abstract notions, while analysing "different features of historical situations" is so vague that it can mean almost anything. "Understanding interpretations of history" is clear, as long as the teacher is aware of the idea that history is comprised of different interpretations of the past and not a body of knowledge, while AT 3 relies on the teachers' ability to distinguish "sources" from "evidence" (something which few textbook writers have done until recently), and which was listed as one of the most frequently mentioned concerns of teachers about teaching history in Truman's (1990) inquiry into the nature of teacher thinking about the history curriculum.

The Attainment Targets, therefore, cannot stand alone. The Statements of Attainment serve to illustrate what is intended by them, as understanding "that stories may be about real people or fictional characters" (Statement of Attainment Level 1) explains AT 2 more clearly, but their usefulness is limited in terms of suggesting teaching methods to be employed. "Distinguish between a fact and a point of view" (Statement of Attainment Level 3), for example, is not simple to assess at any level and certainly not easy to "teach" to a class of seven year-olds. It is in the Links with Attainment Targets of the programmes of study of the National Curriculum that it is possible to find both help for the teacher and a sense of the kind of activity which John West would have recommended:

- use of common words and phrases relating to time [e.g. old, new, before, after, century BC, AD]
- identify a sequence of events [e.g. life of a family]
- develop an awareness of different ways of representing past events [e.g. pictures, television, plays songs]
- examine why versions of the past differ [e.g. different memories of life during World War II]
- find out about the past from different types of historical source [e.g. houses, objects, paintings, photographs] ( examples from DES 1991:14,16).

The Historical Enquiry sections in Key stages 1 and 2 also contain suggestions which would be familiar to someone aware of any of the approaches related to the new history: drama and dance, model making, making a survey, using a database, making field trips. They make history teaching far more accessible to teachers than the Attainment Targets do.<sup>37</sup>

In the hands of a sensitive teacher there is now the possibility that a new curriculum type containing common elements of the four discussed above, which allows children to become involved in the *process* of constructing their own view of the past, might emerge. This can only happen when content and the historical sources which are related to it can be combined as the Links of Attainment suggest. Part of the process will involve a narrative understanding of the nature of history in Egan's terms and from the process could come the skills and concepts to which West aspires.

---

## Notes

1. While much can be written on the use of history across the primary school curriculum, the emphasis in this Chapter is on the distinctive teaching and learning of history, whether as a subject or in an integrated manner.
2. *History in the Primary School* (1950).
3. *Teaching History in the Junior School* (1956). Purkis (1980:34) criticised Unstead's books as being "structured, safe and conventional, using a chronology that traditional teachers, especially those non-specialists teaching in primary schools remember from their own school days", noting, perhaps prophetically, "It is possible that if a Government ever decided to standardize the history curriculum in schools, R.J. Unstead would be prescribed reading." She did, however concede that she found much she could agree with in *Teaching History in the Junior School*, and was glad that he had justified the inclusion of history because of its power to enrich the imagination of children. Lang (1990a), in rehabilitating Unstead, has pointed out that his books for children were concerned far more with ordinary people than the great ones, and that he was no apologist for nation and empire.

4. Aldrich and Dean (1991:101) comment that at this time, though teachers in theory had the freedom to select their own syllabuses, in practice there was considerable uniformity, because of the acceptance of (1) that the chronological approach was natural and (2) that British, or even English, history was central.
5. In the first edition of *History in Primary Schools*, Joan Blyth included five frameworks for a chronological content-based syllabus, four based on national history and one on a multi-cultural approach (1982:29-36). It is indicative of the move away from history as content that these frameworks were dropped from the second edition (1989). Swift and Jackson (1987:30), in a survey of primary schools in Cheshire found that while Local history (79%) and Family (40%) approaches dominated, 41% of teachers used a chronological approach and 67% of teachers taught elements of English national history.
6. Noble (1980). In his evaluation of the history taught in four primary schools he found that in none of the schools had there been a decision to assign time for historical studies at a level above that of class teacher, and that there "was a marked absence of any rationale for what was done"(1980:53-54).
7. Originally published by himself in a pamphlet (Noble 1981), and expanded upon in the extended version of the pamphlet published by the Historical Association (Noble 1985). Also contained in DES (1985:42-44). Blyth, J. (1989:26) has an adapted version of the syllabus.
8. 67% of the teachers which Swift and Jackson (1987:31) surveyed used television regularly in their teaching, and 5% used radio. In a survey of primary schools in Cornwall, Trevorrow (1980) found that 74% of teachers found television programmes useful as part of topic work in history.
9. Based on *History Long Ago* and *History Not So Long Ago* (BBC Radio).
10. Buckinghamshire (1979:12); Hertfordshire (1979:14); West Sussex (1984:23).
11. Batho (1985:4), in a survey of 43 LEA guidelines conducted for the Historical Association, comments that these "come as close as any discussion document to prescribing a history syllabus...."
12. Blyth and Derricott (1985:21) explore one possible reason for the lack of curriculum development in this way. They argue that "the continuity between [individual] development and interests must be partial and unpredictable"; what applies to one child will not necessarily apply to another.
13. Shawyer, Booth and Brown (1988) and Booth (1987) review the research. See Hallam (1970), (1978), (1979).
14. Egan (1982:439) explains his psychological position, which is opposed to a narrow Piagetian view of cognitive development, as follows:  
 "If our concern is education we might more wisely concentrate on the conceptual abilities children clearly have and consider in what ways those can be used to accomplish educational ends.... we might as well accept that they lack a concept of historical causality. At the same time, however, we can observe that they clearly do have a concept of the kind of causality that holds stories together and moves them along."

15. Hertfordshire (1979:12-15). School F in Chapter 5 (Appendix 3) had a curriculum based on similar principles.
16. Lally and West (1981:24-25) discuss the skills which the Dudley Project sought to develop, and provide a table similar to that of Sylvester (1980) showing the progress of children between 9 and 13 years in the areas of Time; Authenticity; Evidence; Observation / Identification; Deduction; Vocabulary and Concepts. West (1981b) contains examples of the tests for pupils at each of the four levels. The Timeline History Pack (West 1986) uses many of the ideas of the guidelines in a set of 32 pupil cards, divided into eight phases: Past and present; Order and sequence; Themes and topics; Periods and people; Family history; Dates and numbers; The concept of a century; Documents.
17. East Sussex n.d. *Curriculum Working Papers. Humanities: Skills Progression in the Humanities 7-14* (8pp.)
18. There is little reason to doubt the general tendency indicated by Swift and Jackson's (1987) Cheshire figures: 14% of schools taught history as a separate subject and 86% as environmental studies, topic work or as part of an integrated approach.
19. Blyth, W.A.L. et al (1976).
20. Seen most clearly in the widely praised DES (1985). Cook (1984) has argued that between 1978 and 1983 the HMI produced a consistent set of demands for a national framework for primary history, "a more evolutionary policy concentrating on the slow process of conversion through the continued reiteration of a number of what are deemed to be fundamental messages". DES (1989) is the confirmation of Cook's view, repeating the need for structure and planning, and reporting on the lack of improvement since 1978.
21. She considers "Integrated work in the Junior School" under the following headings: Environmental Studies; History, music, dance and drama; History and Science; History and Art; Integrated topics based on history; The Schools Council and integrated frameworks; and two sections written by other authors, Anne Joyce: 'The place of multicultural education the primary school' and Alan Blyth: 'Place, Time and Society 7-11: History in an interrelated framework.'
22. Nash (1991:11) quotes Carol White (a History Adviser and member of the History Working Group) as saying that humanities came unstuck when there were different subject methodologies at work. "It was driven by one subject or the other, usually by history...."
23. Amongst them are: Happer and Blyth (1970); Edgington (1974); Dix and Smart (1981); Mathews (1982); Ross (1982); Edgington (1983); Ross (1983); Rogers (1984); Wibberley (1984); Wright (1984); Pearson (1985).
24. Low-Beer and Blyth (1983:10-11) endorse this methodology. "Pupils who are introduced to a suitable and vivid piece of evidence can learn methods of making sense of it by questions and further investigation. These are methods which fit in well with modern theories of active learning, as well as being part of the discipline of history."
25. The Cornish questionnaire results revealed that 54% of teachers decided on the projects themselves, 36% with their pupils and 2% pupils alone; only 12% of teachers seldom had difficulty finding reference material; 70% felt that lack of resources was responsible for an unsuccessful project and 74% felt there was a need for more published packs (1980:74-78).

26. The effect of the outcomes of topic work on the curriculum is raised specifically by Miles (1984:26), who comments on the fact that topic work customarily has either display work or the folder as its outcome, each of which has pros and cons for pupils.
27. The discussion is of the History curriculum as at the statutory order stage (March 1991). It does not cover the process by which the curriculum was created. For the wider discussion, see Aldrich (ed.) (1991).
28. After an analysis of the proposed content topics in the Interim Report, Knight (1990:29) concluded that "it was clear that teachers have a lot of new content areas to master."
29. See Noble (1990b) and (1991).
30. Though not as weak as it appeared in the Final Report (DES 1990a), it is restricted to local history in Category B and the compulsory Category C.
31. Lang (1991) draws attention to the advantages of the report of the Northern Ireland History Working Group, which merely identified "Central issues" instead of the PESC formula.
32. Honeybone (1990:11) comments of the Interim Report, "The nagging worry... must be the continued failure of the DES to appreciate that there has been a hundred years of study of the psychology of the development of historical thinking in children."
33. "These ideas may seem risible or mistaken or inconsequential to politicians or professional historians, but to professional teachers they are of central importance.... Any comment on what can or should be taught in school history which is ignorant of the available evidence of children's ideas, invites treatment as amateur speculation, or worse as empty pontification" (Lee 1991:47).
34. See, for example, Blyth and Bish (1990:15-16), Honeybone (1990:11) and Dawson (1990:17).
35. The issue in National Curriculum history is whether the Attainment Targets are used to support the syllabus, or whether the syllabus has been constructed to support the assessment targets (Slater 1991:19).
36. Pountney (1990), Saunders (1990) and Newton (1990) provide exemplars.
37. Paul Noble's idea of a Primary History Fair, a market of ideas for primary teachers, (Klein 1991), designed to "wrap [teachers] up in enthusiasm and ideas... to get them going away saying 'Hey, we can do that, too'", is an example of the possibilities which these suggestions present for making National Curriculum history "compatible with the work they have been doing already", in his words.



*Chapter Four***CASE STUDIES: THE SCHOOLS****Research design**

The objective of the research investigation undertaken in 1985 was to describe aspects of "good practice" in primary school history teaching in order to discover the extent to which it was influenced by the new history and to establish what might be unique about the new history in the primary school as opposed to the secondary school.<sup>1</sup> The study was premised on a specific notion of good practice in primary history: it was regarded as being the exception to the usual, that which stood out as being different and could be identified by an innovative approach in some area of history teaching.<sup>2</sup> Because of the variety of ideas about what constituted history at primary level, it was assumed that there would be a number of teaching approaches to be considered, all of which could be labeled as good practice.

It was decided that the most effective way of documenting good practice would be to visit a range of primary schools and to treat these visits as case studies. Information would be gathered principally by the use of 'semi-structured' teacher interviews using a prepared interview schedule (Wragg 1978) and a pupil questionnaire<sup>3</sup>.

The questionnaire was regarded as a vital adjunct to the interviews as it was believed that it could provide evidence of the effect of the teachers' innovation in history teaching and enable the pupils to record their opinions about history (albeit in a very structured way). While it could furnish information of a certain kind only,<sup>4</sup> its use offered the possibility of comparisons between the schools and groups of pupils and would make generalisation possible on account of the relatively large size of the pupil sample. The administration of the questionnaire at a number of control schools would help to validate the pupils' responses. As one of the central concerns of the study was the question of whether primary practice could accommodate the new history, it was regarded as essential to gain an indication of pupil attitudes, perceptions and competency in history by means of the questionnaire.

The choice of a number of schools as small case studies was influenced by two current models of curriculum investigation. One was that used by Cade and Tolley (1984), who studied curricular provision in a sample of eight small rural primary schools by means of a questionnaire survey, followed by semi-structured interviews with the headteachers. Their research was based on what Bastiani and Tolley (1979:23) describe as "Surveys of provision, practice, perception and attitude", and restricted in scope according to what was believed to be a manageable survey area (North Nottinghamshire) and the number of schools within that area which were prepared to be involved. The other model was that provided by the publication by HMI of reviews and surveys of primary practice based on their published inspection reports of primary schools, specifically DES (1984) *Education Observed 2* and surveys such as DES (1983), which considered environmental education in eight primary schools in Manchester. The comparisons of schools and teaching drew attention to the possibilities of curriculum research through short school visits and their recommendations contained a justification for it.<sup>5</sup>

To select the schools for the case studies letters were written to all the history and humanities advisers in the LEAs requesting them to provide the names of schools where they knew there to be good practice in history. There was a positive response from approximately 40% of those written to and from these replies a number of primary schools in different parts of England were selected

on the basis of the range of teaching approaches which they, or individual teachers on their staff, appeared to represent. Arrangements were made to visit eight primary schools and one middle school, which was included for the extra dimension it could add to the study. One further primary school was approached independently for the insight it might offer into subject teaching in history.

Pilot visits were undertaken to two primary schools recommended by a headteacher in a nearby city for their interest in history teaching to test the scope of the proposed teacher interview schedule and the administration of the pupil questionnaire. As a result of these visits it was decided that a day spent in each school would be adequate for the study if no formal classroom observation was done. Observation of teaching, it was felt, would alter the nature of the visits completely. They would change from collegial discussions to interventions by an outsider which would require considerably longer than one afternoon of teaching to analyse, and would significantly alter the nature of the negotiation required. It was, however, regarded as important that the teachers should be interviewed in the context of their work to make it easier for them to illustrate their teaching approaches and material. For this reason it was realised during the pilot visits that tape recorded conversations conducted during the school day would be the most practical (and natural) means of gathering data from the teachers (as long as the interviewees' consent could be obtained). A research journal would complement the tape recordings.

### **The schools**

The ten schools visited have been divided into four groups according to the type of history curriculum followed. The first group consists of three schools where an in-depth study of local history formed the most important part of the history taught. In the second group there are two schools in which history was integrated with other subjects, as part of topic teaching. Thirdly, there are four schools which taught history through topics which were specifically historical. The final school taught history as a separate subject, timetabled and with homework, as in a secondary school.

#### *Schools where local history predominated*

School A was a Junior school of 250 pupils in a medium-sized town. There were two classes per year group. The school did not have its own guidelines for history, but the teachers were familiar with their county guidelines. History was usually taught through integrated topics, chosen by the teachers each term. The exception was the work done on local history by one of the teachers, who was now teaching a second-year class, but had taught fourth years for the past few years. He was recommended as being an enthusiastic local historian, able to communicate his enthusiasm to his pupils.

The school was situated in the centre of a town of considerable historical and natural attraction, an ideal situation in which to exploit the environment in teaching. It was this which had prompted the teacher's interest in local history: "When we came to look for resources in the community, we realised how little we knew."<sup>5</sup> He began investigating the town's past, a quest which resulted in his publishing a booklet on its history, and the creation of considerable local awareness amongst the public. At the time he was also completing a course for the Advanced Certificate in the Teaching of History.

As his enthusiasm for local history grew, so he began to incorporate it more and more into his classroom teaching. Local history, he believed, was the way to provide pupils with an opportunity to investigate and question as an historian would. "Local history is such a positive way of developing genuine inquisitiveness amongst children, of showing them that there can be open-ended situations where you can literally say, 'I don't know'.<sup>7</sup> He also valued local history because

it provides the opportunity for people in the community to come into the school and to involve parents. While he did not think local history should form part of the curriculum of all primary schools, he believed that whenever the environment was suitable, it was important for all to do it.

Examples of the work done included the following: studies of maps of the town, facilitated by an interesting board simulation game involving people trying to find their way around the town in the nineteenth century; the handling of large-size photographs of events and buildings from the town's past and the use of census returns and newspaper reports to question what life was like. To provide factual information he had written leaflets for the pupils on different aspects of the history of the town, containing description and detailed information. Pupils used worksheets to record their responses.

School B was a Primary school of 270 pupils situated outside a rural village close to an armed forces base, which accounted both for the relatively large size of the school, and for the cosmopolitan backgrounds of its pupils. The school has a very high turnover of pupils. As was the case with School A, a teacher (here the headteacher) had been recommended to me rather than the school itself. He had been at the school less than two years and was still in the process of defining the school's curriculum. No guidelines for history existed. Much of the work seen and discussed related to his previous school, in a smaller village, though some of this work was being copied and extended at this school.

While not trained as a history specialist, the headteacher's interest had been stimulated by the wealth of historical material available in the parish chest and archives in his previous village. This had made it possible to study the history of the village from documents in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries with successive fourth year junior classes. He took a century each year, "just for my own peace of mind", and spent one and a half terms on it, repeating the same skills each year. His aims were to create an empathy for the time, to develop the concepts of continuity and change in the country and to teach pupils how to use documents and maps.

Pupils were expected to make a book of their work and examples of these books were studied and discussed. The work done on the Seventeenth century, for example, covered the following: A time-line of important events in the century; a description of the village in 1629; a copy of a petition to the Countess of Warwick (the girls in the classes had become interested in calligraphy and imitated the handwriting of the original document very successfully); a picture of the lord's mill; a graph showing the age of first marriage, drawn from the marriage registers ('in most cases it was in Latin and we got in deep water'); a map of the village in 1654; a comparison of a ploughman's day and the pupils' day done with pie charts; a graph of the age of death of people during a period in the 17th century; a letter based on empathetic imagination; a comparison of the inventory of the possessions of a gardener and a farmer in the 1660s with one in 1980; a graph showing the size of the farms in 1654 and a comparison of the pattern of fields in 1980, and questions for an imaginary role-play interview of another pupil in the class. The documents used allowed a certain degree of differentiation between pupils, more advanced pupils being given longer inventories to read and decipher, using glossaries.

To prepare the top juniors to do this relatively sophisticated work, the history done in the lower classes had also been based on the locality. The environment of the school, the church and the village respectively were topics in the first, second and third year classes. The headteacher was emphatic that he was not simply concerned with teaching history, but with teaching skills. "I'm interested in higher learning skills and through history I've achieved this."<sup>8</sup> An example of the degree of success he had achieved as shown by the work done by a group of boys on the 1851 census returns. They decided to plot the route followed by the census enumerators as they had gone from house to house through the village. The idea was taken up by the headteacher's wife in a

study of the village for a local history diploma - a case of an adult historian building on the work done by children.

School C was a 10-12 Middle school in a medium-sized town. It had three years, with eight classes in each year. The teacher interviewed was responsible for history in the school and had devised a local history curriculum for the third year classes, with whom he did most of his teaching. The first and second year classes followed a more traditional curriculum, from Roman to Medieval times in Britain. There were no history guidelines for the school, but in order to co-ordinate the work done on local history, notes of what ought to be covered and how it ought to be taught were circulated to other members of staff teaching history.

As with the teachers in Schools A and B, local history became part of the curriculum because of the teacher's own interest in it. His attitude reflected that of other teachers towards the resources available in their environment:

There is just so much material, that as you go through it you let it take you into various ways, and because I'm interested in poking around particularly in local history myself, as I find some new absolutely marvellous thing I immediately dash off and that becomes part of the work.<sup>9</sup>

He expressed his main emphasis as being on the two Es - evidence and empathy - and the content of the work done reflected this.

The main element in the third year work was a study of a small village nearby, based on the records of the church warden, dating back to 1420. It was "concerned to show how a community has interacted over a period of time with a changing landscape, changing economic conditions and advancing technology."<sup>10</sup> Contemporary accounts were used to show the growth and decline of the village at different times, the impact of the civil war, the results of the draining of the marshes, the coming of the railway and the advantages and disadvantages of its being regarded contemporarily as a very picturesque village. Current parish council minutes and newspaper reports formed the basis of a study of the village as it had been in recent times.

The work which followed was based specifically on empathy, "not as an exercise of pure imagination,...[but] disciplined and purposeful: not a way of testing knowledge but a way of explaining some action." Topics included the Poor law and workhouses; responses to pictures to make pupils feel what it was like to be someone else; and the creation of an historical saga, 'The Archers'. The local inspiration for the Archers came from the grave of an Elizabeth Archer (d. 1761) which had been seen in the village churchyard. An imaginary family tree was constructed for the Archer family till 1900, supported by a framework of historical facts and likely events. The pupils were then expected to write accounts of situations in the lives of each of the fictitious progeny of Elizabeth Archer, "fleshing out fact with non-anachronistic fiction"<sup>11</sup> they were helped to imagine the characters by a very good collection of pictures of people whom the Archers might have resembled. Their general response was that it was better than ordinary history, but, as one of the pupils said, 'It's hard to think of what they felt'.

The Archers was followed by a project to collect oral evidence on trams in the town. Pupils were asked to collect three kinds of information that could not be found in books. Questions about facts (Where did the trams go? How much did it cost?); questions which could only be answered by someone who knew the trams (What did it feel like? Was it noisy?) and questions which would provide anecdotes (Did anyone ever get run over by a tram?). For a school festival the top classes were being prepared to hold a public enquiry into the question of building a railway to their town in the nineteenth century. Each class was divided into sectional groups for and against the railway,

ready to campaign for and publicise their points of view. The teacher's comments on his teaching echoed the ones previously heard. He described it,

I'm teaching them a scientific method and an enquiry method, that's what I take to be the thing. Facts - silly to say that they are useless - they are not useless, but they are not that important. It's method that's important.<sup>12</sup>

*Schools where history was integrated with other subjects as part of general topic work*

School D was a Junior school of 150 pupils in a large industrial town. Numbers on the roll had fallen to the point where the staff was now half of what it had been ten years previously. While there was little evidence of deprivation it was in a socially depressed area. The school had been recommended because it had a humanities curriculum based on *Place, Time and Society* and had previously been one of a relatively small number of primary schools which had used the *Man: A course of study* [Macos] curriculum<sup>13</sup>. In fact, some of the *Macos* material was still being used with a class of eight year-olds. It was far from the typical innovative primary school, and yet the vision and dedication of the headteacher and staff showed how curriculum projects could make a significant difference to classroom practice.

After *Macos* had made the school aware of what it was doing in the humanities, the headteacher and three members of staff attended a course on *Place, Time and Society*. They decided to implement it in the school as, "We felt the concept approach, the skills approach, was worth following up and that it was better than [separate] history books, geography books."<sup>14</sup> Further meetings on *Place, Time and Society* were attended and the head of humanities was given the responsibility for drawing up guidelines based on the concept approach. This took longer than expected, partly because of staff changes, but eventually a course was compiled which provided a framework for one unit a term, selected from broad areas, such as Strangers and Settlers, Local Environment and Power and Energy (see Appendix 3). Equally important was the fact that teachers were required to complete a "planning exercise" for each unit, stating their objectives, the key concepts and the key questions. This structure meant that topics were narrowed down and there was little opportunity for repetition. "It's given direction to the topic work. Before, we were in a vacuum, choosing whatever took our fancy and not knowing why we were doing it and what it was for... it was very hit and miss", the head of humanities stated. "Key concepts are invaluable focusing tools for curriculum planning which then becomes a continuous process as the teacher must constantly check what he is doing...", she had written in 1982.<sup>15</sup>

The school experimented with one of the project resource packs, but found it unsatisfactory, as it did not seem to demonstrate the concepts required. All the other units had been chosen and resourced by the teachers. They included: All about me, a local church, a village study, farming, electricity, the school, houses and homes, the town at war, and a local industry for which the town had been famous in the past. Few of them were specifically historical, though it was clear that the school accepted the *Place, Time and Society* view that history, geography and possibly R.E., should be kept in mind during planning. The teachers involved all confessed that it was difficult to get to grips with the kind of curriculum planning, but after a number of years, they seemed satisfied with what was being achieved. "It took several years to get it even half working.... Now everybody tries to have a go at it."<sup>16</sup>

School E was a Primary school of 350 pupils in a relatively affluent part of a small, rural town. The headteacher and the deputy headteacher were both interested in the teaching of history and shared very similar concerns. The school had produced a detailed curriculum statement, expressing its philosophy and objectives for the school as a whole, and for the individual subject areas, but stopping short of prescribing content. The most important aspects of its history were more implicit

than explicit, namely, that it ought to be taught in an integrated way, particularly with literature and craft work, and that the teachers should be able to construct their own topic work in accordance with the guidelines.

Great stress has to be placed upon the fact that this history policy is based on a conceptual approach with teachers free to develop these concepts in ways best suited to themselves and the needs of their children.<sup>17</sup>

The history guidelines analysed the nature of the subject in four areas: history as the roots of the present, history is about change, history is about enquiry, and history is about people. History was seen to develop attitudes such as a concern for evidence, an awareness of continuity and change, an interest in causation and a sense of empathy. Five skills were listed: the collection and analysis of evidence; recognition and use of chronological conventions; an understanding of sequence and duration of time; learning and practising a range of language skills, including reference skills and practice in problem solving.

Examples of topic based work included a term's activity on Sutton Hoo and Roman Britain with a fourth year junior class, and a project on family trees which had led to a study of the time when their parents had been young (1950- early 1970s) by a second year junior class. The deputy head began the fourth year topic with a simulated archaeological 'dig' of Sutton Hoo, followed by a class visit to London to see the artefacts they had "discovered". The class had then done their own dig in an area of the school grounds, with much enthusiasm, but few finds. The work on Roman Britain included the use of Rosemary Sutcliffe's novel *Song for a Dark Queen*, and visits to Bath and Wales. His attitude towards the use of literature, the deputy head explained, was that he would always use it where appropriate "as a back-up, not as a stimulus". The second year class had done fairly detailed work on their own family trees and were collecting artefacts from the 1950s to illustrate what they were learning about and to help construct a time-line.

The headteacher justified the school's attitude to the integration of history with other areas of the curriculum in terms of the nature of the child, the nature of the subject and the nature of the school. Integration was meaningful to children, he argued, because it was part of the process of gathering all knowledge together through play and learning to make sense of it. If history was as difficult for children as some made out, it should be propped up by other subjects. In many cases subjects such as science shared very similar objectives with history. His final argument was that primary schools should never narrow the range of experiences available to their pupils - "There is so much that history can give to other subjects and other subjects can give to history, that to deny it would be to deprive the pupils."<sup>18</sup>

#### *Schools where history was taught through specifically historical topics*

School F was a modern open-plan Primary school of 180 pupils on the edge of a metropolitan area. The homes in the neighbourhood were all privately owned, the children coming from a middle and lower management background. The visit to the school took place at a very appropriate time as all eight classes were currently displaying the work they had done in history during the past term. Every available wall and display area featured children's work. This had been an outcome of the recent introduction of a detailed set of humanities guidelines drawn up by the head of humanities at the school.

The guidelines were not for an integrated humanities curriculum. History and geography were approached as separate disciplines which shared similar criteria, "for a sequence of development in children's thinking and the emphasis on an active involvement in problem-solving."<sup>19</sup> That far more attention was devoted to history than geography and that the only example of a geography

topic was one in which there was almost more history than geography, revealed the author's interest in teaching about the past. The history guidelines were based on the assumption that pupils,

...should learn to understand the past in the way that an historian does, through: (a) empathy, (b) moral awareness, (c) developing a historical vocabulary through the use of selected concepts, (d) learning to interpret a variety of contemporary evidence.<sup>20</sup>

They explored the development of young children at three stages (5-7, 7-9, 9-11) in each of the four areas (see Appendix 4). There was no emphasis on content, rather a concern for emotional and intellectual growth. Detailed examples of three topics taught by the author during the previous three years were provided to illustrate how topics could be planned according to the four criteria. They included: A village study; A Story: The murder of Thomas 'a Becket; and Eighteenth Century England. The headteacher's opinion was that the guidelines were intended to make a co-ordinated approach to history possible while leaving room for the initiative of the individual teacher. As the head of humanities confessed, the guidelines could not have been content-based, "because nobody in this school would want to be told what they were teaching in terms of content."

The work displayed in the school demonstrated the type of curriculum envisaged by the guidelines. The four 5-7 year-old classes produced work on the following topics: 'Me', 'Mummy - me', 'Granny - me', and 'When Granny was little'. In each there had been some investigation of the pupils' own experiences and development, time charts had been made, and questionnaires had been completed on the basis of talks with mummy and granny. All of the work had been designed with display in mind and much was of a graphic and concrete nature. The other four classes (8-11 year-olds) had done 'When Granny was little - the 1930s', 'The Bronze and Iron Ages in Britain', 'The Victorians' and 'Medieval England'. The Medieval England topic with which the top class had been involved, had included work on Roman castles, the Norman conquest and settlement, the Tower of London (which was one of their two field trips), the feudal system, the causes of war in medieval times, and the history of the local manor. There was a variety of writing, poems, dramatisations, copied documents and historical accounts, and a range of art and craft work ranging from a model of a medieval town and a motte and bailey castle modeled in clay, to painting. Each pupil had to keep a record in which she or he entered the written and creative work which had been done. This was later to be bound in a book by the pupils, together with the exercises they had done on historical skills such as examining evidence and detecting bias.

The school was firmly committed to the open-plan philosophy and much of the work done by the junior classes took place in one large room, which had a few smaller "quiet" rooms leading from it. Work is usually done in groups or individually, with a great deal of movement and interchange between children of different ages, who were encouraged to merge together and ask each other questions. At a time when the classes were all busy with their history topics one could find any number of small projects being tackled in one room, ranging from the Iron age to the Victorians. Adding to the interest of the history displays was one made by the headteacher herself, illustrating her family's history from 1770 to the present, with pictures, photographs and memorabilia.

School G was a Primary school of 360 pupils which was built 35 years ago in what was then a new housing development on the edge of a large town. It was situated between a council estate and a private suburban estate and drew pupils from both areas. The number of pupils had dropped by a quarter during the previous five years, leaving the school with surplus classroom space. When the present deputy headteacher had arrived at the school, he had found that in three junior classes a 'Castles' topic was being done in three successive years. It was to remedy this situation and to try to change the strong tradition of classroom autonomy that he drew up guidelines for social studies in the junior section of the school.

The guidelines approached social studies (history and geography) from a common philosophical position. They were eclectic, influenced by Bruner, statements of objectives and skills, *Place, Time and Society 8-13*, and the requirements of local comprehensive schools. A syllabus consisting of four possible topics was presented for each year together with the skills and concepts to be taught (see Appendix 5). Although the intention was that history and geography be taught in an integrated way, except for the fourth year, where they were to be treated separately in preparation for high school, the topics themselves were usually either historical or geographical. 'Family history', 'Exploration' and 'Invaders' for the third year, for example, were mainly historical, while 'Power' was geographical. Each topic was explained in some depth, under the following headings: A. Generalisations formed from the factual content; B. Material content; C. Visits and Fieldwork; D. Methods; E. Specific concepts and vocabulary.

Ideally, a teacher would select three of the topics to teach each year but would not be bound to teach them in the way laid down by the syllabus, nor would the topics necessarily be taught in exactly the same way the following year. The guidelines were compiled at the same time as the school had begun to develop its resources centre in an unused classroom and a large sum had been spent on providing sets of books, resource packs and video and audio-visual material specifically for the new syllabuses. They had been explicitly designed to limit the content overlap and, as the deputy head put it, "What I was keen to do was to make a balance between what I thought... it would be better for the children to know and what their teachers wanted them to know."<sup>21</sup> He had worked on the assumption that the pupils had "a first responsibility to their own history", rather than world history, which only featured in the 'Pioneers of the American West' topic. The other factor which had been considered in the choice of content was concepts and skills: "I had to have vehicles where I could get certain concepts and certain skills over."<sup>22</sup>

As part of the third year 'Family history' and fourth year 'Neighbourhood' themes, the school had collected items from the pupils to make a school museum, which was about to be opened at the time of the visit. There had been a very good response and a wide variety of items had been gathered within three weeks. The idea went further than simply involving pupils in creating a museum and in handling objects from the past; it was designed to create a point of focal interest for social studies and to draw the attention of parents and the public to what was being done.

School H was a Junior school in a city area, built about 20 years previously. At its peak enrolment there had been 500 pupils. When the visit took place there were 180 pupils divided into six classes. The headteacher and the head of humanities were both interested in history teaching and had a long association with the school. In 1982, after the county had published its guidelines for history and geography and the school had taken part in some of the work which had preceded them, the staff had decided to write its own scheme of work for history. They were preparing to do the same for geography.

Although much of the initiative for the scheme of work had probably been the headteacher's, the document provided every evidence that it had been negotiated with the staff at a number of meetings. A staff minute confirmed this. This was possibly why the suggestions made were very practical, and why the philosophical justification provided was brief and to the point. The main aims of the scheme of work were to be more specific about the school's objectives in teaching history and to avoid unnecessary repetition and serious omission. It was acknowledged that this would result in some restriction of choice for individual teachers, but, in the words of the headteacher, "What we were trying to do was to preserve some right of the teacher still to follow their own enthusiasms... so there's a tremendous lot of flexibility in the thing."<sup>23</sup> Another important advantage considered was that resources could be more effectively selected for acquisition and use and ideas and information shared. A list of the school's resources for teaching history was appended to the document.



The scheme of work could not be divided into four year-group classes because of the way that the six classes in the school had been organised, so it was divided into two sections, 7-9 and 9-11 years (see Appendix 6). In the Autumn term a 'patch' of time had to be chosen from five choices arranged chronologically from 'Before Man' to 'Modern Times'. In the Spring term there are four 'themes', such as 'Transport' and 'Inventions' in each section from which one was to be chosen, and in the Summer the work could be chosen either from a topic previously not chosen, from a television or radio series, or from a visit/field work. There was "a kind of core curriculum for the school" contained within the topics. It had been agreed, for instance, that the pupils should not leave the school without having come into contact with the Vikings and the Middle Ages, and that they should have some knowledge of local history. The flexibility of the scheme was illustrated by the headteacher, who indicated that it retained all the "main things" (in the Autumn term) but still allowed the choice of topics from television programmes.

As had been found in School G, the resources centre had become essential to the implementation of the history curriculum. It contained a similar range of fairly recent textbooks and audio-visual material. It was felt that a wide range of resources was needed to give teachers a proper choice of topics and to enable them to avoid having to repeat the same topics again the following year.

School I was a Primary school of 350 pupils in an area of a large town which was developed after the First World War. There were 200 juniors divided into seven classes. The school was approaching its 50th anniversary, and though not as old, its buildings reflected a time when there was much more money (and less imagination) available to be spent on primary schools. The teacher responsible for humanities had been a member of a study group for primary history which had been convened by the local adviser about five years previously. She had written the chapter on 'Teaching history' in the group's publication and had been responsible for compiling an environmental studies guideline for the school.

In many ways the school presented a contrast with Schools G and H. There was little to show that other teachers had adopted the ideas in the guidelines and their teaching appeared formal and textbook oriented. The guidelines were more properly for history and geography than for environmental studies. For each year there was a period of British history with a range of themes and patches (Year 3: Henry VI to George I; Year 4: George I to Elizabeth II) from which teachers could select what they wished to teach. At the end of each section there was a table of links between the history and geography syllabuses, showing how the two could be integrated. At first and second year level, where the head of humanities was teaching, pupils were involved with Anglo-Saxon and Viking history. They had done attractive craft work and maps, showing what could be achieved in a mixed ability class skewed to the lower range. She believed that the content was important because it was what is needed to "carry the concepts and skills".<sup>24</sup>

The most interesting aspect of the history teaching at the school was the history club. It had been running for five years and met about twice a week. There were approximately 20 pupils regularly involved. Activities had included a model-making exhibition, excursions to flint mines and a stone age village and compilations of local history. At the time of the visit the members were engaged in writing a history of the school and were visiting the records office to study an old school log book.

### *History as a time-tabled subject*

School J was a Junior school of 255 pupils on the outskirts of a large city. Unlike the other schools, it had not been recommended for its good practice in history, but was approached because of its policy of introducing a subject time-table in its two fourth year classes as a preparation for secondary school. The top classes were team-taught in some subjects while other subjects were

taught by the teachers who had a particular interest in them. In the lower classes the teaching of history and geography was integrated and done by means of topics chosen by the teachers. Most of these teachers typically spent a term each on history, geography and science topics. There were no curriculum guidelines for history, but the school did have a detailed reading and study skills guideline.

The headteacher and fourth year teachers believed that they had been able to combine the traditional strengths of group work and individual skills in the primary school with subject teaching. As the pupils still spent most of their day with their class teachers and the school was much smaller than a secondary school, they felt the subjects did not become more important than the pupils themselves. Thirty minutes homework a week was given in history and pupils were expected to complete at home what they did not complete at school. The teachers pointed out that this policy gave them extra time to devote to the basics during school hours. They rejected the accusation that they were simply introducing subject specialisation: what the pupils were getting were the specific skills and specialist vocabulary of the subjects but they were being taught by people who were not necessarily subject specialists.

The history curriculum for the fourth years was 20th century history, emphasising continuity and change and major events. It included an introduction about what history is and how one could learn about it. Teaching tended to be formal class teaching, with one two-hour period a week, though there was a significant degree of flexibility in teaching style. One of the teachers helping with the fourth year had recently been re-deployed from a secondary school. She had trained in history, and had been teaching a small third year class a course of local and family history.

---

## Notes

1. This objective is echoed in Knight (1983:16): "I am saying that before work on the past is put into the curriculum it is important to understand its classroom potential and the ways in which it is special." [Knight (1983) and Knight (1984) only became known to me after I had completed planning for the research and were not the inspiration for this thesis. It has been a source of interest to note how much of Peter Knight's subsequent writing has also coincided with areas of my interest and I regret that I have not enjoyed more direct contact with him.]
2. Knight and Smith (1989) have problematised the concept of good practice. They are concerned that the concept has been used as a route to educational improvement without any agreement over how it can be identified and broadcast.

The use of the term "good practice" in this research is a loose one, where it was not regarded paradigmatically, nor as a means to define curriculum development, but only to identify teachers who possessed a particular expertise in history teaching (compare Knight and Smith (1989:432-433)).

3. The decision to use a pupil questionnaire was influenced by Wilson (1981), who had used a pupil aptitude questionnaire in his study of slow learners in history in secondary schools. As the use of questionnaires with primary pupils involved similar research problems to those which he had encountered, his instrument was used as a pattern for some sections of the questionnaire and as a basis for comparison. The purpose which the questionnaire would serve was not dissimilar to that which Booth suggested for the pupil questionnaire in his study of the problems of secondary school history and assessment in 1966: "to see the

classroom situation from the children's angle" and "to give some indication of their attitude towards the subject" (1969:xii).

4. Nisbet and Watt (1978:8) regard the two serious weaknesses of survey research as (1) that it can obliterate unique features and patterns within small groups, and (2) that the researcher finds only what he seeks as, "if something is not covered in the survey instruments, it will be lost unless the respondent particularly wishes to supply extra information." The criticism is relevant to the pupil questionnaire as there was to be no opportunity to interview any of the pupils afterwards about their questionnaire responses.
5. As shown, for example, in DES (1984:5 and 6):  
From this group of reports a number of issues arise...
  - the need to consider the deployment of teaching staff in primary schools in relation to the curriculum offered and the specialist strengths which teachers have....
  - how to ensure that curricular guidelines are implemented, and their effect on the day-to-day work in the classroom evaluated.
6. Tape 1, side A.
7. Tape 1, side A.
8. Tape 4, side A.
9. Tape 6, side B.
10. Notes for course outline.
11. Tape 6, side B.
12. Tape 7, side B.
13. "*Man: A Course of Study* is an American social science curriculum mainly for the 10-12 year-old age range. It is film-based and is rich in materials. It was directed by Peter Dow with Jerome Bruner as chief consulting scholar, and the force of Bruner's ideas was powerful throughout the process of development" (Stenhouse 1975:90).
14. Tape 1, side B.
15. From an essay submitted for a B.Ed course requirement in 1982, entitled "A critical analysis of History, Geography and Social Science - Place, Time and Society (8-13)" See Appendix 2.
16. Tape 1, side B.
17. School curriculum statement, History, p.75.
18. Notes from a lecture given at an in-service course.
19. School Humanities curriculum, p.27.
20. School Humanities curriculum, p.3.

21. Tape 5, side B.
22. Tape 5, side B.
23. Tape 8, side A.
24. Tape 6, side B.

*Chapter Five***THE TEACHER INTERVIEWS**

Eleven teachers, six men and five women, were interviewed in informal discussion and more formally by means of the interview schedule (Appendix 7).<sup>1</sup> They were the staff members responsible for history in each school and the two teachers who taught the 4th year class at School J. With the exception of one of the teachers at School J, they were all history enthusiasts. Many of their comments related to their own teaching and not to the school as a whole, as they were interviewed as individuals rather than as representatives of the school. In some schools the headteachers were interviewed about their school's policy towards history. Some of their views have also been included in this chapter.

**The backgrounds of the teachers**

There was a wide range of age and educational experience amongst the teachers interviewed. Many of them had taken history at A-level and all except one, who was a University graduate, had received initial teaching qualifications at a College of Education. Of the ten who had a special interest in teaching history, only five took history as a main subject for their first teaching qualification. Two of the five who had not had become interested in history teaching through local history. One confessed that it was a response to a life-long interest in the past, one had become involved through an integrated humanities project and the other had come to history via geography and environmental studies. Four of the ten had qualified since 1973 and would have been exposed to some of the new thinking in history and geography during their training. The most recently qualified teacher had been teaching for six years, while four teachers had 20 or more years' experience. Five teachers had obtained further qualifications or were studying at the time, two of whom had studied full-time.

**Inspiration in history teaching**

An important objective of the interviews was to discover what had sparked the teacher's enthusiasm for teaching history as history in the primary school and what important influences continued to act as professional spurs.

Local history was a particular concern of three of the teachers. They shared common interests in that all three not only enjoyed discovering the past around them, but were interested in the historical method and were men who had a scientific background. To them the past provided information and data which could be used in the development of historical skills.

What whet my appetite was that in the late 60s I went on a Department of Education course and we did some work on census material up in Durham. That was what got me started.<sup>2</sup>

I feel myself very strongly influenced by what I would call the investigative dimension.... Local history gives you the opportunity for first-hand observation, for inquiry, for involving people in the community to come into the school, parents feel involved - it snowballs.<sup>3</sup>

They came closer than most of the other teachers to enabling their pupils to perform some of the tasks of the historian. In School B a micro-computer was being used to store census data (using the 'Quest' programme), and in School C the teacher had attended a course on Micro-PROLOG in history and was about to begin using computers in his teaching. But this was seen to be a natural

extension of their teaching. As the headteacher at School B put it, "We've always been doing it [data handling], but not with computers."

The most important recent influence in the teaching of the teacher at School A was his taking the course for the Advanced Certificate in the Teaching of History. The course had given him greater clarity of thought, "enabling me to put a better, more cohesive, structure into my history teaching", and a great deal of encouragement. He preferred long courses as he felt they provided the opportunity for reflection and had previously done diplomas in mathematics and science teaching. Short courses had, however, been valuable in introducing him to ideas such as the use of concepts and games and simulations. A lecturer at a College of Education had encouraged the teacher at School B in his local history work and he drew some of his ideas from a few books on the methods of local historians. Other in-service courses he had attended had also played an important part. At one he had obtained a glossary which his pupils could use when working with documents, which greatly facilitated his teaching. The teacher at School C had previously taught history in a high school, though he had left teaching for a few years before coming to his present post. In-service courses had been an important inspiration and he had tried to keep abreast of developments in history teaching through books published on the subject.

The involvement of staff members from School D in *Macos* had been through the county history adviser. Following a week-end course, *Macos* had been introduced to the school's curriculum. The school had become known for this, largely as a result of the work of one teacher, who had since left. The Open University featured it in a programme on *Curriculum in Action*. This was the background to the school's adoption of *Place, Time and Society*. Again the impetus was provided by an in-service course. "It all stems from... when we did the course," the teacher stated. Members of staff had attended other courses run by Fred Thompson<sup>4</sup>, and he had visited the school. The headteacher seemed to look back on the period with a certain amount of nostalgia. A number of teachers who had been involved in *Place, Time and Society* had been promoted to posts at other schools, and the Head indicated that their interest in the project had probably helped their promotion. There was no specific influence mentioned on history teaching as such.

The teachers at Schools E and F had been influenced by relatively recent training and involvement in educational research. The deputy head at School E was probably as close to being a primary history specialist as one could be while at the same time believing strongly in integrated teaching by class teachers. He had been influenced initially by a good college history course which had forced students to go beyond the lecture room to discover the past and to produce their own resources. As a result, his teaching depended very little on published materials. As a young teacher he had been involved in speaking at an in-service course led by his present headteacher, who had then been a county education adviser. Since then he had served on the history advisory committee for the county, and edited the primary section of its history periodical. A significant stimulus to his current teaching had been his assistance in the research done by his headteacher on materialising the spirit of a former age through literature. In-service experience had been important, though it was not courses which he regarded as most valuable, but the contribution of visitors invited to the school. The teacher at School E had previously been responsible for art and craft and found her interest in history re-kindled when she wrote a dissertation on children's thinking in history for an Advanced Diploma in Psychology. On her return to the school, she became head of Humanities. She set about creating a framework for history which was not content based. Her research interest had been maintained and she was currently engaged in an investigation into children's responses to different kinds of historical evidence.

Involvement in the process of curriculum development had been a significant stimulus for the teacher at School G. At the beginning of his career he had become part of a working group on environment studies in the primary school. He later served as a member of a group who had been

trying to rationalise curricula for newly created middle schools and was strongly influenced by a humanities adviser. During this period he was introduced to the ideas of *Place, Time and Society*. His most recent concerns had been in trying to establish liaison between high schools and primary schools in the locality, and assisting with the organisation of LEA in-service history courses. The main inspiration for the teacher at School I had also been involvement in a working group for primary history and participation in in-service courses.

School H had been brought to my attention as a result of its participation in a pilot project on the use of historical objects from a museum in the classroom. Pupils had been observed acting as 'detectives', trying to discover what the artefacts were. Their conversations had been tape recorded and an approach to using historical objects in the classroom had been developed. This was an example of the close liaison between the school, its humanities adviser and other interested primary history teachers which exists in the county. A more recent example had been the work done by a similar group of teachers in developing ideas on how to use local history as a resource for juniors. The teacher interviewed had always been encouraged by his headteacher to take part in courses held in the county, and these, together with a B.Ed course he had recently completed, had been the main influence in his current teaching.

The history teacher interviewed at School J had had only two terms at the school, since being re-deployed from a secondary school, where she had been in the physical education department. She had attended one in-service history course, which she thought had influenced her teaching quite significantly.

### **Integrated topic work and subject teaching**

All the teachers interviewed were anxious to distance themselves from what one referred to as "Unstead and Taylor, four books, one book per year"<sup>5</sup>, and yet were concerned that history should be taught in a recognisable way in the primary school. All believed that history could not be taught in isolation from other subjects, and no one wanted subject specialist teaching introduced.<sup>6</sup> A distinction was drawn between subject teaching and specialist teachers. One of the teachers who believed that subject teaching was wrong, believed in "an integrated style of teaching, where each teacher can bring their particular talent into it."<sup>7</sup> His headteacher had recognised him as having specialisms in history and mathematics, and was happy that he should not have to teach much science.

Beyond these basic ideas there was a wide range of opinions. In an area where one would expect little consensus there was one important point of agreement: whatever view was taken of the way that humanities or social studies should be taught, there could and ought to be the opportunity to teach historical skills within an historical framework or progression.

The accepted wisdom of progressive primary practice was very clearly stated by one of the headteachers:

It's ever so simple to put a label 'History' on an idea, or 'Geography' on an idea, but in fact we're probably all doing this all the time anyway.... If you examine... the planned curriculum documents, there's a wealth of subject area stuff, but we haven't done timetables to segregate it into little compartments of learning.... Where do you put it into little boxes? That's not what education is.<sup>8</sup>

There was an appreciation of the idea that the methods of the new history could be accommodated within an integrated primary approach. Its strength lay in the relation of the skills of different

subjects to each other. This was clearly illustrated by a statement made by the deputy head at School E, which taught history through integrated topics:

One of the things I've been kicking against is the transfer of our children from this broad-based integrated approach to studies in primary schools that is based upon enquiry, upon evidence, upon using the historian as detective, being able to sort out clues, interpret evidence, come to a conclusion, and that may be the same in science or geography, or whatever; where we bring to a period the literature, the art, the drama, the geography... and they go to a comprehensive school where it is pigeon-holed and no one subject will bear any resemblance to another.<sup>9</sup>

The teacher developed his view further when he explained, "All subjects dwell in the house of history... so if we use history as our starting point we can draw upon all these other subject areas to expand and fulfill what we're trying to do in the classroom with any particular project."<sup>10</sup>

The teachers at School J did not share the optimism of the advocates of integrated topic work. Their reasons were pragmatic, rather than philosophic. As one of them elucidated,

Why people stick to topic work is that it is so broad. It doesn't matter if you don't (sic) make mistakes, because all you're basically doing is giving the children books and saying, 'Go and answer the questions'. And if they end up with nothing you can blame it on the books or anything else, but not on you.<sup>11</sup>

While she generalised about the nature of topic work, she focused on the position of the teacher in the classroom. She felt that post-Plowden teachers had become very insecure because they were unsure of what their role was, as "nobody showed the teacher at what point they should need to be, and at what point they need to point a child in the right direction." Teaching within the subject divisions restored a sense of direction to the teaching and gave the teacher a sense of security. She believed that the advantages of subject-based teaching were apparent to children as well, because they were provided with a framework in which to organise their knowledge,. Previously on entering secondary school her pupils had had " ...four years of bits and pieces - they've not had any sort of scientific work, they've not had any history or geography work that they can identify." She added her justification:

I often feel that when people say that children see things in an integrated way that's an adult approach being imposed on a child. I'm not sure that children necessarily see it. I think they're probably more compartmentalised than we give them credit for.<sup>12</sup>

Though the school believed that it is not simply reproducing a secondary subject pattern at primary level, there is a certain traditionalism about subject boundaries, as the teacher was against creating new subjects (such as World Studies), which she felt could easily be incorporated into the existing framework.<sup>13</sup>

A question which all the teachers were asked was whether they ever repeated what they had taught with subsequent classes, and if so, at what intervals. The hypothesis on which the question was based was that teachers who had put effort into resourcing a topic well and were attempting to achieve some of the objectives of the new history would be less likely to find it "boring" to teach it again. Their answers appear to support the hypothesis. The teachers who were using local history as the basis of their teaching all agreed that they would include elements of their work in subsequent years. Their approach would be similar, but they would use some new material. Teachers at School D following *Place, Time and Society*, had repeated about half of the topics taught, but they had not always been taught in the same way. "If something worked particularly



well then I might want to do the same thing again. After doing it three times, I must admit I would be glad perhaps to change it next time and come back to it again after a rest,"<sup>14</sup> one replied. All of the teachers at the schools where history was taught through specifically historical topics were inclined to repeat topics to a certain extent, though for some this had been a recent novel experience. One acknowledged that it was the first time she had done so. "I would not have considered doing that until last year... but having done that, I would certainly recommend it, because what I've done this year has been a) so much easier and b) so much more refined."<sup>15</sup> Another expressed the same sentiment and added that, "...when you do things a couple of times... you can also help some one else."<sup>16</sup> One experienced teacher was clearly not in favour of an annual repeat because he enjoyed exploring new ground. He estimated that he repeated a topic once every three years, as he felt it would be silly not to use the resources which had been accumulated again.<sup>17</sup> Teachers at School J were happy to repeat their history course. As one described it, to take the attitude that a theme should not be repeated because it gets boring, "suggests that you as a teacher have got nothing to learn.... I don't feel that at all, because all the time I feel that I've learned something about the way it has gone across."<sup>18</sup>

Two suggestions were made regarding the need for specialist subject knowledge in primary schools. The first was that teachers ought to be able to contribute their own particular talents to the curriculum. One teacher was emphatic, stating that he tended to teach projects that were historically biased because that was his strength, and that other teachers should emphasise their strengths. It was right, he felt, to build a curriculum around the strengths of the staff.<sup>19</sup> Others were not so explicit, but seemed implicitly to have accepted that they would teach more history orientated topics than others, and their allocation of time reflected this. Another suggestion was that it was in the best interests of the school to look at the overall curriculum and to decide which areas needed particular attention. Teachers with specialist knowledge could then be used in classes where the teacher was not as well equipped to teach the subject.

### **Innovation and the new history**

Teachers were asked about the influence of *Place, Time and Society*, the work of John West (the Dudley project on children's awareness of the past) and the Schools Council History 13-16 project on their teaching. They also commented on the implications of teaching in terms of the new history.

The teachers who concentrated on local history, saw themselves clearly as introducing their pupils to the work of an historian, though the techniques of the historian were not taught in a systematic way.<sup>20</sup> In each case this meant that the teachers were constantly immersing themselves in historical study. It meant also that they were exposing themselves to questions to which they did not know the answers. Some suggested that this was the beginning of pupils' historical understanding: "Children get quite cross when they think they [the facts] should be known."<sup>21</sup> Another teacher linked this process to children's natural curiosity.

I think the children ought to develop an inquiring nature. They want to find out for themselves... it's our job to act as a filter for that type of thing, facilitator to gain access to, maybe, a period.<sup>22</sup>

Most of those interviewed believed that the main challenge was to get away from the idea that history was more than simply reading and copying from a book, as so much topic work tended to be.

At School D, the implications of using *Place, Time and Society* were explored. From the headteacher's point of view, a very important reason for adopting the ideas of *Place, Time and*

*Society*, was that it would give the school direction in the humanities. There was a concern that the school should be clear about what it was doing and that staff members ought to work together to achieve common curriculum goals. He believed that the fact that the school had had more staff at the time it was introduced had made it easier to innovate and motivate people. It had been essential to get as many staff members as possible to attend the courses, as even with this experience it had been difficult to implement the project. He regarded the use of key concepts as the most difficult area with which teachers had to familiarise themselves. It was not clear how many concepts could be taught in a unit and what exactly should be taught about each concept. Trial and error and the realisation that one needed to limit each unit to one concept eventually led the school a relatively simple but practical planning exercise for each term's work. The head of humanities described the responses of other teachers on being introduced to the project:

And you bring it back to school and you're all enthusiastic because you think this is really good. And you show it to other people and there was an instant, 'God, that's really difficult.' 'That's far too complicated, it'll never work.'"<sup>23</sup>

In her analysis of *Place, Time and Society* she had attempted to explain the failure of the diffusion phase of the project. The main cause was that it was too complicated for most people: "There's such a mass of words and ideas and things, that it's very confusing."<sup>24</sup> She was more specific in her written account. "the frequent fact of its failure must... be blamed upon the unwillingness of many teachers to accept a process which involved them in unaccustomed decision making and responsibility."<sup>25</sup> The long term nature of the project and the fact that individual teachers on their own could not really succeed in achieving its ideals were stressed. It required sustained support, preferably from a project team, and adequate opportunity to build up resources. The fact that most teachers, "prefer concrete materials contained in kits which can be used in the classroom to a difficult and abstract book"<sup>26</sup>, was another important reason for its failure.

Four of the other nine teachers interviewed had not read or made use of any *Place, Time and Society* material. The remaining five had read something on the project and had been influenced by it in various ways. They had all rejected the project packs, but identified themselves with the concepts approach. Two of them had incorporated some of the project's ideas in their curriculum guidelines. The most positive response came from a teacher who had found that it expressed his own ideas,

...in a better way than I could ever explain them. Concepts, skills and attitude teaching is exactly where I wanted to be rather than content and knowledge, and I could see that those concepts and skills were the perfect vehicle for teaching the content."<sup>27</sup>

Eight of the ten teachers knew the Schools Council History 13-16 project, particularly the 'What is History?' unit. But beyond the detective exercise, they had not used any of its ideas in their teaching. Five teachers knew of John West's work. One described him as "my great hero"<sup>28</sup>, and two had attended courses that he had helped run. There was no evidence of any of them having used his curriculum outlines (West (1981b)), but two teachers had used artefacts in the classroom along the lines which he had pioneered. One of the local history teachers, at School B, had made much use of West's Village Records<sup>29</sup> but knew nothing of his Dudley work. Although the question had not been asked, five of the teachers volunteered that they were familiar with Jon Nichol's Evidence series of books<sup>30</sup> and had used some of the material in their teaching. One teacher who knew neither the History 13-16 or Dudley projects, enthused about the response to one of the books from a very average class of 10-year-olds<sup>31</sup>.

## Barriers to innovation

Teachers were not asked to discuss the barriers to innovation per se, but during the course of the interviews issues were raised which revealed the difficulties which the teachers had faced.

For the local history teachers the main difficulties related to getting suitable material to use in the classroom. Each of them had spent a great deal of time, and sometimes his own money, on obtaining resources. The teacher at School A admitted that he would not have been able to what he had if he had not lived very close to the county record office. The cost of copying and enlarging the photographs which he used, which had been quite considerable, he had met himself.<sup>32</sup> The teacher at School C lived in a town forty miles from the record office. He described spending an afternoon "just finding some details of census material" as a joy but a chore especially, as he said, "I quite like to use the real thing all the time."<sup>33</sup> The main difficulties experienced by the teacher at School B were in using the documents and census returns. Glossaries had to be obtained, contemporary pictures or photographs of artefacts had to be found and, while it wasn't difficult or expensive to obtain census statistics, it took hours to type them on to a computer.

Where the curriculum innovation had involved the whole school, there was only one example (School H) of it being tackled by the staff as a whole. In Schools F, G and I the curricula had been drawn up by one teacher, with some consultation with others. At School F, there appeared to be a ready acceptance of the guidelines prepared and a willingness to try them out. As they only been in operation for a term, it was too early to tell whether other staff members would continue to follow the suggested approaches closely. The adoption of the guidelines was undoubtedly helped by the fact that the staff were accustomed to co-operating with one another within the open plan building. There was less openness to change at School G. The teacher described how he had established the new social studies curriculum, as follows,

Unfortunately, if I'd gone to the staff and perhaps used the prescribed democratic approach: 'Let's get together and talk about our curriculum development', I'd have got absolutely nowhere. So very autocratically, I said, 'Right, there is the system - this is it'. Now, I think if I had done it as blandly as that, I think there'd have been an eruption. Fortunately there wasn't, what I did - I realised that there was going to be a problem with choice, people were very keen to choose - so what I did, I really structured the content first of all, and made a sort of menu situation... within a narrow area they can choose what they want to do.<sup>34</sup>

His main concern had been to co-ordinate the content of the history and geography taught in the school, to avoid overlapping. The 'menu' incorporated in the guidelines ended this problem, but despite this, some staff members had still "felt a bit aggrieved". The guidelines also contained much information on how history ought to be taught, but it seemed, possibly in the light of the resistance to the content changes, that there had been little attempt to influence the teaching approaches of other members of staff. School I provided an unexpected example of how such curricula changes could fail to find acceptance. The teacher interviewed seemed to be the only history enthusiast on the staff, and the attitude of others appeared to be to indulge her interest rather than to turn to her for advice. The guidelines for content were being followed but there was little sense of innovation in classroom practice. Of all the schools visited, this was the only one without a number of young teachers on the staff. The impression gained was that of contentment with the status quo.

At two schools, G and H, the introduction of a new curriculum guideline was linked with the provision of extra teaching resources. Both schools had good resource centres, which had been furnished in part by the PTAs, and both had spent proportionately more on resources for history as a result of the new guidelines. In School G it was part of the attempt to convert staff to the guideline to provide resources for them, while in School H it seemed to be the natural response to

having to decide what history would be taught. Both teachers involved were aware of the advantages of introducing new ideas to the staff through new books and resource packs. Each school had a good collection of video tapes of television programmes, each had collected class sets of textbooks/resource books on a range of topics, and, to a lesser extent, had bought slide and computer programmes. Another parallel was that their resource centres had been established in empty classrooms. One can only speculate whether the centres would have been developed had the physical space not been available. The importance of such resources was underlined by another, older, teacher at School H. He commented on the comprehensive set of teacher's notes and suggestions which accompanied a computer simulation of the voyages of discovery<sup>35</sup>: "To be honest, it's very useful to me to have all the information provided." These were not the only schools visited which had resource collections, but they were better organised and more extensive than at other schools. The most important resource available to all the teachers was the photocopier, of which one teacher commented, "I think the photocopier has liberated teachers."<sup>36</sup> It is difficult to envisage source based teaching having been conducted without one.

### **The role of textbooks**

None of the teachers interviewed were particularly keen on using textbooks. There were two distinct groups - those who used textbooks in a limited way and those who used them seldom, if ever. The local history teachers fell into the latter category, as did the teachers at Schools D, E and F. They were inclined to use textbooks solely for their illustrations when they did use them, though one remarked, "I always find the Oxford books very useful, because they are so awful and full of mistakes, that I use them for that."<sup>37</sup>

Where textbooks were used, albeit sparingly, the most common series seen were the *Oxford Junior History*, Longmans *History in Focus* and individual titles of Longmans *Focus on History*. At Schools G, H, I and J where textbooks might be used by a class as a whole, the teachers interviewed tended not to use them as the basis of a series of lessons, but rather as resources for particular lessons. A teacher at School J explained that she thought they were particularly relevant when you wanted all the pupils to work on something at the same time. Her attitude was atypical, however and was probably influenced by her high school teaching background. The teachers at Schools G and H felt that the textbook did help to provide a structure for a period of history, and were important for those times when a teacher simply did not have the time to prepare his own material. Both agreed that they were more important for the non-specialist teacher - as had been demonstrated in practice at School I - and could provide a reasonable basis for teaching. Almost all the teachers commented that the reading level of a series such as the *Oxford Junior History* was too high. This might have been a contributory factor towards not wanting to use textbooks, though they also acknowledged that the reading levels of the supplementary books used for topic/project work were also too high. It was common to find amongst these books titles from series such as Nichol's *Evidence*, which were intended for the lower secondary school. These books, as more than one teacher recognised, were a valuable source of ideas for the teacher, and, when simplified, could be used successfully with Juniors, as the reading level was not as high as that of many other books available<sup>38</sup> A recent series of books praised by one of the teachers was Sallie Purkis' *Into the Past*, published by Longman. "We found these extremely good. The advantage of these is that they can be used by less able kids as well - they're spot on. You've got contemporary comment as well as the photographs of actual artefacts themselves and just enough information to be digestible."<sup>39</sup> He added that they had been used by most of the teachers in the school.

## Television and radio

Attitudes towards using television and radio programmes were similar to those to textbooks. Most teachers used educational broadcasts in a limited way whenever they suited the topics being taught. Four schools made more use of television than the others. The teachers' comments contrast interestingly. The teacher in School D stated that she used television programmes frequently, "They do produce an awful lot of material to go with them - it's produced well." She confessed that television was one of the main influences determining the content of the topics she taught - that and the availability of books from the library service.<sup>40</sup> At School H there was an explicit recognition that TV and radio programmes ought to be used by teachers, and the curriculum was designed to accommodate them in a structured way, not haphazardly as before. The headteacher gave his opinion, "... history broadcasts, whether they're on radio or TV are pretty good - you can hardly fault them really...."<sup>41</sup>

The teacher at School E responded in more detail and was critical of some of the popular TV programmes. *History Around You* he disliked the most, because he felt that it treated the past in complete isolation and the programmes themselves were not even linked together. "These programmes are dipstick programmes - in terms of enriching the curriculum they do nothing for it at all." He admitted *that How We Used To Live* used drama to great effect, and that, "for non-historians they're probably super programmes", but he felt that there were deficiencies in that they did not reflect the international events or the life of the everyday man in the street.<sup>42</sup> The programmes which he did favour were those of Michael Wood, despite their difficulty for children. He had developed part of the topic on the basis of some of Wood's programmes and the accompanying book. He described it as,

...the classic case of an historian drawing on other resources, music, drama, sound effects, photography, literature, the link from the past to the present. When he does William the Conqueror, for example, he starts off with the D-Day landings, and talks to French historians, goes to places, follows a theme. I think that's what the other programmes ought to do for the primary children to draw on and... to stimulate their imagination, but it doesn't say at the end of the programme, 'Oh, well chaps, we've done a railway station today.' But leads on to enough work across the curriculum for the rest of the week.<sup>43</sup>

He was more enthusiastic about BBC Schools radio programmes, because they allowed more scope for imagination and provided many opportunities for integrated work. At the time he was using an historical fiction series<sup>44</sup> with his class, and it provided them with setting and factual account on which to base creative work and study skills.

## Objectives for Pupil Progress in Historical skills

Four of the teachers (at Schools B, E, F, J) were asked to comment on David Sylvester's *Some Objectives for Pupil Progress in Historical Skills* matrix (Appendix 1) in order to test whether the objectives it suggested for 10 and 12 year-old pupils were realistic or not, and to find to what extent the teachers made use of such objectives. The teachers represented the four different teaching approaches identified in Chapter 4 and were from four very different types of schools. They all regarded the objectives as attainable, with some reservations regarding the more abstract vocabulary in Column 3, the making of inferences about evidence in Column 4, and some of the questions listed in Column 6. One of the teachers was familiar with the matrix, but none consciously used objectives like these as a checklist in his own teaching. All the teachers responded to the objectives by indicating the areas where they thought their teaching was weak or strong (though they had not been asked to do so), as if to show that they were sure pupils could achieve what was listed, but that their own pupils had not always been taught everything

mentioned. One teacher thought her pupils should know the periods from Roman to Victorian (Column 2) in sequence, but was not sure, another used the opportunity to test his class and found that half the class placed them in correct order, though they had not been taught the list mechanically, and a third commented that, while he was strong on the use of evidence (Column 4), he was weakest on chronology. Two of the teachers noticed immediately that the computer was not included in the list of reference skills (Column 1) and felt that it should have been.<sup>45</sup> The impression gained from all four teachers was that they had been aware of the implications of the objectives listed, but had never considered trying to attain them in the comprehensive way the matrix seemed to envisage. They had been conscious that they had chosen to select certain areas to concentrate upon while neglecting others. Nevertheless, they had been satisfied with what their pupils could achieve, measured against these objectives.

---

## Notes

1. The interviews were semi-structured in that teachers were encouraged to talk freely about their practice and enthusiasms. Where there was obviously no interest or knowledge of an aspect included in the interview schedule, it was not pursued. All of the interviewees granted permission for the interviews to be tape recorded. The tapes are held by the researcher.
2. Teacher School B, tape 4, side A.
3. Teacher at School A, tape 1 side 1.
4. F.A. Thompson was national co-ordinator for the project.
5. Teacher at School H tape 8, side A.
6. Though one of the teachers commented that the term non-specialist was a misnomer, as, "primary teachers were now expected to be experts in everything" (tape 6, side A).
7. Teacher at School E, tape 2, side A.
8. Headteacher at School F, tape 4, side B.
9. Tape 2, side B.
10. Tape 2, side A.
11. Tape 3, side A.
12. Tape 3, side A.
13. Tape 3, side B.
14. Tape 2, side B.
15. Teacher at School F, tape 5, side B.
16. Teacher at School G, tape 6, side B.

17. Teacher at School H, tape 8, side A.
18. Tape 3, side A.
19. Teacher at School E, tape 2, side A.
20. See Chapter 7 for comment on the pupils' questionnaire responses.
21. Teacher at School A, tape 1, side A.
22. Teacher at School E, tape 2, side A.
23. Tape 1, side B.
24. Tape 2, side A.
25. An essay submitted for a B.Ed course requirement in 1982, entitled "A critical analysis of History, Geography and Social Science - Place, Time and Society (8-13)." Appendix 2.
26. Appendix 2.
27. Teacher at School E, tape 2, side A.
28. Teacher at School A, tape 1, side A.
29. West (1962).
30. Textbooks published for the 11-14 age range by Basil Blackwell.
31. Headteacher at School D, tape 1, side B.
32. Tape 1, side A.
33. Tape 6, side B.
34. Tape 5, side B.
35. Into the unknown published by Tressel publications.
36. Tape 7, side A.
37. Teacher at School C, tape 7, side A.
38. Trevorrow (1980) analysed the reading levels of 158 project/topic books commonly used in primary schools and found that half of them had a reading level of 15+ years.
39. Teacher at School H, tape 8, side B.
40. Tape 1, side B; tape 2, side A.
41. Tape 8, side A.

42. [A generalisation which is not entirely correct.]
43. Tape 2, side B.
44. Armada Rock by Christopher Russell, a story involving the Coast Guard Service and a crooked museum curator paying a frogman to dive to a ship from the Armada.
45. Tape 2, side B; tape 3, side B; tape 4, side B; tape 5, side B.



**THE PUPIL QUESTIONNAIRE****Design and purpose**

The questionnaire was intended to provide evidence of ways in which the new history was being accommodated within the primary curriculum by the schools and, equally importantly, to allow the attitudes and opinions of the pupils to influence the case studies. Specifically, it was designed to provide answers to the following research questions:

- 1 What correlation is there between the pupils' attitude towards school in general and their attitude to history in particular? Is there a difference between the attitudes of the pupils in the research sample of ten case study schools from those in the control group?
- 2 How do the pupils rate history and their other school subjects from the point of view of interest?
- 3 How do the pupils describe what history is, and what reasons have they for wanting to do more, the same, or less history at school?
- 4 What transfer of interest is there from history in the classroom to other areas? Is there a difference between the responses of the two groups?
- 5 Which of the common elements of the content of the primary history curriculum do pupils enjoy or dislike most?
- 6 What do the pupils know and understand of the work of a historian?
- 7 How familiar are the pupils with the vocabulary associated with history and an awareness of the past?

*The sample*

There was no sampling procedure used for the pupils of the ten schools studied, as they had been selected on the basis of their history teachers and the teaching being done. It was intended that a fourth year junior class (10-11 years) and a third year junior class (9-10 years) in each school should complete the questionnaire. In practice, one of these classes was usually that of the teacher interviewed (except Schools A, B, F, and I), the other being selected by him, chosen by the headteacher, or otherwise offered by an interested staff member. In the event, it proved difficult to involve as many third years as fourth years. One reason was that at some schools the third years had not done any history at the time of the visit (Schools A and B). Another factor affecting the response from certain schools was that some teachers whose classes completed the questionnaire taught history in a markedly different way from those interviewed (Schools B, E and I). At School C, a Middle School, the pupils who completed the questionnaire were 11-12 years and 12-13 years old. It was felt that their inclusion in the sample would not seriously affect the correlations found and might provide an interesting, though not statistically significant, comparison with the juniors. Table 1 gives the breakdown of the sample by sex and class. At all of the schools the classes were of mixed ability, as confirmed later by the distribution of scores for the vocabulary test.

Table 1: Pupil Questionnaire Sample: The Ten Schools

| School | N   | Boys | Girls | 3 <sup>rd</sup><br>year | 4 <sup>th</sup><br>year | 11-12 | 12-13 |
|--------|-----|------|-------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|
| A      | 30  | 17   | 13    | -                       | 30                      | -     | -     |
| B      | 27  | 16   | 11    | -                       | 27                      | -     | -     |
| C      | 47  | 21   | 26    | -                       | -                       | 27    | 20    |
| D      | 40  | 16   | 24    | 20                      | 20                      | -     | -     |
| E      | 46  | 25   | 21    | 16                      | 30                      | -     | -     |
| F      | 43  | 14   | 29    | 19                      | 24                      | -     | -     |
| G      | 35  | 21   | 14    | 17                      | 18                      | -     | -     |
| H      | 46  | 23   | 23    | 3                       | 43                      | -     | -     |
| I      | 42  | 21   | 21    | 19                      | 23                      | -     | -     |
| J      | 55  | 23   | 23    | 25                      | 30                      | -     | -     |
| TOTAL  | 411 | 197  | 214   | 119                     | 245                     | 27    | 20    |
| %      | 100 | 49.7 | 52.1  | 29.0                    | 59.6                    | 6.6   | 4.9   |

The schools for the control group were chosen after the completion of the main study with the aid of a survey of history teaching made during teaching practice by B.Ed students at the University of Exeter. The three schools selected drew their pupils from different social backgrounds. At one of them (School K) only fourth year juniors completed the questionnaire so that the proportion of third to fourth years would be the same as that in the sample of ten schools. It was apparent that if three primary schools had been chosen at random, one or more might not have taught any history in a recognisable way, so the schools selected were ones where the history curricula were known. The size of the control group was 39% of the total number of pupils who had completed questionnaire in the ten schools studied, as shown by Table 2.

Table 2: Pupil Questionnaire Sample: The Control Schools

| School | N   | Boys | Girls | 3 <sup>rd</sup><br>year | 4 <sup>th</sup><br>year | 11-12 | 12-13 |
|--------|-----|------|-------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|
| K      | 56  | 25   | 31    | -                       | 56                      | -     | -     |
| L      | 41  | 21   | 20    | 20                      | 21                      | -     | -     |
| M      | 64  | 37   | 27    | 31                      | 33                      | -     | -     |
| TOTAL  | 161 | 83   | 78    | 51                      | 110                     | -     | -     |
| %      | 100 | 51.5 | 48.5  | 31.7                    | 68.3                    | -     | -     |

Table 3: Pupil Questionnaire Sample: Ten Schools and Control Schools

| School | N   | Boys | Girls | 3 <sup>rd</sup><br>year | 4 <sup>th</sup><br>year | 11-12 | 12-13 |
|--------|-----|------|-------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------|-------|
| TOTAL  | 572 | 280  | 292   | 170                     | 355                     | 27    | 20    |
| %      | 100 | 49.0 | 51.0  | 29.7                    | 62.1                    | 4.7   | 3.5   |

### *The content of the questionnaire*

The questionnaire (see Appendix 8) was constructed on the model of the Pupil Attitude Questionnaire used by Wilson (1981)<sup>1</sup> in his study of low achievers in history in three comprehensive schools. It was believed that it would be advantageous to use an instrument which had been carefully constructed and successfully employed previously, and that Wilson's results might provide a basis for comparison. Section 1 of the questionnaire contained five items on school in general and the same five items on history to provide a comparison of attitude. It was

based on items used by Wilson (1981:62-63, 65-68; 1985:141-147), but was an abbreviated version of his test (10 items in the case of attitude towards school; 20 in the case of attitude towards history.) As such it might be criticised as having been too brief to provide a valid measure of attitude. The purpose of Section 1 was, however, not to measure attitudes in depth, but to provide a yardstick against which to judge responses in the rest of the questionnaire. Increasing the number of items would have made the questionnaire longer and have made it less likely that the pupils would sustain their concentration till the end. The five items chosen were selected to provide a basis for correlation between attitude towards school and history and for correlations with scores on other sections of the questionnaire.

Sections 2, 3 and 4 were derived from Wilson's (1981) questionnaire, adapted and abbreviated for primary pupils. Section 2 contained a list of eight primary school subjects to be considered on a criterion of interest. Geography had to be excluded from the analysis of results, as there were schools where the pupils were unfamiliar with the term. Section 3 was included to give pupils the opportunity of writing something to break the succession of alternative response items, and to allow an analysis of their definition of history. Section 4 contains items which test the pupils' attitude to history in more depth and items to test to what extent an interest in history is transferred to activities beyond the classroom. The list of 'Kinds of history' in Section 5 was constructed to test the popularity of common areas of the primary school curriculum. The wording of this section was criticised by a teacher who thought it ought to refer to 'Finding out about' rather than 'Learning about'.

Section 6 was designed to test whether the thinking typical of the new history was familiar to pupils or not. The score would be correlated with the score of Section 7 to indicate to what extent historical understanding was linked to vocabulary acquisition. The vocabulary test was adapted from that of West (1981b: 85-86, 176) with the intention of comparing the results with his. Ten definitions which covered the range of his responses, from 'century' (94%) to 'periods' (21%) were chosen. To the words from his list, five others which were not specifically historical were added. This was to make it easier to identify what proportion of the sample had a good general vocabulary, as opposed to a 'historical' vocabulary. The words added were: catalogue, autobiography, vagrant, slogan and sanctuary.

### *The administration of the questionnaire*

A pilot trial of the questionnaire was conducted to test the differentiation of the items, the comprehension of the questions by the pupils and the practicality of administering the questionnaire within a certain time to a wide range of pupils in different classroom settings. After the pilot trial the following procedure was adopted.

The class teacher remained in the classroom at her/his own discretion. The teacher's presence was useful when there was a pupil who was much slower than the rest of the class. She/he could then complete the questionnaire at her/his own pace with the teacher's assistance, when needed. The wording of the questionnaire was read in its entirety page by page to each class by the researcher, the pace usually being determined by the slowest pupil. The pilot trial raised the issue of the honesty (or ability) of pupils in giving independent and truthful answers. This aspect was stressed when the instructions were read. It was made clear that there was no point in answering the questions if the answers were not the pupils' own, or if they had not thought about them. Talking to each other was forbidden and pupils were advised not to look at others' answers, as they were private, and knowing what someone else had answered would only make it more difficult to give a personal answer of their own. Once this had been explained there was never any difficulty in obtaining the full co-operation of the pupils. The impression gained was that, with almost no exceptions, they gave the questionnaire their full concentration. Many clearly enjoyed the exercise.

The naivety of primary school pupils must, despite the potential problems mentioned, make them good subjects when the questions are within their understanding and concentration span.

With Section 1, the five options to Questions 1-3 were carefully explained. The fact that the questions are posed in the opposite way in Questions 4 and 5 was clearly indicated, and the term "your mind wander off" explained. The classes were asked before they answered Question 6 whether they could say what history was. The answer obtained was almost always "about the past" (or similar). Reference was then made to work that they had previously done in history, to ensure that the connection was made. Pupils were asked to understand that the term "history lessons" meant everything which they had done at school in history that year. With Section 2 the column headed 'Undecided' was explained to the pupils. They were told to use it when there were some things which they found interesting and some things which they found boring in a subject, and therefore, could not make up their minds. They were asked not to use the column as an excuse for not making up their minds, but rather only after they had considered the other columns first. Encouragement was given to pupils to write whatever they could in Section 3. A short sentence about what they thought history was would suffice, but if they could write more than one sentence or give more than one idea, they should try to do so. As some pupils had found it difficult to provide the reason for their response in Question 2 during the pilot trial, particularly if their answer was 'The same as now', pupils were told that if they did not have a reason, they need not complete the statement. 56 of 411 (13.6%) did not.

No additional instructions were given for Section 4. With Section 5 it was emphasised that pupils should imagine that they were able to learn about the different kinds of history. Where it was known that they had studied a particular area of history, the example was mentioned. The statement, 'Learning about the history of my family and other families' twice elicited the question, 'What if I like learning about my family but not about others?' The response was to use the 'Undecided' column. Classes were asked if they could explain what a historian was before they answered Section 6. The answer, 'Someone who studies the past', was always easily elicited from a pupil. Though the format differed from the previous sections, there were no questions regarding it, and pupils appeared to find it easy to understand. Only two pupils made all their responses in one column, both in the 'Undecided' column. The vocabulary test in Section 7 was left till the end to give pupils the opportunity to finish it in their own time. As it was appreciated that there would be those who might not be able to complete any of the words, it was stressed that they need not attempt any of the words if they did not want to, but they were encouraged to use it as a test for themselves to see how many they could do. 18 pupils (3.2%) did not complete any of the words correctly.

### *Limitations of the enquiry*

The completion of a relatively long questionnaire by 9 to 11 year old children presents particular problems. These are similar to those mentioned by Wilson (1981). In his discussion of his questionnaire for slow-learners in the secondary school, he also found that he had to read the questions for the pupils section by section. He was concerned about the concentration span of his pupils and he feared illogical responses from some pupils (1981:62-63).

The pilot trial established, as Wilson's had done, that the pupils had no difficulty in coping with the length of the questionnaire (average time to complete = 35 minutes), and were interested in the questions asked. They were often eager to turn over to see what was on the next page when they had completed a section. The questionnaire was so designed that no section would take too long to complete, and that there would be differences between the way questions were asked in each section, making unreasoned responses less likely. The issue of illogical responses is a potentially serious limitation. Two or three teachers raised it after they had seen their classes complete the questionnaire. A number of questions were designed to cross reference with each other to allow for

inconsistencies to be tested. The incidence of completely illogical responses was so low<sup>2</sup> that none of the questionnaires were rejected for statistical analysis. Eight (4 from each group) of a total of 580 questionnaires (1,4%) were found to be incomplete and were eliminated from the sample. They did not contain any illogical responses. One way to have identified possible illogical responses might have been to interview a sample of the pupils from each school. This was not possible within the scope of the research, and should be regarded as an important limitation.

The questionnaire refers to history as if it were a subject taught independently, as in a secondary school. Although all the pupils were familiar with the term history, it was only at Schools C, F, J and M that history was taught in a distinctly separate way. At all the other schools there was always some degree of integration with other 'subjects'. It is questionable what exactly these pupils perceived history to be - what activities it included and what it excluded. It should be accepted, then, that the concept of history which the questionnaire study reflects will not be uniform, and will be influenced in part by primary school curriculum practice. This may also affect the pupils' attitude towards history, and their perception of it compared with the other six subject areas, which with the possible exception of Science, are more clearly definable by the pupils.

Sections, 1, 2, 4 and 5 of the questionnaire all made use of the five-point Likert scale, with provision for two positive responses, a neutral response, and two negative responses. This instrument, it seems, was not always discriminating enough to measure the range of possible positive responses to the items - something which was not observed when the pilot trial was done. For many pupils the choice, particularly in Sections 4 and 5, was between the two positive columns. If they did not choose one, they chose the other. The range of mean scores for these items is very narrow, making significant comparisons very difficult, despite the relatively large size of the total sample. A scale of alternative responses could possibly be devised and tested against the present one using three positive responses and one negative response, together with the neutral response.<sup>3</sup>

### *Statistical procedures and analysis*

Questionnaires were classified according to school, year group, gender and whether the pupils could supply their date of birth or not. Sections 1, 2, 4 and 5 were scored on a scale of 1 (most negative) to 5 (most positive). Scores were totalled in the two parts of Section 1 and in section 4. Section 6 was scored as follows: 2 for a correct 'I am sure' response, 1 for a correct 'I think' response and 0 for any other response. Scores were totalled, giving a maximum score of 16. Responses to Section 7 were scored either right or wrong, depending on whether the word given sounded like the correct word (e.g. decaid, anteak, tradishun).<sup>4</sup>

## **Analysis of the questionnaire responses**

### *SECTION 1: Attitudes*

There was no significant difference between the attitude scores for the two samples. In each case the mean for the control schools was only 0.2 (0.8%) less than the mean for the ten schools.

Table 4: Section 1 Attitudes

|                         | Attitude towards school |          | Attitude towards history |          | Correlation of attitudes to school & history |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|----------|--------------------------|----------|--|
|                         | Mean                    | Std.Dev. | Mean                     | Std.Dev. |  |
| 10 schools (N=411)      | 18.623 <sup>1</sup>     | 3.64     | 17.986 <sup>1</sup>      | 4.32     | 0.528  |
| Control schools (N=161) | 18.422                  | 3.43     | 17.733                   | 4.09     | 0.562  |

1 Difference of means significant at 0.05

The scores show that the attitude towards school as measured on the five items was slightly more positive than that towards history. The difference was not significant for the control schools and was only significant at the 0.05 level for the ten schools and the combined means. The correlations of 0.528 and 0.562 between the attitude towards school and the attitude towards history are very similar to those obtained by Wilson (1981:173-174), showing a positive relationship, as one would expect. They suggest that the attitude towards history was distinct from that towards school, yet subject to many similar influences. There was, however, a fairly wide range of correlations found among the different schools, from 0.269 (School J) to 0.859 (School B), as seen in Table 5. Schools J and F were both schools where history was taught as a distinct subject, in contrast to schools B and D, which followed integrated approaches, hinting that the attitude which pupils had towards the subject might be affected by the way in which it was treated by teachers. The more distinct the subject boundaries possibly, the more distinct the attitude might have been. Owing to the relatively small size of the school samples and the sensitivity of the correlation coefficient to standard error, no more detailed comparison of the school correlations can be made. There were only two schools where the difference between the attitude scores was statistically significant, Schools I and K. In School I, history was textbook dominated and not taught by specialist or interested teachers, nor influenced in any appreciable way by the spirit of the schools' guidelines. It is no surprise, then, that history should have been regarded in a less favourable light than the other school work. (No comment is possible on School K as the control schools were not studied as cases.)

Table 5: Section 1 Comparison of Schools Attitude Scores

| School | N  | Attitude towards school Mean | Attitude towards history Mean | Correlation of attitudes to school & history |
|--------|----|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| A      | 30 | 18.23                        | 18.8                          | 0.369  |
| B      | 27 | 18.37                        | 17.89                         | 0.859  |
| C      | 47 | 18.28                        | 17.34                         | 0.480  |
| D      | 40 | 17.2                         | 17.37                         | 0.628  |
| E      | 46 | 17.7                         | 16.83                         | 0.488  |
| F      | 43 | 20.84                        | 20.02                         | 0.282  |
| G      | 35 | 17.1                         | 16.83                         | 0.581  |
| H      | 46 | 19.44                        | 20.76                         | 0.603  |
| I      | 42 | 18.58 <sup>2</sup>           | 15.69 <sup>2</sup>            | 0.543  |
| J      | 55 | 19.66                        | 18.36                         | 0.269  |
| K      | 56 | 18.30 <sup>2</sup>           | 16.46 <sup>2</sup>            | 0.496  |
| L      | 41 | 17.24                        | 17.88                         | 0.696  |
| M      | 64 | 19.28                        | 18.75                         | 0.488  |

2 Difference of means significant at 0.01

Examination of Table 6 shows that there was no significant difference between the attitudes of the boys to school and to history.

Table 6: Section 1 Comparison of Boys and Girls Attitude Scores

|                 | Attitude towards school Mean    | Attitude towards history Mean | Correlation of attitudes to school & history |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Boys</b>     |                                 |                               |  |
| 10 schools      | 17.95 <sup>2</sup>              | 18.16                         | 0.512  |
| Control schools | 18.40                           | 18.02                         | 0.566  |
| TOTAL           | <sup>2</sup> 18.06              | 18.13                         |  |
| <b>Girls</b>    |                                 |                               |  |
| 10 schools      | 19.24 <sup>23</sup>             | 17.83 <sup>3</sup>            | 0.519  |
| Control schools | 18.45 <sup>1</sup>              | 17.42 <sup>1</sup>            | 0.613  |
| TOTAL           | <sup>2</sup> 19.03 <sup>2</sup> | 17.71 <sup>2</sup>            |  |

- 1 Difference of means significant at 0.05
- 2 Difference of means significant at 0.01
- 3 Difference of means significant at 0.001

The girls had a more positive attitude towards school in general than history. There was also a significant difference between their more favourable attitude score towards school and that of the boys. The difference between the boys' and girls' attitude scores towards history was, however, not statistically significant. It appears that the boys and the girls differed little in their attitude towards history, but that there was a difference in their attitude towards school, as measured on the five items. Simon and Ward (1975a:41) found that, "...sex does not appear to be significantly associated with history", as far as comprehensive school pupils in forms 2 to 4 were concerned. This finding was not confirmed by Booth's (1983) research project using a group of 14 plus boys and girls. He found that the girls had a less favourable attitude to history, which might have been influenced by the following differences: home background, oral skills, teacher expectation and attitude towards the world history course generally. West (1982:35) commented that his research had also found an "embarrassing but significant correlation with sex", but did not elaborate.

When the differences in attitude between third (9-10) and fourth (10-11 year old) year pupils are analysed, no clear pattern emerges. Comparisons are made difficult because of the differences between the sizes of the samples, and because a relatively larger proportion of the third years came from schools I and J (25.9% against 14.9%), where there was little noteworthy teaching being done. None of the third year classes was being taught by any of the teachers interviewed.

Table 7: Section 1 Comparison of 3rd and 4th Year Juniors Attitude Scores

|                     | Attitude towards school Mean | Attitude towards history Mean | Correlation of attitudes to school & history |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| <b>Third years</b>  |                              |                               |  |
| 10 schools          | 18.66 <sup>2</sup>           | 16.9 <sup>23</sup>            | 0.525  |
| Control schools     | 18.8                         | 19.51 <sup>3</sup>            | 0.464  |
| TOTAL               | 18.7 <sup>1</sup>            | 17.68 <sup>1</sup>            |  |
| <b>Fourth years</b> |                              |                               |  |
| 10 schools          | 18.67                        | 18.64 <sup>3</sup>            | 0.555  |
| Control schools     | 18.25 <sup>2</sup>           | 16.91 <sup>23</sup>           | 0.609  |
| TOTAL               | 18.53                        | 18.1                          |  |

- 1 Difference of means significant at 0.05
- 2 Difference of means significant at 0.01
- 3 Difference of means significant at 0.001

This might partly account for the significant difference in attitude score towards history between the third years and the fourth years in the two samples. Among third years, the control schools revealed a more positive attitude towards history, while among the fourth years, the ten schools revealed a more positive attitude, both differences being significant at the 0.001 level. Some importance may be attached to the fact that the ten schools' fourth years' attitude towards history was significantly higher than both their own third years and the control schools' fourth years<sup>5</sup>, in the light of the finding by Croucher and Reid (1981:46) that there was a deterioration in attitude among primary school pupils when tested at 9 years and again a year later. This deterioration was apparently reversed in the case of the ten schools, but was clearly present in the control schools.

### SECTION 2: Comparison of subjects according to a criterion of interest

Figure 1: Section 2 Subject Ratings according to Interest (N=572)

#### Physical Education:

|      |      |     |     |     |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 74.1 | 18.5 | 3.9 | 2.1 | 1.4 |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|

#### Art and Craft

|      |      |     |     |     |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|
| 67.3 | 23.6 | 4.4 | 2.3 | 2.4 |
|------|------|-----|-----|-----|

#### Maths

|      |      |      |     |     |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| 33.4 | 38.9 | 13.6 | 8.7 | 5.2 |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|

#### Science

|      |      |      |     |     |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| 31.6 | 42.1 | 13.8 | 7.9 | 5.4 |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|

#### History

|      |      |      |      |     |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 30.4 | 38.3 | 13.3 | 12.4 | 5.4 |
|------|------|------|------|-----|

#### English

|      |      |      |      |     |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 14.7 | 49.1 | 21.3 | 10.3 | 4.5 |
|------|------|------|------|-----|

#### Music

|      |      |      |      |      |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 34.4 | 28.1 | 13.6 | 11.4 | 11.5 |
|------|------|------|------|------|

|             |             |           |        |             |
|-------------|-------------|-----------|--------|-------------|
| Interesting | Interesting | Undecided | Boring | Very boring |
|-------------|-------------|-----------|--------|-------------|



Figure 1 shows the grouping of subjects: PE/games and art and craft are much more favourably rated than other subjects (as Croucher and Reid (1981:44) found); there is no significant difference between the means for mathematics, science and history, though history has the lowest; and English and music have means which are significantly different from mathematics and science (at 0.01) and history (at 0.05). There were considerably fewer 'Very Interesting' and more 'Undecided' responses to English than any other subject. The diversity of activities embraced by the label 'English' is a possible explanation of this.

Table 8: Section 2 Comparison between school means for History according to interest

| School | Average of means |         | Rank of history relative to other 6 subjects |
|--------|------------------|---------|--|
|        | Other 6 subjects | History |  |
| A      | 4.03             | 3.77    | 6  |
| B      | 3.88             | 3.96    | 5  |
| C      | 3.86             | 3.64    | 6  |
| D      | 3.98             | 3.8     | 4  |
| E      | 3.97             | 3.48    | 6  |
| F      | 3.95             | 4.3     | 3  |
| G      | 3.83             | 3.46    | 5  |
| H      | 4.02             | 4.26    | 3  |
| I      | 4.02             | 3.12    | 7  |
| J      | 4.06             | 3.46    | 7  |
| K      | 4.12             | 3.57    | 7  |
| L      | 4.8              | 3.78    | 5  |
| M      | 4.13             | 3.98    | 3  |

There is a fairly high correlation of 0.713 between the mean for history in Figure 1 and the attitude towards history score for the ten schools. This is illustrated by comparing Tables 5 and 8. School F, which had done more history than any other school during the past term and was the most aware of history at the time that the questionnaire was administered, shows the highest attitude score and the highest ranking of history (together with School H) while Schools I and J again show the lowest.

There was no significant difference between the mean for history of the ten schools and that of the control schools. This was also true of the means for mathematics, science and music. The difference between the means of the two groups in PE/games, art and craft and English was significant at 0.01. In each case, the control schools had a higher mean.

Table 9: Section 2 Comparison of boys and girls interest means for subjects

| Subject   | Boys              |          | Girls             |          |
|-----------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------|
|           | Mean              | Std.Dev. | Mean              | Std.Dev. |
| English   | 3.37 <sup>3</sup> | 1.09     | 3.81 <sup>3</sup> | 0.84     |
| Maths     | 3.81              | 1.21     | 3.91              | 1.07     |
| Science   | 3.91              | 1.21     | 3.76              | 1.17     |
| History   | 3.81              | 1.19     | 3.69              | 1.18     |
| PE/Games  | 4.7 <sup>1</sup>  | 0.76     | 4.54 <sup>1</sup> | 0.83     |
| Art/Craft | 4.43              | 1.0      | 4.57              | 0.79     |
| Music     | 3.17 <sup>3</sup> | 1.49     | 4.01 <sup>3</sup> | 1.16     |

1 Difference of means significant at 0.05

3 Difference of means significant at 0.001

Table 9 shows the differences in interest in subjects by boys and girls. There are conspicuous differences in English and music, and a barely significant difference in PE/games. The differences in other subjects are not significant. History ranks fourth (with mathematics) amongst the boys, and last amongst the girls, though the difference between the means is less than that for other objects, apart from Mathematics. The differences in attitude towards history found between third and fourth year juniors were again apparent in subject interest. (3rd years: 10 schools  $x = 3.54$ , Control  $x = 4.35$ ; 4th years: 10 schools  $x = 3.85$ , Control  $x = 3.5$ .)

### SECTION 3: Written responses

Answers to the question 'What is history' were graded into four categories.<sup>6</sup> The first category comprised answers along the lines of 'History is about the past', with little extra comment or illustration. It included the following among the most original (unaltered) responses.

History is ...studying things that happened long ago or in times gone by.  
 ...things that you look back in the past at. (3)  
 ...a subject which I find interesting. It is about the past and is usually fun.  
 ...about back in time and about famous people.

87.6% of the responses of the sample of ten schools were judged to fall into this category, showing that the majority of pupils were able to write a brief definition of what they considered history to be. 4.1% either did not respond, or made inappropriate responses, such as *History is "good"* or *"boring"*.

The second category contained responses which showed more insight or good illustrations. 6.6% (27) responses were considered to fall into this category. It had been anticipated that there would be a greater percentage of responses here, enabling comparisons to be made, bearing in mind that it was relatively simple for pupils to write that history is about the past, after this had been mentioned to them. Many of the responses which were made, do, however, show an awareness of some of the processes of history:

An appreciation of a sense of time -

*History is* ...when you go back in time to learn things that happened a long time ago.  
 (3)

The importance of people -

*History is* ...about famous people or places in the past. History tells you about people who invented things and tells you about wars  
 ...about looking back to see what other people used to do and what they were like.

The significance of important events -

*History is* ...Big events that have happened in the past. (3)  
 ...about wars and plagues, fires and disasters.  
 ...about the past you learn about what happened before you and things that happened like discoveries.

The need to discover the past -

History is ...about looking back into the past and finding out about new things for yourself.  
 ...about the past and you find things you've never found out before. (3)

The writing of history -

*History is* ...about looking at the Past and writing things about it.

More abstract answers showing understanding of the nature of the subject were placed in the third category. There were only two.

*History is* ...the knowledge of the past in the present passed from generation to generation.  
...something that happened in the past long ago. Now we look back on it and study it.

Original answers which could not be placed in the other three categories included,

*History is* ...good because it includes art and I like art because I am a keen drawer.  
...something in the past which you try to remember.  
...a place behind time it has an interesting feature looking back on ourselves.

The majority of responses in the second and third categories were made by pupils at Schools J, F and B.

The written responses to the second question, 'Would you like to have more history at school or less?' were used to interpret the responses given to the first part, as shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Section 3 Responses to the question, 'Would you like to have more history at school or less?'

| School | % positive | % neutral | % negative |
|--------|------------|-----------|------------|
| A      | 40.0       | 36.6      | 23.3       |
| B      | 55.5       | 18.5      | 25.9       |
| C      | 36.1       | 44.6      | 19.1       |
| D      | 60.0       | 22.5      | 17.5       |
| E      | 50.0       | 19.5      | 30.4       |
| F      | 53.5       | 41.8      | 4.6        |
| G      | 28.5       | 51.4      | 20.0       |
| H      | 45.6       | 50.0      | 4.3        |
| I      | 28.5       | 28.5      | 42.8       |
| J      | 40.0       | 32.7      | 27.3       |
| K      | 19.6       | 64.2      | 9.0        |
| L      | 26.8       | 46.3      | 26.8       |
| M      | 21.8       | 65.6      | 12.5       |

[Note: 'The same as now' responses were recorded as positive, neutral, or negative according to the reason given. If no reason was given, the response was recorded as neutral.]

Responses were divided into four categories according to the type of reason given. 69% (284) of the pupils gave their enjoyment or dislike of history as their reason. They included the following examples.

*Less*  
That I haet it.

Less because I just don't like it.

*Same as now*

I don't particularly like history but I want education so I don't want less or more (too much) so I picked the same as now.

because I don't like it much but it's all right.

that we have quite a lot at the moment.

because it's not boring and I think we do a lot already.

*More*

History is interesting because you find things that you never thought happened.

I want to find out more.

The second category of response included those who referred to problems of coping with more (6.3%, 26).

*Less*

Because we have far too much homework. I can not keep up with it. (School J)

because I can not go back a lot of years.

*Same as now*

Because history is a subject you would do at high school.

because I am coping with it now and if I had more I probably wouldn't. (School J)

it would get too hard.

because I like the amount that is going into my folder.

Because if we had more I would get left behind.

The third category reflects the concern of some pupils (6.6%, 27) that there should be a balance maintained between subjects studied.

*Same as now*

the same as now so it does not interfere with other lessons.

because if we did more history we would not be able to do anything else and it would be boring if we did the same thing all the time.

*More*

that we only have it on Fridays and not very long at it. (School G)

because we hardly ever have history and we need to learn more. (School I)

more because we are only having a bit of history. Maybe all of us don't want more.

(School D)

Reasons which fitted none of the other categories were placed in a fourth group (4.4%, 18). They included,

*Less*

because you can't do anything about the past and I would rather talk about the future.

*Same as now*

that when I do history I can never find the correct books...

because some of it is boring. But I would like to be able to choose what history to do.

because history is not as important as maths and English and it is not everyday when you are asked about the Normans.

*More*

that I like finding out about things have changed from the old days.

Because we might be a high school teacher and we might teach history.

that it is fun and it could help you get a job.

because I just love History every single time I look forward to it.

I would like to know more about the past so I can tell my children what happened.

Two statements made by pupils in the same class reflect how differences in attitude can affect pupils' perceptions. One, with an attitude score below the school average, wanted the Same as now, 'because it is good but we have a lot now', while the other, with a much higher than average attitude score, wanted More, because 'We hardly ever have history lessons'. This difference may help interpret Table 10. Schools such as F, H, and D which had favourable attitudes towards history and ranked history highly in Section 2, were also the schools where the most pupils wanted more history. At School B, which also had a high positive response to the question, the reason is probably that the class had not done very much history at the time (they were about to embark on a topic with an historical core). School I, with its negative attitude towards history also had the highest number of pupils wanting less history. School E is a special case, with its contrast between the teaching approaches in the third and fourth year junior classes. 60% of the fourth years (with a significantly more positive attitude score) wanted more history and 17.3% less. The percentages for the third years are reversed. 21.7% want more and 43.3% less. The third year class at School G represents another possible tendency - that a class might decide that it had done too much history. None of the class wanted more and 28% wanted less. There is a striking difference between the case study schools and the control schools on this measure. The percentage of pupils wanting more history was lower in all three control schools than in any of the others.

*SECTION 4: Statements about history and the past*

Responses to this section showed (Table 11) that there were areas of strong interest in the past beyond the classroom. The statement, 'I like visiting places like museums and old buildings' might have attracted positive responses because pupils associated it with school visits, thus inflating the result. This was not the case with the other statement which had a positive response of over 80%, as it was always explained that the films and TV programmes referred to were not school programmes. The expectation that there might be a more positive response to the statements from the ten schools sample than the control schools was not fulfilled. There was, in fact, a very slightly higher mean score for the control schools. (The difference was not significant at the 0.05 level.) The only statement which showed a significant difference between the two samples was 'Some of the best stories I have heard come from the past'.

Table 11: Section 4 Responses to statements about history and the past

|                     | % positive responses | % neutral responses | % negative responses | Mean 10 schools   | Mean control schools |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Visiting museums    | 82.2                 | 7.8                 | 10.2                 | 4.18              | 4.12                 |
| T.V. programmes     | 80.4                 | 8.4                 | 11.2                 | 4.10              |                      |
| The best stories    | 65.5                 | 17.3                | 17.2                 | 3.63 <sup>2</sup> | 3.9 <sup>2</sup>     |
| Knowing the past    | 60.1                 | 22.3                | 17.5                 | 3.55              | 3.69                 |
| My History lessons  | 55.4                 | 19.7                | 24.8                 | 3.46              | 3.29                 |
| Reading books       | 52.4                 | 18.4                | 29.1                 | 3.28              | 3.43                 |
| I imagine sometimes | 30.9                 | 18.8                | 50.0                 | 2.67              | 2.8                  |
| Mean Total score    |                      |                     |                      | 24.85             | 25.46                |

2 Difference of means significant at 0.01

There was also no significant difference between the responses of boys and girls to items in this section, supporting the finding that there is no significant difference in their attitudes. But the difference between the mean scores for third and fourth year juniors is significant at 0.01, and the decline in interest associated with age is further illustrated by a comparison with the mean for School C (11-13 year olds). (3rd years  $x = 26.1$ , 4th years  $x = 24.66$ , School C  $x = 23.98$ .)

Table 12: Section 4 Responses to statements about history and the past: Comparison of ten schools

| School | N  | Mean for 7 items<br>(7x5=35) | Std.Dev. |
|--------|----|------------------------------|----------|
| A      | 30 | 24.93                        | 4.33     |
| B      | 27 | 23.81                        | 5.09     |
| C      | 47 | 23.98                        | 5.96     |
| D      | 40 | 25.05                        | 5.38     |
| E      | 46 | 24.43                        | 4.68     |
| F      | 43 | 26.0                         | 3.87     |
| G      | 35 | 24.17                        | 5.15     |
| H      | 46 | 25.85                        | 4.48     |
| I      | 42 | 24.14                        | 5.57     |
| J      | 55 | 25.53                        | 5.04     |

Some comparisons between schools can be made on the basis of the data in Table 12 and Table 4 of Appendix 9, though they are only suggestive, as the differences between schools are so small. As previously observed, schools with the highest scores on attitude towards history tended to have the highest mean scores and vice versa. Schools such as F and G, which stressed school visits to museums and places of historical interest provided the most positive responses to that statement.

#### SECTION 5: Areas of content in history

Figure 2 and Table 13 show the areas of content ranked according to their popularity. Again, the differences between the means are small, making comparison uncertain. The differences between the means of the top three items and the bottom two are significant at the 0.01 level.

Figure 2: Section 5 Ratings for areas of content in history (N = 572)

#### Stories of Adventure (X = 4.12)

|      |      |      |     |     |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| 45.8 | 33.4 | 10.7 | 7.3 | 2.6 |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|

#### My family (X = 3.98)

|      |      |      |     |     |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| 35.7 | 40.6 | 13.3 | 7.7 | 3.0 |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|

#### Village, town or city (X = 3.86)

|      |      |      |     |     |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| 27.1 | 47.4 | 12.9 | 9.8 | 2.8 |
|------|------|------|-----|-----|

#### My country (X = 3.81)

|      |      |      |      |     |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 28.3 | 41.1 | 17.0 | 11.0 | 2.5 |
|------|------|------|------|-----|

#### TV in class (X = 3.81)

|      |      |      |      |     |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 33.4 | 35.8 | 15.2 | 10.3 | 5.1 |
|------|------|------|------|-----|

#### Dinosaurs (X = 3.74)

|      |      |     |      |     |
|------|------|-----|------|-----|
| 41.4 | 24.8 | 8.0 | 17.5 | 8.8 |
|------|------|-----|------|-----|

#### The world (X = 3.70)

|      |      |      |      |     |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 26.4 | 38.8 | 16.8 | 15.4 | 2.6 |
|------|------|------|------|-----|

Egyptians and Romans ( $X = 3.65$ )

|      |      |      |      |     |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 30.8 | 34.6 | 11.4 | 16.1 | 7.2 |
|------|------|------|------|-----|

Buildings and things ( $X = 3.51$ )

|      |      |      |      |     |
|------|------|------|------|-----|
| 21.5 | 37.9 | 16.6 | 18.0 | 5.9 |
|------|------|------|------|-----|

|                 |       |           |         |                   |
|-----------------|-------|-----------|---------|-------------------|
| Enjoy very much | Enjoy | Undecided | Dislike | Dislike very much |
|-----------------|-------|-----------|---------|-------------------|

There is a tendency for pupils to have more definite views, for or against, the categories which are clearly definable, such as 'Dinosaurs', 'Egyptians and Romans' and 'Stories of Adventure', while the omnibus categories such as 'My country', 'the World' and 'Buildings and things people used' have a greater percentage of responses in the 'Enjoy' and 'Undecided' columns. The pupils' love of story is a clear preference, followed by history which is closest to the pupil, family then town, then country, followed by long ago and far away. It is difficult to make comparisons between the two samples. It might be suggested that the control schools favoured the less academic categories, such as 'Stories of adventure' and 'dinosaurs', but, apart from local history, where the difference is not statistically significant, there is no evidence to confirm that the case study schools preferred the more academic categories.

The clearest difference between the preferences of boys and girls is in the history of families, which girls enjoy more than boys do. Fourth year juniors ranked 'Learning history in class from TV' third, while third years only ranked it seventh. School C (11-13 year olds) ranked it fourth. No survey of the extent of TV use by the different year groups was made, so it is not possible to comment on this result.

Table 13: Section 5 Responses to areas of content in history

| Areas of content     | Mean 10 schools   | Mean control schools | Mean Boys         | Mean Girls        | Mean Third years  | Mean Fourth years |
|----------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Stories of adventure | 3.97 <sup>2</sup> | 4.49 <sup>2</sup>    | 4.12              | 4.12              | 4.18              | 4.12              |
| My family & others   | 3.95              | 4.06                 | 3.78 <sup>2</sup> | 4.17 <sup>2</sup> | 4.01              | 3.93              |
| Village, town & city | 3.90              | 3.76                 | 3.84              | 3.77              | 3.91              | 3.87              |
| My country           | 3.78              | 3.88                 | 3.86              | 3.76              | 3.98 <sup>1</sup> | 3.74 <sup>1</sup> |
| T.V.                 | 3.82              | 3.79                 | 3.71 <sup>1</sup> | 3.92 <sup>1</sup> | 3.64 <sup>1</sup> | 3.91 <sup>1</sup> |
| Dinosaurs            | 3.64 <sup>2</sup> | 3.98 <sup>2</sup>    | 3.93 <sup>2</sup> | 3.76 <sup>2</sup> | 3.68              | 3.72              |
| The world            | 3.67              | 3.77                 | 3.81 <sup>1</sup> | 3.61 <sup>1</sup> | 3.81              | 3.71              |
| Egyptians & Romans   | 3.52 <sup>2</sup> | 3.99 <sup>2</sup>    | 3.85 <sup>2</sup> | 3.47 <sup>2</sup> | 3.81              | 3.64              |
| Buildings & things   | 3.52              | 3.49                 | 3.54              | 3.49              | 3.55              | 3.51              |

1 Difference of means significant at 0.05

2 Difference of means significant at 0.01

Examination of Table 4 in Appendix 9 gives clues to the rankings of some of the categories. School A, in which the class had spent a year doing a fairly detailed local study, ranked local history very high. The same was not true, however, of Schools B and C. The class at School B had not done any local history that year, and, while two-thirds of the work which had been done by pupils at school C was related to a study in the locality, much of the work was not about the town itself. Schools E and F gave the history of families a higher ranking. Pupils in these classes had either done topics on families or were familiar with (and possibly interested in) the work which other classes had done. The highest rankings for 'Buildings and things people used' came from schools G and H. School G was currently involved in collecting items for their school museum, and School H was the school which had worked with museum artefacts in the classroom. The influence of pupils' attitude towards history was again discernible, in that Schools I and C had the

greatest number of negative responses, while Schools F and H had the greatest number of positive responses.

### SECTION 6: The work that historians do

It had been expected that this section would reveal how much pupils understood about what they had been taught about the way history is recorded and how historians work. There was, however, no evidence among any of the schools that teachers had taught this systematically. Tables 14 and 15 and Figure 3 show the responses to this section of the questionnaire.

Table 14: Section 6 Responses to statements on the work that historians do (Total score = 16)

| Mean 10 schools | Mean control schools | Mean Boys | Mean Girls | Mean Third years  | Mean Fourth years |
|-----------------|----------------------|-----------|------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| 8.78            | 8.65                 | 8.99      | 8.51       | 8.14 <sup>2</sup> | 8.84 <sup>2</sup> |

2 Difference of means significant at 0.01

Table 15: Section 6 Distribution of responses on the work that historians do (%)

|                 | Total score: |      |      |       |
|-----------------|--------------|------|------|-------|
|                 | 0-3          | 4-7  | 8-11 | 12-16 |
| 10 schools      | 3.9          | 30.2 | 45.4 | 20.4  |
| Control schools | 4.3          | 29.8 | 50.9 | 14.3  |
| Combined        | 4.0          | 30.1 | 47.0 | 18.7  |

Where there was an association between the description in a statement and something which the pupils readily identified with history, such as "dates", "evidence" and "books", there was a higher percentage of correct responses.

When the statements referred to a more specific aspect of the work of an historian, such as reading letters, knowing everything about the past, or agreement with other historians, there was a lower percentage of correct responses, showing that the items discriminated between pupils with only a general knowledge, and those with deeper insight. The relatively high percentage of correct responses to the statements suggests that, despite the lack of specific teaching about the nature of history, pupils had grasped some of its fundamentals. That 'I think' responses outnumbered the 'I am sure' responses in 5 of the 8 items indicates the tentative nature of many answers. (A possible explanation is that the statements were often novel ones for the pupils, whose inclination might have been to choose the less certain alternative.) Table 15 shows the distribution of scores for the section. It does not disclose that only four pupils (three from the ten schools) attained the maximum score.

Figure 3: Section 6 Responses to the statements on the work historians do (%) (N = 572)

Historians write books about the past and its events. (81.5%)



Historians try to find out why people did things. (72.6%)



Historians know everything that happened. (60.5%)





Historians read letters and books that people wrote. (58.7%)



Historians always agree with each other. (59.7%)



Historians find out the dates when things happened. (82.5%)



Historians work like detectives do. (74.4%)



Historians find evidence about the past. (82.8%)



% correct:



There was not a significant difference between the mean total scores or any of the individual item scores of the two samples, or between those for boys and girls, though, as might have been expected in the light of the previous responses, the case study schools and the boys had the higher mean scores. Third year juniors scored lower than fourth years, who in turn scored lower than the 11-13 year olds at School C (see Table 19). It is difficult to interpret the scores of schools. It might have been anticipated that School I would have the lowest average score, and that Schools E and B would have the highest scores. That School F did not have a higher average score and School J had a relatively high score, points possibly to the contrasts in teaching style in the two schools (non-directive vs. directive). As shown in Table 20, there are low positive, and sometimes negative, correlations between the total score for this Section and the attitude towards history score, the history subject rating, and the statements on history in Section 4, indicating that it is an independent variable, not significantly influenced by attitude to or interest in history.

### SECTION 7: The vocabulary test

Examination of Tables 16 and 17 reveals that the pupils in the two groups of schools fared relatively worse than those in John West's samples.

Table 16: Section 7 Vocabulary test results (% correct)

| Words:        | 10 schools | Control schools | John West (Age 10+) <sup>7</sup> |                                |
|---------------|------------|-----------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
|               |            |                 | Random sample                    | Project sample (after 4 years) |
| Century       | 93.9       | 90.7            | 90                               | 94                             |
| Antique       | 67.4       | 74.5            | 77                               | 82                             |
| Ancestors     | 61.3       | 65.8            | 72                               | 74                             |
| Decade        | 57.4       | 54.0            | 31                               | 82                             |
| Document      | 55.5       | 63.4            | 75                               | 95                             |
| Anniversary   | 53.2       | 52.7            | 70                               | 72                             |
| Evidence      | 46.2       | 42.8            | 42                               | 55                             |
| Archaeologist | 43.3       | 47.2            | 68                               | 58                             |
| Tradition     | 42.3       | 47.2            | 68                               | 71                             |

|               |      |      |  |  |
|---------------|------|------|--|--|
|               |      |      |  |  |
| Catalogue     | 35.5 | 45.5 |  |  |
| Autobiography | 31.1 | 18.0 |  |  |
| Slogan        | 22.9 | 27.9 |  |  |
| Sanctuary     | 14.8 | 21.7 |  |  |
| Vagrant       | 12.9 | 15.5 |  |  |

With the exception of the words century and decade none of the words was as well known to them as they were to West's 1975 random sample of pupils. The control schools had a higher mean score than the ten schools, though the difference was not significant.

Table 17: Section 7 Vocabulary Test means (Total score = 15)

| Mean 10 schools | Mean control schools | Mean Boys | Mean Girls | Mean 3 <sup>rd</sup> years | Mean 4 <sup>th</sup> years |
|-----------------|----------------------|-----------|------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| 649             | 6.97                 | 6.80      | 6.46       | 5.53 <sup>2</sup>          | 6.93 <sup>2</sup>          |

2 Difference of means significant at 0.01

Table 18: Section 7 Distribution of vocabulary test scores (%)

|                 | Total score: |      |      |       |
|-----------------|--------------|------|------|-------|
|                 | 0-3          | 4-7  | 8-11 | 12-15 |
| 10 schools      | 23.6         | 36.9 | 28.5 | 10.9  |
| Control schools | 21.1         | 36.0 | 29.2 | 13.6  |
| Combined        | 22.9         | 36.7 | 28.7 | 11.7  |

Table 19: Sections 6 and 7 Comparison of schools: Responses to the work that historians do and the vocabulary test

| School | N  | Mean work of Historians (16) | Vocabulary test mean (15) |
|--------|----|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| A      | 30 | 8.07                         | 9.0                       |
| B      | 27 | 9.22                         | 7.67                      |
| C      | 47 | 10.19                        | 8.28                      |
| D      | 40 | 7.7                          | 5.73                      |
| E      | 46 | 9.26                         | 6.83                      |
| F      | 43 | 8.63                         | 6.55                      |
| G      | 35 | 8.2                          | 6.43                      |
| H      | 46 | 8.98                         | 6.7                       |
| I      | 42 | 7.83                         | 4.3                       |
| J      | 55 | 9.18                         | 6.0                       |
| K      | 56 | 9.16                         | 6.66                      |
| L      | 41 | 7.44                         | 4.4                       |
| M      | 64 | 8.98                         | 8.89                      |

Mean (N=572)                      8.74                      6.63

The results appear to indicate that the pupils in the case study schools did not enjoy an enriched historical vocabulary (barring evidence and autobiography), though their scores for the non-historical items show that their vocabularies in general were not as good as those of the pupils of the control schools. The mean score for the five non-historical words for both samples was 24% correct, suggesting perhaps what proportion of the sample were pupils who would have found little difficulty in completing the list of historical words without having come across them during history at school. The mean number of correct responses for the fourth year juniors was 25% higher than that of the 3rd years.

The comparison of schools in Table 19 shows that the schools with the most positive attitudes towards history, such as H, D, F and A were not necessarily the schools with the highest means for Sections 6 and 7. School I which has the lowest vocabulary mean, and one of the lowest means for Section 6, may be contrasted with Schools L and D, which also have low scores on Table 19, but favourable attitudes towards history. In School E the difference between the third year and fourth year classes is again illustrated. The third year mean for Section 6 is 7.74 (below the average), while the fourth year mean is 10.07, well above the average.

Table 20: Correlations between sections of the questionnaire

| <b>Control Schools</b>             |                                       |                                      |                                       |                                |      |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|------|
| Attitude to history<br>(Section 1) |                                       | 0.533                                | .515                                  | .072                           | .128 |
| .713                               | History subject rating<br>(Section 2) |                                      | .472                                  | -1.46                          | .124 |
| .442                               | .498                                  | Statements on history<br>(Section 4) |                                       | .048                           | .036 |
| .305                               | .223                                  | .183                                 | The work of historians<br>(Section 6) |                                | .380 |
| .189                               | .056                                  | .043                                 | .329                                  | Vocabulary test<br>(Section 7) |      |

**10 Schools**

The correlations of 0.329 and 0.380 between the vocabulary test score and the score for the work that historians do (Table 20), suggest that the two tests measure relatively independent variables but that verbal aptitude has an influence on insight into the nature of history. It is of interest to note that there is (with one exception) a more positive correlation between the sections of the questionnaire amongst the case study schools than the control schools, hinting perhaps that attitude towards history was a stronger general factor.

## Conclusions

### 1. *Pupils' attitudes towards school and history*

There are few significant differences between the sample of ten schools and the control schools in attitude, interest in history, the popularity of areas of content, insight into the work of historians and vocabulary. This homogeneity of the total sample suggests that the results of the enquiry reflect the view of primary school pupils studying history in general. There is, however, one potentially important difference between the two samples. The attitude of fourth year juniors towards history in the ten schools was significantly more positive than that of either their own third years or the control schools' fourth years. This is possible evidence of the success of the teaching strategies of the teachers interviewed. There is also evidence that the most positive responses to the attitude and interest sections of the questionnaire came from the schools where pupils had been most actively involved in history during the term in which the enquiry was made, but not all schools which had followed a full history curriculum were equally positive in their attitudes.

### 2. *Pupils' rating of history according to interest*

No significant difference was found in the level of interest in mathematics, science and history, all of which were regarded as more interesting than English and music, and less interesting than PE/games and art and craft. This finding contrasts with that of the Schools Council Young School Leavers enquiry (1968) which found history regarded as interesting by only 41% of boys and 40% of girls.<sup>8</sup> In the present study, 71% of boys and 66% of girls found history interesting. The Hargreaves report of 1983 revealed that 61 percent of fifth

formers taking history found it interesting, and Aldrich (1987) noted that it had been one of the few subjects to show an improvement in both interest and usefulness. History is clearly rated more highly amongst top juniors than secondary school leavers, even when the overall difference in attitude towards school is accounted for.

3. *Pupils' written responses: What is history? Should there be more, less or the same as now?*

The pupils revealed an ability to write a simple definition of history in terms of the past or what happened long ago, but only 12.4% of those in the ten schools were able to write a response which was judged to show a greater grasp, contained an illustration, or captured something of the nature of the subject. Answers showed both the possibilities of historical insight and the limitations of understanding implicit in primary history teaching. There was nothing to suggest that pupils from the ten schools were better equipped to write their responses, and no clear indication that pupils from certain schools amongst them showed greater insights.

The second question provided a similar range of responses. The reasons of most pupils (69%) for wanting more, less or the same amount of history were expressed in terms of their likes or dislikes. It was plain, however, that there were wide individual variations in the perception of how much history was being done and whether it was worth doing more or not. An easily distinguishable tendency was for all the control schools to be less positive than the case study schools about wanting more history.

4. *Transfer of interest from history in the classroom to other areas*

The attitude of pupils towards history was also reflected in their views about the past and in activities beyond the classroom, indicating a transfer of interest from school to other pursuits, such as visiting museums and television programmes. The results might suggest a naive fascination with the past among younger children as there were lower numbers of positive responses in older year groups.

5. *Pupils' content choices*

Although there were not very wide differences in the pupils' choice of content areas in history, the more popular categories were those closest in time and place, and the less popular were long ago and far away. 'True stories of adventure' was generally the most popular area, though family history was most popular with girls, and local history was almost equally well liked by the case study schools. There was some evidence, however, that pupils tended to favour those areas of the curriculum with which they were familiar - indicating possibly a positive response to the history that they had been taught and could appreciate.

6. *Understanding the work of a historian*

The questionnaire analysis confirmed what had emerged as a suspicion during the teacher interviews, namely, that teachers did not teach concepts related to the work of historians in any systematic way. Booth (1980:13) concluded after a research study to investigate the historical thinking of 14 to 16 year-old pupils that,

The crux of the matter, however, is the structure of the course and the teaching techniques used... methodology has to be taught in a structured, explicit way... Pupil activity was not conceived as a simple do-as-you-like philosophy. Again, structure was the key note.

This is probably the explanation of the fact that there was not a greater difference between the case study schools and the control schools in understanding about history.<sup>9</sup> The test

items employed had not been used before (except in the pilot study) and it would require further testing to show whether the responses given by the research sample were superior to what might be obtained on the basis of the pupils' general knowledge alone.

7. *Historical vocabulary*

Only five of eleven words with specifically historical meanings were known better by the pupils of the case study schools than those of the control schools. Their general vocabulary knowledge was not as good as that of the control schools, however, and it is of interest to note that the results for this test were rather worse than those which John West had obtained with a random group of pupils in 1975. No significant correlation was found between the attitude towards history and insight into the work of historians or vocabulary scores.

8. *Gender differences*

History was found to be less popular among the girls than among the boys in the sample using the criterion of subject interest but there was not a statistically significant difference between their attitude scores towards history, though the girls had a more favourable attitude towards school in general. There were no significant differences between boys and girls in terms of their insight into the work of historians or their vocabulary scores, boys having slightly higher scores for both. The only important differences in their content choices were that girls preferred the history of families, while boys had a greater preference than girls for the history long ago categories.

---

**Notes**

1. Subsequently published in Wilson (1985).
2. There were nine cases (0.79%) where pupils scored 5 on items 1 and 6 and 1 on items 5 and 10, or vice versa, in Section 1. There are correlations of 0.462 and 0.297 (control schools) between items 1 and 5 and correlations of 0.621 and 0.549 (control schools) between items 6 and 10. There are correlations of 0.638 and 0.549 (control schools) between history in Section 2 and the first item in Section 4, and correlations of 0.621 and 0.539 (control schools) between the attitude towards history score in Section 1 and the first item in Section 4. See Appendix 9, Tables 1-3 for the item correlations for Sections 1, 4 and 6. These correlations are, "spuriously high because the items' specific error variances contribute to the correlation as well as to its common-factor variance" (Guilford and Fruchter (1973:454). This is especially true of Section 1. Each component in Section 1 would correlate with the total to the value of 1/ 5, or .45; .38 in Section 4; .35 in Section 6. The item correlations show satisfactory homogeneity among the items. It is observable, though, that items 4 and 5 and 9 and 10 in Section 1 have slightly lower correlations, indicating that the reversed phrasing of these items might have yielded slightly less consistent responses.
3. Croucher and Reid (1981) used a scale of four categories (negative, neutral, positive and very positive) for their study of pupil attitude change in junior schools. They comment, "The preference in this sample for the responses 'I love it', 'I hate it' and the neutral category may indicate that children of this age tend to plump for the obviously contrasting categories, not the 'grey areas' in between" (1981:47).
4. Scores from the questionnaires were tabulated and the data prepared by the University of Exeter Computer Unit for analysis using the Minitab statistical package (Penn State University). The statistics thus obtained were means, correlations (Pearson product

moment) and t tests (two-sided), which also provided standard deviation and standard error. Percentages were calculated for the numbers of responses to items.

5. The difference between the mean scores of the third years in the control schools and the fourth years in the ten schools is not statistically significant.
6. The pupils whose responses are recorded below were all 4th year juniors except where indicated (3) for 3rd years.
7. West (1981b:176).
8. Schools Council (1968). The comparative percentages are:

|             | 15 year-old school leavers % |       | Present research % |
|-------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------------|
|             | Boys                         | Girls | Boys & Girls       |
| History     | 41                           | 40    | 68.7               |
| Science     | 60                           | 44    | 72.8               |
| Mathematics | 49                           | 44    | 72.3               |
| English     | 53                           | 70    | 64.8               |

As Aldrich (1984:221) points out, however, of the 19 - 20 year-olds, 65% of boys and 69% of girls viewed the subject as interesting.

9. A result which contrasts with Shemilt's (1980) finding on the conceptualisation of adolescents in history as a result of the History 13-16 project. See, for example, his table of control vs. experimental stereotypes (1980:25). See also Booth (1980:12): "...learning history can make a significant contribution to [adolescents'] ability to use evidence and to conceptualise".

## Chapter Seven

### SIX YEARS ON

There have been considerable changes in the nature and status of history teaching in the primary school since the research for the case studies was completed in the summer of 1985. Most obvious amongst them is the implementation of the National Curriculum, which has not only made history compulsory, but has prescribed both the content and, to a lesser extent, through detailed Statements of Attainment, the methods by which it ought to be taught and assessed. Also significant is the increased concern for primary history teaching, as seen in the establishment of the Primary History Association and the growth in research and writing about it. The new history has come under close scrutiny from within and without the profession and "empathy" and "skills" are no longer regarded as they were then. At the same time, some of what had been considered entrenched values in primary education have been eroded, and there is a more critical attitude towards progressive methods. The case studies provide a reference point for comparisons and a critique of these developments.

#### The new history

Peter Knight, in an article published at the time that this research was conceived in 1984<sup>1</sup>, argued that the new history was compatible with primary practice, but that good practice in primary history on the basis of it appeared unattainable (1984:28-29). His reasons were that it implied a level of planning in content and skills which was unlikely to be achieved by most schools and teachers because history was low in the status hierarchy and could not justify the amount of time which would need to be spent on it; that a reform of this nature would be seen to be very formal and restrictive by teachers; that a "teacher leader", who would be an enthusiast for the subject would be necessary where the size of a school allowed; and that new resources, books and packages which allowed the development of a scheme of progression<sup>2</sup> would be required.

Against this background the studies were undertaken. It was assumed that cases of teachers consciously trying to innovate by using the ideas of the new history would be difficult to find (as they proved to be), and that where they were found, the teachers would be experimenting with aspects of the new history, rather than trying to adopt a package of new approaches, such as *History 13-16* had done in secondary schools. This was confirmed during the first visits to schools.

The interviews revealed that, given an enthusiastic and informed teacher, the new history could find very fertile ground in the primary school. Unencumbered by formal assessment and examination boards, departmental policies and unenthusiastic adolescents, primary schools could benefit by the structure provided by the discipline of history, yet have the freedom and time to explore avenues opened by the various strands of the new history. It did not appear important to any of the teachers that the history they taught should be part of a wider scheme such as Knight had in mind. What was important was that they had a rationale for their teaching and that their pupils were engaged in meaningful activity which was introducing them to some of the facets of an historical awareness.

The history teaching encountered in the case studies was distinguished by the richness of its variety.<sup>3</sup> Wherever history was taught for its own sake, whether in an integrated way or not, the combination of keen pupils accustomed to being able to follow their own inclination and imagination at times and teachers who saw the possibility of giving their teaching a sharper edge without abandoning their own pedagogy made for liveliness and enjoyment. The teachers had in common the fact that they were certain that they were doing something which was right for them

and their classes. It did not matter that one's approach to local history might exclude the concepts and skills which another sought to achieve through a more structured approach, that one had a strongly narrative emphasis, while another ignored it completely, that one could only teach in an integrated way and another considered it the source of problems: the new history had given them an interest in teaching history creatively and imaginatively.

The research confirmed that primary history practice was not informed by any common source of knowledge or influence. There was no consistency in the pattern of responses to the interview questions on the new history, and it was almost impossible to predict whether an interviewee might have heard of John West, *Place, Time and Society 8-13*, or any of the other developments inquired about. Likewise, there was no predicting how their pupils would respond to the tests of vocabulary or the work that historians did. The results revealed that while certain teaching approaches did result in pupils having a specific knowledge of particular aspects of history and the past, their knowledge was not always significantly different from that of those who had not been exposed to those approaches. The most apparent differences were those between age groups rather than schools.

The success of the new history teaching strategies adopted by teachers was reflected in the responses of their pupils to the pupil questionnaire sections on attitude towards history and their ranking of the subject against others. The data indicate that the children enjoyed the history and identified strongly with what they had done. Though conclusions from the research into attitudes towards history must be restricted to older pupils, there are two clear indicators of positive benefits derived: the classes of the teachers who had been interviewed on the basis of their history practice revealed more favourable attitudes towards history than those of other teachers, and the general trend for fourth year juniors to show lower attitude scores than third years was reversed in the case of history in these classes. If the criterion for including the new history in the primary curriculum is pupil choice, this is evidence that its inclusion is justified.

From being the hard-to-find exception in 1985, the new history has become national orthodoxy in 1991. Knight's article has in retrospect a prophetic note. His prescription for a "scheme that works" required a coherent content and "attitudes and concepts arranged in some scheme of progression". He explained,

If a scheme is to move from paper into practice then resources have to be organised, teaching and learning strategies have to be formulated, suitable tasks and activities devised and assessment processes constructed and followed, all within the context of a coordinated scheme designed to produce progression in the children's work (Knight 1984:30).

The evidence of the teachers interviewed in 1985 was that, while they were familiar with the idea of pupil progression in history, it was not something which they overtly practiced, but rather something which one approached instinctively.<sup>4</sup> The decision to write the new history into the National Curriculum by the device of the attainment targets and statements of attainment in Key stages 1 and 2 is one which the teachers would have found alien to their practice, beginning, as they all did, not with a sense of what their pupils could be brought to achieve but with the adoption of a method or approach which would enable them to experience something of the past.

The way the teachers in the case studies approached the selection of content was also at variance with the way in which content has been structured in the statutory orders (DES 1991) for the National Curriculum. Those interviewed all made their decisions of what to teach in relation to their decisions of how it should be taught, a process which the detail of the core study units upsets. As much of their work was based on being able to exploit a suitable stimulus (something in the local environment; a novel; a TV programme; collecting and displaying artefacts; a special



occasion or trip), they rejected an approach which would commit them to a fixed content. Textbooks were rejected for content but sometimes used for illustrations and evidence. A generally felt concern was that it was far too easy to rely on them to give all the information required and that one needed to prevent copying from them. The teachers' attitude to repeating topics (most would repeat a topic at some time, but never have an annual repeat) also contrasts with the way in which content is now specified in the National Curriculum.<sup>5</sup>

One of the more obvious contradictions between the practice of the teachers interviewed and that proposed for history in the National Curriculum is the depth of study envisaged. It was not recorded how the teachers divided their time between areas of study such as history, geography and science, but it was obvious in almost all cases that they spent as much time as they felt they could afford on history because of their particular interest in it. The number of themes which they covered in a year was, however, often less than that prescribed in DES (1991). One theme in depth might be all that a school working on local history would cover. It is impossible to speculate on the basis of these case studies alone, but it would seem correct to assert that with no more, and every probability of less time being available for history, the CSUs would have to be studied in less detail (or at more of a canter) than the history which was being undertaken in 1985. The question of what constituted good practice then and how that might have changed is considered within the context of the broader philosophy of primary education.

### **Primary practice**

"Look at good practice" was the advice given in 1984. It was intended as a rationale for researching history in the primary school and a means of identifying which schools to visit, rather than a more detailed study of teachers and their work, "by reference to which classroom practices might be improved and curricula fashioned" (Knight and Smith 1989:427). It was anticipated, though, that the study would throw some light on aspects of "good practice" in history teaching. An important common strand linking the teachers (with the possible exception of those at School J) was their resourcefulness. They were all prepared to find or create resources for their history teaching to an extent which usually went far beyond the preparation required for topic work. For some of them the activity was an extension of a leisure interest or academic study, so it may be questioned whether this should be regarded as good practice or not. Another distinguishing mark of the teachers interviewed was the degree of expertise they had attained in certain small areas encompassed within the scope of the new history. Only three teachers could be said to have had an overall conception of the paradigms of the new history but it was enough that they had built up enough expertise in one area to innovate and experiment in their teaching with confidence.

Were the teachers subject specialists? They were certainly subject enthusiasts, capable for the most part of inspiring other members of staff to teach history in a considered way. None considered themselves to be teachers of history rather than class teachers and in this sense they would fall into the category which Wragg (1984) described as "semi-specialist"<sup>6</sup>. Looked at more closely in terms of an analysis proposed by Morrison (1986:176f)<sup>7</sup>, the teachers, with the exception of those at School J, did not regard themselves as "initiating pupils into the received wisdoms and knowledge of... a traditional and subject-centred curriculum", saw themselves as working within a process view, not a product one, and saw the value of subject knowledge but did not denigrate integrated forms of knowledge. In these senses they were subject specialists, who clearly had "in their grasp the potential for transforming pupil experience from the mundane to the creative, from the ephemeral to sustained depth of study and the satisfaction that it brings" (Morrison 1986:182).

Over the past six years the critique of child-centred education has developed in two opposing camps. Steedman (1983:110) represents the argument against "the individualistic ideology of child-centredness" which has been reluctant to teach history and "has sought to root all learning in

the child's individual experience of the world", rather than in a growth away from egocentricity and the indirect experience of the world. The National Curriculum, on the other hand, is critical of individualism in that children should not be allowed the freedom associated with child-centredness and that they should be measured not by the a teacher's sense of how successfully they had occupied themselves during history activities but by more objective attainment criteria. The teachers interviewed were not questioned about their beliefs in this area, and had they been it would have been impossible to establish whether they practised their beliefs or not. From observation notes and the materials which they used in teaching, it would not be far off the mark to suggest that there would have been sympathy for the first argument, given that the teachers were seeking to impose a structure of understanding upon their classes and felt that it was important for them to exercise some control over the content and form of learning experienced. Despite their adherence to the importance of skills very similar to those described by the Statements of Attainment in the National Curriculum and the use of lists of specified skills in planning history by teachers at Schools B and G, there was no evidence at all of an attitude towards individual attainment which came close to approximating the approach of the National Curriculum. Their objectives were (again with the exception of School J) group objectives, aimed at producing work which could be displayed in class in a way which gave recognition both to individuals and groups.<sup>8</sup>

The discussion of what constitutes important knowledge and how it is made accessible is continued in the context of the history curriculum.

### **Curriculum concerns**

The period during which the research was undertaken was possibly the high water mark for the school-based approach to history curriculum planning. Many LEAs had immediately prior to this time issued or were currently issuing their guidelines for primary history and schools everywhere were being encouraged to adapt them or develop their own. In all of the schools visited there had been an attempt to conduct (or begin) an exercise of this kind, and in some the exercise itself had been one of the reasons why they had been drawn to my attention. It seemed at the time that this was a logical development, implementing the kind of change urged by the Primary Survey (DES 1978), serving as a source of professional challenge and renewal for staff. In schools such as Schools F, G, I and H, where guidelines had been completed shortly before my visit, there was still a sense of fresh achievement, of optimism at what had been gained by tackling history, and conviction about having found a model which would serve not only to avoid the unnecessary repetition of topics, but allow for the development of historical skills in a systematic way.

1991 has seen the culmination of a process which has all but reversed the practice of school-based subject syllabus making. Instead, the National Curriculum has presented different challenges to teachers, such as, how to plan to teach history in combination with other subjects which do not share the same attainment targets and statements of attainment; how to "get around" the prescriptiveness of the statutory order; and how to balance the demands for time from other areas of the curriculum. It is difficult to imagine that these will (and could?) be met with the same feelings of pride and accomplishment which were present amongst the teachers interviewed in 1985. This raises a fundamental issue for the new history at primary school level: Is it a characteristic of the new history that teachers should also experience the sense of discovery and investigation in their curriculum planning which pupils experience when they are introduced to working with sources and evidence?

The case studies indicate that this sense of discovery, of "finding out" alongside one's pupils and having the freedom to expand successful investigations was an important motivation for the teachers in their teaching. If Knight (1991:139) is correct that the consent of teachers has to be won to manage curriculum change effectively and that their current history teaching is

characterised by what he has termed "history as exposure" (1991:133), whereby children are exposed to the right sort of historical activities and the outcomes are relatively unimportant, then many teachers will have to be won over from what they regarded as one of the more attractive features of the practice of the new history to the conformity which characterises history in the National Curriculum.

In their interviews, the teachers showed that they were concerned about the historical knowledge<sup>9</sup> which their pupils gained through "exposure", acknowledging that it was essential to whatever skills they wished them to achieve. But there was no suggestion that it was important to be able to decide which knowledge was more significant than any other. The following extract encapsulates the view generally held:

Who is going to say that if you don't teach skills and so on, you're going to have to teach facts and knowledge? Now who is going to say what knowledge they ought to learn...? We had a great fire in [name of the town], I couldn't care less about the fire of London... but if they've got the necessary study skills and they know how to go to the archives or how to read a document they can find out about the great fire of London.<sup>10</sup>

For these teachers the importance of knowledge was to bring children to a "point of interest", in the terms of Blyth and Derricott (1985:21) where they could begin to think like historians. They would accept that the point of interest would be different for each individual, and in their endorsement of primary methods would believe with Blyth and Derricott that, "The art of designing a curriculum for any class or group is to ensure that its central thrust is not too far distant from the interests and capacities of the children individually" (1985:21). One of the teachers reflected,

People say that the content of the history doesn't matter, it's the concepts and skills, but I think that content does matter in so much as it's got to interest the children. It's like having a car engine without the body - you've got to have something to carry the concepts and skills, and if it's content that's not going to interest the children, you're lost before you start!<sup>11</sup>

The answers of the pupils to the section of the questionnaire dealing with areas of content make it possible to add the children's voice to the discussion of the curriculum, muted though it is by the format of response. The choice of "true stories of adventure" as the most popular curriculum area might have been predicted on the basis of classroom experience and the reading of Unstead or Joan Blyth. It lends strength to the views of Egan and West, and to those of teachers such as the one who commented, "I would always try to use poetry or literature",<sup>12</sup> and the teacher at School C, who devoted a term to the writing of historical fiction informed by sources. It is ironic that the National Curriculum did not make more explicit reference to it, or try to structure any of the content of the CSUs on this so widely recognised preference.

The other pupil choices reflect what primary teachers apparently told the History Working Group<sup>13</sup>, namely that the content of Key stage 1 was right, but that Key stage 2 was problematic. "Learning about my family and other families" was the second most popular theme generally and the most popular choice for girls. It is difficult to understand why a specific place could not be found for it in Key stage 2, for the skills and insights involved (derived from oral history) would be of a completely different order from those described in the Statements of Attainment for Key stage 1, thus avoiding repetition. Local history was marginally more popular than "my country", while the Egyptians and Romans were the least popular of the traditional topics and significantly less popular than local or national history.

The information derived from the pupil preferences is not enough on its own to give anything more than an indication of interest. Two more substantial conclusions may, however, be drawn from the research. The first is that one way to have convinced teachers of the worth of the content of Key stage 2 would have been to have linked it much more closely to their perceptions of children's interests in history and to what could be established about their pupils own perceptions of historical themes. The second is that there was evidence that pupils responded positively to history which had been enthusiastically taught. It seems plain that if the teaching of the new history is to be successful in the primary school and pupils attracted to its study there is no substitute for motivated and keen teachers.

### **'A place behind time'**

History is a place behind time it has an interesting feature looking back on ourselves.<sup>14</sup>

This was the most interesting and original description of history provided by a pupil in response to the questionnaire. It serves as a reminder on one hand that when asked to write as much as they could about what history was almost 90% of the sample of 572 pupils could not manage much more than to say it was about the past and whether it was interesting or not, and on the other of the fact that for all our teaching and research we will never again experience the past as a child does.

This study has been concerned to show that the new history has a place in the primary school, but a peculiar place, where its final meaning can only be mediated by children, not adults.

---

### **Notes**

1. See note 1 in Chapter 4.
2. Knight's thinking has since refined on the issue of "progression", see Knight (1989b:207,216).
3. The only aspect of the new history which was not well represented in the case studies as a whole was the use of drama. While schools had not neglected it (School E had used elements of drama prominently in teaching) there was no example of an approach which had drama at the core.
4. Something which is confirmed in Knight's recent study of twenty-eight Junior school teachers: "assessment was subjective and undifferentiated; and... there was little or no explicit progression (Knight 1991:138)."
5. Although a school could plan the nine units in Key Stage 2 in such a way that teachers themselves did not repeat topics frequently, it would be restricted in its planning by considerations of chronology and suitability for the age of the pupils.
6. He wrote that all teachers should be encouraged to develop "one or two semi-specialist strengths" in which they "would be obliged to offer some degree of leadership and inspiration to their colleagues."
7. See also Morrison (1985) and (1989).

8. The Statements of Attainment for history in the National Curriculum, are, however, not very useful for the purpose which their name conveys. There is no clear progression from one stage to another in them, and the choice of Level for the individual descriptions for Key stages 1 and 2 is completely arbitrary in many places.
9. In the terms of the History Working Group's (DES 1990a:7) definitions, this would have been "knowledge as 'understanding'", a distinction from "knowledge as 'information'" which is useful in the primary school context, where pupils very often work in detail with information and need to be able stand back from it to understand its significance.
10. Headteacher at School B, tape 4, side A.
11. Teacher at School I, tape 6, side B.
12. Teacher at School E, tape 2, side A.
13. See Guyver (1990:104).
14. Fourth year junior boy at School F. Compare his statement with that of Ortega y Gasset (1959:68): "History is the attempt to give the past new life, to live again in the imagination that which used to be."

## BIBLIOGRAPHY AND LIST OF REFERENCES

- Aldrich, R.E. (1984) 'New history: An historical perspective.' In A.K. Dickinson and P.J. Lee *Learning History*. London: Heinemann.
- Aldrich, R. (1987) 'Interesting and useful.' *Teaching History*, no 47.
- Aldrich, R. (ed.) (1991) *History in the national curriculum*. London: Kogan Page.
- Aldrich, R. and D. Dean (1991) 'The historical dimension.' In Aldrich, R. (ed.) *History in the national curriculum*. London: Kogan Page.
- Alexander, R J. (1984) *Primary Teaching*. London: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Austin, R., G. Rae and K. Hodgkinson (1987) 'Children's evaluation of evidence on neutral and sensitive topics.' *Teaching History*, no 49.
- Avon County (1982) *History and Geography in Primary Schools. Guidelines: A Framework for the Whole School*. County of Avon.
- Ballard, M. (ed.) (1970) *New Movements in the Study and Teaching of History*. London: Temple Smith.
- Barker Lunn, J. (1984) 'Junior school teachers: their methods and practices.' *Educational Research*, vol. 26, no 3.
- Bartho, G. (1985) History: A most crucial element of the curriculum. *Teaching History*, no 42.
- Bassey, M. (1978) *Nine Hundred Primary School Teachers*. Slough: NFER.
- Bastiani, J. and H. Tolley (1979) *Rediguide 16: Researching Into The Curriculum*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.
- Birt, D. and Nichol, J. (1975) *Games And Simulations In History*. London: Longmans.
- Blenkin, G. and A.V. Kelly (1981) *The Primary Curriculum*. London: Harper and Row.
- Blenkin, G. and A.V. Kelly (eds.) (1983) *The Primary Curriculum in Action*. London: Harper and Row.
- Bloom, B.S. (1956) *Taxonomy of educational objectives*. London, Longman.
- Blyth, J. (1978) 'Young children and the past: an experiment with six year old children.' *Teaching History*, no 21.
- Blyth, J. (1979) 'Teaching the young about the past.' *Education 3-13*, vol. 7, no 2.
- Blyth, J.E. (1982) *History In Primary Schools*. London: Mc Graw Hill.
- Blyth, J. (1984) *Place and time with children five to nine*. London: Croom Helm.
- Blyth, J. (1988) *History 5 to 9*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Blyth, J. (1989) *History In Primary Schools*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Blyth, J. and P. Bish (1990) 'History 5-11: Issues raised by the National Curriculum.' *Education 3-13*, vol. 18, no 2.
- Blyth, W.A.L. (1967) *English Primary Education I & II*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Blyth, W.A.L. (1973) 'Discovering time, place and society.' *Education 3-13*, vol. 1, no 2.
- Blyth, W.A.L. (1973) 'History, Geography and Social Science 8-13: A second-generation project.' In P.H. Taylor and J. Walton *The Curriculum: Research Innovation and Change*. London: Ward Lock.
- Blyth, W.A.L. (1984) *Development, Experience and Curriculum in Primary Education*. London: Croom Helm.
- Blyth, W.A.L., A. Derricott, G. Elliott, G.H. Summer, A. Waplington (1975) *Place, Time and Society 8-13: an Introduction*. Bristol, Collins/ESL.
- Booth, M.B. (1969) *History Betrayed?* London: Longmans.

- Booth, M. (1971) 'History.' In R. Whitfield (ed.) *Disciplines of the Curriculum*. London: Mc Graw Hill.
- Booth, M. (1978) 'Children's inductive historical thought.' *Teaching History*, no 21.
- Booth, M. (1980) 'A recent research project into children's historical teaching.' In Nichol, J.D. (ed.) *Developments In History Teaching*. Exeter: University of Exeter.
- Booth, M. (1983) 'Sex differences and historical understanding.' *Teaching History*, no 36.
- Booth, M. (1987) 'Ages and concepts: A critique of the Piagetian approach to history teaching.' In C. Portal (ed.) *The History Curriculum for Teachers*. Lewes: Falmer.
- Booth, M. (1990) 'National Curriculum History: Interim Report.' *Teaching History*, no 58.
- Booth, M.B. (1969) *History Betrayed?* London: Longmans.
- Boyd, J. (1984) *Understanding the Primary Curriculum*. London: Hutchinson.
- Bramwell, R.D. (1978) 'School broadcasting and curriculum innovation in English schools.' *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, vol. X, no 1.
- Bruner, J.S. (1960) *The Process of Education*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J.S. (1967) *Towards A Theory Of Instruction*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bryant, P. (1984) 'Piaget, teachers and psychologists.' *Oxford Review Of Education*, vol. 10, no 3.
- Buckinghamshire Education Department (1979) *Geography and History for Children 8 to 12. Suggested Guidelines for Planning Courses*. Buckinghamshire County Council.
- Buckinghamshire Education Department (1984) *Formulating Guidelines in History for Children 5 to 12 - A Planning Aid*. Buckinghamshire County Council.
- Burston, W.H. and D. Thompson (eds.) (1967) *Studies in the Nature and Teaching of History*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Cade, L. and H. Tolley (1984) *Curricular Provision In Eight Small Rural Primary Schools In North Nottinghamshire*. 1 AND 2. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.
- Campbell, R.J. (1985) *Developing the Primary School Curriculum*. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Campbell, J. (1990) 'Blaming the victims again.' *Junior Education*, vol. 14, no 4.
- Carr, E.H. (1964) *What is History?* Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Cairns, J. 'Some reflections on empathy in history.' *Teaching History*, no 55.
- Chaffer, J. and L. Taylor (1975) *History and the History Teacher*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Clare, J.D. (1989) 'Goodbye to all that.' *Times Educational Supplement*, 8 September.
- Clark, T. (1986) 'Childwrite.' *Teaching History*, no 44.
- Coates, P.J. (1984) *An Evaluation of a History Course for the Less Able at Fifteen Plus*. M.Phil. dissertation, University of Exeter School of Education.
- Cohen, L. and L. Manion (1980) *Research Methods in Education*. London: Croom Helm.
- Collicott, S.L. (1990a) 'What history should we teach in primary schools?' *History Workshop Journal*, issue 29.
- Collicott, S. (1990b) 'Who is the National Curriculum for ?' *Teaching History*, no 61.
- Collicott, S. (1990c) 'Pulling strings.' *Times Educational Supplement*, 14 December.
- Collingwood, R.G. (1946) *The Idea of History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coltham, J. (1971) *The Development Of Thinking And The Learning Of History*. London: The Historical Association.
- Coltham, J.B. and J. Fines (1971) *Educational Objectives for the Study of History: A Suggested Framework*. London: Historical Association.

- Cook, T. (1984) 'A nationally agreed framework for primary history'. *Education* 3-13, vol. 12, no 2.
- Cook, T.D. (1985) 'Towards a rationally agreed framework for the teaching of primary school history.' *Teaching History*, no 62.
- Cooper, H. (1983) 'From marbles to murder.' *Teaching History*, no 36.
- Cooper, H. (1984) 'Patterns of development.' *Times Educational Supplement*, 30 November.
- Cooper, H. (1987a) in 'Debate: What sort of history for the core?' *Teaching History*, no 48.
- Cooper, H. (1987b) 'Monitoring the Past.' *Junior Education*, vol. 11, no 12.
- Cooper, H. (1990) 'The National Primary Conference: National Curriculum history: How will it work ?' *Teaching History*, no 61.
- Corfe, T. (1970) *History in the Field*. London: Blond Education.
- Croucher, A. and I. Reid (1981) 'Pupil attitude changes to junior school activities.' *Research in Education*, no 26.
- Culpin, C.B. (1984) 'Language, learning and thinking skills in history.' *Teaching History*, no 39.
- Daniels, C.W. (1978) 'A new approach for research on classroom history in primary schools.' *Teaching History*, no 22.
- Davis, John (1984) 'Past learning.' *Junior Education*, vol. 8 no 10.
- Davis, J. (1986) 'Artefacts in the primary school.' *Teaching History*, no 45.
- Davis, J. (1987) 'Evaluating evidence.' *Junior Education*, vol. 11, no 6.
- Dawson, I. (1990) 'Why does it matter ? A personal reference to the Final Report.' *Teaching History*, no 61.
- Dearden, R. (1967) 'Instruction and learning by discovery.' In R.S. Peters (ed.) *The Concept of Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Dearden, R.F. (1968) *The Philosophy of Primary Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Dearden, R.F. (1976) *Problems in Primary Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Dearden, R. (1980) 'The Primary Survey: An assessment.' In C. Richards (ed.) *Primary Education Issues For The Eighties*. London: A&C Black.
- De Marco, N. (1989) 'Pupils and the professional historian.' *Teaching History*, no 55.
- Derricott, R., G. Elliott, H. Sumner and A. Waplington (1977) *Time, Place and Society 8-13: Themes in Outline*. London, Bristol: Collins/ESL.
- DES (1967) *Children and their Primary Schools 1. The Report*. London: HMSO.
- DES (1978) *Primary Education in England A summary by HMI Inspectors of schools*. London: HMSO.
- DES (1983) *A Survey Of Environmental Education In Eight Primary Schools In Manchester (DS 21/82)*. Stanmore: DES.
- DES (1984) *Education Observed 2*. Stanmore: DES.
- DES (1985) *History In The Primary And Secondary Years: An Hmi View*. London: HMSO.
- DES (1988) *History from 5 to 16*. London: HMSO.
- DES (1988) *The Curriculum from 5 to 16* Second Edition. London: HMSO.
- DES (1989) *Aspects of Primary Education. The teaching and learning of history and geography*. London: HMSO.
- DES (1990a) *National Curriculum History Working Group Final Report*. London: HMSO.
- DES (1990b) *History for ages 5 to 16. Proposals for the Secretary of State for Education and Science*. London: HMSO.
- DES (1991) *History In The National Curriculum (England)*. London: HMSO.



- Devon County Council Education Department (n.d.) *History and Geography in the Primary School*. Devon County Council.
- Dickinson, A.K. and P.J. Lee (1978) *History Teaching and Historical Understanding*. London: Heinemann.
- Dickinson, A.K., A. Gard and P.J. Lee (1978) 'Evidence in history and the classroom.' In A.K. Dickinson and P.J. Lee (eds.) *History Teaching and Historical Understanding*. London: Heinemann.
- Dickinson, K., I. Poole and B. Ward (1988) *Reliving the Past: All about clues*. Walton-on-Thames: Nelson.
- Dickinson, A.K., P.J. Lee and P.J. Rogers (1984) *Learning History*. London: Heinemann.
- Dix, B. and R. Smart (1981) 'Down among the deadmen: graveyard surveys for local studies.' *Teaching History*, no 30.
- Donaldson, M. (1978) *Children's Minds*. Glasgow: Collins.
- Douch, R. (1967) *Local History And The Teacher*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Douch, R. (1984) Primary school teacher and local history.' *Primary Education Review*, no 21.
- Dow, G. and R. Barrers (1982) 'Looking at topic-centred teaching.' In G. Dow (ed.) *Teacher Learning*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Driscoll, K. (1986) *Humanities Curriculum Guidelines for the Middle and Secondary Years*. Lewes: Falmer.
- East Sussex (n.d.) *Curriculum Working Papers. Primary History: History 7-13*.
- Edgington, D. (1974) 'Teaching history through the local school.' *Teaching History*, no 12.
- Edgington, S. (1983) 'Mortality: a local history and computing project.' *Teaching History*, no 35
- Egan, K. (1978) 'Teaching the varieties of history.' *Teaching History*, No 21.
- Egan, K. (1979) *Educational Development*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Egan, K. (1982) 'Teaching history to young children.' *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 63, no 7.
- Egan, K. (1983a) *Education and Psychology*. London: Methuen.
- Egan, K. (1983b) 'Children's path to reality from fantasy: Contrary thoughts about curriculum foundations.' *Journal Of Curriculum Studies*, vol.15, no 4.
- Eggleston, S.J. (1977) *The Sociology of the School Curriculum*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Eggleston, J. (1984) 'What did the children learn?' *Education 3-13*, vol. 12 No 1.
- Elliott, G. (1976) *Place, Time and Society 8-13: Teaching for Concepts*. Glasgow and Bristol: Collins/ESL.
- Elton, G.R. (1967) *The Practice of History*. Sydney: Sydney University Press.
- Elton, G.R. (1970) 'What sort of history should we teach?' In M. Ballard (ed.) *New Movements in the Study and Teaching of History*. London: Temple Smith.
- Fenton, E. (1967) *The New Social studies*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Ferguson, S. (1970) 'The project method.' In M. Ballard (ed.) *New Movements in the Study and Teaching of History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Fines, J. (1968) 'Archives in School.' *History*, vol. LIII, no 179.
- Fines, J. (1969) *History*. London: Blond Educational.
- Fines, J. (1981a) 'Educational objectives for history - ten years on.' *Teaching History*, no 30.
- Fines, J. (1981b) 'Towards some criteria for establishing the history curriculum 8-13.' *Teaching History*, no 31.
- Fines, J. (1982) 'Go West young man.' *Teaching History*, no 34.
- Fines, J. (ed.) (1983) *Teaching History*. Edinburgh: Holmes McDougall.

- Fines, J. and J. Nichol (1986) 'Doomsday book - Past and present.' *Teaching History*, no 44.
- Fishbein, M. (ed.) (1967) *Readings in Attitude Theory and Measurement*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Foster, J. (1972) *Discovery Learning in the Primary School*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Galton, M. (1987) 'Change and continuity in the primary school: the research evidence.' *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 13, no 1.
- Galton, M. and B. Simon (ed.) *Progress and Performance In The Primary Classroom*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Galton, M., B. Simon and P. Croll (1980) *Inside the Primary Classroom*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Garvey, B. (1980) 'Programmed learning and guided learning.' *Teaching History*, no 27.
- Gauld, M.B. (1982) *History's Contribution to Environmental Studies in the Primary school*. Aberdeen: Aberdeen College of Education.
- Goodson, I. 'History 13-16.' In L. Stenhouse (ed.) (1980) *Curriculum Research and Development in Action*. London: Heinemann.
- Goodson, I. (1978) 'New views of history: From innovation to implementation.' In A.K. Dickinson and P.J. Lee (eds.) *History Teaching and Historical Understanding*. London: Heinemann.
- Gosden, P.H.J.H. and D.W. Sylvester (1968) *History for the Average Child*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Granada Television (1985) *History Around us Teacher's Guide*. Manchester: Granada Television.
- Guilford, J.P. and B. Fruchter (1973) *Fundamental statistics in Psychology and Education*. New York: Mc Graw Hill.
- Guyver, R. (1985) *Skills in History 5-16. Report of a Talk by HMI P.H.W. Garwood*. Plymouth: Devon Association of Teachers of History.
- Guyver, R. (1990) 'History's Doomsday book.' *History Workshop Journal*, issue 30.
- Guyver, R. (1991) 'Past orders.' *Junior Education*, vol. 15, no 2.
- Hadow Report (1931) *The Report of the Consultative Committee on the Primary school*. London: HMSO.
- Hall, C. (1989) *Evidence for starters*. Glasgow, Blackie.
- Hallam, R.N. (1970) 'Piaget and thinking in history.' In M. Ballard *New Movements in the Study and Teaching of History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Hallam, R.N. (1978) 'An approach to learning history in primary schools.' *Teaching History*, no 21.
- Hallam, R.N. (1979) 'Attempting to improve logical thinking in school history.' *Research in Education* 21.
- Hallam, R.N. (1982) 'History.' In M. Hinson and M. Hughes *Planning Effective Progress*. Amersham: Hulton Educational Publications.
- Hallam, R.N. (1984) "'Robin Hood". History for children with learning difficulties.' *Education 3-13*, vol. 12, no 1.
- Hamlyn, D.W. (1967) 'Logical and psychological aspects of learning.' In R.S. Peters *The Concept of Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Happer, E. and J.E. Blyth (1970) 'Model making as an approach to local history in the middle school.' *Teaching History*, no 3.
- Harries, E. (1975) 'Teachers' conceptions of history teaching.' *Teaching History*, no 14.
- Harris M., M. Evans and G. Rees. (1972) *Schools Council Environmental Studies Project: A Teacher's Guide*. London: Rupert Hart Davis.

- Harrow (n.d.) *Time and Place. A suggested Approach to Geographical and Historical Studies in Middle Schools.*
- Hayter, C.G. (1974) *Using Broadcasts in Schools. A study and Evaluation.* London: BBC/ITV.
- Healy, S. (1974) *Ideas for Teaching History.* London: B.T. Batsford.
- Henerson, M.E., L.L. Morris and C. Fitzgibbon (1978) *How to Measure Attitudes.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Hereford and Worcester Primary Study Group (n.d.) *Geography and History 5-11.* Hereford and Worcester Education Department.
- Hertfordshire County Council (1979) *History Guidelines for the Primary and Middle Years.* Hertfordshire County Council.
- Hexter, J.H. (1971) *The History Primer.* New York: Basic Books.
- Hillingdon Education Department (1983) *Historical Elements in the Primary School Curriculum.* London Borough of Hillingdon.
- Hinton, C. (1990) *What is Evidence?* London: John Murray.
- Hirst, P.H. (1965) 'Liberal education and the nature of knowledge.' In R.D. Archimbault (ed.) *Philosophical Analysis and Education.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hirst, P.H. (1967) 'The logical and psychological aspects of teaching a subject.' In R.S. Peters (ed.) *The Concept of Education.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hirst, P.H. (1974) *Knowledge and the Curriculum.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Historical Association (1973) *Report of a Short Course on Educational Objectives and Curriculum Planning and Design (3-5 January 1973).* Course Tutor: J.B. Coltham. London: Mimeographed pamphlet.
- HMI (1983) *A Survey of Environmental Education in Some Derbyshire Primary schools.* London: DES.
- HMI (1983) *Survey of Environmental Education in Eight Primary Schools in Manchester.* London: DES.
- HMI (1985) *The Curriculum from 5-16. (Curriculum Matters 2)* London: DES.
- Hodgkinson, K. (1986) 'How can artefacts stimulate historical thinking in young children?' *Education 3-13*, vol. 14, no 2.
- Honeybone, M. (1990) 'The nature of history and the National Curriculum.' *Teaching History*, no 60.
- ILEA (1980a) *History in the Primary School.* London: ILEA learning Materials Service.
- ILEA (1980b) *Social Studies in the Primary School.* London: ILEA Learning Materials Service.
- Jamieson, A (1985) *History detective.* Edinburgh, Oliver and Boyd.
- Jenkins, K and P. Brickley (1986) 'A level history: from 'skillogy' to 'methodology.'" *Teaching History*, no 46.
- Jenkins, K. and P. Brickley (1989) 'Reflections on the empathy debate.' *Teaching History*, no 55.
- Johnson, T. (ed.) (1983) *In touch with the past. A practical approach to Primary History.* Avon Resources for Learning Development Unit, Bristol.
- Jones, G. (1978) 'Traditional and new history teaching: Towards a synthesis?' In Jones, G. and L. Ward *New History Old Problems. Studies in History Teaching.* Swansea: University College of Swansea.
- Jones, G.E. (1970) 'Towards a theory of history teaching. *History*, vol. LV, no. 183.
- Jones, R.B. (1973) *Practical Approaches to the New History.* London: Hutchinson Education.
- Jones, R.B. (1979) 'Roman lead pigs or how to avoid some perils of the "New History".' *Teaching History*, no 25

- Jones, D.J. (1988) 'Research work in the primary school.' *Teaching History*, no 50.
- Kelly, A.V. (1981) 'Research and the primary curriculum.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol. 13, no 3.
- Kendall, P. (1972) 'Beginnings.' In W. Lamont (ed.) *The Realities of Teaching History: Beginnings*. London: Chatto and Windus for Sussex University Press.
- Kerry, T. (1985) 'Barriers to, and preconditions for, innovation in primary teaching.' *British Journal of In-Service Education*, vol. 12, no 2.
- King, R. (1978) *All Things Bright and Beautiful? A Sociological Study of Infants' Classrooms*. Chichester: Wiley.
- Kirby, N. (1981) *Personal Values in Primary Education*. London: Harper and Row.
- Klein, R. (1990) 'Playing a part in the past.' *Times Educational Supplement*, 14 December.
- Klein, R. (1991) 'Getting to grips with history.' *Times Educational Supplement*, 7 June.
- Knight, P. (1983) 'The 'new' history and primary schools.' *Primary Education Review*, no 18.
- Knight, P. (1984) 'Primary History.' *Education 3-13*, vol. 12, no 2.
- Knight, P. (1985a) 'The practice of school-based curriculum development.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol. 17, no 1.
- Knight, P. (1985b) 'Examining the licence to skill.' *Curriculum*, vol. 6, no 2.
- Knight, P. (1989a) 'Children's concepts, the curriculum and change.' *Curriculum*, vol. 10, no 1.
- Knight, P. (1989b) 'A study of children's understanding of people in the past.' *Educational Review*, vol. 41, no 3.
- Knight, P. (1989c) 'Empathy: Concept, confusion and consequences in a national curriculum.' *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 15, no 1.
- Knight, P. (1990) 'Inset research and the National Curriculum: The case of history in key stages 1 & 2' *British Journal of In-Service Education*, vol. 16, no 1.
- Knight, P. (1991) 'Teaching as exposure: the case of good practice in junior school history.' *Curriculum*, vol. 12, no 1.
- Knight, P. and L. Smith (1989) 'In search of good practice.' *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, vol. 21, no 5.
- Lally, J. (1983) 'Writing history.' *Teaching History*, no 35.
- Lally, J. and J. West (1981) *The Child's Awareness of the Past: Teachers' Guide*. Bromsgrove: Hereford and Worcester County.
- Lamont, W. (ed.) (1972) *The Realities of Teaching History: Beginnings*. London: Chatto and Windus for Sussex University Press.
- Lancaster Primary Humanities Group (1986) Review: 'A secondary source? History in the primary and secondary years.' *Education 3-13*, vol. 14 no 2.
- Lang, S. (1990a) 'Mr. History': The achievements of R.J. Unstead reconsidered.' *Teaching History* no 58.
- Lang, S. (1990b) 'Irish model looks a winner.' *Times Educational Supplement*, 14 December.
- Lawton, D. and B. Dufour (1973) *The New Social Studies*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Lawton, D., J. Campbell and V. Burkitt (1971) *Social studies 8-13*. London: Evans Brothers and Methuen.
- Lee, P.J. (1984) 'Why learn history ?' In A.K. Dickinson, P.J. Lee and P.J. Rogers (ed.) *Learning History*. London: Heinemann.
- Lee, P. (1991) 'Historical knowledge and the National Curriculum.' In Aldrich, R. (ed.) *History in the national curriculum*. London: HMSO.

- Leith, S. (1981) 'Project work: an enigma.' In B. Simon and J. Willcocks *Research and Practice in Primary Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Levine, N. (1981) *Language Teaching and Learning: History*. London: Ward Lock International.
- Lewis, A. (1984) 'Points of conflict: Education 5-9 and the Plowden Report.' *Curriculum*, vol. 5, no 3.
- Little, V. (1983) 'History though drama with top juniors.' *Education 3-13*, vol. 11, no 3.
- Little, V. (1983) 'What is historical imagination ?' *Teaching History*, no 36.
- Little, V. (1990) 'A national curriculum in history: A very contentious issue.' *British Journal of Educational Studies*, vol. XXXVIII, no 4.
- Little, V., A. Thorne, M. Llewellyn and P. Birt (1986) 'Historical fiction and children's understanding of the past.' *Education 3-13*, vol. 14, no 2.
- Longmans (1973) *History Games*. York: Longman Group Resources Unit.
- Low Beer, A. and J. Blyth (1983) *Teaching History to Younger Children*. London: The Historical Association.
- Low Beer, A. (1989) 'Empathy and history.' *Teaching History*, no 55.
- Mac Donald, B. and R. Walker (1976) *Changing the Curriculum*. London: Open Books.
- May, T. (1982) *History and the Young Child*. London: Historical Association.
- May, T. and S. Williams (1987) 'Empathy - A case of apathy?' *Teaching History*, no 49.
- McBride, G. (ed.) (1979) *Teaching History 8-13*. Belfast Teachers' Centre, Queens University.
- Miles, A. (1984) 'A closer look: A case study of topic work in the classroom.' *Education 3-13*, vol. 12 No 1.
- Moorhouse, E. (1970) 'The philosophy underlying the British primary school.' In V.R Rogers (ed.), *Teaching in the British Primary School*. New York: Macmillan.
- Morrison, K. (1985) 'Tensions in subject specialist teaching in primary schools.' *Curriculum*, vol. 6, no 2.
- Morrison, K. (1986) 'Primary school subjects specialists as agents of school based curriculum change.' *School Organisation*, vol. 6, no 2.
- Morrison, K. (1988) 'Serving two masters - the politics of skills based primary teaching.' *Forum*, vol. 30, no 3.
- Morrison, K. (1989) 'Training teachers for primary schools: the question of the subject study.' *Journal of Education for Teaching*, vol. 15, no 2.
- Morrison, K. (1989) 'Training teachers for primary schools: the question of subject study.' *Journal of Education for Teaching*, vol. 15, no 2.
- Muir, M. (1970) 'Your children take responsibility for their learning.' In V.R. Rogers (ed.) *Teaching in the British Primary School*. New York: Macmillan.
- Nash, I. (1991) 'A time and place.' *Times Educational Supplement*, 19 April.
- Newton, S. (1990) 'Meeting the challenge.' *Junior Education*, vol. 14, no 11.
- Nichol, J.D. (1974) 'History simulation and resource based learning.' *Teaching History*, no 12.
- Nichol, J. (1980a) *Simulation in History teaching a practical approach*. London: Historical Association.
- Nichol, J.D. (1980b) 'History teaching, the historian's evidence and pupils historical understanding in developments. In Nichol, J.D.(ed.), *Developments in History Teaching*. Exeter: University of Exeter.
- Nichol, J. (1991) 'The Romans are coming.' *Times Educational Supplement*, 22 March.
- Nisbet, J. and J. Watt (1978) *Rediguide 26: Case Study*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.

- Noble, P.C. (1980) *The place of history in the Education of eleven year olds. A historical evaluation of four schools.* Unpublished M.Ed. dissertation. Bristol University.
- Noble, P.C. (1981) *Time Sense, Curriculum Planning in Primary History.* Blunsdon.
- Noble, P.C. (1982) 'Primary history: What guidelines are needed?' *Teaching History*, no 33.
- Noble, P. (1985) *Curriculum Planning in Primary History.* London: Historical Association.
- Noble, P. (1990a) 'Time to rectify past mistakes: The case for investment in Primary History.' *Teaching History*, no 59.
- Noble, P. (1990b) 'The essential Stanley.' *Times Educational Supplement*, 20 April.
- Noble, P. (1991) 'Past masters.' *Times Educational Supplement*, 5 April.
- Oliver, D. (1982) 'The primary curriculum: A proper basis for planning. In C. Richards (ed.) *New Directions in Primary Education.* Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Oliver, D. (1985) 'Language and learning: History.' *Education 3-13*, vol. 13, no 1.
- Oliver, D. (1990) 'When will they ever learn?' *Education 3-13*, vol. 18, no 2.
- Ortega y Gasset, J. (1959) *Man in Crisis.* London: Allen and Unwin.
- Partington, G. (1980) *The idea of an historical education.* Windsor: NFER Publishing.
- Pearson, G. (1985) 'Jorvik - Inside the museum case.' *Teaching History* No 41.
- Peters, R.S. (1969) *Perspectives on Plowden.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Pleuger, G.F.W. (1981) 'In defence of projects.' *Teaching History*, no 31.
- Plowright, J. (1983) 'Examining the detectives: A critique of the Schools Council's analogy between the historian and the detective.' *Teaching History*, no 35.
- Pollard, M. (1983) *History with Juniors.* London: Evans Brothers.
- Pond, M. (1983) 'School visits and Piagetian theory.' *Teaching History*, no 37.
- Portal, C. (ed.) (1990) *Sources in History: from Definition to Assessment.* London: Longman.
- Portal, C. (ed.) (1987) *The History Curriculum for Teachers.* Lewes: Falmer Press.
- Pountney, G. (1990) 'Topic Work: the future.' *Junior Education*, vol. 14, no 4.
- Price, M. (1968) 'History in danger.' *History*, vol. LIII, no 179.
- Pring, R. (1978) 'Curriculum content: Principles of selection.' In D. Lawton, P. Gordon, M. Ing, B. Gibby, R. Pring and T. Moore *Theory and Practice of Curriculum Studies.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Proctor, N. (1985) 'Redefining the basics of primary education.' *Education 3-13*, vol. 13, no 1.
- Purkis, S. (1980) 'The unacceptable face of history?' *Teaching History*, no 26.
- Reeves, M. (1980) *Why History?* London, Longman.
- Richards, C. (ed.) (1980) *Primary Education Issues for the Eighties.* London: A&C Black.
- Richards, C. (ed.) (1982) *New Directions in Primary Education.* Lewes: Falmer.
- Rogers, G. (1984) 'The use of primary evidence in the Junior School classroom.' *Teaching History*, no 38.
- Rogers, G. (1986) 'Project work and the history curriculum.' *Education 3-13*, vol. 14, no 2.
- Rogers, P.J. (1972) 'History.' In K. Dixon (ed.) *The Philosophy of Education and the Curriculum.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Rogers, P.J. (1979) *The New History: Theory into Practice.* London: The Historical Association.
- Rogers, P.J. (1981) 'Some thoughts on the textbook.' *Teaching History*, no 31.
- Rogers, P.J. (1987a) 'The past as a frame of reference. In C. Portal (ed.) *The history Curriculum for Teachers.* Falmer: Lewes.
- Rogers, P.J. (1987b) *History: why, what & how?.* London, The Historical Association.

- Ross, A. (1982) 'Faction' and history: Solving some problems in primary children's understanding of the past.' *Teaching History*, no 34.
- Ross, A. (1984) 'Children becoming historians: an oral history project in a primary school.' *Oral History*, vol. 12, no 2.
- Ross, A.M., A.G. Razzell and E.H. Badcock (1976) *The Curriculum in the Middle Years*. (Schools Council Working Paper no 55). London: Evans Brothers and Methuen.
- Ryan, A.M. (1989) 'Preserving integration within the National Curriculum in primary schools - Approaching a school development plan.' *Curriculum*, vol. 10, no 3.
- Schools Council (1968) *Enquiry 1: Young School Leavers*. London: HMSO.
- Schools Council (1976) *A new look at history*. Edinburgh, Holmes McDougall.
- Schools Council Committee for Wales (1973) *Environmental Studies 5-13: The use of historical resources*. London: Evans Brothers and Methuen. Schools Council Working Paper 48.
- Schools Council (1983) *Working Paper 75 Primary Practice*. London: Methuen Educational.
- Scott, B. (1973) 'Historical enquiry and the younger pupil.' In G. Jones and L. Ward *New History Old Problems. Studies in History Teaching*. Swansea: University College of Swansea.
- Scott, B. (1975) 'Teaching and learning the new history.' *Education for Development*, vol. 3, no 3.
- Scott, J. (1981) 'Contents and concepts.' *Teaching History*, no 31.
- Shawyer, G., M. Booth and R. Brown (1988) 'The development of children's historical thinking.' *Cambridge Journal of Education*, vol. 18, no 2.
- Shemilt, D. (1980) *History 13-16 Evaluation Study*. Glasgow: Holmes McDougall.
- Shemilt, D. (1984) 'Beauty and the philosopher: Empathy in history and the classroom.' In A.K. Dickinson, P.J. Lee and P.J. Rogers (ed.) *Learning History*. London: Heinemann.
- Shemilt, D. (1987) 'Adolescent ideas about evidence and methodology in History.' In Portal, C. (ed.) *The History Curriculum for Teachers*. Lewes: Falmer.
- Shulman, L. (1986) 'Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching.' *Educational Researcher*, vol. 15, no 2.
- Skilbeck, M. (1975) 'School-based curriculum development.' In V. Lee and D. Zelchin, (1982) *Planning in the Curriculum*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Simon, A. and L. Ward (1975a) 'Variables influencing attitudes to history among comprehensive school pupils.' *Teaching History*, no 14.
- Simon, A. and L. Ward (1975b) 'Variables influencing attitudes to aspects of history.' *Teaching History*, no 134.
- Simon, B. and J. Willcocks (1981) *Research and Practice in the Primary Classroom*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Slater, J. (1989) *The politics of history teaching*. London: Institute of Education University of London.
- Slater, J. (1991) 'History in the National Curriculum: the final report of the History Working group.' In Aldrich, R. (ed.) *History in the national curriculum*. London: Kogan Page.
- SREB (1986) *Empathy in History. From Definition to Assessment*. Southampton: Southern Regional Examinations Board.
- Smallbone, J. (1987) 'History across the secondary years.' in C. Portal (ed.) *The History Curriculum for Teachers*. Lewes, Falmer.
- Standen, J. (1981) "'Place, Time and Society 8-13" with top juniors.' *Teaching History*, no 31.
- Steedman, C. (1984) 'Battlegrounds: History in primary schools.' *History Workshop Journal*, issue 17.
- Steele, I. (1982) 'The 'New' history in schools: From content to understanding.' In B. Dufour (ed.) *New Movements in the Social Science and Humanities*. London: Maurice Temple Smith.

- Stenhouse, L. (1975) *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London: Heinemann.
- Stenhouse, L. (ed.) (1980) *Curriculum Research and Development in Action*. London: Heinemann.
- Stephens, W.B. (1977) *Teaching Local History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Stewart, J. (1986) *The Making of the Primary School*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Strong, C.F. (1950) *History in the Primary School*. London: University of London Press.
- Sylva, K. (1987) 'Plowden: History and prospect - Research.' *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 13, no 1.
- Sudworth, P. (1982) 'An analysis of history teaching in the primary school since 1960.' *Teaching History*, no 33.
- Sylvester, D. (1973) 'First views from the bridge.' *Teaching History*, no 10.
- Tann, S. (1988) 'The rationale for topic work in the primary school.' In S. Tann (ed.) *Developing Topic Work in the Primary School*. Lewes: Falmer.
- Taylor, P.H. (1970) *How Teachers Plan Their Courses*. Slough: N.F.E.R.
- Taylor, P.H., W.A. Reid, B.J. Holley and G. Exon (1974) *Purpose, Power and Constraint in the Primary School Curriculum*. London: Macmillan.
- Thomas, K.C. (1978) *Rediguide 7: Attitude assessment*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.
- Thompson, F.R. (1980) 'Place, time and society 8-13.' *History Teaching Review*, vol. 12, no 1.
- Thompson, F. (1982) 'Place, Time and Society 8-13. The project's view of the meaning of history today.' *Teaching History*, no 32.
- Thompson, F. (1983) 'Empathy: An aim and a skill to be developed.' *Teaching History*, no 37.
- Thompson, F. (1984) 'The Schools Council Place, Time and Society 8-13 project.' *The History and Social Science Teacher*, vol. 19, no 3.
- Trevorrow, H. (1980) *An Examination of the Project/Topic Approaches to Teaching in the Primary school*. Unpublished Advanced Dip. Ed. thesis. University of Bristol.
- Truman, P. (1990) 'Teachers' concerns over the current vogue in teaching history.' *Teaching History*, no 58.
- Unstead, R.J. (1956) *Teaching History in the Junior School*. London: A&C Black.
- Walkerdine, V. (1984) 'Developmental psychology and child-centred pedagogy: the insertion of Piaget into early education.' in Hendiriques, J., Hollway, W., Urwin, C., Venn, C., and Walkerdine, V. *Changing the Subject. Psychology, Social Regulation and Subjectivity*. London: Methuen.
- Walton, J.(ed.) (1971) *Curriculum Organisation and Design*. London: Ward Lock.
- Waplington, A (1975) *Clues*. Glasgow and Bristol: Collins/ESL.
- West Sussex (1984) *Curriculum Papers No 4: History 8-13*. West Sussex County Council.
- West, J. (1962) *Village Records*. London: Macmillan.
- West, J. (1966) *History Here and Now*. Kettering.
- West, J. (1978) 'Young children's awareness of the past.' *Trends in Education*, no 1.
- West, J. (1981a) *Children's awareness of the past*. PhD thesis. University of Keele.
- West, J. (1981b) *History 7-13 (Guidelines, Structures, resources)*. Dudley: Dudley Teachers' Centre.
- West, J. (1981c) 'Primary school children's perception of authenticity and time in historical narrative pictures.' *Teaching History*, no 29.
- West, J. (1982) 'Testing the use of written records in Primary Schools, 1979-80.' *Teaching History*, no 32.
- West, J. (1984a) 'From the known to the unknown.' *Junior Education*, vol. 8, no 6.



- West, J. (1984b) 'Ring the changes.' *Junior Education*, vol. 8, no 7.
- West, J. (1984c) 'The Dudley Project: "Children's awareness of the past".' *Teaching History*, no 40.
- West, J. (1986) *Timeline*. Walton-on-Thames: Nelson.
- West, J. (1990) 'Past historic: Future uncertain.' *Junior Education*, vol. 14, no 6.
- Wheeler, S. (1970) 'Young children, documents and the locality.' *Teaching History*, no 3.
- Whitehead, D.J. (1980) *The Dissemination of Educational Innovations in Britain*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Wibberley, I. (1984) 'Developing local history materials in Enfield.' *Teaching History*, no 39.
- Wilson, M.D. (1981) *Slow Learners and the Secondary School History Curriculum*. M.Ed. dissertation, University of Exeter School of Education.
- Wilson, M.D. (1982) 'The attitudes of slow-learning adolescents to the teaching and study of history.' *Teaching History*, NO 34.
- Wilson, M.D. (1983) 'A critical view of the compulsory history curriculum 11-14.' *Teaching History*, no 36.
- Wilson, M.D. (1985) *History for Pupils with Learning Difficulties*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Wilson, V. and J. Woodhouse (1990) *History through Drama. A Teacher's Guide*. London: Historical Association.
- Wragg, E.C. (1978) *Rediguide 11: Conducting And Analysing Interviews*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.
- Wragg, T. (1984) 'Semi-specialists.' *Junior Education*, vol 8, no 12.
- Wright, D. (1984) 'A small local investigation.' *Teaching History*, no 39.
- Young, R. (1985) 'Child development under threat: its place in initial teacher education for the years of primary schooling.' *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, vol. 9, no 3.
- Youngman, M.B. (1978) *Rediguide 12: Designing and Analysing Questionnaires*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.
- Youngman, M.B. (1980) *Rediguide 25: Presenting Research Results*. Nottingham: University of Nottingham.