Experiences of teaching history 1985—2011: the teachers' voice

Mary Catherine Woolley

UCL Institute of Education

Submission for the award of PhD

2017

I, Mary Catherine Woolley, confirm that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

Acknowledgements

Contents

List of figures

List of abbreviations

A level	Advanced level examination
AfL	Assessment for Learning
AS level	Advanced supplementary level examination
AST	Advanced Skills Teacher
AT	Attainment Target
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
CSE	Certificate of School Education (until 1987)
DCSF	Department for Children, Schools and Families
DFE	Department for Education
DFEE	Department for Education and Employment
DFES	Department for Education and Skills
EBacc	English Baccalaureate
EdD	Doctorate in Education
ERA	Education Reform Act
GCSE	General Certificate of Secondary Education (from 1988)
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
ILEA	Inner London Education Authority
INSET	In-service training
ITE	Initial Teacher Education
KE	Key Element
KS4	Key Stage 4
LA	Local Authority
LEA	Local Education Authority
NC	National Curriculum
NHS	National Health Service
NQT	Newly Qualified Teacher
Ofsted	Office for Standards in Education
O-level	Exam taken at 16 up until 1987
PBL	Project Based Learning
PGCE	Postgraduate Certificate in Education
PLO	Palestine Liberation Organisation
PoS	Programme of Study
Project CHATA	Concepts of History and Teaching Approaches: 7-14

RE	Religious Education
RSA	Royal Society of Arts
SCHP	Schools Council History Project
SEF	School Evaluation Form
SEG	Southern Examining Group
SEN	Special Educational Needs
SHP	Schools History Project
SLT	School Leadership Team
TVEI	Technical Vocational Education Initiative
VLE	Virtual Learning Environment

Abstract

An oral history approach was used to explore history teachers' perceptions, experiences and enactments of curriculum and policy between the years 1985 and 2011. The history curriculum has long been a site of contention. However, research has tended to concentrate on policy creation, policy documentation and textbook content. More recently, some studies have considered the voice of the history teacher. This research set out explicitly to understand teachers' experiences in the history classroom throughout a period of rapid curriculum and policy change.

Interviews were conducted with thirteen history teachers, who had taught across this timeframe. The focus in using oral history was on teachers as witnesses, interpreters and enactors of curriculum and policy changes. Findings are set out in a chronological and occasionally thematic form, supported where relevant by secondary material. The relative autonomy of history teachers in the 1980s is explored, finding a diversity of practice and a significant amount of 'dual practice,' with teachers employing both traditional and progressive methods. The impact of the introduction of the National Curriculum in 1991 on teachers' experience is considered before detailing the prescriptive policies that dominated the first decade after 2000. This is followed by a consideration of other agents of change acting on history teachers across the period.

This study concludes that there were dramatic changes in history teaching across this period, in terms of teachers' epistemological position, professional status and pedagogic practice. All of the teachers interviewed perceived and experienced a loss of autonomy over this period. Exam boards were particularly powerful agents in effecting change in the history classroom. There was also a noticeable shift in the discourse teachers used to describe their practice, from an 'authentic' focus on substantive content at the beginning of their careers to a more 'technical' focus on assessment details after 2000. A small group of teachers appeared able to resist this pressure, maintaining a subject-specific, disciplinary approach. This study demonstrates the value of listening to the voices of experienced teachers and placing oral evidence against secondary literature to provide a richer and more meaningful account of this significant period of change. Additionally, it provides lessons for teacher educators and policy-makers concerning the need for subject-specific support networks for history teachers at every stage of their career.

Chapter 1   Introduction

In 2013 the Conservative and Liberal Democrat coalition government launched the fifth version of the History Programme of Study since the Education Reform Act of 1988 introduced a National Curriculum. The policy debates and documents of the National Curriculum have been well researched.[1] However, nearly thirty years after the Education Reform Act, a paucity of research exists about the impact of the National Curriculum in history classrooms across England. While debates over details in the documentation have earned many pages of media coverage and academic interest, much less is known about how teachers enacted the curriculum in their classrooms. Curriculum policy forms part of a complex network, with overlapping and sometimes contradictory policies that teachers experience and enact.[2] There is, therefore, a need to explore teachers' experiences of both curriculum and policy in order to more fully understand how history teachers perceived, experienced and enacted change in this period of considerable educational upheaval. Such research could inform the way curriculum and policy are written, shared and enacted in the future.

The purpose of this study, therefore, was to explore the changing experience of history teaching from the perspective of a major agent: the history teacher. It employed an oral history approach to explore history teachers' perceptions, experiences and enactments of curriculum and policy between 1985 and 2011. Over twenty hours of interviews took place with thirteen experienced history teachers from across the south of England. The evidence provided by the teachers was set against a contextual backdrop of existing literature and a documentary analysis of relevant policy. This dual approach resulted in the creation of a richer, more detailed narrative of change than currently exists.

This thesis provides a historical lens to several contemporary debates. The year 2017 saw recruitment and retention crises in secondary teaching.[3] Questions were raised over

---

[1] R. Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics* (London: Cassell, 1998). R. Guyver, "The History Working Group and Beyond: A Case Study in the UK's History Quarrels," in *History Wars and the Classroom*, ed. T. Taylor and R. Guyver (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2012).

[2] S. J. Ball, M. Maguire and A. Braun, *How Schools Do Policy: Policy Enactments in Secondary Schools* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012).

[3] N. Carmichael, " Recruitment and Retention of Teachers: Fifth Report of Session 2016-17," ed. House of Commons Education Committee (London: HMSO, 2017).

teacher autonomy and the role of assessment.[4] The debate over the place and even the nature of knowledge in the history classroom has been reignited; traditional and progressive approaches to teaching the subject are debated daily among history practitioners in the realms of Twitter and the 'blogosphere'.[5] The longitudinal approach of this thesis demonstrates that many of these issues have a long history and there is a need for that history to inform both current debates and future classroom practice.

This study consists of several parts. First, a rationale sets out in further detail the purpose of the intended research. Chapter 2 sets out the existing research in the areas of history education, curriculum theory and teachers' interaction with curriculum and policy. Chapter 3 explains and justifies the choice of an oral history approach, considering the possible limitations inherent within this methodological approach and the need for a contextual backdrop. Chapter 4 provides a summary of the historical background; a socio-cultural overview; a summary of the changing politics of education and finally an overview of changes in history education according to documentary sources.

Chapters 5 to 8 set out findings from the interviews, exploring both teachers' perceptions and experiences of history teaching and eliciting changes across the period. Chapter 5 considers experiences of history teaching in the relative autonomy of the late 1970s and 1980s, before the introduction of the National Curriculum. Chapter 6 explores the National Curriculum itself: how teachers perceived it and enacted it, not only in 1991 but across the next three iterations. Chapter 7 focuses on the first decade of the twenty-first century in exploring history teachers' responses to other policies enacted within their schools, such as the 'raising standards' agenda and the associated pressure for target-setting and 'surveillance.' Chapter 8 explores teachers' views of the role of professional learning and resources in history education within the context of changing curriculum and policy. The final chapter, chapter 9, draws together the themes of knowledge, prescription and agency established across the thesis and raises

---

[4] Y. Williams, "If Education in 2017 Is So Good, Why Are Teachers Voting with Their Feet?" in *The Times Educational Supplement* (TES) 2017.
[5] See blogs on history education such as https://clioetcetera.com/, https://mrhistoire.com/, www.andallthat.co.uk, https://robertpealhistory.wordpress.com/

implications of the study for future research, policy and practice, in particular the need for subject-specific support for history teachers throughout their careers.

Rationale

The last thirty years have been a period of rapid change in education. Since the 1988 Education Reform Act, the National Curriculum for England has evolved and endured. Despite fears of deprofessionalisation and reduced autonomy, teachers have tended to interpret and mediate curriculum and policy in many different and often unexpected ways.[6] Many history teachers have come to see the curriculum in a positive light as long as they can be flexible in how they 'play around' with it, 'make choices' and even 'subvert' it for their own purposes.[7] However, if print media speculation is to be believed, the history curriculum has proved particularly contentious across this period. There is protracted debate concerning the perceived lack of historical knowledge displayed by young people and the particular historical knowledge that should appear within any programme of study.[8] As a new Minister for Education announced further changes to the history curriculum in 2011, the lack of evidence-based research about the existing state of play in history classrooms became apparent. While research exists on relevant policies and textbooks across this period, there is less research from the perspective of the teacher in the classroom, and very little which asks teachers to take a retrospective and longitudinal view of their own experiences of history teaching across their career. Such an approach has the potential to influence future curriculum policy and to ensure it is appropriate to the needs and expectations of teachers themselves.

This study explores changing experiences of history teaching between 1985 and 2011; a period which saw the replacement of O-level examinations with the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE), followed closely by the introduction of the National Curriculum. The choice of 1985 as a starting point related to a moment in time before GCSE and National Curriculum. The year 2011 was chosen as an end point for more practical reasons as it was when the majority of the interviews took place. The broadening of the academisation programme around this time gave 2011 added

---

[6] G. Helsby and G. McCulloch, eds, *Teachers and the National Curriculum* (London: Cassell, 1997).

[7] C. Husbands, A. Kitson and A. Pendry, *Understanding History Teaching: Teaching and Learning About the Past in Secondary Schools* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2003), 99-102.

[8] M. Baker, "What History Is For," (BBC, 2002). L Clark, "Trendy Teaching Is 'Producing a Generation of History Numbskulls'," *Daily Mail*, 2 July 2009; G. Paton, "Simon Schama: Schoolchildren 'Shortchanged' in History Lessons," *Daily Telegraph*, 10 November 2010.

significance, with academies no longer being required to adhere to the National Curriculum.[9] Significant debates over the nature and purpose of history education continued between 2011 and 2017, particularly relating to the place of history education within a broad and balanced curriculum and the role of the 'national story' within the history curriculum. Taking a retrospective approach is essential to providing perspective to these debates.

As a teacher of history since 1998, I was aware of many of the tensions involved in teaching to the National Curriculum. As a head of department I inherited schemes of work based on the study units of the original National Curriculum and teachers who were resistant to yet more change. A reliance on familiar resources, a chronic lack of time to embed reforms and a distinct lack of 'professional confidence'[10] meant my colleagues were reluctant to try new teaching approaches. As a head of department from 2002, I witnessed the intensification of pressure for GCSE results with regular target-setting and the tracking of 'levels' for each child three times a year. Whole-school in-service training was provided on three-part lessons and Assessment for Learning. In addition, senior management regularly observed teaching and scrutinised books to ensure such policies were being put into practice. In 2006 I moved into a teacher educator role, visiting history departments across the south of England over the following ten years. I observed a decline in the status of the subject across many schools, particularly until 2011, in terms of time for teaching, the rise of cross-curricular approaches at Key Stage 3 and more vocational options at GCSE. This variety of experiences has afforded me a range of lenses on history education which have informed my perspective as an active researcher in this area. Throughout my career I have worked closely with more experienced teachers who began their careers before the National Curriculum. Their commitment to the intrinsic nature and purpose of the subject despite the cacophony of change around them in many ways inspired this study.

If change occurred in the history classroom in direct response to changes in curriculum documents then it is important to research this phenomenon as it would offer

---

[9] The Academies Act 2010 sought to increase the number of academies, enabling all maintained schools to convert to academy status. In May 2010 there were 203 Sponsored Academies in England. By August 2011 there were 1070 academies in England.

[10] G. Helsby and P. Knight, "Continuing Professional Development and the National Curriculum" in *Teachers and the National Curriculum*, eds G. Helsby and G. McCulloch. (London: Cassell, 1997).

implications for curriculum policy-makers. If change occurred for reasons other than curriculum, for example, due to professional development or school-led initiatives then this also offers valid evidence for those trying to effect change in the classroom. Learning from an experienced generation of teachers about what has or has not enabled them to develop their practice over the course of their career could provide important insights for those involved in continuing professional development. There is potential for the findings of this study to influence history teachers' needs in terms of initial education, resourcing and communities of practice. This study offers invaluable insight and perspective for future studies into policy effectiveness, teacher agency, curriculum change and teacher articulation of practice. Above all, a lack of research concerning the impact of curriculum documentation exists and this thesis seeks to address this shortcoming.

Research questions

Two main research questions underpinned and guided this research. The first, primary research question was, '*how did history teachers perceive, experience and enact curriculum and policy changes 1985–2011?'* This question intended to explore teachers' practice, how their teaching had changed over their careers as history teachers and the impact curriculum and policy had (or did not have) on their classroom practice. Here 'curriculum' is defined quite narrowly and intentionally as the National Curriculum. Policy is defined very broadly as other government policy related to teaching, but outside the narrow confines of the National Curriculum. It could, therefore, include the National Strategies and the government agenda of 'raising standards' in education. An exploration of experiences of curriculum and policy was intended to cover both affective and attitudinal dimensions; teachers' emotional responses to curriculum and policy as they existed on an official, national level, and their attitude to the policies both on a national level and in how it affected them within the context of their own schools and departments. The 'enact' part of the question related to teachers' responses to curriculum and policy and the way they were able to enact government and related school policies in their history classrooms.

By using a retrospective, oral history approach to exploring this first question, it became possible to offer responses to a second, broader historical question, '*how did history*

teaching in English secondary schools change between 1985 and 2011?' The focus here was specifically on teaching and the teacher, rather than a consideration of the learner. History teachers rarely, however, speak with one unanimous voice. As Cannadine et al. put it in their overview of history teaching across the twentieth century, 'the only generalisation on this subject that is truly safe is that few, if any, generalisations on this subject are ever safe.'[11] There were several sources of evidence for approaching this question. First, the individual experiences of the thirteen history teachers forming the bulk of evidence for this thesis. Second, the insights those teachers occasionally offered of change in a wider sphere, whether in their departments, their locality or their perceptions of the national context. Secondary literature was used to provide a more solid contextual backdrop to this oral evidence, which by its very nature could be partial and fragmented.

Change is a concept worthy of explanation. There can, of course, be changes in a teacher's practice from one lesson to the next. The purpose of this research, however, was to try to elicit some of the larger-scale trends across the time period, considering change as a process rather than an event. Beyond this analysis of change, the intention of this research was to draw out some of the reasons for those changes in teacher practice. Further subsidiary questions, therefore, included *'what agents acted on teachers to effect change over this period?'* Continuities in the history classroom were also considered, particularly from the perspective of the teacher. For example, if particular views or methods were maintained across this time period, there is a need to explore what sustained them. Answers were sought from the perspective of the particular teachers interviewed. Analysis of these responses raised questions over what agents affected practice in the history classroom.

History education appears in a relatively healthy position in 2017, with over 40% of students taking the subject at GCSE in 2015, and history retaining a place as one of the five most popular A-level subjects.[12] Practitioner research in the history education

---

[11] D. Cannadine, J. Keating and N. Sheldon, *The Right Kind of History: Teaching the Past in Twentieth-Century England* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), 17.
[12] K. Burn and R. Harris, "Why Do You Keep Asking the Same Questions? Tracking the Health of History in England's Secondary Schools," in *Teaching History* 163 (2016); M. Jones, "Positive Reflections: History Teaching in 2016-17," *Times Educational Supplement,* 26 August 2016.

community is thriving and there is healthy optimism about the future of the subject.[13] However, the period between 1985 and 2011 witnessed some more problematic periods for the status of school history. Talking to teachers, exploring their experiences of these years, with the introduction of GCSE, the National Curriculum and National Strategies, revealed a richer, more complex experience of the long-term experiences of history teachers than currently exists. The next chapter sets out the existing literature relating to history education, history teachers and the way teachers have responded to curriculum and policy.

---

[13] C. Counsell, K. Burn and A. Chapman, eds., *Masterclass in History Education: Transforming Teaching and Learning* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016).

Chapter 2 Literature review

A host of international research exists on teaching and learning history in schools. A variety of aims and purposes can be identified in this body of research, from evaluating the position of school history within the development of national identity to forms of progression in students' understanding of the subject, to the training and development of history teachers. This literature review aims to set out some of the key current debates in the history education community before exploring the origin of these debates. Where applicable, research beyond the history education community is also considered, particularly where it relates to teachers' agency and enactment of policy. This review seeks to identify the gaps in research addressed by this thesis, particularly in researching the voice and experience over time of history teachers in England.

The purposes of history education research

The main body of history education research in England can be placed within four very broad categories. The first broad category is concerned with identifying and defining the purpose of school history. Such research has often been related to concerns about national identity, the development of national identity and the extent of the relationship identity formation should have with school history. As Parkes and Vinterek succinctly assert, history education is 'tethered to its national milieu, but increasingly confronted by cultural diversity.'[1] From the 1980s onwards a desire for multi-cultural history was evident in research literature in England.[2] Around the turn of the century, a wave of writing focused on the place of English history within Britain and Europe came to the fore.[3] In the 2000s increased concerns emerged in the literature over teaching a 'diverse'

---

[1] R.J Parkes and M Vinterek, "History Curriculum, Geschichtsdidaktik, and the Problem of the Nation," in *Education Sciences* 2, no. 2 (2012): 54.

[2] D. Edgington, "The Role of History in Multicultural Education," in *Teaching History* 32 (1982). P Goalen, "Multiculturalism and the Lower School History Syllabus: Towards a Practical Approach," in *Teaching History* 53 (1988). Dyer, History in a Multicultural Society: Teaching of History Discussion Paper 2 (London: Historical Association, 1982).

[3] R. Phillips, "National Identity and History Teaching in Britain: English, Northern Irish, Scottish and Welsh Perspectives," in *Principles and Practice: Analytical Perspectives on Curriculum Reform and Changing Pedagogy From History Teacher Educators*, eds A. Pendry and C. O'Neill (Lancaster: Standing Conference of History Teacher Educators in the United Kingdom, 1997). A. Low-Beer, "School History, National History and the Issues of National Identity," in *International Journal of Historical Learning Teaching and Research* 3, no. 1 (2003). P. Bracey and A. Gove Humphries, "An Evaluation of Pupil Perceptions of Ireland, Irish History and Its Contribution to History Teaching in Our Multicultural Society," in *The Curriculum Journal* Vol 14, no. 2 (2003).

history sensitively and effectively.[4] Chapman, Burn and Kitson suggested very recent debates have been characterised by a defence of the discipline against 'advocacy of the use of story and canonical narratives as tools for fostering national identity and integration across the political divide.'[5] This interest in the relationship between national identity and history education is international and long-standing and is reflected not only in theoretical research but also empirical research with school history textbooks in different countries.[6] While history teachers' changing relationship to the national 'canon' over the last thirty years would be worthy of study, it did not form a distinctive part of this research. As Counsell has argued, teachers' published discourse tends more to focus on 'the practical consideration of how pupils might gain enough knowledge, efficiently and enjoyably, to be able to do history at all.'[7] It is reasonable to assume this would also be the case with teachers' spoken discourse.

The second category of literature, not unrelated to the first, concerns research into the practice of history education itself, in particular, theorising and defining the structures of school history. Haydn has identified England as one of a number of countries that moved away from the 'traditional' model of school history centred on the national canonical narratives with the introduction of a National Curriculum in 1991. This document placed significant emphasis on the importance of developing pupils' disciplinary understanding.[8] The development of this form of history education and the move to this structure within a National Curriculum is detailed in Chapter 4. As Fordham has argued, the transition to this 'new history' in the 1970s and 1980s led to 'a growth in interest in how pupils progressed in their understandings of the discipline, particularly in the form of second-order concepts.'[9] Counsell has defined second-order concepts as 'those intellectual categories essential to the practice of history, such as

---

[4] M. Wilkinson, "The Concept of the Absent Curriculum: The Case of the Muslim Contribution and the English National Curriculum for History," in *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 46, no. 4 (2014). A. Mohamud and R. Whitburn, *Doing Justice to History: Transforming Black History in Secondary Schools* (London: Trentham Books, 2016).
[5] A.J. Chapman, K. Burn and A. Kitson, "What Is School History For? British Student-Teachers' Perspectives," in *Arbor: Revista de Ciencia, Pensamiento y Cultura* forthcoming (2017), 1
[6] S. Foster and K Crawford, eds, *What Shall We Tell the Children?: International Perspectives on School History Textbooks* (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2006). I. Nakou and I. Barca, eds, *Contemporary Public Debates over History Education*, in R. Ashby, S. Foster, and P. Lee, eds, International Review of History Education series (Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2010).
[7] C. Counsell, "Disciplinary Knowledge, the Secondary History Curriculum and History Teachers' Achievements," in *The Curriculum Journal* 22, no. 2 (2011), 210.
[8] T. Haydn, "History in Schools and the Problem of 'the Nation'," in *Education Sciences* 2, no. 4 (2012).
[9] M. Fordham. "Knowledge and Language: Being Historical with Substantive Concepts," in *Masterclass in History Education: Transforming Teaching and Learning*, eds C. Counsell, K. Burn and A. Chapman (London: Bloomsbury, 2016).

cause, change and evidence.'[10] The two largest empirical studies in this area were the evaluation of the Schools Council Project 'History 13-16' and Project CHATA.[11] Project CHATA sought to explore pupil progression in their understanding of second-order concepts. Further research work sought to clarify and refine such models and definitions both nationally and internationally.[12] Practitioner research has been a distinctive feature of the history education community over the last two decades, with many articles published in the professional journal, *Teaching History,* seeking to tease out practical ways to develop students' disciplinary understanding of history.[13] Key texts recently published within the history education community are structured around second-order concepts, or building blocks of the discipline of history with chapters on historical change, historical causation, evidential thinking, historical interpretation and historical significance.[14]

This disciplinary frame has, to a great extent, defined history education literature in England. Part of the purpose of this research was to explore how far that disciplinary language also framed the practice of history teachers. This disciplinary approach to history education has a history which will be explored further in chapter 4 and later in this review. It was summarised effectively by Counsell in 2011. She argued history teachers have been attempting for the last twenty-five years to develop pupils' understanding of 'the distinctive properties of disciplinary knowledge and its difference from the "everyday"'. Furthermore, Counsell suggested 'history teachers' published theorising has rendered the principles of that practice increasingly explicit.'[15] There are some examples of research into the teaching of substantive aspects of history, most notably the Holocaust. Large-scale projects have explored how teachers approach

---

[10] Counsell., 206.
[11] D. Shemilt, *Evaluation Study: Schools Council History 13-16 Project* (Edinburgh: Holmes McDougall, 1980). P. Lee and R. Ashby, "Progression in Historical Understanding among Students Ages 7-14," in *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, eds P. Stearns, P. Seixas, and S. Wineburg (New York: New York University Press, 2000).
[12] L. Cercadillo, "Significance in History: Students' Ideas in England and Spain," in *Raising Standards in History Education: International Review of History Education* ed. A.K. Dickinson, P. Gordon, and P. Lee (London: Woburn Press, 2001). E. Pickles, "Valid Assessment of Students' Use of Historical Sources," in *International Journal of Historical Learning Teaching and Research* 9, no. 2 (2010). P. Seixas and T. Morton, *The Big Six Historical Thinking Concepts* (Toronto: Nelson, 2012).
[13] K. Hammond, "Teaching Year 9 About Historical Theories and Methods," in *Teaching History* 128 (2007); G. Howells, "Being Ambitious with the Causes of the First World War: Interrogating Inevitability," in *Teaching History* 92 (1998).
[14] Counsell, Burn, and Chapman. I. Davies, ed. *Debates in History Teaching*, 2nd edn., Debates in Subject Teaching series (Abingdon: Routledge, 2017).
[15] Counsell, 203.

Holocaust education and students' understanding of the Holocaust.[16] This can be seen as part of a sub-group of recent literature exploring students' attitude to and perspectives of history as a school subject.[17]

A third category of literature took a more political or historical approach to researching history education. Aldrich and Dean and Sylvester provided brief, but important overviews of the development of history education in the twentieth century which are explored in Chapter 4 to provide a context for this study.[18] Phillips' detailed book on the battle over the History National Curriculum was a key political and historical study.[19] More recently, Counsell provided some historical analysis of how the disciplinary form of history emerged through research and teachers' practitioner research.[20] Fordham built on this work in conducting a citation analysis of articles from *Teaching History* which charted a development in the published discourse of teachers.[21] Haydn has explored the role of politicians, particularly Secretaries of State for Education, and their relationship with the history curriculum.[22] Even so, there was an obvious gap for research which looked in more depth at history education in England over a longer period of time.

Having identified this gap in the literature, Cannadine established the 'History in Education Project' in 2009 to explore the development of the teaching of history in English state schools across the twentieth century. This will be evaluated further later in this thesis. Suffice it to say that the project left plenty of scope to explore certain periods of change within history education in more detail. Edwards set out to do just that in his analysis of history education in the twenty years following the Second World War.[23]

---

[16] A. Pettigrew et al., "Teaching About the Holocaust in English Secondary Schools: An Empirical Study of National Trends, Perspectives and Practice," (London: Institute of Education, 2009); S. Foster et al., "What Do Students Know and Understand About the Holocaust? Evidence from English Secondary Schools," (London: Centre for Holocaust Education, 2016).

[17] R Harris and T. Haydn, "Pupils' Enjoyment of History: What Lessons Can Teachers Learn from Their Pupils?" in *The Curriculum Journal* 17, no. 4 (2006). K. Hawkey, "History and Super Diversity," in *Education Sciences* 2 (2012).

[18] R Aldrich and D Dean, "The Historical Dimension," in *History in the National Curriculum*, ed. R Aldrich (London: Kogan Page, 1991). D Sylvester, "Change and Continuity in History Teaching 1900-93," in *Teaching History*, ed. H. Bourdillon, The Open University Postgraduate Certificate of Education (London: Routledge, 1994).

[19] Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*.

[20] Counsell.

[21] M. Fordham, "Realising and Extending Stenhouse's Vision of Teacher Research: The Case of English History Teachers," in *British Educational Research Journal* 42, no. 1 (2016).

[22] T. Haydn, "'Longing for the Past:' Politicians and the History Curriculum in English Schools, 1988-2010," in *Journal of Educational Media, Memory and Society* 4, no. 1 (2012).

[23] C. Edwards, "Recovering History Education's Forgotten Past: Diversity and Change in Professional Discourse in England, 1944-1962" (PhD Thesis, University of London, 2016).

The final category identified here relates to research into history teachers themselves. This can be sorted into two sub-groups; one associated with beginning teachers and the other dealing with more experienced teachers. Key literature in this area includes the work of Husbands, Kitson and Pendry exploring the experiences and practices of practising history teachers engaging with Curriculum 2000 and the work of Harris and Burn with the Historical Association surveys. This category of literature will be explored in more detail below.

History education research has become far more prominent over the last ten years with substantially more papers on history teaching in leading research journals.[24] Its position as a 'foundation' subject on the curriculum, however, has limited the amount of research in comparison with 'core' subjects of maths and science.[25] Large-scale funded projects have been scarce. Practitioner research, however, is thriving and the experiences of a small, 'intellectually-confident' group of history teachers are well publicised.[26] This study, however, sought to give voice to a different group of teachers and therefore broaden understandings of the experiences of history teachers over the last thirty years.

Contemporary debates in history education

School history has often been a site of contentious debate, whether in media stories about the National Curriculum or between academics theorising the precise definition or significance of certain concepts. The history education community has often sought to defend itself and its integrity from various perceived attacks, such as the imposition of a new National Curriculum or other potentially damaging policies related to assessment or teaching and learning. This section sets out two current debates concerning history education.

The first, related to one of the categories above, concerns the fostering of national identity and its place in the history classroom. This is summarised well in articles by

---

[24] See journals such as *The Curriculum Journal*, *Journal of Curriculum Studies* and *British Educational Research Journal*

[25] English, maths and science are compulsory to 16 and therefore referred to as 'core' subjects in the National Curriculum. Other subjects on the curriculum are 'foundation' subjects.

[26] See Teaching History or Counsell, Burn and Chapman. The term 'intellectually-confident' is used in Counsell.

Chapman et al., Haydn and Burn and Harris.[27]   All three studies found a markedly different discourse about history education within the history teacher community to that promoted by politicians and in the media. This raises questions about conflict between consecutive versions of curriculum and policy documentation and the teachers that enact it. As Chapman et al. conclude, 'curriculum projects that seek to mobilise school history in service of a national narrative in its "island story" or "British identity" genres are unlikely to find favour with undergraduates and postgraduates trained in the discipline of history'.[28] This shows the importance of listening to teachers' experiences of curriculum and policy rather than relying on documentary evidence to form conclusions about history education in the past.

The second debate concerns the place of substantive knowledge in the history classroom. Michael Young wrote a seminal book in 2008 promoting the place of knowledge within debates on the curriculum. Young et al. have built on this in describing three possible futures for schools. Future 3 promotes the place of subject-specific knowledge and treats subjects as 'the most reliable tools we have for enabling students to acquire knowledge and make sense of the world.'[29] The history education community has sought to use Young's work to defend the subject-specific nature of history as a discipline, particularly against some of the more generic education policies of the twenty-first century.[30] Questions have been raised about the place of substantive and disciplinary knowledge echoing some of the debates of the 1970s and 1980s in history education. This second debate in particular relates to teachers' testimony of experience from across their careers.

Literature on history teachers and experiences of history teaching

Little research has been undertaken on English history teachers' perceptions and experiences of curriculum and policy. Phillips and O'Neill researched the views of

---

[27] Chapman, Burn and Kitson; Haydn, " 'Longing for the Past:' Politicians and the History Curriculum in English Schools, 1988-2010."; R. Harris and K. Burn, "English History Teachers' Views on What Substantive Content Young People Should Be Taught," in *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 48, no. 4 (2016).
[28] Chapman, Burn, and Kitson, 24.
[29] M. Young and D. Lambert, eds, *Knowledge and the Future School* (London: Bloomsbury, 2014), 67.
[30] C. Counsell; "History Teacher Publication and the Curricular 'What?': Mobilizing Subject-Specific Professional Knowledge in a Culture of Genericism," in *Masterclass in History Education: Transforming Teaching and Learning*, eds C. Counsell, K. Burn, and A. Chapman (London: Bloomsbury, 2016).

history teachers on the inception of the National Curriculum in the late 1980s.[31] Husbands et al. based their book, *Understanding History Teaching,* on interviews with and observations of eight heads of history departments.[32] They explored the extent to which teachers exploited the flexibility of the 2000 National Curriculum and the ways they drew on the different traditions of history teaching in doing so. While one of the most detailed accounts of the thinking and planning of history teachers in existence in this country, it provides a depth-study of a particular period, rather than considering teachers' experience over a longer time. Harris and Haydn conducted interviews with forty history educators during the period 2003 to 2006. This number included eight history advisors or ITE curriculum tutors. They explored the status of history as a secondary school subject within a 'free market' curriculum.[33] This research provided a compelling picture of the state of history education in the early twenty-first century, but it offered a single picture of a concerning problem rather than framing this within an overarching historical context. Harris and Burn explored similar issues in a 2011 paper, drawing on the views of over 500 history teachers to explore the impact of 'alternative curricular arrangements' on the value of disciplinary thinking.[34] This research was based on part of the annual survey of history teachers carried out by the Historical Association. This large-scale survey, begun in 2009, provides a crucial regular insight into the health of the subject in England's schools and provides a voice for history teachers to share their experiences.[35] Apart from the research of O'Neill and Phillips mentioned above, however, there was no similar survey over the period 1991 to 2009. These years are therefore less charted in terms of teachers' experience in the history classroom.

In 2009 Cannadine set up the 'History in Education Project' which looked at the development of the teaching of history in English state schools throughout the twentieth century. This research used archives, primary and secondary source material and interviews with former pupils, teachers, school inspectors, educationalists and

---

[31] R. Phillips, "Change and Continuity: Some Reflections on the First Year's Implementation of Key Stage 3 History in the National Curriculum," in *Teaching History* 70 (1993); C. O'Neill, "Implementing Key Stage 3 History: The View from the North-West," in *Teaching History,* 75 (1994).
[32] Husbands, Kitson and Pendry.
[33] R. Harris and T. Haydn, "What Happens to a Subject in a 'Free Market' Curriculum? A Study of Secondary School History in the UK," in *Research Papers in Education* 27, no. 1 (2012).
[34] R. Harris and K. Burn, "Curriculum Theory, Curriculum Policy and the Problem of Ill-Disciplined Thinking," in *Journal of Education Policy* 26, no. 2 (2011).
[35] Burn and Harris.

Secretaries of State for Education.[36] It was a huge undertaking and the project was clearly very relevant to this study. However, the chapter covering the period 1979-2010 amounts to less than forty pages, half of which focus on changes at the political level. There is, therefore, plenty of scope for a research study focused in more depth on the experiences and memories of thirteen teachers over a shorter period of time. Cannadine et al.'s work is the only study in England explicitly exploring changes in history teaching over such a long period of time. This thesis offers a more detailed and methodologically justified account of a short period within Cannadine et al.'s epic study.

History of history education

Chapter 4 sets out a full historical context for this thesis. This section aims only to offer an overview of literature in the area. In a history of history teaching from 1900 to 1993, Sylvester claimed history teaching in the twentieth century was dominated by the 'great tradition' in which didactically active teachers instilled a mainly British, political history into passive pupils.[37] A number of academics have disputed this in terms of pedagogy and teaching approach. For example, Aldrich and Dean highlighted the work of Keatinge and Happold who wished to introduce more historical methods to schools in the early twentieth century.[38] More recently, Edwards has questioned a polarity of approach in discussion of history education in the post-war era.[39]

Several commentators have pointed to the notable influence of the 'great tradition' in the construction of the 1991 History National Curriculum.[40] However, the National Curriculum, in its inclusion of evidence-based learning, owed just as much to the emergence from the 1970s of an alternative approach to school history which became popular first through the Schools Council Project 13-16 (later Schools History Project [SHP]).[41] This will be explored further in chapter 4. A very positive American critique of SHP suggested it was one of the largest curriculum reform projects in history education and arguably one of the most successful; replacing a traditional, chronological

---

[36] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon.
[37] Sylvester, 9.
[38] Aldrich and Dean.
[39] Edwards.
[40] Husbands, Kitson and Pendry; R. Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*; Sylvester.
[41] SCHP became SHP in 1984.

curriculum with a thematic curriculum, focusing on history as a distinct form of knowing and understanding. It has been argued that in moving towards SHP, history teaching developed from a 'technical act for conveying knowledge' to a 'cultural act that taught students about warrant, about the nature of understanding and about their own role in making historical knowledge.'[42] Barker, in a retrospective of his career as a history teacher in the 1970s, commented on the high value placed on the understanding and experience that teachers and children brought to the classroom with SHP.[43] Winter, comparing a humanities department in the 1970s and the 1990s, offered possibly rather nostalgic memories of the early 'opportunities to be creative, talk to colleagues, listen and respond to students' views and incorporate teaching about values and beliefs.'[44] More recently, Smith identified this 'New History,' as the approach came to be known, as an epistemological, rather than a pedagogical rejection of former approaches to teaching the subject. He described the approach:

> New History starts from the epistemologically uncontroversial position that historians create accounts of the past and that these accounts inevitably differ… children must be given the tools to pick between these accounts and to formulate their responses to them.[45]

Smith suggested this was the approach later described as 'social realist' by Young, or 'disciplinary' by Counsell.[46] This thesis explores the long-term impact of involvement with SHP on teachers themselves and their approach to teaching history.

The SHP approach to history teaching was not without its critics. It was argued by some that students lacked the 'historical imagination' to understand the past through sources. Deuchar feared students would be trained to make the statements examiners would be looking for; he claimed the skills-based approach of SHP, therefore, ran the risk of becoming 'a parlour game' which 'distorts and diminishes history.'[47] A more common attack, coming from the political right, was based on the premise that a focus on skills undermined the knowledge of the past that pupils needed in order to foster a sense of

---

[42] P.N. Stearns, P. Seixas and S. Wineburg, *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History* (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 3.

[43] B. Barker, "Values and Practice: History Teaching 1971 - 2001," *Cambridge Journal of Education* 32, no. 1 (2002).

[44] C. Winter, "Teacher Professionalism and the Changing Discourse of the Humanities Curriculum," in *Teacher Development* 1, no. 2 (1997): 202.

[45] J. Smith, "Discursive Dancing: Traditionalism and Social Realism in the 2013 English History Curriculum Wars," in *British Journal of Educational Studies* (2017): 312.

[46] Ibid.

[47] Deuchar 1987 cited in Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*, 37.

national identity.[48] In the mid-1980s the Conservative government feared that traditional identity was becoming threatened, so adopted policies to halt this perceived threat. In the world of education, the government took more control of the schools and what was happening within them.[49]

These diverging schools of thought about the nature and purpose of school history led to passionate discussion during the construction of the National Curriculum. Indeed, of all the subjects, it has been suggested history aroused the fiercest controversies and the wildest debate.[50] Phillips's book set out the debate about history in the National Curriculum within the context of the educational politics and policies of the period and demonstrated how elements within the New Right sought to influence the policy process relating to history in the National Curriculum in the late twentieth century.

One of the reasons for the contentious nature of the National Curriculum was the freedom teachers in England and Wales had experienced over the curriculum since 1944.[51] Batho, conducting a survey of guidelines for the teaching of history from Local Education Authorities in 1985 concluded the authorities were loath to appear to dictate to the profession. Indeed, most papers included a disclaimer of any such intention.[52] Nevertheless, from the 1970s onwards, government control was growing at the expense of teacher autonomy. The introduction of the National Curriculum was certainly seen as an imposition. The History Working Group was criticised for only having two teachers among some ten members.[53] However, Phillips showed how the Historical Association acted as a curriculum pressure group in order to mediate the implementation of the curriculum.[54] The National Curriculum itself and the debate surrounding it are explored in further depth in chapter 4.

---

[48] S. Wood and F. Payne, "The Scottish School History Curriculum and Issues of National Identity," in *The Curriculum Journal* 10, no. 1 (1999).
[49] D. Lawton, *Beyond the National Curriculum: Teacher Professionalism and Empowerment* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1996). Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*. Winter.
[50] M. Booth, "History," in *The Multicultural Dimension of the National Curriculum*, ed. S.A. King and M.J. Reiss, (London: Falmer Press, 1993).
[51] G. Helsby, *Changing Teachers' Work* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1999); Helsby and McCulloch.
[52] G. Batho, "History: A Most Crucial Element of the Curriculum: LEA Guidelines for the Teaching of History 5-16," *Teaching History* 42 (1985).
[53] R. Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics* (London: Cassell, 1999).
[54] R. Phillips, "'The Battle for the Big Prize.' The Shaping of Synthesis and the Role of a Curriculum Pressure Group: The Case of School History and the National Curriculum," in *The Curriculum Journal* 3, no. 3 (1992).

History teachers' responses to the first National Curriculum were recorded at the time by Phillips and O'Neill. From a series of questionnaires and interviews in 1993, Phillips concluded teachers were concerned about various aspects of the History National Curriculum: lack of resources, insufficient time and assessment issues. The survey demonstrated both continuity and change as far as teaching and learning were concerned. For example, few teachers noted changes to basic classroom activities, but they did assert more time was spent preparing lessons and assessing pupils' work. Phillips concluded that teachers were the most crucial players in the implementation of educational innovation.[55] In a comparable empirical study carried out by O'Neill in the north-west of England, similar concerns were raised about time pressures and assessment frameworks. Differentiation and cross-curricular links were also raised as issues to be addressed. However, the conclusion argued that solutions were almost out of teachers' hands, suggesting the establishment of the National Curriculum would be 'a developmental process and a partnership between 'teachers, trainers and the government".[56]

An earlier piece of research, conducted just before the introduction of the National Curriculum, found history teachers concerned with potential threats to their autonomy. One head of department commented, 'I'm only really happy when I'm in the classroom because it's then that I'm my own boss because I feel in control of what I'm teaching.'[57] Questioned further, the teacher defined 'feeling happy' in terms of autonomy as having control over the subject. Phillips commented that the head of department's perception of her own importance and her sense of job satisfaction was defined in terms of her ability to determine her choice of curriculum and then apply it within her classroom. Another teacher in the same piece of research asserted, 'I am being asked to dismantle a syllabus that I have faith and experience in for one that is artificial, contrived and lacks integrity.' Another teacher claimed the National Curriculum 'smacks of a cultural determinism by seeking to prescribe some parts of history as more important than others'.[58] Such fears from the teachers were echoed in the writings of many on the power of history teaching over identity formation; a potential area of tension between

---

[55] R. Phillips, "Change and Continuity: Some Reflections on the First Year's Implementation of Key Stage 3 History in the National Curriculum."

[56] C. O'Neill, "Implementing Key Stage 3 History: The View from the North-West," in *Teaching History* 75 (1994), 13-14.

[57] R. Phillips, "National Curriculum History and Teacher Autonomy: The Major Challenge," *Teaching History* 65 (1991), 22.

[58] Ibid.

the purposes of the state and the purpose of the individual teacher in the early 1990s.[59] While there was, therefore, some evidence of teacher voice around the time the National Curriculum was introduced, covering topics such as their fears for autonomy, there has been very little research since. This study seeks to explore how far history teachers continued to feel threatened and compromised by the National Curriculum in the twenty years after its inception.

As the fourth iteration of the National Curriculum was introduced in 2008, school history was faced with a double-edged sword. While it was acknowledged by Ofsted as one of the best-taught subjects on the curriculum, there was a distinct feeling among history teachers that their subject was under threat in an increasingly vocational curriculum.[60] While it was clear pupils enjoyed history lessons, only a third of pupils continued with the subject beyond the age of 14.[61] Twenty years on from a curriculum which teachers felt limited their autonomy in the classroom, the tables were turned. The new curriculum encouraged flexibility, removing prescription so teachers were able to tailor topics towards the needs of their pupils. Indeed, personal and family history even appeared as possible elements.

In May 2010 a Conservative and Liberal Democrat coalition government came to power after thirteen years of 'New Labour'. In January 2011 the Secretary of State for Education, Michael Gove, announced a fifth review of the National Curriculum. The major controversy around the draft history curriculum, published in February 2013 has been covered in close detail.[62] The history teaching community was relieved when the controversial draft was replaced in August 2013 with a more palatable final version. Smith has commented on the strength of the history education community in resisting the unpopular first draft: 'it is a sign of a robust subject association and a mature subject community with a strong self-concept and clear vision of how a curriculum should be framed.'[63] He charted a direct course from the influence of New History in the creation

---

[59] P. Goalen, "The History Curriculum and National Identity: Exploring Children's Perceptions of National Identity," in *Curriculum* 19, no. 1 (1998). I. Grosvenor, "History and the Perils of Multiculturalism in 1990s Britain," in *Teaching History*, 99 (1999). J Pankhania, *Liberating the National History Curriculum* (London: Falmer Press, 1994).
[60] Ofsted, "History in the Balance: History in English Schools 2003-07," (London: Ofsted, 2007).
[61] Harris and Haydn.
[62] Smith. Harris and Burn, "English History Teachers' Views on What Substantive Content Young People Should Be Taught."
[63] Smith.

of such a community. One reason for interviewing long-serving history teachers in this study was to explore how such a shift in epistemology had emerged.

Enacting curriculum and policy

This research focused on how history teaching has changed since the inception of the National Curriculum. An analysis of educational change is far from simple, however. Change through policy implementation might appear straightforward and linear, but the reality of change in education is a more complex, multi-faceted process. Theory of educational policy has moved from language of implementation around the time of the National Curriculum to policy mediation and, more recently, policy enactment.[64]

The introduction of the Education Reform Act in 1988 prompted fears the National Curriculum would be top-down and prescriptive. Literature from this period supports this view of the curriculum. Ozga feared the nature of teaching was being fundamentally altered and central government control over the teaching force was being increased.[65] Simons feared the loss of teacher professionalism, suggesting any opportunity for curriculum development outside government control would be swept away.[66] Helsby and McCulloch compared similar reforms in the USA and Sweden, finding that the introduction of the National Curriculum in England could be seen as particularly top-down involving 'minimal consultation, strong central prescription and draconian systems of assessment and accountability'.[67] Indeed, prescriptive implementation may well have been the intention of the government. Bowe and Ball argued that implicit in the National Curriculum itself was the idea that it reflected an unequivocal government position which would filter down through quasi-state bodies such as the National Curriculum Council and subject working parties.[68]

Later literature, however, suggested fears of total prescription and loss of teacher autonomy were not completely realised. Empirical research into the implementation of

---

[64] S.J. Ball and R. Bowe, "Subject Departments and the 'Implementation' of National Curriculum Policy: An Overview of the Issues," in *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 24, no. 2 (1992). Helsby and McCulloch; Ball, Maguire and Braun.

[65] J. Ozga, *Schoolwork: Approaches to the Labour Process of Teaching* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1988).

[66] H. Simons, "Teacher Professionalism and the National Curriculum," in *The National Curriculum*, eds D. Lawton and C. Chitty (London: Kogan Page, 1988), 79.

[67] Helsby and McCulloch, 2.

[68] Ball and Bowe.

the National Curriculum supported this proposition. Margaret Roberts, studying the implementation of the Geography National Curriculum, found the huge variety of practice which existed in geography education in 1989 was replaced, not by standardisation, but by a continued diversity.[69] Indeed the continuing difference between schools implied central control had limitations and there was still scope for professional choice or 'space for manoeuvre'.[70] Other research found science teachers and their representatives within the Association for Science Education played an active and substantial role in originating and sustaining policy in teaching and assessing 'Sc1', the Scientific Investigation module of the curriculum.[71]

Although these studies were small-scale, it is clear the relationship between the policy of curriculum and teacher action in the classroom was complex. Indeed, Ball has claimed, where policies were crude and simple, practice was 'sophisticated, contingent, complex and unstable'.[72] Helsby and McCulloch suggested 'translation of the National Curriculum from initial conception to Working Group design to Curriculum Order and thence to school and classroom led teachers into uncharted waters in adapting not simply to change, but to experiment.'[73] They offered a reading of the National Curriculum as a form of educational settlement that placed teachers at the centre of the equation; negotiating a meaningful role in relation to the state.

Theories of policy, therefore, moved away from implementation towards mediation with a range of actors including, importantly, teachers in their classrooms. This implied a dialectical relationship where policy-makers and implementers act down upon teachers and teachers act back and up on the curriculum policy. Ball stated, however, that this was still 'too simplistic a model' and, building on Schweich, argued the need to go beyond the dominance/resistance binary as school and classroom life was more complex, with 'other concerns, demands, pressures, purposes and desires'.[74] He argued that the translation of the crude, abstract simplicities of policy texts into interactive and

---

[69] M. Roberts, "Reconstructing the Geography National Curriculum: Professional Constraints, Challenges and Choices," in *Teachers and the National Curriculum*, eds G. Helsby and G. McCulloch (London: Cassell, 1997).
[70] Helsby, 169.
[71] E. Jenkins, "Legislating Philosophy and Practice: Teaching and Assessing Scientific Investigation," in *Teachers and the National Curriculum*, ed. G Helsby and G McCulloch (London: Cassell, 1997).
[72] S.J. Ball, *Education Reform: A Critical and Post-Structural Approach* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1994), 10.
[73] Helsby and McCulloch, 9.
[74] Ball, 11.

sustainable practices involved productive thought, intervention and adaptation; that enactment of texts relied on 'commitment, understanding, capability, resources, practical limitations, cooperation and intertextual compatibility'.[75] Such requirements showed the vital place of teacher agency in the era of the National Curriculum.

As the National Curriculum evolved, so too did the place for teacher agency. Helsby and McCulloch identified three phases: innovation, the bureaucratic control implicit in the design for the curriculum and a settlement phase symbolised in the review of the National Curriculum by Dearing.[76] After the introduction in 1994 of his recommendations for a 'slimmed down' version to allow teachers 'scope for professional judgement', there was less criticism of the curriculum.[77]

It is crucial to link theory on policy enactment to the experience of history teachers, particularly considering potential divisions in access to the subject. In an early evaluation of the National Curriculum, Bowe, Ball and Gold stated their discomfort with the political and epistemological assumptions of 'implementation research' and offered an alternative, rival framework for an analysis of change.[78] They claimed much existing research in education policy focused on the state control mode of implantation, absorption and delivery to the exclusion of practitioners. They argued there was a great deal of room for teacher manoeuvre and raised the idea of 'policy as discourse'. This approach emphasised the role of the teacher as policy mediator. Over the next two decades, these ideas evolved into a theory of 'policy enactment', specifically research on how schools 'do' policy, 'how policies become 'live' and get enacted (or not) in schools.'[79] A funded project on 'policy enactments in the secondary school' led to observations and documentary analysis in schools between 2008 and 2011 to develop a theory, or 'set of tools and practices' of policy enactment.[80] Such language proved very useful as a backdrop for this study. There is a distinct focus on the teacher in this body

---

[75] Ibid., 19.
[76] Helsby and McCulloch.
[77] Cited in ibid., 7.
[78] R. Bowe, S. J. Ball and A. Gold, *Reforming Education and Changing Schools: Case Studies in Policy Sociology* (London: Routledge, 1992), 7.
[79] Ball, Maguire, and Braun, 1.
[80] Ibid., 2. See also A. Braun, M. Maguire, and S. J. Ball, "Policy Enactments in the UK Secondary School: Examining Policy, Practice and School Positioning," in *Journal of Education Policy* 25, no. 4 (2010); J. Perryman, S.J.Ball, M. Maguire and A. Braun, "Life in the Pressure Cooker – School League Tables and English and Mathematics Teachers' Responses to Accountability in a Results-Driven Era," in *British Journal of Educational Studies* 59, no. 2 (2011).

of work, in how teachers relate to policy requirements and the competing pressures they experience. However, where Ball et al.'s research on policy enactment is subject-specific it tends to deal only with the 'core' subjects of English, maths and science. Harris et al. have applied some elements of Ball et al.'s theories of policy enactment to an interpretation of the data collected in 2010 for the Historical Association survey. They compared the health of history teaching reported in the school with publicly-available data on the socio-economic status of students in the school, the number of SEN students in the school and the affluence of the surrounding area as 'situated factors' and placing in league tables as 'external factors' to explore reasons for variety in history education practice. They concluded that there was 'a growing divide between those students who have access to the "powerful knowledge" provided by subjects like history and those who do not'.[81]

The place of the teacher in relation to curriculum change is also emphasised by Priestly et al., in their recent work on the Scottish 'Curriculum for Excellence.' In comparison to Ball et al.'s work, the teacher is placed at the very heart of the research, with a consideration of teacher beliefs and aspirations, teacher vocabularies and discourses and the importance of relationships. Teacher agency is defined as teachers' 'active contribution to shaping their work and its conditions', particularly focusing on an ecological approach to teacher agency where agency results from the '*interplay* of individuals' capacities and environment conditions'.[82] The authors distinguish between teacher agency and teacher autonomy, especially where those in favour of teacher autonomy want to provide teachers with complete power in education, emphasising education as part of a complex socio-political configuration. The study concludes by emphasising the need to foster teacher agency. Although data collection for this thesis did not include the broader, ecological aspects of teachers' lives and schools, the potential interplay between individuals and contexts will be considered.

[81] R. Harris, C. Downey and K. Burn, "History Education in Comprehensive Schools: Using School-Level Data to Interpret National Patterns," in *Oxford Review of Education* 38, no. 4 (2012), 432.
[82] M. Priestly, G. Biesta and S. Robinson, *Teacher Agency: An Ecological Approach* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015), 1-3.

Conclusion

There is a consensus in this literature that history was a contentious subject over the period 1985-2011. Questions were raised over what topics should be taught, how they should be approached and who should make these decisions. The voice of the history teacher, however, is poorly represented across this body of literature. It is therefore difficult to know whether the curriculum documentation that has caused sensational headlines over the last thirty years was received, perceived and enacted in the way it was intended.[83] It is therefore essential to listen to the voices of history teachers who experienced such policies and chart their experiences of change. While the experiences of some history teachers are shared through the pages of *Teaching History,* social media or related conferences, it is not known how far such views represent the experiences of the broader body of history teachers. This approach of engaging and listening to a wider range of teachers is endorsed by recent literature. Priestly et al. emphasised their interest in supporting and enhancing the agency of every teacher, not just particular teachers identified as future leaders.[84] Hargreaves and Fullan called for a 'collective transformation of public education achieved by all teachers and leaders in every school'.[85] However, Counsell refers to 'intellectually confident' and 'less intellectually confident' history teachers in her account of 'history teachers' achievement'.[86] While published literature on history education may provide insights into the thinking and practice of the more 'intellectually confident' teacher, more likely to publish and promote their work, this thesis sought to share the experiences of a wider group of history teachers. The following chapter charts the thinking and planning behind exploring those voices.

---

[83] For example, L. Clark, "Schools Told to Dump Churchill and Hitler from History Lessons," *MailOnline,* 13 July 2007; M. Baker, "History Study Needs Facts First, Analysis Later," *The Guardian,* 18 January 2011; G. Paton, "National Curriculum Being 'Dumbed Down'," *The Telegraph,* 4 January 2010.

[84] Ibid., 5.

[85] A. Hargreaves and M. Fullan, *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School* (London: Routledge, 2012).

[86] Counsell, "Disciplinary Knowledge, the Secondary History Curriculum and History Teachers' Achievements."

Chapter 3   Methodology

This research explored the experiences of history teachers in English secondary schools between 1985 and 2011, a time of considerable curriculum change. The history of history education has tended to be painted with rather a broad brush, at a national, political level.[1] As Cunningham and Gardner have argued, the majority of work in educational research has been 'at the apex' of the educational pyramid.[2] They suggested that somewhere very near the base of the pyramid is 'the world of the classroom in past time.'[3] Comparatively little has been written about historical experiences of teaching and learning. More recently there has been some voice given to history teachers, as discussed in Chapter 2.[4] However, in order to fully appreciate the complexity of processes of change and how educational policy and curriculum was enacted, there is still a need to explore the detailed experience of individual history teachers. This study took an oral history approach to exploring the research questions. This chapter provides a justification for that decision and then details the particular methods used to collect and analyse data.

Methodological considerations

A qualitative approach

This research sought to explore how teachers perceived, experienced and enacted curriculum and policy. Curriculum and policy exist as a series of documents. They are, however, more than an amalgam of words and directions and the way they are enacted in practice is social and complex. An exploration of history teachers' perceptions and experiences of such constructs required an interpretative approach to research. At the core of this research were history teachers; human beings. To understand more fully the perspectives of these classroom teachers required an appreciation of the interpretations they assigned to what they were doing.[5] Creswell claimed qualitative research should be

---

[1] Aldrich and Dean. Sylvester.
[2] P. Cunningham and P. Gardner, *Becoming Teachers: Texts and Testimonies 1907-1950* (London: Woburn Press, 2004), 10.
[3] Ibid., 11.
[4] Cannadine, Keating, and Sheldon; Husbands, Kitson, and Pendry.
[5] R. Pring, *Philosophy of Educational Research*, second edn (London: Continuum, 2000), 98.

employed when we need 'a complex, detailed understanding of the issue.'[6] He explained further:

> This detail can only be established by talking directly with people, going to their homes or places of work, and allowing them to tell the stories unencumbered by what we expect to find or what we have read in the literature. We conduct qualitative research when we want to empower individuals to share their stories, hear their voices, and minimise the power relationships that often exist between a researcher and the participants in a study.[7]

Silverman has also suggested that, in choosing an emphasis on voice, 'an interest in subjectivity and the authenticity of human experience' is a strong feature of qualitative research.[8] The focus on human experience of policy and curriculum in this research, therefore, necessitated a qualitative approach.

Narrative research is the study of stories. 'Stories are also told by people about themselves and about others as part of their everyday conversation.'[9] Counsell has stated that 'narrative is a tool for exploring the temporal dimensions of the social world,' but also pointed out that 'a narrative is not something that is found – it is created through interpretation.'[10] Polkinghorne distinguished between analysis of narrative and narrative analysis.[11] Thomas found that in the move from the 'search for the objective and observable' to a 'rediscovery of meaning and interpretation' narrative had been reclaimed and given status as a form of thought of equal validity to that used in logical thinking and inductive argument.[12] He marked the publication of Abbs's 1974 *Autobiography in Education* as a turning point signalling the arrival of a distinctive approach to the study of teachers and teaching. He suggested that since then there had been a steady increase in the number of works focused on listening to what teachers have to say about classroom practice and their experience of schools.

Within qualitative, narrative research, however, a wide variety of research approaches could have been chosen for this study. Definitions vary across literature and boundaries overlap and are blurred in several areas. Be that as it may, it is important to attempt a

---

[6] J. W. Creswell, *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design*, 2nd edn (London: Sage, 2007), 40.
[7] Ibid.
[8] D. Silverman, *Doing Qualitative Research*, 4th edn (London: Sage, 2013), 6.
[9] D. E. Polkinghorne, "Validity Issues in Narrative Research," *Qualitative Inquiry* 13, no. 4 (2007): 471.
[10] C. Counsell, "Interpretivism: Meeting Our Selves in Research," in *School-Based Research: A Guide for Education Students*, ed. E. Wilson (London: Sage, 2009), 267.
[11] Polkinghorne.
[12] D. Thomas, *Teachers' Stories* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995), 3.

distinction between oral history, life story, auto/biographical approaches and more classic qualitative interviews in order to better define oral history. Classic qualitative interviews have proved useful in a wide number of studies in education, including studies of history teachers.[13] These have, however, tended to focus specifically on understanding a single point in time and therefore would be less suitable for an exploration of change. Classic qualitative interviews might also tend to have a more specific focus, with the choice of topic coming from the interviewer rather than the participant. The latter part of the twentieth century saw a growth in life stories and life histories. Zinn has identified two particular forms of biographical method; that concerned with the development of an individual's 'personality' over the life-course and that more concerned with the systematic comparison of different action modes.[14] Goodson raised some of the challenges of the life story or biographical approach; the individualisation of stories, the de-contextualisation and the lack of acknowledgement of cultural location.[15] He suggested the transition from life story studies to life histories through the use of documentary resources and other testimonies surmounted many of these difficulties. One example of this was the large-scale *Learning Lives* project, conducted between 2004 and 2008. A life-history study was combined with a three-year, longitudinal survey study to investigate what learning 'means' and 'does' in the lives of adults.[16] Life histories can, therefore, be a rich source of evidence using biographical and autobiographical data and they may provide some detail of past cultures and practices.

The approaches of life history and oral history, therefore, have much in common in their methods, but they emerge from different roots in sociology and history and have a different purpose. Oral history specifically seeks to contribute something to the historical record. McCulloch quoted Maxine Stephenson in her presidential address to the Australian and New Zealand History of Education Society in 2007 in saying 'oral history could help to include a wide range of voices in historical investigations.'[17] Gardner has made a clear distinction between life history and oral history. While both may use life stories elicited through interview, he argued life history emerges when we

---

[13] Harris and Haydn. Husbands, Kitson, and Pendry.
[14] J.O. Zinn, "Introduction to Biographical Research," *Social Contexts and Responses to Risk Network* (2004), https://www.kent.ac.uk/scarr/papers/Introduction%20biographical%20research.%20WP%204.04doc.pdf.
[15] I.F. Goodson, *Curriculum, Personal Narrative and the Social Future* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2014).
[16] Ibid.
[17] G. McCulloch, *The Struggle for the History of Education* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011), 80.

'remain content to listen to the narrative on its own terms, as a constructed and purposeful account'. However, if we wish to take this narrative as a starting point from which to 'probe individual memory for more precise, detailed, or verifiable information about the past,' this approach takes us towards oral history.[18] In choosing to explore a historical concept such as change and with an aim to enrich the existing historical record, it was decided to use a specifically oral history approach, seeking witness of events and changes that took place in the classroom, rather than a life history approach which might have focused more on the broader lives of participants themselves.[19] This research sought to provide and understand a story of change in history teaching across twenty-five years. It looked to the stories and experiences of individual history teachers for evidence of change.

The voice of the teacher

Over the last forty years, there has been a growing body of work on the experience of teachers. Casey pointed to the importance of this work suggesting, previously, the failure to record the voices of ordinary teachers had actually silenced teachers.[20] This section considers some of that body of work, in particular, the methods employed to explore and record the experiences of teachers.

There have been an increasing number of life history studies of teachers in the UK. Several early studies were written up in Goodson and Ball's book *Teachers Lives and Careers* which opened up a new field of study focusing on teachers' lives and work.[21] Nias undertook a large, longitudinal study into the lives of primary school teachers, focused on the concept of the self. [22] There have been several qualitative studies of different groups of teachers and different aspects of teachers' lives. Sikes studied teachers as parents.[23] Several studies have been made of teachers of different subject disciplines such as Sikes and Everington's studies of RE teachers.[24] In the twenty-first

---

[18] P. Gardner, "Oral History in Education: Teacher's Memory and Teachers' History," *History of Education* 32 (2003).
[19] P. Gardner, *Hermeneutics, History and Memory* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010).
[20] K Casey, "Why Do Progressive Women Activists Leave Teaching? Theory, Methodology and Politics in Life History Research," in *Studying Teachers' Lives*, ed. I.F. Goodson (London: Routledge, 1992).
[21] S.J. Ball and I.F. Goodson, eds., *Teachers' Lives and Careers* (London: Falmer Press, 1985).
[22] J. Nias, *Primary Teachers Talking: A Study of Teaching as Work* (1989).
[23] P. Sikes, "Parent Teachers: Reconciling the Roles," *Teacher Development* 2, no. 1 (1998).
[24] P. Sikes and J. Everington, "RE Teachers Do Get Drunk You Know: Becoming a Religious Education Teacher in the Twenty-First Century," *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice* 10, no. 1 (2004); "'I'm a Woman before I'm an RE Teacher:' Managing Religious Identity in Secondary Schools," *Gender and Education* 15, no. 4 (2003).

century biographical, narrative methods of research have become an acceptable and necessary part of several multi-method research projects.[25]

There is, however, a paucity of qualitative research with history teachers in the UK. Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon carried out the largest-scale research on the history of history education in England. The substantive findings of their work are discussed throughout this thesis. The methodology they use is cited as oral history, stating:

> We have created our own archive, by undertaking a series of interviews with teachers of history of all ages, across the length and breadth of England, and from all levels and types of state school… these interviews provide vivid and abundant evidence of what it was like to teach history in English schools, and also of the backgrounds, presumptions, attitudes, training and experiences of successive generations of history teachers.[26]

No further information about the interview method is given in the main text of the book. An appendix lists the names of 79 people interviewed including six Secretaries of State, four inspectors, three local authority advisors, seven teacher trainers and twenty-one 'pupils.' Twenty of those 79 interviewed are described as 'teachers,' covering both primary and secondary education. Of those, at least six are well-known names within the history education community as authors of articles, books or resources on history teaching.[27] Cannadine et al.'s research often provided essential substantiation to the evidence provided by teachers in this study, but this thesis attempted to explore a narrower period in more depth through the personal stories of thirteen teachers. More detail, therefore, comes through in the voice of the teachers and there is room in this thesis for a more considered methodological justification.

Several smaller-scale studies of history teachers take a life-history approach to consider the impact of personal backgrounds. Coughlin moved towards this in the USA, using open-ended interviews focused on experiences of learning history inside and outside school to find military backgrounds of teachers had an influence on their presence in the classroom.[28] Barker wrote a biographical account of his own experience as a history teacher between 1971 and 2001, touching upon his experiences of the 'New History'

---

[25] The *Learning Lives* project and the research surrounding the Scottish 'Curriculum for Excellence' are two examples
[26] Cannadine, Keating, and Sheldon, 8.
[27] Ibid., 240-42.
[28] M. Coughlin, "Life History Influence on Teaching United States History," in *AERA* (Chicago, 2003).

and his appearance before the school's governing body for the use of 'biased teaching materials' on the Chinese Communist revolution.[29] These studies show the richness and potential in exploring individual lives and stories of history teachers.

Some qualitative studies with history teachers specifically explored their relationship with the National Curriculum. Phillips interviewed history teachers in several different studies regarding their relationship to the National Curriculum when it was first established in the 1990s.[30] Questionnaires were sent to over 180 history teachers in five local authorities and a series of detailed interviews was conducted with a representative sample of twenty-one heads of department. Key questions included, 'To what extent did teachers feel part of the decision-making process? … Did they feel that the National Curriculum undermined their sense of professionalism?'[31] Husbands, Kitson and Pendry, interested in history teachers' relationship with the 2000 version of the National Curriculum, explored the work of eight history teachers in eight different history departments. They observed the teachers across a day of teaching and then carried out two semi-structured interviews with each participant. Both of these studies provide a fascinating insight into the rewards and pressures of teaching history, and some of the thought and planning processes undertaken by history teachers, but they focused on a particular moment in time, rather than a retrospective consideration of change across time which is the focus of this study.

More recently, several doctoral studies have used life history approaches to further understand the experiences of history teachers. Thompson's doctorate explored professional knowing among twelve early career history teachers using an approach inspired by life history.[32] He observed a lesson taught by interviewees, without judgement, in order to root interviews in a shared experience of practice. Thompson suggested the life history approach emerged as his research progressed. He 'regretted the limits of a modest interview which restricted delving deeper into past experiences.'[33] Instead, he used pre-existing educational autobiographies as ready-made life history

---

[29] Barker.
[30] Phillips, "National Curriculum History and Teacher Autonomy: The Major Challenge;" "Change and Continuity: Some Reflections on the First Year's Implementation of Key Stage 3 History in the National Curriculum."
[31] Phillips, "National Curriculum History and Teacher Autonomy: The Major Challenge," 21.
[32] S. Thompson, "Where Do History Teachers Come From? Professional Knowing among Early Career History Teachers" (University of Sussex, 2010).
[33] Ibid., 62.

documents to provide a further source for understanding early influences on participants. Thompson was inspired by Charmaz's constructivist reading of grounded theory and developed a series of 'open codes' from his transcriptions, identifying 'enquiry, visual sources and interpretations' as significant categories.[34]

McCrum, in her similar doctoral study, collected data through in-depth individual interviews with eleven beginning history teachers to explore history teachers' knowledge of the nature and purposes of the subject.[35] Unlike Thompson, she decided not to observe lessons of the teachers in her study, believing this would only provide 'snapshots' of practice. She was inspired by the work of Goodson and Sikes to ask participants to complete a timeline before the interview and this became the subject of the first question. The timeline recorded those factors interviewees felt had shaped and influenced their views of history. Interviews were semi-structured and transcriptions were analysed individually before data were compared to identify emerging patterns. The in-depth interviews in these two studies show the wealth of material and experiences that can be sourced from teachers, even at the beginning of their careers. However, the focus of this thesis was on teachers at the other end of their careers. Although McCrum's idea of a timeline was used to chart teachers' careers, this was seen as a backdrop to their experiences of teaching, rather than the broader context of their lives.

Like Thompson, I considered observing teachers but decided against it as, unlike Thompson, I was not known to the majority of my participants before the interview and an observation, necessarily a snapshot of teaching practice, might have provided more discomfort than it would data. The intention, therefore, became to take the carefully planned interview approaches of Thompson and McCrum and apply them to the rationale for the use of oral history as advocated by Cannadine et al.

---

[34] Ibid.

[35] E. McCrum, "Diverging from the Dominant Discourse - Some Implications of Conflicting Subject Understandings in the Education of Teachers," in *Teacher Development* 17 (2013).

Oral history

'Oral history is as old as history itself. It was the *first* kind of history.'[36] So proclaimed Paul Thompson in his influential book tracing oral history through its own past from the oral traditions of pre-literate societies through the social surveys of Booth and the Poor Law Commission at the beginning of the twentieth century, to the new sympathy with working-class history in the 1960s. He suggested that from 1968 the oral history movement grew fast in Britain and pointed to the creation of the Oral History Society in 1973 and the growth of local history and labour history since then. He identified a shift from oral history as a key part of historians' work up to the nineteenth century to a move away from oral history with the rise of the printed word and the downplaying of oral accounts in comparison with evidence drawn from documents towards the end of the nineteenth century. The last decades of the twentieth century saw a rediscovery of oral history by historians. As Thompson claimed, 'It gives history a future no longer tied to the cultural significance of the paper document. It also gives back to historians the oldest skill of their own craft.'[37] From suspicion of the approach in early twentieth century, oral history came to be used across a wide variety of fields, perhaps especially medicine and education. Indeed, Thompson pointed to the inter-disciplinary projects emerging from the 'new universities' in the 1960s as a key time for the re-establishment of oral history as a valued method. According to the Oral History Society, by the 1990s, 'oral historians were engaged in black and ethnic minority histories, lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender histories and the history of medicine'.[38] Rather than supporting official histories of elites at the 'top of the apex', oral history was most often used to evidence an alternative history. The twenty-first century saw radical revolutions in the world of oral history due to the possibilities of digital technology for recording, preserving, interpreting, sharing and presenting oral histories.[39]

The choice of an oral history approach for this study was based on the idea that powerful insights could be derived from people talking about their experiences, thereby offering an alternative historical perspective.[40] In this research, it was utilised to

---

[36] P. Thompson, *The Voice of the Past*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 25.
[37] Ibid., 81.
[38] Oral History Society, "History of Oral History," Department of History, Royal Holloway, University of London, http://www.ohs.org.uk/about/history-of-oral-history/.
[39] R. Perks and A. Thomson, "Critical Developments: Introduction," in *The Oral History Reader*, ed. R. Perks and A. Thomson (Abingdon: Routledge, 2006), 8.
[40] L. Jordanova, *History in Practice*, 2nd ed. (London: Hodder Education, 2006).

introduce new evidence from 'the underside'; in this case, the teacher.[41] Where there has been a focus on changes in policy in the past, this research is intended to give voice to the teachers who were responsible for enacting the policy. McCulloch has argued that 'concentrating on particular kinds of documentary source' in the past 'meant a failure to engage with the history of the classroom and the teaching-learning interface'.[42] The use of oral history interviews in this research was intended to bring detail, personal experience and emotion to an area of study that has tended to be dominated by document-led research.

There are inevitable limitations to the use of oral history, potential problems associated with mis-memory, accuracy and selection. Abrams devoted a chapter in her book on oral history theory to issues of memory. It is important to consider not only how memory might fail, but how memories might be altered across a course of time.[43] Jordanova raised a danger of over-emotional responses to this type of history; Samuel insisted on the need for theoretically informed discussion on language and oral tradition.[44] The following section seeks to consider the existing debate about such limitations, in particular, the relationship between memory and history.

Memory and the process of remembering are central to oral history.[45] Memory was long regarded as the enemy of academic history.[46] Where modern history sought to be an objective search for the truth about the past, memory was seen to be more subjective and more selective. Hegel's doctrine of historicism held that 'truth' is rooted in history itself.[47] Where traditional history saw itself as based on verifiable fact, memory was more dependent on the acceptance of a range of truths. There was also a danger of memory evolving and altering over time; not solely concerned with the past but accepting the role the present plays in affecting our views of the past. A study of memory values perceptions over reality; consequence and meaning over actuality. Halbwachs referred to 'the ultimate opposition between memory and history.'[48] Where

---

[41] Paul Thompson, *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 7.
[42] McCulloch, 78.
[43] L. Abrams, *Oral History Theory* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010).
[44] Jordanova. R. Samuel, "Raphael Samuel," in *Historians on History*, ed. J. Tosh (Harlow: Pearson, 2000).
[45] Abrams.
[46] Gardner, Hermeneutics, History and Memory.
[47] J. Appleby, L. Hunt, and M. Jacob, Telling the Truth About History (London: Norton, 1994).
[48] Halbwachs cited in P. H. Hutton, History as an Art of Memory (London, VT: University of Vermont Press, 1993).

history has developed as a disciplined, organised process of inquiry, a study of memory is often perceived to be less precise.

In the past, professional historians have often, therefore, dismissed memory, fearing it would encroach upon their scientific methods and linear, analytical narrative. Indeed, A.J.P. Taylor once dismissed oral history as 'old men drooling about their youth'.[49] Towards the end of the twentieth century, some historians, under the influence of postmodernism, sought to celebrate memory at the expense of history, suggesting all history is necessarily subjective and the product of the author.[50] Gardner provided a most compelling account of the relationship between history and memory. He distinguished between memories as marking witness rather than those of the personal narrator sharing a familiar narrative. He claimed:

> Memory exercised in the act of bearing witness to the events of the past can no longer be so readily cast as the old enemy of history but now as its ally and its ultimate source.[51]

It could be argued that a failure in the past to acknowledge the relevance of memory to the study of history has led to a blinkered and limiting perspective. If the study of memory can be integrated into the study of history, in spite of conflicting aims and the need for compromise, the resulting combination of ideas could lead to a fuller understanding of the past. Gardner summarised the potential relationship:

> If history deprecates memory, it lays waste to its wellspring. If memory ignores history, it squanders its credibility.[52]

Halbwachs judged that history is self-conscious where memory is primitive and instinctual; memory is time-warped in comparison to the linear and progressive nature of history and where history is the product of analysis and reflection, memory comes naturally to mind.[53] Samuel identified popular memory as dealing in broad contrasts between now and then, past and present; it 'measures change in terms of generations' and 'assigns events to mythicized good/bad old days'.[54] This concept of broad contrasts was evident in the data for this research when it came to be transcribed. While teachers

---

[49] Cited in D.A. Ritchie, *Doing Oral History*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 10.

[50] Hayden White, for example, suggested that all history is fictive, a product of the present rather than the past. According to Jenkins, White's most succinct response to the question of what is history is that it is a narrative discourse, the content of which is as much imagined/ invented as found.

[51] Gardner, *Hermeneutics, History and Memory*, 112.

[52] Ibid., 115.

[53] Halbwachs, discussed in Samuel.

[54] R. Samuel, *Theatres of Memory: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture* (London: Verso, 1994), 6.

readily talked about the beginning of their career and recent practice, it was more difficult to elicit detail about the mid-point of their careers in the late 1990s. This was where timelines, searching questions and second interviews were used in this study 'to probe individual memory for more precise, detailed or verifiable information about the past'.[55]

One problem in the study of memory is that any narrative is not necessarily linear, but sporadic and segregated, encroaching on history to differing degrees at different points in the past. Part of this problem arises from the issue of how to access and study memory, whether at an individual or collective level. In *History as an Art of Memory,* Hutton pointed out that memory is an internal activity of the living mind that can never be recovered.[56] This poses a challenge for the historian who is limited to studying the ways in which memory manifests itself outside of the mind. Halbwachs believed the historian's first task was to keep memory honest, 'to remedy its distortions of the past by comparing its suspect claims to those based on documented historical evidence'[57] By setting oral history accounts against a contextual backdrop gathered from other sources a justified, valid account of the past can emerge. As Cunningham put it, 'documents and personal memory together can shed new light on important themes.'[58]

In this research study oral history was used to unpick some of the minutiae of change in the classroom and place it against a backdrop of policy change. There is precedent in research for this approach. Cunningham studied Piaget's influence on early years teachers. He aimed 'to gain some insights from the perspective of the practitioner about their experience of change through key developments in policy and practice; their responses and motivation in adapting to change'. He justified this by suggesting 'it offers a more complex account than the grand narratives that historians have traditionally compiled from purely documentary evidence centring on great thinkers, key texts and policy initiatives.'[59]

---

[55] Gardner, "Oral History in Education: Teacher's Memory and Teachers' History," 179.
[56] Halbwachs cited in P.H. Hutton, *History as an Art of Memory* (London VT: University of Vermont Press), xxiv.
[57] Peter Cunningham and P.L Gardner, *Becoming Teachers: Texts and Testimonies 1907-1950* (London: Woburn Press, 2004), 5.
[58] P. Cunningham, "Early Years Teachers and the Influence of Piaget: Evidence from Oral History,"in *Early Years: An International Journal of Research and Development* 26, no. 1 (2006): 16.
[59] Ibid., 14.

Cunningham and Gardner also point to more recent work celebrating memory as a resource rather than a problem. 'Memory may… have as much to tell us about the nature of the past by way of its selective or fictive devices as by virtue of its factual accuracy.'[60] Several times, in the analysis of data in this study, it was the choice of memories that teachers chose to share and give significance to that illuminated their experiences; the way teachers elected to prioritise and dwell on certain stories, while seemingly neglecting other key events, led to the creation of understandably selective narratives that nevertheless held their own veracity. For example, the early part of chapter 6, which focuses on the National Curriculum in the early 1990s, is rich in its discussion of substantive historical content. Chapter 7 described teaching in the 2000s, but includes far more generic experiences than stories directly about history teaching, perhaps reflecting the prioritisation of generic policies at the time.

What an individual remembers or forgets at any time reflects the present context as much as the past. Postmodernists have claimed there is no simple truth to be sought concerning the past, but a range of truths, dependent as much on the context of the historian as on the actors of the past.[61] Samuel refers to memory as historically conditioned; progressively altered from generation to generation. 'It is stamped with the ruling passions of its time.'[62] This oral history, therefore, was very much a product of the time the interviews were conducted. This is inevitable in any historical analysis and not restricted to oral history.

Layers of evidence

Oral history interviews rarely provide a neat, complete account of chronological events. In this study, for example, teachers proved more familiar with the detail of school and classroom experience than with the minutiae of policy or curriculum documentation. A brief documentary analysis was therefore undertaken to provide a contextual backdrop within which to frame the words of participants. The fragmentary nature of interview evidence, coupled with the potential problems of memory suggested a need to set a historical backdrop from alternative sources. This provided a chronological and

---

[60] Cunningham and Gardner, 4.
[61] Discussed in Appleby, Hunt, and Jacob, 7. They suggest postmodernist critics of history and science argue against the possibility of any certain knowledge, but argue that truths about the past are possible, even if they are not absolute.
[62] Samuel, *Theatres of Memory: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*, x.

contextual structure within which to frame the evidence of participants. Each of the four National Curriculum Programmes of Study from across the period was analysed and summarised.[63] An analysis of the initial National Curriculum documents provided an insight into the intentions of policy-makers when the Curriculum first came into play. A comparison between the initial curriculum documents and further versions of the Programme of Study in 1994, 1999 and 2007 enabled an overarching picture to emerge of changes in curriculum documentation across this period. A further review of National Strategy documentation gave detail of broader education policy in the early 2000s and this can be found in chapter 4 which aims to set a historical backdrop within which to frame the interview findings discussed in chapters 5 to 8. In chapter 4, the policy and curriculum texts are related to a broader historical and political context, with a brief exploration of how and why they were produced and how they were received.[64]

Attempts were made to map out the key government policies and shifts over the 1985 to 2011 period on one A4 page (see Appendix 1). This was shared with the teachers who took part in the second round of interviews in 2016 in order to jog memories and help them to be as precise as possible in dating when some of the changes they experienced in the classroom actually happened. Both interviews were therefore placed within a context, the first within the timeline of career developments produced by the teachers themselves and the second within the broader policy context as shared in Appendix 1.

Secondary literature was also used to provide as rich a backdrop as possible within which the interview findings could be framed. Chapters 5 to 8 all start with a context-setting introduction developed from secondary literature. Findings were also compared wherever possible to other written sources, whether documentary, empirical research from the time or other, secondary, commentary.

Several layers of evidence were accordingly built up to provide a framework within which to place the findings of the oral history interviews. In part, this was necessary as the detail provided by the teachers often needed a broader context in order for it to be

---

[63] See Figure 3.
[64] G McCulloch, *Documentary Research in Education, History and the Social Sciences*, ed. R.G. Burgess, Social Research and Educational Studies Series (Abingdon: Routledge, 2004).

fully understood. Moreover, it helped to build a more general and valid picture of teachers' experiences at the time and provided important insights into the process of change.

Methods

Recruitment of sample

As an active member of the history education community, I chose to start exploring this area through contacts and personal acquaintances.[65] I was keen to find history teachers who had taught the subject across the whole period, from 1985 through to 2011. I carried out pilot interviews with two of these contacts in 2009, details of which are explained later in this section. I was aware of several teachers in the local area who were in the target age-range and a conversation with the local authority advisor provided me with a list of those who had been teaching since 1985 or before. At one point, too many respondents emanated from one small geographical area which retains selective education.[66] I therefore turned down some offers from participants working in this area and extended the search to other areas of southern England. Due to practical considerations within this doctoral research, it was not possible to make this a national study. Emails were sent to PGCE tutors in three other geographical areas who provided a similar list of potential contacts. Emails were sent to all the potential participants, telling them about the project and inviting them to participate. Around half replied. Morse has suggested that a 'good' informant has the necessary knowledge, information and experience of the issue being researched, is capable of reflecting on that knowledge and experience, has time to be involved in the project, is willing to be involved in the project and can provide access to other informants.'[67] The participants in this study met those criteria, with some even able to provide access to other informants. Alison, for example, provided Edward as another member of her department.[68]

---

[65] A.L. Cole and J. G. Knowles, eds, *Lives in Context: The Art of Life History Research* (Lanham, MD: Altamira, 2001); I.F. Goodson and P. Sikes, *Life History Research in Educational Settings: Learning from Lives*, ed. P. Sikes (Buckingham: Open University Press, 2001); J. Muchmore, "Methods and Ethics in a Life History Study of Teacher Thinking," in *The Qualitative Report* 7, no. 4 (2002); J. Nias and K. Aspinwall, "'Composing a Life:' Women's Stories of Their Careers," in *Teachers' Stories*, ed. D. Thomas (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995).

[66] I work in an area which has retained grammar schools. I was aware of several more teachers I could have interviewed from this area, but became concerned that they might describe a very particular experience of history education.

[67] Cited in L. Cohen, L. Manion, and K. Morrison, *Research Methods in Education*, 6th edn (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007), 180.

[68] Alison and Edward are pseudonyms as are the names used for all the teachers in this thesis.

A summary of the participants is included in Figure 1.[69] The final cohort of participants included nine men and four women. This was an unfortunate and unintended gender bias, but representative of the contacts offered to me. Several of the sample began teaching earlier than 1985 but were able to provide interesting data about teaching history in the late 1970s. Two began teaching later. Dana started teaching in America in the mid-1980s, but moved to teach in England in 1991 and actually began teaching history in 1993. Nicholas worked in the family business until 1991, when he trained as a teacher. These precise details only came out at interview, when it was too late to turn down the participant based on such details. Several of the participants spent less time in the history classroom towards the end of their careers (and the time of the interviews), but their significant experience in the history classroom justified their inclusion in the research.

Figure 1: Summary of participant details

Participant (Date interviewed)	Role at time of first interview	Prior teaching experience
Allan (2009, 2016)	Head of history at a selective 11-18 girls' school	Taught 1976 to 2014 in two schools, first non-selective, second selective. Head of history department and AST supporting history teachers in other schools
Diane (2009, 2016)	History teacher at a Catholic 11-18 mixed comprehensive	After a BEd, Diane taught history from 1976 to 1984, then took six years parental leave. Taught in three schools from 1990 to 2011, one secondary modern, one Catholic comprehensive and one grammar school.
Laura (2011, 2016)	University ITE tutor	After a history degree, Laura completed a History PGCE. Taught from 1977 in a new school, developing curriculum herself and became head of history and then an AST responsible for teacher education. In 2008 she moved into a teacher education role at a local university, covering professional studies.
Mark (2011)	Assistant headteacher and teacher of history in selective 11-18 boys' school	Mark started teaching at a technical high school in 1973. 1977 to 1982 pursued alterative career, then returned to his first school for two years. Moved to head of history in a selective school from 1985 where he remained until interviewed in 2011.
Simon (2011, 2016)	Head of history 11-16 comprehensive boys' school	Simon completed a BA History in 1981 then PGCE. Taught in four different schools spread across the south of England. Head of history in current school since 1991. Also a senior GCSE examiner.
Dana (2011)	Head of history in 11-18 mixed comprehensive	Dana attended university teacher training degree in USA. After briefly teaching in America, and short pursuit of a different career, she moved to England in 1989. Taught English before moving to history teaching in 1993. Head of department since 2002. Dana and Laura worked in the same department.

---

[69] Fuller details of the participants are included in Appendix 4.

Patrick (2011, 2016)	Assistant headteacher and teacher of history in 11-18 mixed comprehensive	After a PGCE Patrick taught in four different schools across the east of England. 1990, appointed Director of Studies at his current school. Noted on timeline MA completed 1992.
Nicholas (2011)	Head of history in 11-18 mixed comprehensive	After history degree, initial career was in family business, followed by time as a 'house husband.' 1990 History PGCE, started teaching current school 1991. Head of department in 1996. Claimed schemes of work first introduced to his department in 2006.
William (2011, 2016)	University ITE tutor	After a degree in International History, William completed his PGCE in 1976 and started teaching in a comprehensive on the south coast in the following year. From 1980 he worked in three different schools across London. William had a parallel research career, completing a Masters in Curriculum Studies by 1992 and an EdD by 2007. By 2011 he had been working for about a year on a university ITE course teaching History PGCE students.
David (2011)	Local Authority advisor for History	After a PGCE he worked at selective and non-selective schools and as a head of history before in 1987 starting work as a teacher advisor for the Local Education Authority.
Richard (2011, 2016)	Head of History/ Assistant Head, 11-18 mixed Catholic comprehensive	PGCE 1983. Second training placement offered him a job and he has been in the same school since.
Edward (2011)	Head of History, 11-18 mixed comprehensive	Edward described how he started teaching in 1977 in a 'secondary modern school' in the south-west of England. After a year he moved to a Catholic school on the outskirts of London, stayed ten years, completing a Masters in History. 1989 appointed head of history at current comprehensive. Worked with Alison in that department for over twenty years. Retired shortly after the 2011 interview.
Alison (2011)	History teacher and NQT co-ordinator at 11-18 mixed comprehensive	1979 started teaching in current school. 1981: head of history, 1985 onwards variety of roles: head of year, head of humanities, co-ordinator for raising achievement at GCSE and finally NQT co-ordinator.

By the time of the interviews in 2011, two worked in teacher education, one worked for the local authority. Many of the participants held different roles within the school beyond history teaching. For example, Patrick, Mark and Richard were assistant head teachers at the time of interview, although all three still spent half their time in the history classroom. William had been a deputy head teacher before moving into initial teacher education. Allan and Laura were Advanced Skills Teachers (ASTs). Nicholas, Dana, Allan, Richard, Simon and Edward were all responsible for history departments at the time of interview. David was the participant who had taught the least (ten years in total), but as a local authority advisor for twenty-five years, including at the time of the interview, I felt his interview was still worth including. The teachers worked in a wide

range of schools; academies, selective, comprehensive and faith schools were all represented. Between them, the sample had taught history in twenty-four schools in thirteen different local authorities across the south of England.

Structuring the interviews

Interviews form a critical part of oral history research. In conducting interviews for the study a decision was made to keep them open-ended. As Lichtman has argued, the intention of any interview is for the participant to reveal his or her 'feelings, intentions, meanings, subcontexts or thoughts on a situation'.[70] An open-ended approach was intended to enable these aspects to come through while keeping a focus on the subject of enquiry: history teaching, curriculum and policy and change over time.

A simple personal timeline, constructed by each participant, was included to support and add structure to the first part of the interview, a method borrowed from life history research. Goodson and Sikes argued that timelines are a useful start for interviews, by inviting the interviewee to construct a timeline of key events.[71] The intention, in this case, was to collect accurate data as to when and where the participant started teaching and when they had changed teaching positions across the course of their career. While I did not ask for personal information such as marriage or children, which might have affected professional and career decisions, participants were left free to provide such information. This timeline, blank except for years, was sent electronically in advance so that the participants would have the opportunity to complete it. For this research, the timeline served several purposes. It enabled the interviews to start in a simple way; indeed, the history teachers laughed at the irony of starting with a timeline. It also acted as a frame of reference for the chronological and geographical location of specific narratives. As Adriansen has argued, timelines are 'an organising principle for the events' and provide opportunities for 'linking the story with the wider social and political context.'[72]

---

[70] M. Lichtman, *Qualitative Research in Education: A User's Guide* (London: Sage, 2006), 117.
[71] Goodson and Sikes.
[72] H.K. Adriansen, "Timeline Interviews: A Tool for Conducting Life History Research," in *Qualitative Studies* 3, no. 1 (2012): 53.

An interview protocol was drawn up to provide for these open-ended interviews (see Appendix 4). The choice of questions stemmed from the research questions and resulted in two initial themes: changes in teaching over time and perceived agents for those changes. The protocol was divided into five sections with a key question driving each. The first sought an overview: 'How has history teaching changed over the course of your career?' The second prompted specific examples, asking participants to describe a typical lesson when they first began teaching and a typical recent lesson. Further questions focused on changes in the nature and purpose of history teaching and perceived agents driving change, if change was felt to have taken place. A final section provided room to talk about whether any changes were perceived to have improved history teaching (See Appendix 3). The intention was to guide the participants through a conversation about their personal experience of history teaching and then their perceptions of the more general experience of history teaching. Open questions and prompts were written into the protocol, but I felt free to encourage participants to elaborate on particular responses.

Pilot interviews, with Allan and Diane, were undertaken in June 2009 to test out the initial interview protocol. I had worked with these two teachers in my capacity as a PGCE History tutor. One had been a mentor and the other a head of department. At this point, they had worked in five different schools and four different LEAs between them and at the time of interview they were both teaching history in schools thirty miles apart, one a selective school, the other a faith comprehensive. The interviews were successful and generated revealing data concerning patterns of change in recent history teaching. However, the analysis raised a variety of issues to consider before the commencement of further interviews. These related to the selection of participants, questioning technique, prior instruction, the interview protocol and ethical issues. The two participants interviewed in the pilot had very different career trajectories and this showed in the way they articulated their experience of history teaching. While this was a concern at the time, when further interviews had been carried out, both appeared representative of a wider group of teachers.

Allan arrived at the pilot interview with a selection of old textbooks to illustrate his points. This was useful and was suggested to later participants.[73] Diane's interview took place in the school staffroom where other teachers and senior leaders wandered in and out. Diane spoke quietly when criticising school policies and it was difficult to know whether she felt restricted in what she could share in this environment. I ensured that future interviews took place either in teachers' classrooms or in a different setting. The most useful part of the pilot process was in transcribing my own voice and listening to the balance of voices and narratives. I recognised that successful questions, resulting in rich, useful data, resulted from asking the participants to be more specific or to relate general points to specific classroom examples. This practice was developed in further interviews, linked to Gardner's point discussed above that the distinction between oral history and life history lies in the ability to probe for certain memories. Several answers tended to focus on the difference between 'now' and 'then' which led to more requests for specific dates in later interviews, using both the timeline and contextual events to prompt this where possible. Diane and Allan selected very different memories in response to the same interview protocol. This provided reassurance that there was freedom in the interview protocol to allow for a personal response; a selection of key memories important to individual participants. After further interviews were recorded, it was decided that these initial pilot interviews provided rich evidence, so they were included in the final sample.

After the two pilot interviews conducted in June 2009, eleven further interviews were conducted during 2011. Two interviews were held at my place of work, and one in a participant's office, but the other eight took place in schools, usually in the teacher's classroom after school had finished for the day. Although there was potential for these different contexts to make a difference to the content of interviews, there was no evidence of such a difference in the transcripts. Interviews lasted between 45 and 100 minutes with most lasting around an hour. Most of the teachers came to the interview with the timeline already completed and some notes on their version of the interview protocol. The teachers involved gradually opened up through the course of the interview and appeared to become more relaxed as the interview went on, revealing more about their practice, but also occasionally discontent in their current roles.

---

[73] Simon was the only one of the later teachers who took up the opportunity to share textbooks, although several showed resource worksheets.

As identified below, after substantial coding, recoding and drafting it was decided to conduct second interviews with participants in the interests of eliciting more detail on some of the points raised. These took place in 2016, five years after the initial interviews.[74] As discussed above, Gardner has suggested one feature of oral history is the need to probe for certain memories. Practical reasons prevented second interviews taking place sooner, which would have been ideal, as would interviewing all of the participants for a second time. However, some participants became difficult to reach due to retirement; others decided that they did not wish to take part in a second interview due to time constraints.

I approached ten out of the thirteen teachers for a second interview (nine by email and one by post) and nine replied. Seven were eventually interviewed. I returned to each transcript from the first set of interviews individually to develop a new set of questions that focused on asking participants to develop points that they had already raised. These questions were sent to the participants 24 hours in advance of each interview (see Appendix 5). Second interviews lasted between 45 and 70 minutes and appeared to be more relaxed affairs. One took place in a coffee shop, another at a participant's home. Questions for Patrick, for example, tried to elicit more detail in areas that he had skimmed over in the first interview. For example, questions included the following:

> Has there been much change in the topics/content that you taught across the school in this period? You mentioned wanting to teach India. What drove that interest? What about the status of history within the school? Has that changed at all? Did Tx [the particular curriculum initiative in the school] affect the status of history as a school subject? In the first round of interviews, you stand out from several of the others interviewed for your sense of autonomy and professional confidence. Where do you think that professional confidence came from?

By the time of the second interviews several teachers in the sample had already retired or were planning to do so. This could have affected the tone of the interviews, but at the same time, such teachers seemed to be in more of a position to reflect back on their career.

---

[74] This delay was not planned, but was inevitable due to the personal circumstances of the author. It was reassuring to see how much consistency there was between the two sets of interviews.

Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations are at the centre of any valid research process, but particularly so in interviews where people's lives and memories are being explored. As Measor and Sikes so succinctly asserted, 'because the material is intimate, the potential for harm is greater'.[75] The questions provided for participants in this research were very broad, giving them freedom of choice about which avenues of their teaching experience they would explore in the interviews. While some chose to be directly critical of school policies and senior leaders, others were more subtle and discreet in their approach.

Malone has written at length on real ethical considerations in interviews; the need to avoid harm and pursue benefit, but also the difficulty of really informing consent or providing confidentiality when researching in your own 'backyard'.[76] The close-knit nature of the history teaching community and my personal links with the Historical Association meant, despite geographical distance from some, these interviews took place in my professional 'backyard'. This could have implications in terms of anonymity within this community. One of the participants, in particular, is possibly better known in the community through his own work since this research took place and in the second interview, I raised concerns over his recognisability. He did not express concern over this matter.

As a university tutor, I regularly visited schools and worked with history teachers at the time these interviews took place. I had an existing professional relationship with five of the thirteen teachers interviewed. This had both advantages and disadvantages. These teachers knew me, some better than others, and may have been more willing to open up and share 'more intimate' experiences. However, they may also have known more about my interests and values in history education. Two had attended mentor meetings I had run and completed joint observations of student teachers with me. This may have swayed their choice of memories towards what they believed I wanted to hear. Nias, in interviewing both her own ex-student teachers and other student teachers was initially concerned about such issues. However, she found little difference in what the two groups of teachers had to say, finding instead that both groups benefited from the

[75] L. Measor and P. Sikes, "Visiting Lives: Ethics and Methodology in Life History," in *Studying Teachers' Lives*, ed. I.F. Goodson (London: Routledge, 1992).

[76] S. Malone, "Ethics at Home: Informed Consent in Your Own Backyard," in *Qualitative Studies in Education* 16, no. 6 (2003).

opportunity to open up and share their experiences with an interested person. She recalled, 'The hunger that they all showed to reflect upon their professional lives in the presence of a neutral but friendly outsider was almost insatiable, a fact that in itself taught me much about the loneliness of many teachers' working lives.'[77]

There were also power relations implicit within these interviews, particularly in terms of the teachers I had worked with. As the PGCE lead in the area, I could decide whether to continue sending student teachers to their departments or even influence student teachers considering jobs in their department. This may have affected what teachers were willing to share or any slant they decided to put on their own practice. Although it was not my purpose to judge or evaluate them, it was clear that they wished to be judged positively. A majority of teachers in the sample, however, were not known to me before the research. Here there were perhaps still power issues inherent within the interview, with one party being the experienced history teacher and the other the academic researcher. Participants had the power to share or to hide their experience; the interviewer had power over questioning paths. Muchmore found in his own research that there is 'no set of hard and fast rules for ensuring ethical behaviour' but rather only guiding principles because 'ethical dilemmas are usually deeply embedded within the contexts of the situations in which they arise and what may be ethical behaviours in one circumstance may not be ethical in another.'[78] During the teacher interviews, I found it constantly challenging to show interest in and empathy with the experiences of the teacher to elicit detail from them without being too evaluative or critical over the topics discussed.

Several teachers commented after the interview that they found the experience of talking about their teaching careers 'cathartic' or 'refreshing'; that nobody had really listened to their voices and concerns before. There was potential for both harm and good in this revelation. Tedder has suggested that 'the narration of a life story not only enables people to articulate their identity but also offers the possibility of learning from their life and the potential to effect change as a consequence.'[79] One teacher handed her

---

[77] J. Nias, "Primary Teachers Talking: A Reflective Account of Longtitudinal Research " in *Educational Research: Current Issues*, ed. M. Hammersley (London: OUP, 1993), 135.

[78] Muchmore, 12.

[79] M. Tedder, "Biographical Research Methods," in *Research Methods and Methodologies*, ed. J. Arthur, M.Waring, R.Coe and L.V.Hedges (London: Sage), 323.

resignation in shortly after the interview but found herself a new job and in her second interview, five years later, did not relate the change of school to participation in the research interview. Several of the teachers relished the opportunity to open up and share their experiences.

In conducting the interviews I was aware of the need to ensure fully informed consent from my participants. They had initially responded to an email request for an interview. This detailed the suggested length of interview, about an hour, and provided the scope of the research. It also set out that the interview was part of a doctoral research project. 48 hours before each interview participants were sent a further email with an empty timeline grid and a list of questions (see appendix 2). At the beginning of each interview, I read a statement from the interview protocol that covered questions of recording and confidentiality (see appendix 3). It also gave participants the explicit option to stop the interview and/or withdraw from the research at any point. The ethical approval form of the Institute of Education was completed and approved before the pilot interviews took place. Recordings of the first round of interviews were made using a dictaphone and second interviews on an iPhone. Recordings were transferred to a personal computer and memory back-up and, after transcription and analysis, deleted from the devices to ensure confidentiality.

Data analysis

Thompson pointed to several methods in which oral history can be re-constructed and presented. One option would be to present testimonies 'with no more than minor comment'.[80] However, the purpose of the interviews in this study was to form part of an historical interpretation. Something more than a testimony approach was therefore needed. A second form of presentation would be the individual life-story. No particular story stood out from the others within this study to warrant such particular attention. A third form of presentation Thompson suggested was the collection of stories. In this form, the stories could be grouped around common themes to construct a broader historical interpretation. Although there are elements of the narrative approach within this thesis, 'reconstructive cross-analysis' was the preferred form of presentation.[81] In this approach, 'the oral evidence is treated as a quarry from which to construct an

---

[80] Thompson, 269.
[81] Ibid., 271.

argument about patterns of behaviour or events in the past.'[82] In this research therefore, evidence was compared across the set of interviews and combined with evidence from secondary sources. As Thompson concludes, 'argument and cross-analysis are clearly essential for any systematic development of the interpretation of history.'[83]

Cross-analysis provided the main method of analysis in this study, coding first, then identifying emerging themes between interviews and comparing findings with secondary literature. Half of the interviews were transcribed by a third party due to time limitations. The interviews were then imported into NVivo for analysis.[84] The interviews were analysed in sympathy with grounded theory as the method offered 'systematic and at the same time flexible guidelines for collecting and analysing data'.[85] As Thornberg suggested, in a grounded theory study, 'data collection and analysis go hand in hand throughout the entire research project'.[86] The approach this study took suited the more constructivist grounded theory approach described by Charmaz which assumes theories are constructed by the researchers as a result of their interactions with the field and its participants and coloured by the researchers' perspectives and socio-cultural context in which they are embedded.[87]

McCrum wrote in her doctorate that, 'research did not flow smoothly through a premeditated course but was subject to false starts, reappraisals and side steps.'[88] There was a reassuring honesty to her approach that echoed my own experiences. The use of constructivist grounded theory enabled some coding of the interviews before further interviews took place. There were several rounds of coding. Initial, open coding took place through close, detailed analysis of the first three interviews.[89] These derived codes were then used for the full sample of first interviews. The first codes that emerged, which reflected discussion of the timeline and participants' career development at the beginning of the interview were 'background', 'alternative career',

---

[82] Ibid.

[83] Ibid.

[84] G.R. Gibbs, "Software and Qualitative Data Analysis," in *Research Methods and Methodologies in Education*, ed. J. Arthur, et al.

[85] R Thornberg, "Grounded Theory," ibid., 85. B.G. Glaser and A.L Strauss, *The Discovery of Grounded Theory* (Chicago: Aldine, 1967).

[86] Thornberg, 86.

[87] K. Charmaz, *Constructing Grounded Theory*, 2nd edn (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2014).

[88] E. McCrum, "Teaching History in Postmodern Times: History Teachers' Thinking About the Nature and Purposes of Their Subject" (unpublished EdD thesis, University of Sussex, 2010), 49.

[89] M. Waring, "Grounded Theory," in *Research Methods and Methodologies in Education*, ed. J. Arthur, et al.

'career progression', 'further qualification' and 'roles beyond history teaching'. The codes with most references in this first set of codes were 'national curriculum', 'assessment', 'agents of change' and 'knowledge' (see Appendix 7 for full details of these codes). This coding process was completed on NViVo which proved a very useful tool for sorting large amounts of qualitative data.

There was, however, a need for some larger themes to pull the codes together. First, the original enquiry question was used, exploring changes in history teaching and the concepts of change and continuity to pull these codes into an overarching narrative. The interplay between change, continuity and agency, however, proved too strong to separate into different themes. Further analysis of interviews led to new themes around 'prescription', 'autonomy' and 'agency' emerging. At this point, further reading took place alongside the creation of some tentative claims. Further, more focused coding identified the need for a second round of interviews with certain participants. Second interviews took place after this initial coding, drafting and thematic analysis. This second round of interviews was coded according to the existing set of themes as participants were usually asked to expand on points from the first set of interviews.

Limitations

Several limitations to this methodological approach were identified through the process of collecting and analysing data. They are raised here and discussed in an attempt to add validity to the research and contribute to ideas on how such research methodologies might be developed in the future.

One unexpected limitation was in the struggle several of the teachers had in articulating their planning in practice and teaching. Eraut has written of the difficulties of making tacit knowledge explicit.[90] There is a danger inherent within this approach that some teachers who were more articulate, were able to explain their practice better than others. The practice of the less articulate teachers may come across as different, but this may have been a difference in the process of articulation rather than the processes of planning and teaching. As I was a known member of the history education community

---

[90] M. Eraut, "Non-Formal Learning and Tacit Knowledge in Professional Work," *Journal of Educational Psychology* 70, no. 1 (2000).

and an experienced teacher, the participants tended to take for granted that I understood what they were saying and their situation. This was often the case, but it was not particularly helpful for sharing their experience with a broader audience in their own authentic words. As the interviews went on I became more experienced at asking teachers to articulate and expand on certain points, but there were times when this limited the flow of conversation or the narrative the participants wished to convey.

In some ways, this issue of articulation was exacerbated by only interviewing teachers rather than observing their practice. The decision not to observe was not made lightly. Any observation would be a necessarily partial and subjective experience from which it would be difficult to generalise. There is at least some authenticity in oral history in that teachers were able to choose for themselves which memories to share.

Although I did not collect data on the age of participants, by the nature of being in the classroom for twenty-five years, they were all in at least their fifties at the time of interview. This raises questions about how far early-career experiences of teaching were different from late-career experiences due to the amount of teaching experience or due to other factors such as changes in curriculum and policy. For example, how far were many history teachers dependent on knowledge-transmission in the early stages of their careers? With the natural development of behaviour strategies and the development of subject knowledge, might more experience enable a more honest portrayal of their epistemological values in the classroom? The data presented in the next chapters could be considered with such questions in mind.

Certain limitations also had to be more pragmatically imposed on the research to confine it to a particular sample of teachers who were accessible and willing to participate. For example, it was decided only to interview teachers from the state-sector in the south of England. Furthermore, although A-level teaching was mentioned by some of the teachers, as others worked in 11-16 schools, it was decided to make 11-16 the focus of this study.

Conclusion

There are, of course, limitations to any historical enquiry. While the use of oral history can raise questions over memory, selection and subjectivity, it can also provide rich detail and access to emotion and the affective dimension that far outweighs any such concerns. The use of several layers of evidence within this study alongside the cross-analysis of interview data led to an authentic, robust and rich set of narratives. This substantially contributed to uncovering the experiences of teachers that had been little explored until this point. This supported an understanding of the process of change across this period, through the lens of the teacher, rather than the document; the policy-enactor rather than the policy-maker, and so provides new perspectives on the history of history education across this period.

The next chapter offers a historical context for the changes explored in this study, based on secondary literature and documentary sources. Having this backdrop provided a skeleton framework within which to situate the personal insights and experiences of the teachers interviewed.

Chapter 4   The historical context

This chapter seeks to provide a historical context for the study, setting out an overview of the socio-cultural and political background in the UK and focusing in particular on the educational policy context. A more detailed analysis of policy and events in English history education follows, including a brief analysis of the National Curriculum documents published over this period. The specific episode explored in this research was 1985 to 2011, but to provide some background, this chapter starts around the time of Callaghan's Ruskin speech in 1976.

There were rapid social, economic, political and cultural changes across the United Kingdom in the decades following the Second World War and these accelerated towards the turn of the century. The gradual demise of the British Empire during the twentieth century contributed to the accelerating decline of Britain as a world power in both political and economic terms. After a concerning time of economic depression in the 1970s, there was a rise of consumerism in the 1980s with an expansion of out-of-town shopping centres and a growth in foreign travel leading to a changing sense of place and identity for many.[1] In this decade the UK and US moved closer to laissez-faire economic policies and then towards neo-liberalism in the 1990s as the fall of the USSR led to a rise in economic policies from the right.

Aldrich and Dean have pointed to broader societal changes in the second half of the twentieth century that included the abandonment of many traditions, the advent of the contraceptive pill and the rebirth of the feminist movement.[2] In particular, they highlight the impact of immigration to the British Isles of people of 'other races and faiths, principally from lands formerly colonised by Britain'.[3] Many of these changes were reflected in the academic history of the time and then later in the choices of history teachers. The popularity of social and economic lenses for approaching the past led to different groups of people (such as women and the working classes) being represented in the history books and then in the history textbooks of the time. Haydn has identified

---

[1] J Black, *Britain since the Seventies: Politics and Society in the Consumer Age* (London: Reaktion Books, 2004).
[2] Aldrich and Dean.
[3] Ibid., 105.

two possible solutions offered to these societal changes; 'whether the history curriculum should change to accommodate the demographic changes caused by postcolonial immigration' or 'whether the aim of using history to foster social cohesion would be best achieved by getting newcomers to assimilate to British society and culture by learning "the traditional canon" of British history'.[4]

The pace of change accelerated in the last quarter of the twentieth century. Phillips has described it as a period of 'intense economic and political, cultural and social change' citing Lyotard in referring to 'the postmodern condition'.[5] He points out that many long-standing ideas and traditional values began to be questioned in the late twentieth century identifying in particular Marxism, capitalism, formal religion and a canon of knowledge. He identified the explosion in the search for 'other histories' as traditional identities became questioned. Haydn has supported this perspective, pointing to the growing gulf between 'politicians and populace about the importance attached to crown, commonwealth, and constitution'.[6]

The fall of communism in the Soviet Union contributed to changes in the substantive content of history books through the opening of previously sealed archives. Moreover, it also changed the way the discipline of history was conceived. Evans suggested that these events:

> destroyed not only the grand theories and teleologies of previous historians, but also any idea that history could be seen to have a single direction and purpose at all. The belief that this idea could be proven by scientific methods which delivered a demonstrably objective view of historical progress was simply refuted by events.[7]

He went on to argue that this collapse of grand narratives and large teleological theories in history assisted the reinstatement of individual human beings in the historical record. He summarised: 'Historians began writing about people again, and above all about humble, ordinary people, history's obscure, the loser and bystanders in the process of historical change.'[8]

---

[4] Haydn, ""Longing for the Past:" Politicians and the History Curriculum in English Schools, 1988-2010," 11.
[5] R. Phillips, "Government Policies, the State and the Teaching of History," in *Issues in History Teaching*, ed. J. Arthur and R.Phillips (London: Routledge, 2000).
[6] Haydn, " 'Longing for the Past:' Politicians and the History Curriculum in English Schools, 1988-2010," 10.
[7] R.J. Evans, "Prologue: What Is History Now?," in *What Is History Now?*, ed. D. Cannadine (Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002), 6.
[8] Ibid.

The events of 11 September 2001 in the USA and 7 July 2005 in London and wars in Afghanistan and Iraq dominated the first decade of the twenty-first century and changed attitudes to and interest in terrorism, Islam and the Middle East.[9] An increased focus on migration in this period, not only from the Middle East but also eastern Europe, Africa and Asia redrew the attention of historians to religious divisions, the nature of diasporas and forced migrations.[10] In Britain, this historical interest in diverse identities existed in parallel to growing governmental emphasis on shared British values, possibly part of a project of 'cultural restorationism' in the face of perceived threats.[11]

This twenty-five year period from 1985 to 2011 saw rapid changes in the expansion and use of new technologies. In 1985 the very first British mobile phone call was made; by 1986 80% of schools had a 'microcomputer', but at the same time teachers were still using Banda machines, as photocopiers were prohibitively expensive. Ball has pointed to the movement from an industrial to informational and service economy and shows how this placed education at the centre of the policy stage.[12] By 1996, New Labour declared their intention to make Britain a country of 'innovative people' and the 'electronic capital of the world'.[13] The twenty-first century saw fast-paced change in the use of new technology and there was heavy investment in bringing technological change into schools. Haydn has described the history classroom of 2003 when Wikipedia had only recently been launched, Facebook, YouTube, Twitter and iTunes did not exist and few history classrooms were equipped with data projectors, interactive whiteboards or VLEs.[14] Over this twenty-five year period not only did technology change culture, but also the way culture was communicated; it changed the way history was produced and consumed. Jordanova has charted the impact of the internet on historians in three ways, through storage, manipulation and visibility.[15] Online archives and articles led to history becoming more available to the masses; an army of 'twitterstorians' keen to share their latest publications meant students were able to make immediate contact with formerly distant historians through an email or even a tweet.

---

[9] Jordanova.
[10] Ibid.
[11] See Haydn, ""Longing for the Past:" Politicians and the History Curriculum in English Schools, 1988-2010."
[12] S.J. Ball, *The Education Debate* (Bristol: The Policy Press, 2008).
[13] Ibid., 84.
[14] T. Haydn, "Introduction," in *Using New Technologies to Enhance Teaching and Learning in History*, ed. T. Haydn (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013).
[15] Jordanova.

The broader education context

This section tells the broader story of educational change between 1976 and 2011. A comparison between 1976 and 2011 in terms of educational policy and discourse reveals how extensive reforms have been. The pace of change, initially slow, began to accelerate towards the end of the 1980s until educational reform was promoted as the highest priority for the government from 1997 onwards.

Several authors have pinpointed the speech made by Jim Callaghan, the Labour Prime Minister, at Ruskin College, Oxford, on 18 October 1976 as a turning point in educational policy intentions.[16] Callaghan argued that there was a need to make effective and efficient use of the six billion pounds the government was already spending on education rather than investing further in the sector. The speech also marked the replacement of the previous consensus on the welfare state with a new consensus centred on a more direct subordination of education to the perceived needs of the economy.[17] Ball identified the Ruskin speech as a turning-point that 'disrupted the existing settlement' within education policy and made what was to follow possible. He cited Lowe in saying there was a 'shift in the balance of power in policy making... and the real losers in this were the local authorities and teachers.'[18] Chitty suggested the speech marked a clear shift on the part of the Labour leadership towards policies that would facilitate greater control of the education system. The speech emphasised teacher accountability, a relatively new concept according to Chitty.[19] Indeed, Cannadine et al. marked this point as the beginning of the era of teacher accountability. Ball cited Lawton saying this heralded the end of 'the golden age of teacher control (or non-control) of the curriculum'.[20] Commentators are therefore united in pointing to the Ruskin speech as a turning-point in the move towards an accountability agenda.

In 1979 Thatcher replaced Callaghan as prime minister, but the swathe of education reform many expected was not immediately forthcoming. While Chitty noted the

---

[16] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon. C. Chitty, *Education Policy in Britain*, ed. John Benyon, 3rd edn, Contemporary Political Studies (London: PalgraveMacmillan, 2014); Phillips, "Government Policies, the State and the Teaching of History."
[17] Chitty.
[18] Lowe cited in Ball, *The Education Debate*, 74-75.
[19] Chitty.
[20] Lawton cited in Ball, *The Education Debate*.

remarkable degree of caution in the actual implementation of radical or innovative social policies in the first two Thatcher administrations, Marwick argued that in her second term (1983-87), legislation aimed at reversing the direction of social policy was enacted 'at an accelerating pace and with increased certainty'.[21] Such reforms were in evidence under Sir Keith Joseph, who was appointed Secretary of State for Education in 1981 and stayed in office until 1986.[22]

Joseph was concerned at the country's relative economic decline and continued the emphasis on greater accountability for schools and a shift in the balance of power away from local authorities.[23] One particularly significant reform Joseph passed, with some reluctance, was the abolition of the O-level and CSE examinations to be replaced by the General Certificate of Secondary Education examination (GCSE), first sat in 1988. Although the recommendation had first been made in 1978, Joseph feared the disappearance of O-levels, typically favoured and respected by parents and pupils. It was, in fact, the accountability agenda that convinced him of the need to pass the reform; the idea that GCSE would allow a better comparison of pupil performance across all schools and pupils.[24]

Joseph's replacement at the Department of Education by Kenneth Baker in May 1986 heralded a decade of pacier, more far-reaching reform. Chitty has described Baker as 'less ideologically committed' but 'decidedly more pragmatic' and suggested that he inaugurated a period when the Conservative government appeared to legislate on every aspect of education.[25] Baker was committed to introducing a National Curriculum to ensure schools reached a required standard which was testable and comparable. He preferred a common curriculum with details prescribed by government across all subjects in comparison with Thatcher, who only wanted core subjects specified by the government. The resulting National Curriculum was underpinned by a primary focus on ten specified curriculum subjects, closer to Baker's original intentions.[26]

[21] A. Marwick, *British Society since 1945*, 3rd edn (London: Penguin, 1996), 279.
[22] Cannadine noted him as one of the longest-serving education secretaries.
[23] Cannadine, Keating, and Sheldon.
[24] Ibid.
[25] Chitty, 51.
[26] Cannadine, Keating, and Sheldon.

The Education Reform Act (ERA) was passed in 1988 and from its very inception was greeted with mixed reviews. It was widely criticised for being a top-down, centralised and directive approach. Ball identified six key elements of neoliberal and neoconservative thinking fundamental to the passing of this act. They included 'suspicion of teacher professionalism and the "politics" of teachers and the need for systems of control and accountability' and 'a concomitant press for forms of "teacher-proof" evaluation and assessment'.[27] Several of these themes had been in emergence since the 1976 Ruskin speech, but putting them into legislation in the 1988 ERA ensured that the underlying philosophy would be embedded, consolidated and sustained.

The last decade of the twentieth century witnessed a gradual tightening of the grip of accountability on the educational system. Performance measures and league tables were introduced to assess and compare pupil progress within and across schools and Local Education Authorities. Ball identified this reform of state education as being based on private sector models. He gave examples such as the introduction of City Technology Colleges, the concept of parental choice and the creation of Ofsted, through which privatised school inspections were to be undertaken for each school every three or four years.[28]

The National Curriculum was revised three times between the original documentation in 1991 and 2011.[29] The first of these revisions was conducted by Lord Dearing in 1993-94 and resulted in a much slimmer curriculum, to be taught from September 1995.[30] The Blair government of 1997 introduced a third version of the National Curriculum in 2000.[31] This placed a new emphasis on flexibility and freedom and teachers in many subjects were given more choice over what to teach. The 2007 Programmes of Study encouraged integration between subjects and introduced the word 'diversity' to all documentation across the range of subjects.[32] While later comparison between the

---

[27] Ball, *The Education Debate*, 80.

[28] It is interesting to note, from Ball, 81 that the first league tables were published for LEAs in response to a parliamentary question (18 January 1991) and showed that the percentage of students with five or more A to C grades at GCSE ranged from 8.5% to 39.1%.

[29] A fourth review was announced by Gove in 2010 for first teaching in schools in 2013

[30] DFE, "History in the National Curriculum," (London: HMSO, 1995).

[31] QCA, "The National Curriculum for England: History," (DfEE/QCA, 1999).

[32] "National Curriculum Programme of Study: History (Key Stage 3) Document for Review," (QCA, 2007).

History Programme of Study in 1994 and 2007 will show some marked differences, there were also distinct continuities across this documentation.

In 1997 there was a landslide election victory for the 'New Labour' party under Tony Blair. Blair's focus on education was manifested with a raft of legislation aimed at raising standards. The White Paper, *Excellence in Schools,* was published just 67 days after taking office. Ball has argued that almost all of the key themes of education policy for the next ten years were signalled here 'as was a new style of policy whose textures, texts, form, culture, architecture and geography were all changing.'[33] 1998 saw the introduction of numeracy and literacy strategies in primary schools, followed by the introduction of a Key Stage 3 National Strategy from 2001.

For the first time government was taking a stance on pedagogy, on how subjects were taught and learnt, rather than simply prescribing knowledge, skills and understanding. The introduction of the National Strategy to Key Stage 3 was potentially a significant turning-point for history teachers. The document setting out instructions for teaching was entitled 'Training materials for the foundation subjects', an A4 binder of easily-photocopiable worksheets published and disseminated in 2002. The purpose was set out clearly from page 4, linking implementation of the National Strategy to the raising of standards:

> The Key Stage 3 National Strategy aims to raise standards by strengthening teaching and learning across the curriculum for all 11 to 14-year-olds. The purpose of the Foundation subjects strand is to raise standards by supporting and delivering high-quality teaching and learning. It aims to help teachers to become more effective so that pupils improve in what and how they learn. To be successful implementation will need good leadership and management, sustained commitment and strong support. The principles for teaching and learning in the Foundation subjects strand are consistent with those informing the rest of the Strategy.[34]

The document then provided examples to define 'high-quality teaching and learning'. Crucially, however, these examples were generic across the foundation subjects (and very similar to the principles guiding the core subjects) rather than subject-specific. The principles of this strategy, and the strength of the accompanying professional development and inspection regime could be argued to have drawn pedagogy and

---

[33] Ball, *The Education Debate*, 100.
[34] DES, "Key Stage 3 National Strategy: Training Materials for the Foundation Subjects," ed. Department of Education and Skills (London: HMSO, 2002), 4.

assessment into the foreground, sidelining the importance of curriculum. Training modules for the foundation subjects show the influence of Black and Wiliam and the Assessment for Learning research influential in schools at the time.[35] They included 'assessment for learning in everyday lessons', 'the formative use of summative assessment', 'questioning', 'modelling' and 'starters.' Within these training materials, there was promotion of Bloom's Taxonomy as a way of structuring questioning and a distinct emphasis on the regular use of National Curriculum levels as a form of progression. Although this practice would have existed in some schools prior to the publication of this document, the National Strategies gave it new emphasis. Coming at a time of increased surveillance and new forms of data-tracking at the beginning of the 2000s, this document summarised government policy with respect to pedagogy and assessment, but it was entirely separate from subject-specific curriculum documentation.

The responsibilities of schools and teachers were clarified and extended in the final years of the twentieth century to include compulsory citizenship education, an emphasis on economic and financial education and also closer links with social services. The need for more participation in the democratic process and concerns over declining participation in community life more generally were widespread. After the 1997 election, an advisory group was established and Bernard Crick published a report proposing the establishment of citizenship with a 'distinct and separate articulation within the curriculum.'[36] This led to the introduction of citizenship in 2002 as a compulsory subject on the school curriculum to 16, surpassing the age of 14 to which history was compulsory as a school subject. The Programme of Study encouraged pupils towards 'active citizenship' as well as learning about the workings of parliament and the justice system.[37] In reality, only a small number of schools introduced citizenship as a separate subject on the curriculum, but whether or not they did, its presence on the curriculum influenced practice in school history departments.[38]

---

[35] P. Black and D. Wiliam, "Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards through Classroom Assessment," ed. Department of Education & Professional Studies; King's College London (London: GL Assessment, 1998).

[36] Cited in Husbands, Kitson and Pendry, 17.

[37] DfEE QCA, "The National Curriculum for England: Citizenship," (London, 2002).

[38] Husbands, Kitson and Pendry.

A fourth redrafting of the National Curriculum took place in 2007, very much a construct of its time. It was influenced by the Ajegbo report published in early 2007 that made a series of recommendations aimed at promoting diversity across the school curriculum.[39] Each subject was given a new focus on diversity. Second, to this, the 2007 curriculum encouraged a movement out of the 'silos' of different subjects at Key Stage 3 and into more cross-curricular approaches. Various cross-curricular approaches were authored and introduced in schools in response to these demands. The Royal Society of Arts' 'Opening Minds' curriculum was one particular example, promoting a competence-based curriculum that would promote eight 'employability skills'.[40] The introduction of the 2008 National Curriculum was markedly different from previous versions with a consultancy firm employed by the Department for Children, Schools and Families to provide training for secondary teachers in all subjects for the revised Programme of Study. There was a definite intention from the centre that the changes in policy would be put into practice in classrooms, rather than remaining text policy on dusty shelves.

The 2010 General Election resulted in the emergence of a coalition government between Conservatives and Liberal Democrats. Michael Gove took up the role of Secretary of State for Education. He immediately announced the need for a new National Curriculum which prioritised substantive knowledge. Gove will be remembered for his expansion of the academy programme, funding of free schools and support for unqualified teachers. He implemented the move of financing for teacher education increasingly away from universities and into schools and alliances of schools through the Schools Direct programme. The first decade of the twenty-first century had seen powers taken away from Local Authorities and schools and quasi-governmental organisations such as the Specialist Schools and Academies Trust. As the focus on 'standards' was repeated by politicians, schools had to learn to cope with a paradoxical 'Inclusion' agenda. All of these general education policies and pressures had a different impact on the history classroom, but it is also necessary to consider the specific curriculum debates and policies in the sphere of history education itself.

---

[39] K Ajegbo, "Diversity and Citizenship in the Curriculum: Research Report," (DfES, 2007).
[40] RSA, "Opening Minds," http://www.rsaopeningminds.org.uk/about-rsa-openingminds/why-was-opening-minds-developed/.

The changing face of the History National Curriculum

The 'great tradition'

In a history of history teaching from 1900 to 1993, Sylvester claimed that history teaching in the twentieth century was dominated by the 'great tradition'; didactically active teachers instilling a mainly British, political history into passive pupils.[41] He drew on Board of Education pamphlets from 1905 to show the intended patriotic purpose behind school history: 'it is important that from the history lessons they [the pupils] should learn something about their nationality which distinguishes them from the people of other countries... A further and most important reason for teaching history is that it is… a record of the influence for good or for evil exercised by great personalities.'[42] Sylvester suggested that by the 1950s most secondary schools had a chronological syllabus outline, as published by the Ministry of Education in 1952, leading from pre-history for 11-year-olds to nineteenth-century English and European history for 16-year-olds in the grammar schools. He did, however, accept that there was still teacher autonomy, with changes to syllabus construction such as local history, 'lines of development' across time, depth studies and world history adopted by 'some teachers' in 'varying degrees' during the 1950s and 1960s.[43]

Diversion from the norm of this great tradition has also been argued in terms of pedagogy and teaching methodology. Aldrich and Dean gave the examples of Keatinge, 'author of the highly influential, *A History of England for Schools with Documents, Problems and Exercises,* 1911*,* who sought to introduce pupils to the methods of the modern scientific historian'[44] and F. C. Happold whose *Approach to History* was published in 1928, who desired 'the substitution of historical training for the mere teaching of history in schools'.[45] However, Sylvester claimed that there was no evidence that such work was 'highly influential' and argued that although changes in the methodology of teaching were suggested, they had little effect before the 1970s.[46] More recently, Edwards has questioned this polarity of approach in discussion of history education in the post-war era. Through exploring history education texts published

---

[41] Sylvester, 9.
[42] Ibid., 10.
[43] Ibid., 11.
[44] Aldrich and Dean, 103.
[45] Ibid., 104.
[46] Sylvester, 12.

between 1944 and 1962 he found a 'shifting, complex discourse' at odds with any 'Golden Age' or 'Dark Age' descriptions of the period.[47]

Aldrich and Dean explored the role of teacher and the government across the twentieth century in defining the history curriculum. They argued that for a hundred years after the 1860s, central government was 'the major power in deciding how much history should be taught in schools'.[48] The focus here was on quantity, although it is clear that through pamphlets of the Board of Education, the government gave clear suggestions as to the nature of school history. Indeed, they claimed that for many decades there were real, though less visible, control mechanisms at work and a broad uniformity of practice. Sylvester gave more attention to the pamphlets, quoting from a range of publications that emphasised the Board's role in suggesting content and pedagogy. For example, to advance his argument, he cited the 1905 publication, *Suggestions for the consideration of teachers and others concerned in the work of public elementary schools* and the 1923 *Report on the Teaching of History,* and the 1927 *Handbook of Suggestions for Teachers.*[49] In contrast, Aldrich and Dean used similar sources to emphasise the role of the teacher, arguing that the 1905 report showed how central government acknowledged 'the role of teachers in determining the syllabuses and teaching methods' and, to substantiate their argument further, quoted a section of the report that suggested that 'each teacher shall think for himself.'[50] This government encouragement of teacher autonomy was not so apparent in the quotations selected by Sylvester. However, Aldrich and Dean concluded that the nature of the history taught was determined by the aims, not only of the teachers, but also of governments, examination boards and historians, 'which differed not only according to the interests of such groups but also according to political, economic and educational circumstances'.[51] It is possible that the Board documentation exaggerated the importance of teacher autonomy in order to appeal to the teachers themselves. There was, however, the potential for history teachers to mediate curriculum policy according to their own interests in the first half of the twentieth century.

---

[47] Edwards.
[48] Aldrich and Dean, 95.
[49] Sylvester.
[50] Aldrich and Dean, 97.
[51] Ibid., 104.

In 1984, during what is often regarded as a seminal speech, Sir Keith Joseph, Secretary of State for Education, addressed the Historical Association on the subject of school history. Joseph won over the audience by pledging his backing for history as 'an essential component in the curriculum of all pupils' up to the age of 16. He supported the teaching of knowledge alongside skills and understanding, emphasised the need for different interpretations and spoke of the value of empathy. Sheldon and Phillips have both suggested that Joseph was trying to appease all sides with this speech, implying a diversity of opinion would have existed within this audience of committed historians and history teachers.[52]

Several authors have pointed to the existence of two traditions within history teaching from the 1960s onwards.[53] Husbands et al. summarised these traditions succinctly in Figure 2.[54]

Figure 2: The two traditions of history teaching (taken from Husbands et al.)

	The 'great tradition'	*The alternative tradition*
Learners and pedagogy	Emphasises the didactically active role of the teacher. Assumes a high level of teacher subject knowledge. Learner's role is largely passive.	Emphasises constructivist models of learner engagement with the past Places a premium on teacher's ability to manage student learning activities
Content	Characterised by a concern with national history Focuses on the understanding of the present through engagement with the past	Characterised by a variety of content reflecting world history and the experiences of a variety of groups Stresses the importance of learning about a variety of historical situations and contexts
Purposes of learning history	Defined by the content of the subject. Focuses substantially on the cultural capital of historical content.	Defined through the contribution of the subject to wider general education Focuses substantially on the preparation for working life and the acquisition of skills

They argue that cumulatively, the Schools Council projects of the late 1960s spawned an alternative tradition of history teaching with different assumptions about the role of the teacher, the organisation and selection of content and the purposes of the subject.

---

[52] N. Sheldon, "The National Curriculum and the Changing Face of School History 1988-2010," (2011), http://www.history.ac.uk/history-in-education/project-papers/school-history.html. Phillips, "Government Policies, the State and the Teaching of History."
[53] Aldrich and Dean. Husbands, Kitson and Pendry. Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*.
[54] Husbands, Kitson and Pendry., 12

Commentators often identify M.W. Keatinge as the originator of alternative approaches to history teaching.[55] In 1910, in *Studies in the Teaching of History,* he argued for the use of primary source extracts as a way for history education to emulate developments in the field of academic history. This approach was then generally believed to have fallen out of favour until the arrival of the Schools Council History Project (SCHP) in the 1970s. However, recent analysis of post-war documents by Edwards has revealed a landscape of history education 'crowded and bustling with activity'. He has called into question the simplistic narrative of a 'great tradition' and shown authors such as Charlton and Batho directly opposing history education based solely upon 'recalling accepted facts' in the twenty years after the end of the Second World War.[56] Edwards suggests that there were 'islands of good practice located within a sea of mediocrity', but that this was 'a creative period for history education writing'.[57]

The ideals of the 'alternative tradition' or 'new history' came to more prominence from 1972 through the work of SCHP. Edwards does not seek to challenge the claim that the Schools Council History 13-16 Project marked a radical departure from tradition. Instead, he places it within line of work 'carried out by post-war history educators to renew the teaching of history.'[58] The project was based on what were widely believed to be examples of good practice at the time and began with a conscious attempt to re-think the philosophy behind teaching history in school. Topics for 11-14 study generally reflected that traditional school history curriculum with a strong British element. It was in materials for 14-16-year-olds that the topics became rather more controversial, although, as Aldrich and Dean point out, these were natural concerns for the early 1970s (e.g. the Irish question, the Arab-Israeli conflict, the move to European unity and the rise of Communist China).

SCHP emphasised the use of evidence, historical process and historical understanding and this focus on conceptual and procedural understanding alongside substantive knowledge led to the development and use of new methods of assessment. SHP appears to have been popular in official circles. In the HMI pamphlet, *History in the Primary and Secondary Years*, published in 1985, it said 'History is concerned not with the

---

[55] Sylvester. Aldrich and Dean.
[56] Edwards, 324.
[57] Ibid., 327.
[58] Ibid., 329.

conveying of accepted facts but with the making of informed judgements and to the displaying of the evidence on which those judgements are made.'[59] Chapter 6 on progression included a chart of objectives for pupils aged 8 to 16 including skills in chronology, use and analysis of evidence, empathetic understanding and asking historical questions.

The impact of SHP was enduring. Shemilt has suggested rather confidently that, partly due to its existence, large numbers of history teachers have:

> more or less wittingly and to varying degrees, attempted to induct pupils into history as 'a form of knowledge'…students learn how to use evidence to adjudicate between competing accounts; to evaluate explanations of actions, events and states of affairs; and to determine the relative significance of events within developmental narratives of varying durations and ranges…to a greater or lesser degree, British history teachers attempt to develop pupils' understanding of History as a logical and evidence-based means of making sense of the past.[60]

Others have emphasised the rationale for history education as the lasting legacy of the project:

> By articulating a coherent rationale for history education in terms of the wider curriculum, the project gave it an intellectual basis with which to thrive in the face of attempts to restructure the curriculum around skills-led initiatives.[61]

The GCSE History examination was to owe a great debt to the effects of the project. One of Sir Keith Joseph's early money-saving acts was actually to abolish the Schools Council which he viewed as progressively-inclined and teacher-dominated. Be that as it may, the impact of their work in history education was to be long-lasting, enshrined in both the GCSE examination and later the National Curriculum.

There were, however, critics of both SHP approaches and the design of the new GCSE in various pamphlets authored by the New Right which found nourishment in the more traditional of the two approaches to history teaching.[62] Haydn has pointed to the 'series of polemical pamphlets' from *The Centre for Policy Studies,* 'a right-wing think-tank, attacking what it saw as the lack of academic rigour and the insidious moral relativism

---

[59] DES, "History in the primary and secondary years: An HMI view," (HMSO, 1985), 1.
[60] D. Shemilt, "The Caliph's Coin: The Currency of Narrative Frameworks in History Teaching," in *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History*, ed. P. Stearns, P. Seixas, and S. Wineburg (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 85.
[61] Husbands, Kitson and Pendry, 12.
[62] Aldrich and Dean.

of "New History"'.[63] The 1970s and 1980s also saw the establishment of a broader range of subjects in the curricula of some schools with subjects such as Peace Studies, Urban Studies, Women's Studies and Education against Racism finding a place on the curriculum and perhaps posing a threat to the curriculum time allocated to history.[64]

As a National Curriculum for history became a potential reality, the debate about the purpose of history education was played out in broader circles, both in the media and academia. Under Baker, the Secretary of State for Education from May 1986 to July 1989, it became clear that the compromise approach Sir Keith Joseph had suggested to the Historical Association in 1985 was no longer appropriate. Sheldon compared HMI reports from 1985 and 1988 and found that while the former specified very little essential content and expected the curriculum to differ between schools, by 1988 the new report saw the selection of historical content as 'crucial' to the common curriculum and a long list of expected knowledge by age 16 was specified in detail.[65] According to Aldrich and Dean, one of Baker's concerns was that history lessons were being used to challenge rather than to buttress the existing social, economic and political order and that children were not learning about their heritage. In October 1988, in a speech to the Conservative party conference he announced that children would learn the key events in British history and gave examples including the establishment of the Anglican Church, the development of Parliament, the industrial revolution, the extension of the franchise and the 'the spread of Britain's influence for good around the world'.[66]

After the 1988 Education Reform Act, working groups were set up by the Secretary of State to draw up proposals for attainment targets and Programmes of Study in each subject. In guidance to the History Working Group, Baker stipulated that 'the programmes of study should have at the core the history of Britain, the record of its past and, in particular, its political constitutional and cultural heritage.'[67] The working group insisted on the importance of acquiring 'knowledge as understanding' and this led to an attainment target focused on interpretations of history; 'an understanding that history has been written, sung about, spoken about, painted, filmed and dramatized by all kinds

[63] Haydn, ""Longing for the Past:" Politicians and the History Curriculum in English Schools, 1988-2010," 12.
[64] D. O'Keefe, *The Wayward Curriculum: A Cause for Parents' Concern?* (London: Esmonde Publishing, 1986).
[65] Sheldon.
[66] Aldrich and Dean, 95.
[67] DES 1989: 43 cited in A. Kitson, C. Husbands and S. Steward, *Teaching History 11-18* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2011), 21.

of people for all kinds of reasons.' Kitson et al. have suggested that it was innovative elements such as these that meant many of the working group's proposals were popular with the teaching profession. The huge detail of the final Programme of Study for History proved problematic; Kitson et al. claimed that it 'removed substantial elements of decision-making from teachers, including the ability to shape content to local circumstances'.[68] Kenneth Clarke, Secretary of State from November 1990 to April 1992, also ordered that history teaching should stop short at twenty years before the present day which made it difficult for teachers to relate lessons to present-day issues (one of the key aspects of SHP).[69] In 1991 it was decided to make history optional rather than compulsory after the age of 14, which led to further limitations on the amount of content that could be covered.

After several draft iterations and consultation documents, the final Programme of Study for the History National Curriculum was published in 1991, weeks before first teaching was due to commence. Figure 3 provides a summary of the four iterations of the Programme of Study produced between 1991 and 2008.[70] The first document listed a great deal of content, prescribing eight detailed study units spanning over 2000 years of history. This huge range of content was to be assessed through the use of three attainment targets, covering knowledge, understanding, interpretations and sources. This theoretically put historical processes and the concept of history as a construct at the heart of the National Curriculum. However, the detail in prescribed content and assessment proved complex in practice. Foster, writing soon after about his experience as head of humanities during the introduction of the National Curriculum, suggested 'any teacher could have told the politicians that the proposals would not work.' They were 'too prescriptive, detailed and unrealistic'.[71] In 1993 Lord Dearing was commissioned to simplify the demands of the National Curriculum across all subjects, including history.

---

[68] Ibid., 22.

[69] R. Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics* (London: Cassell, 1999).

[70] While a further version of the History Programme of Study was published in 2013, it has not been included here as it falls outside the chronological parameters of this study.

[71] S. Foster, "The Painful Lessons of Introducing the National Curriculum in England," in *The Educational Forum* 58, no. 4 (1994): 376.

Figure 3: Summary of different iterations of National Curriculum for History

	1991	1995	Published 1999/ First taught 2000	Published 2007/First taught 2008
Stated aims	Overarching statement: 'Pupils should be taught to understand how developments from the early Middle Ages to the era of the Second World War helped shape the economy, society, culture and political structure of modern Britain.' Also opportunities for European and world history	At first, similar to 1991, but also: '-make links and connections between historical events and changes in the different periods and areas studied -use historical knowledge to evaluate and use sources of information -construct narratives, descriptions and explanations of historical events and developments'	Similar to 1991. 'Importance of history' statement added 'History fires pupils' curiosity about the past in Britain and the wider world. Pupils consider how the past influences the present, what past societies were like, how these societies organised their politics….'	Curriculum aims specifically stated: 'aims for all young people to become: successful learners…confident individuals…responsible citizens… 'Importance of history' statement, developed and given more prominence: 'History fires pupils' curiosity and imagination, moving and inspiring them with the dilemmas, choices and beliefs of people in the past…'
Disciplinary frame	'Pupils should be taught history from a variety of perspectives: political, economic, technological and scientific; social; religious; cultural and aesthetic.' Explicit mention of 'chronology, diversity, opportunities to use a range of historical sources.' Links made with attainment targets	Five 'Key Elements' (KE) much more clearly set out than previously, on a separate page; including Chronology; Range and depth of historical knowledge and understanding; Interpretations of history; Historical enquiry; Organisation and communication. Each KE further defined in two to four parts	Key Elements changed to 'knowledge, skills and understanding' Subtle changes from previous document: -From 'chronology' to 'chronological understanding' -'social, cultural, religious and ethnic diversity' is separated to have its own bullet point' -'to recall, select and organise' changed to 'recall, prioritise and select.'	Set out as six 'key concepts;' 'Chronological understanding; cultural, ethnic and religious diversity; change and continuity; cause and consequence; significance; interpretation' 'Diversity' prominent -three 'key processes': 'historical enquiry'; 'using evidence'; 'communicating about the past'.
Substantive frame	Five core study units chronologically: The Roman Empire; Medieval Realms; Making of the UK; Expansion, Trade and Industry and The Era of the Second World War. Three supplementary study units to cover British Isles before 1920 (overview or depth study); a turning point in European history; the study of a past non-European society.	Pupils to be taught six study units, with 'Medieval Realms: Britain 1066-1500' to 'The Twentieth Century World' taught in chronological order The other two study units are 'An era or turning point in European history before 1914' 'A past non-European society' An outline structure is provided for each Study Unit	'Breadth of Study' 'Pupils should be taught the knowledge, skills and understanding through three British studies, a European study and two world studies.' Specifies: 'Significant events people and changes; history from a variety of perspectives; aspects of history of EISW; history of Britain in European and wider context; overview and depth'	Ten very loose points under 'range and content' replace any study units. These include, 'the development of political power from the Middle Ages to the twentieth century' including 'changes in the relationship between rulers and ruled over time, the changing relationship between crown and parliament and the development of democracy' -Curriculum opportunities section is new. Includes focus on 'identity, local history, heritage, use of ICT and links between history and other curriculum subjects.'
Assessment	Three Attainment Targets, each with ten Levels: '1 Knowledge and understanding of history 2 Interpretations of history 3 The use of historical sources' Level 5: 'distinguish between different kinds of historical change; identify different types of cause and consequences; show how different features in an historical situation relate to each other'	Nine Level Descriptors for single AT at back of booklet. 'In deciding on a pupil's level of attainment at the end of the key stage, teachers should judge which description best fits the pupil's performance.' Level 5: 'Pupils demonstrate an increasing depth of factual knowledge and understanding of aspects of the history of Britain and other countries…They use this to describe and begin to make links between relevant reasons for, and results of events and changes.'		Only Levels 4 to Exceptional Performance (Level 9) included. These were re-written for this iteration of NC. Level 5: 'Pupils show their knowledge and understanding of local national and international history by describing events, people and some features of past societies and periods in the context of their developing chronological framework'
Other comments	54 pages of statutory guidance, plus another 40 pages of non-statutory guidance, presented in a white A4 folder. -Includes a Programme of Study for 'KS4'	Thin booklet, 17 pages long for History across three key stages, 5 to 14. 'Pupils should be taught about…'	Colourful 39 page booklet. Also has statements about Inclusion and using language across the curriculum -Notes provided 'Pupils should be taught…'	PoS published online. Backgound to every page shows individual colours of different subjects blended together in a rainbow swirl representing cross-curricular approaches.

The different iterations of the National Curriculum documentation have been summarised in Figure 3. Under the Dearing review of 1995, the History Programme of Study for the National Curriculum was substantially slimmed down. The level of prescription was significantly reduced and to some extent, content selection was once again opened up for teachers' professional decision-making. For example, Study Unit 1, Medieval Realms: Britain 1066–1500 suggested a focus on, 'Some of the major features of Britain's medieval past, including the development of the medieval monarchy and the ways of life of the peoples of the British Isles'. On an ensuing page, this was further articulated and detailed to include six sections including: 'the Norman Conquest'; 'relations of the monarchy with the Church, barons and people' and 'relations with other countries'. Examples were given in italics, but there was less content prescription than in the 1991 version of the document.[1]

Another major change in the 1995 version was the move from three Attainment Targets to one. Instead of separating the different skills and processes involved in learning about the past, these were brought together under nine Level Descriptors to be used across the age range from 5 to 14. These were intended for use at the end of a Key Stage which was clearly stated at the top of the page. Perhaps the biggest change comparing the 1995 document with 1991 was the move to five 'Key Elements' which summarised the building blocks, or second-order concepts and processes underlying the teaching and learning of history. At the top of the page, there was a boxed note stating, 'The Key Elements are closely related and should be developed through the Study Units, as appropriate. Not all the Key Elements need to be developed in each Study Unit.' This emphasised a disciplinary framework which was intended to underpin the History Programmes of Study. Husbands et al. have argued the Key Elements sought to clarify the underlying ideas of history in schools, encouraging teachers to teach in a more holistic fashion.[2] They suggested that the move from 'use of sources' to 'historical enquiry' was particularly useful in encouraging teachers to think in enquiry-led ways whereby pupils might use evidence to construct tentative answers to historical questions.

---

[1] DFE "History in the National Curriculum" (London, 1995)
[2] Husbands, Kitson and Pendry, 14.

The third version of the History National Curriculum brought in by the Blair government in September 2000 made few distinct changes. As with the overarching document, there was significantly less prescription in the History Programme of Study. The Key Elements changed slightly and there was a broader remit in the inclusion of two world studies rather than one. There was no requirement for the units of work in this Programme of Study to be taught chronologically, but it is not clear how much that freedom of opportunity was taken up by teachers at the time. A powerful statement was added to this document entitled 'The importance of history'. This responded to some of the fears of the broader history education community at the time. A report from a conference of history teachers held in 2002, looking at the future ten years of history teaching, *Past Forward*, asserted the fear that many pupils who would benefit enormously from more history education were losing out. Conference participants wanted history teachers' efforts to be 'recognised, supported and promoted rather than marginalised'.[3] These fears were discussed in depth in the 2002 book authored by three leading history teacher educators of the time, Husbands, Kitson and Pendry. They stated that there were two particular threats facing history teachers at that point in time; citizenship and the Key Stage 3 National Strategy. There was a mixed response at the time but a definite concern that teaching citizenship would take time and resources away from the teaching of history.[4]

Husbands et al. also claimed that the Key Stage 3 Strategy posed a threat to the subject of history. One might perceive this an unusual threat. After all, £500 million was forecast to have been spent on it by the end of 2004 and the intention was to develop standards at Key Stage 3, based on concerns that students slipped behind as they entered secondary education, the so-called 'attainment dip'. Husbands et al. point out that large quantities of training materials and guidance booklets were distributed and Key Stage 3 Strategy consultants were appointed across the country to work with schools and LEAs. Fears, however, surrounded the pedagogical model of the National Strategies which aimed to deliver the National Curriculum more effectively. As Husbands noted, 'Practitioners at secondary level are familiar with government control of content; they are much less familiar with attempts to shape the way they teach.'[5]

---

[3] M. Riley and R. J. Harris, *Introduction*, Past Forward: A Vision for School History 2002-2012 (London: Historical Association, 2002).
[4] Husbands, Kitson and Pendry.
[5] Ibid., 19.

The fourth version of the Programme of Study for National Curriculum History was published in 2007 for first teaching in September 2008. The very make-up of the documentation for this curriculum demonstrated a new focus on 'cross-curricular' approaches. There was also an emphasis on diversity across each of the NC subjects. As Kitson et al. put it, 'Schools were encouraged to combine subjects, to develop thematic approaches, to organise their timetables in novel ways.[6]

Counsell, in her 2011 article on disciplinary knowledge, focused on detailed and specific points of change in the National Curriculum documents.[7] She noted that the second-order concept of 'significance', for example, was present in every National Curriculum since 1995, but only appeared in the Attainment Target in 2008. She suggested this was largely in response to 'burgeoning teacher discussion' around the concept.[8] Part of the article is devoted to a discussion of 'overview' pointing out that, after the detailed prescription of the 1991 Programme of Study, the 1995 version of the document explicitly required overviews. Counsell argued how potentially one small point on the curriculum documentation could have quite an impact in how it was interpreted in the classroom. For example, she pointed to the move from 'changes' in pre-2008 curriculum documentation to the term 'change' from 2008. She suggested that this indicated 'the type of discipline-specific generalisation pupils were to explore'.[9] The article therefore highlighted the disciplinary framework that was explicit within the curriculum documentation. Chapman et al., however, offered a rather different conclusion. They carried out a content analysis of the different curriculum documents through a quantitative method, counting the number of pages devoted to concepts, content and explicit consideration of aims and purposes in each document.[10] They claimed through this analysis that 'the key purpose of the curriculum, with the exception of 2008, has been to define the content to be taught.'[11] These two contrasting analyses of the same group of documents show how important it is to gather evidence from the teacher voice across this period. It is crucial to know how far teachers have

[6] Kitson, Husbands and Steward, 22.
[7] Counsell, "Disciplinary Knowledge, the Secondary History Curriculum and History Teachers' Achievements."
[8] Ibid., 208.
[9] Ibid., 215.
[10] A.J. Chapman, K. Burn, and A. Kitson, "What Is School History For? British Student-Teachers' Perspectives," *Arbor: Revista de Ciencia, Pensamiento y Cultura* forthcoming (2017).
[11] Ibid., np.

picked up on the minutiae of changes in the documentation articulated by Counsell. Conversations with teachers might also reveal how far they believed the purpose of the curriculum documentation was to define the content being taught.

At this point, and perhaps throughout this period, history in schools was in an ironic quandary. Ofsted argued that it was a very well-taught subject. Their 2010 report *History for All,* based on evidence from inspections of history between April 2007 and March 2010 in 83 secondary schools, stated:

> effective teaching by well-qualified and highly competent teachers enabled the majority of students to develop knowledge and understanding in depth. It also helped students to develop their ability to support, evaluate and challenge their own views and to challenges the views of others. Many students displayed a healthy respect for historical evidence, along with the skills to use it robustly and critically to support their explanations and judgements.[12]

However, the same report indicated that history was being marginalised in fourteen of the fifty-eight secondary schools visited between 2008 and 2010 due to a two-year Key Stage 3 course of competency- or skills-based curriculum. These concerns were supported by the findings of the Historical Association survey of secondary school history teachers that took place annually from 2008. The 2011 survey report highlighted increased teaching by non-specialists in the early years of secondary school, a reduction in the time allocated to the subject and restrictions on who was actually allowed to take history beyond the age of 14. The authors went further in their analysis arguing, 'Division between those encouraged and enabled to study history and those denied such expertise or deterred from continuing with the subject is based on socio-economic factors.'[13]

History for 14—19 and the role of external qualifications

While the loudest and most public debates in school history during the period under consideration were probably about the nature and content of National Curriculum History, similar arguments were played out in the parallel field of public qualifications in the subject. While in 1985 a child might have left school with a CSE, an O-level or even an A-level in history, by 2011 the options were rather different. In 1986 the

---

[12] Ofsted, "History for All: History in English Schools 2007-10," (London: Ofsted, 2011), 4.
[13] K. Burn and R. Harris, "Historical Association Survey of History in Schools in England," (London: Historical Association, 2011), 1.

bilateral system of CSEs and O-levels was abolished. It was replaced by the ubiquitous General Certificate in Secondary Education (GCSE).[14] The first decade of the twenty-first century saw a gradual, but steady move towards modularisation of external examinations which also led to a rise in re-sit examinations of separate modules.

Where O-level History had tended to reward knowledge of substantive content through traditional essays, GCSE History stemmed more from the SHP model and introduced evaluation of sources, or evidential understanding, into all external examinations for the first time. As Phillips summarised, 'the criteria emphasised that in addition to historical knowledge, pupils should be given opportunities to develop awareness of concepts such as causation, change and continuity, and, in the process, develop a wide variety of skills chiefly associated with the evaluation of historical evidence.'[15] One of the most contentious issues of the GCSE requirements was that pupils should be encouraged to 'look at events and issues from the perspective of people in the past'.[16] This focus on empathy in a national qualification sparked a debate among teachers and in the press, which developed further in the later discussions over the National Curriculum.

GCSE History continued to prove contentious with concerns raised over whether it really enabled progression from the increasingly innovative Key Stage 3 programme taught to 11-14 year-olds under the National Curriculum. In 2002 a group of history teachers and other history education professionals met at a strategic conference at The Cherwell School in Oxford. The resulting conference proceedings, *Past Forward,* included a paper by Culpin that is worth closer examination in summarising the perceived issues with GCSE History fifteen years after its first inception. Culpin, writing with over thirty years of experience in examining pupils in history at 16, harked back to the age of choice with the School Certificate Examination (CSE). He emphasised that the CSE was set up by and for schools and that there was a great deal of choice over syllabus and mode. Mode 3 even allowed teachers to set exams, marks and grade their own candidates for the work ultimately to be moderated by the exam

---

[14] GCSEs were first taught in 1986 for examination in 1988. They were sat at 16, the limit of compulsory schooling at the time. History GCSE had a 25% coursework element and there were no tiered entries. Every student sat the same level of examination.
[15] Phillips, "Government Policies, the State and the Teaching of History," 14.
[16] DES, "GCSE: The National Criteria: History," (London: HMSO, 1985), par. 4.1.

board.[17] He set out key advantages in the move to a universal GCSE examination in 1987. This change brought an end to the damaging O-level/CSE divide, and the amount of information from the board increased as the idea of a syllabus being a 'contract' between exam board and schoolteacher developed. Information began to be shared and this continued over the next decade with the publication of mark schemes, reports, training by Chief Examiners, grade definitions, syllabus criteria, even the return of marked scripts. Culpin suggested this as one of the main reasons for the steady improvement in GCSE grades since their inception. He also identified 'levels of response marking' as one of the most important features of the new GCSE, imported from the SHP syllabuses where they had been used for years.[18] Teachers had to learn how to use them, Culpin argued, 'but gradually teachers became assessment experts, with much greater awareness of levels, of progression, of how to identify what their pupils were thinking.'[19]

Culpin also identified several concerns about History GCSE during its initial fifteen years. He was concerned by the merging of examination boards that took place in the 1990s as it led to the boards being in competition with each other. In turn this led to boards being reluctant to offer minority interest options in terms of substantive content. He also identified the issue of boards becoming detached from universities and therefore a gap opening up between schoolteachers and university teachers of history. 'Working together on examinations used to be one of the places where we would meet.'[20] Culpin went on to identify political interference in specific History GCSE exam courses as a problem, with 'ministerial meddling' leading to the limiting of coursework units. He argued that teaching and learning should be prioritised, without the course being shaped to fit the examination. Instead, 'the exam should evaluate and validate the course, its methodology and intentions.'[21] Within this pamphlet both Culpin and Byrom identified issues in progression between Key Stage 3 of the National Curriculum and the GCSE course. 'Key Stage 3 courses today are the focus of innovation. While it is not

---

[17] Unusually, England has several exam boards that award qualifications. Schools are able to choose between them for each subject. CSEs were administered on a local basis with local boards. When GCSE was introduced in 1986, these exam boards merged into regional groups. In 1996, London Examinations formed the Edexcel Foundation. Originally a charity, in 2003 it was taken over by Pearson, a profit-making company.

[18] 'Levels of response' marking set perhaps three or four descriptive, levelled criteria for responses to each question. This system is now widely used by examination boards in England for history assessment.

[19] C. Culpin, "GCSE History," in *Past Forward: A Vision for School History 2002-2012*, ed. M. Riley and R.J. Harris (London: Historical Association, 2003), 15.

[20] Ibid., 16.

[21] Ibid.

impossible to teach the GCSE course in an interesting and motivating way, the exam does not encourage this. The exam questions are often sterile exercises, especially those on source evaluation and on interpretations.'[22] In 2003, therefore, Key Stage 3 history was perceived by such authors to be more innovative than the GCSE courses that followed it.

Another source of evidence, from a slightly later period, which shed a light on practice in GCSE History courses, was the annual survey of secondary history teachers undertaken by the Historical Association and authored by Harris and Burn. The 2009 report showed that while GCSE History was still a concern to the history education community, there had been a shift in the nature of that concern. They found that, while the proportion of students taking GCSE History was declining nationally, there was a difference between different types of school. 'Among the academies a fall in number was much more likely than an increase, while the biggest net increase was to be found among the grammar schools.'[23] Many of those surveyed suggested that history was now in competition with a greater range of subjects, some of which were regarded as being easier. A quarter of respondents specifically referred to the introduction of vocational/ diploma courses which in many cases lower-attaining students were being compelled to take, effectively barring them from continuing with the study of history.[24]

Conclusion

In March 2011, Ofsted published a report on school history based on inspections in the previous three years across eighty-three primary schools and eighty-three secondary schools. This report provides a useful vantage point to evaluate history curriculum provision at this point in time. The report praised much of the history teaching observed suggesting that the subject was 'generally well taught' and 'well led. Most pupils enjoyed well-planned lessons that extended their knowledge, challenged their thinking and enhanced their understanding.'[25] However, the report raised concerns about pupils'

---

[22] Ibid., 17. Partly in response to these concerns OCR developed an alternative History GCSE known as the OCR Pilot or 'hybrid' course from 2006. This allowed for a greater degree of coursework and teacher assessment while giving the opportunity to study more medieval history. However, only a small number of schools took part and around five years later the scheme ended due to new directions in how much coursework was permitted in a GCSE examination.

[23] K. Burn and R. Harris, "Findings from the Historical Association Survey of Secondary History Teachers," (London: Historical Association, 2009), 8-9.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Ofsted, "History for All: History in English Schools 2007-10," 4.

understanding of the bigger picture of the past, saying pupils' chronological understanding was often 'underdeveloped and so they found it difficult to link developments together'. This report also raised the concerns referred to earlier in the Historical Association survey report of 2009, that whole-school curriculum changes were having a negative impact on teaching and learning in history at Key Stage 3. Some schools were assimilating history into a humanities course or establishing a competency-based or skills-based course in Year 7 in place of history and other foundation subjects. This led to concerning conclusions: 'where these developments had taken place, curriculum time for teaching had been reduced and history was becoming marginalised.'[26]

The position beyond 14 was reported positively, with history being taught very well and pupils being thoroughly prepared for public examinations. The report stated that history was one of the most popular optional GCSE subjects, and numbers taking the subject at A-level had risen steadily over the past ten years. Concerns mirrored those of the Historical Association report, cited earlier, that in some schools students were restricted in their subject options at GCSE and 'some had been steered towards subjects which were perceived to be less demanding than history.'[27]

The period between 1985 and 2011 can be viewed as a time of intense and far-reaching change in education. Some of the changes in history education mirrored the broader education narrative. This can be seen in the increasing role government decisions played in the classroom over the period, firstly in what was taught, then later in how the subject was taught and assessed. The push towards vocational approaches saw history, alongside other traditional subjects, losing curriculum time and status in many schools during the latter part of the period. In other ways, however, the history teaching community tried to stand its ground on imposed changes. The Historical Association, and in particular the journal for secondary teachers, *Teaching History,* took a firm stance against many of the more unpopular changes encouraged in the classroom. For example, in 2004 Brown and Burnham, two heads of history departments, wrote an article describing how they did not use National Curriculum Level Descriptors to mark individual pieces of work, causing disagreements with their head teachers. It is difficult,

---

[26] Ibid., 5.
[27] Ibid.

however, to know how widespread this sort of resistance was. However detailed the policy history and documentary analysis may be, it cannot tell the story of how history teaching actually changed in individual classrooms. This chapter is therefore intended as a context for the personal memories and reflections of experienced history teachers that are to follow.

Chapter 5   Freedom and choice 1985—90

The preceding chapter sets out policy and curriculum changes that were directed at teachers in the classroom. The impact of those policy and curriculum changes on the practice of teachers, however, is less-known. Indeed, the voice of history teachers on how those changes manifested themselves in history departments and classrooms, and how those changes were experienced, remains almost silent.[1] This research seeks to redress such an omission.

In the first set of interviews, carried out between 2009 and 2011, teachers were asked to highlight the major changes they had experienced in their professional practice as a history teacher between 1985 and 2011. The selection of issues and examples, therefore, rested with the teachers themselves; they were not imposed by any predetermined research framework. For example, as Chapter 8 details, when teachers were asked about their headline changes over the period, five chose to talk about changes in resources, five chose to talk about the National Curriculum and two others spoke about teaching becoming 'more structured'. The open approach of the interviews was intended to capture the memories teachers felt were important, rather than imposing certain pre-determined narratives. Second interviews were carried out in 2016 to elicit more detail in certain areas, but nevertheless this teacher-led approach resulted in certain inevitable gaps in the chronology; the areas teachers wanted to talk about, such as the introduction of the National Curriculum, came richly described. Factors considered significant in other literature, such as the introduction of citizenship to the National Curriculum, were barely mentioned.[2]

The following chapters are not written as an attempt to provide a full narrative of events in history education over the twenty-five year period in question. Such overviews already exist.[3] Rather, this study deepens, enriches and at times questions the existing narrative. The next four chapters are presented in a broadly chronological frame with themes emerging through them. This chapter broadly covers the period 1976 to 1990,

---

[1] See chapter 2 for examples of work that use the voice of the history teacher e.g. Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon; Harris and Haydn; Husbands, Kitson and Pendry.

[2] Husbands, Kitson and Pendry, 16-18.

[3] E.g. Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon; J. Keating and N. Sheldon, "History in Education: Trends and Themes in History Teaching, 1900-2010," in Debates in History Teaching, ed. I. Davies

including the introduction of the GCSE examination. Chapter 6 explores the impact of the National Curriculum on history teachers, both in its original form and in its various iterations across the 1991 to 2011 time period. Chapter 7 focuses on the enactment by teachers of government policy beyond the National Curriculum, specifically policies related to the New Labour agenda of 'raising standards' in the late 1990s and the decade after 2000. Chapter 8 explores the full 1985 to 2011 period with respect to two themes: resources and professional learning.

The purpose of this chapter is to set the scene of history teaching in the mid-1980s, before the introduction of national changes such as the GCSE examination in 1986 and the National Curriculum in 1991. Although the focus of the study starts in 1985, several of the teachers referred to their early teaching practice, with the earliest reference being 1976.[4] These examples are included to provide a richer context of history teaching in this period of 'relative autonomy'.[5]

This chapter explores the variety of teaching approaches in existence in the mid-1980s, highlighting a continuum of practice between a traditional, didactic history and the alternative 'new history' approaches formalised by SCHP.[6] Teachers' choice of content and approach in this period is then examined, firstly for 11-14-year-olds, then for older students taking external examinations. This is followed by a section on teachers' diverging experiences of the introduction of the common GCSE examination, first taught in 1986. The chapter concludes with a consideration of opportunities for professional development and collaboration in the 1980s. Most of the teachers interviewed would associate this period with a shift in their practice. For some this shift was more radical than others. For some the change in practice was motivated by a source within their own history departments; for others, the shift came with the introduction of GCSE, which imposed certain evidential approaches and required a move away from traditional practice.

---

[4] Diane, Allan, Patrick, Laura and David all started teaching in 1976-77.

[5] D. Gleeson and H. Gunter, "The Performing School and the Modernisation of Teachers," in *The Performing School: Managing, Teaching and Learning in a Performance Culture*, eds D. Gleeson and C. Husbands (London: RoutledgeFalmer, 2001), 142. The term, 'relative autonomy' is used here to describe the period 1960s to mid-1980s. It is compared with the 'controlled autonomy' of the 1980s-1990s and the 'Productive autonomy/ Performativity' of 2000 onwards. This is explored further in chapter 7.

[6] Further details and definitions of 'traditional' and 'new' history can be found in the literature review, chapter 2 and context chapter, chapter 4.

Early career teaching

Eleven out of the thirteen teachers interviewed began teaching history between 1976 and 1986 and enjoyed sharing accounts of their practice at this time.[7] According to their descriptions, there was a wide range of practice in history teaching during this period. At one extreme of the continuum was a didactic teaching approach, often witnessed by participants observing other teachers, rather than independently practised by them. In this approach, which appeared to be dominated by a narrow reliance on an 'authoritative' textbook, the cumulative, uncritical learning of a single narrative was promoted. At the other extreme of the continuum there was the inclusion of large amounts of evidential material or 'sources' into history lessons, supporting a belief that students should be undertaking the exploratory work of a historian. These interviewees, however, as keen young history teachers, took a range of positions between these two polarities. For some, early teaching practice tended heavily towards knowledge transmission; for others there was an occasional foray into evidential work through SCHP publications such as Mark Pullen or work on the local census provided by local library services. For two teachers in this sub-sample of eleven, there was an almost Pauline conversion to the methods of SCHP in the late 1970s and in each case this had a long-term impact on their careers.

At the traditional end of the teaching continuum that existed in the mid-1980s, history was treated as a body of inert, static knowledge that teachers knew, that textbooks presented and that students were required to learn. Richard provided one of the most extreme examples of the knowledge-transmission approach. He has worked in the same school for over thirty years, having started there as a PGCE student on placement. While Richard admitted that the practice encouraged by his PGCE, taken in 1984, focused around evidential thinking and empathy, this was not the practice he observed in his placement school:

> The buzzword of course at the time was empathy. It was a big thing about empathy which of course is slightly dubious, but I can understand why they were trying to do that initially. There was nothing like that going on here. It was very much, 'That's the

---

[7] See Figure 1 for a summary of participants or Appendix 4 for full details. Dana trained to teach history in the USA, coming to England in 1991 and first teaching history here in 1993. Her comments are not included in this chapter. Edward started teaching in 1991, after a previous career in retail.

> stuff, you learn this, you learn that, that and that and then you do that and write an essay.' Just anecdotally I came and took over from a guy called D, who used to be a major in the army in the Second World War. He had a big scarf wrapped round him, always had a sort of runny nose and I said to him on my teaching practice, I said, look I'm sorry Mr D, what do you want me to do with your class? He said, 'well' he said, 'I've got up to page 37, page 38 looks good to me, does it to you?' And that was it. That was all I got.

It appeared that there was a textbook reliance at the heart of Mr D's practice. Not only was the textbook being used to determine the path of the learning, but the textbook appeared to have provided an all-inclusive package and the idea of deviating from it was deemed unnecessary.[8] The historical knowledge to be shared in the lesson had been predetermined by the authors and editors of the textbook. The teacher in question was clearly older, having played a role in the Second World War, but the anecdote does show that such practice existed in classrooms in the mid-1980s.

It is clear that Richard recognised the limitations of this approach even on the teaching placement of his initial teacher education course. Even so, it is understandable that Richard developed some similar practices himself in his early years of teaching:

> I used to make Bandas[9]…the kind of teaching I was doing was very much reading through stuff, presenting things, telling stories, which I still do a little bit of but I used dictation and things like that you know, but I haven't done that for twenty years.

Here, Richard had moved away from the textbook-dependence of his colleague, and was creating his own resources, but the emphasis was still on knowledge transmission, with dictation forming part of his teaching pedagogy. Through creating his own resources though, and telling his own stories, Richard as the teacher had taken ownership of the selection of knowledge that was deployed in the lesson. Simon, who started his career in 1983 in a school on the other side of the country, described similar practice.

> I can certainly remember when I first came into teaching, rows of very miserable-looking children, with a textbook and a pen, and, and an exercise book, with, well, in some cases dictation still going on, and I think that probably, that was probably the end of that era.

Here Simon substantiates the use of dictation in this period. He adds to this a description of unhappy students, taught in a traditional classroom format of rows, but suggests that such practice was coming to an end in the early 1980s.

---

[8] Changing use of textbooks in the history classroom is explored further in chapter 8.
[9] The Banda was a spirit-based duplicator machine that could make a limited number of low-cost copies of one original. It was invented in 1923, but commonly used in schools until the 1990s when it was replaced by the photocopier.

Within this didactic approach to teaching, at this end of the continuum, historical content was the entire substance of lessons; resourcing and planning centred round that content. Allan summarised this approach, recalling use of the phrase, 'Today, we're going to look at...' He elaborated on this when comparing his early practice in 1976 to more recent approaches:

> So, it didn't start with finely tuned lesson objectives. It was mainly an area of knowledge to cover. So, then we might read together the text, discussion questions and then get on with answering some comprehension questions to finish off the class. I mean that's a bit of a stereotype and probably a little unfair. I mean there were role plays. It wasn't completely prehistoric, but I think that was the standard and probably the typical lesson.

Allan's reference to an 'area of knowledge' referred to a division of the past into particular periods or sub-topics; a measured approach to progressing steadily through historical time. The use of the verbs 'to cover' and 'to look at' showed the intention to transmit a static body of knowledge which needed to be learnt and understood, hence the comprehension questions. Edward, like Allan, described textbooks being used as a resource, but said that comprehension questions based on the text were seen as enough:

> It would be much more focused on, give 'em a text book and give them questions to do, to answer from the text book... And they would be primarily getting information out of the text.

The emphasis here was on comprehension rather than evaluation, on the transmission of substantive knowledge rather than questioning the origins or reliability of that knowledge.[10]

The late 1970s and early 1980s are often portrayed as a time of change in history teaching,[11] but it is clear that traditional practice continued to exist in many history classrooms. When participants were asked to describe a 'typical lesson' at the beginning of their career, they all described elements of a knowledge-transmission approach. Cannadine et al. have argued that it was during the 1970s that 'new history' became 'powerfully embedded in comprehensive classrooms,' but the evidence from this sample of history teachers shows that more traditional approaches also continued to

---

[10] Lee elaborates on the distinction between these forms of history in P. J. Lee, "Putting Principles into Practice: Understanding History," in *How Students Learn: History in the Classroom*, eds S. Bransford and J.D. Donovan (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2005).
[11] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon. Sylvester; Aldrich and Dean.

exist.[12] While there were examples of 'new history' emerging, as witnessed in the next section, for the majority of history teachers interviewed, this came into existence alongside, not instead of, the existing traditional approach.

The influence of the Schools Council History Project (SCHP)

At the other end of the history teaching continuum from the traditional, content-delivery approach in the late 1970s and early 1980s was the practice promoted by SCHP (SHP from 1984). The 'Schools Council Project History 13-16' was set up in 1972 to undertake a radical re-think of the purpose and nature of school history. Student needs were identified as:

1. The need to understand the world in which they live
2. The need to find their personal identity by widening their experience through the study of people of a different time and place
3. The need to understand the process of change and continuity in human affairs
4. The need to begin to acquire leisure interests
5. The need to develop the ability to think critically, and to make judgements about human situations.[13]

These aspirations stand in stark contrast to the examples of history teaching given above in which the transmission of a fixed historical narrative appeared as the primary purpose. These SCHP principles were not based on a need to 'know' the past, or certainly not a single-narrative version of the past presented by a dictating teacher. Rather, SCHP promoted a need to 'understand' the past, to 'make judgements,' and to use that understanding to attempt to comprehend current affairs; a more extrinsic than intrinsic purpose for the subject.[14]

For Allan and Patrick, and to some extent Simon, the Schools History Project movement was a force that abruptly challenged their epistemology of the subject, changed their teaching practices in the classroom and had a long-term impact on their teaching career. Allan was the most ardent proponent of SHP from the very beginning

---

[12] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon, 165.
[13] SCHP, *A New Look at History* (Edinburgh: HolmesMcDougall, 1976), 12.
[14] J. Slater, *Teaching History in the New Europe* (London: Cassell, 1995).

of his interview.[15]   When asked what came along to challenge the typical 'knowledge-transmission' lesson described above, he remembered a conversation with his head of department in 1977, at the end of his first year of teaching:

> I'd prepared materials for an O-level course on Tudors and Stuarts and a CSE course on Tudors and Stuarts and I was teaching Year 10 and current Year 11 (fourth form and fifth form as we called them) so I'd done an enormous amount of work and I thought at least I'll be able to use them again. And she said – we're going to change course [to SCHP]. I was not best pleased, but after the first year, once I got into it I realised how much more valuable it was. What it gave was so much more of a rationale for teaching history and an emphasis on the skills and the concepts of history and not just the content – and the methodology of the historian.

Allan was particularly articulate in being able to describe the change of emphasis that the SCHP encouraged in both content and approach to school history.[16] Becoming involved with the project was a transformative moment in his teaching career, as the principles of SCHP became a fundamental part of his personal philosophy of teaching.[17] Allan went on to describe an SCHP lesson in the early 1980s:

> In some ways it's a similar framework to today. So, key question, key question for the lesson, focusing on a particular concept or skill so we might be looking at causation or we might be doing investigative work using sources. And that's one thing we often forget about the Schools History Project and its impact – it really introduced sources into the lesson. They weren't there before. I mean they were there in a sort of sense you know, occasionally the photographs and occasionally a quote.

In summarising the impact of the early SCHP movement on his teaching style, Allan chose to identify three particular features; the role of the key question, the focus on concepts or skills and the place of sources in the lesson. These three features marked out a distinct difference in teaching approach from the traditional, didactic practice described at the other end of the teaching continuum. They therefore deserve further explanation.

The use of a key question to frame, or even to introduce a lesson, shifted the nature of knowledge within the lesson from a transmission model to an enquiry model. This was very different to the typical lesson Allan described in the first year of his teaching career where lessons started with 'Today we're going to look at...' This was a fundamental and

---

[15] The Schools Council Project History, the term used when it was founded in 1972, is referred to here as SCHP. In 1984, when the Schools Council was disbanded, the name changed to Schools History Project (SHP).

[16] Allan's later role as an Advanced Skills Teacher (working in an advisory capacity to support other history departments in the county one day a week) might have helped him express the difference in the two approaches, but equally, his experience with SHP may have helped him gain that very role.

[17] The impact of involvement with SHP on Allan's teaching is explored further in chapters 6 and 8.

significant change. As Allan put it, 'It was a big re-think and there was a sort of revolutionary idealism to it.' Within a lesson framed by a key question, there was at least the intention, if not the opportunity for knowledge construction, although it's possible that the balance of who was constructing that knowledge may have remained with the teacher, rather than becoming a joint-construct between teacher and students.[18]

The second major change that Allan highlighted was the introduction of a particular 'concept or skill' providing the example of causation.[19] The idea of planning a lesson or sequence of lessons which focused on students' understanding of causation (or any other of the second-order concepts) evidenced a radical rethink of progression in history, demonstrating understanding that the subject was now more than the simple accumulation of factual content. While earlier lessons might indeed have looked at the causes of major historical events and changes, there would have been little focus on students' progression in their understanding of causation. SHP, particularly in the analysis of examination responses, could be seen as the starting point of models of progression which then became enshrined in the GCSE and later in the National Curriculum.[20]

A third area that Allan identified was the use of sources in the history classroom. He substantiated others such as Alison and Laura in stating that teachers were already using sources outside of the SCHP approach, but that SCHP gave more weight to the idea of emulating the methodology of a historian.[21] The early work with sources most commonly referred to by participants was the 'Mark Pullen' exercise.[22] Mark Pullen was a fictional character who died on the A2 road in Kent. SCHP had created and published a pack including a policeman's report and a set of 'evidence' from Mark's

---

[18] See Chapter 6 for an example of Simon moving to similar key questions, but nearly fifteen years later with the introduction of the National Curriculum. See Chapter 8 for Allan's discussion of moving from key questions for single lessons to enquiry questions 'overarching' a series of lessons.

[19] The particular language used to describe building blocks of the subject such as causation, change and chronology has changed over time. Whereas original documentation from SCHP used the term 'skill,' Shemilt, in his review of SCHP used the term 'concept.' The 1995 version of the National Curriculum used 'Key Element' whereas later versions used 'Key Concepts and Processes' and research literature tends to refer to second-order concepts. There is a full definition in P. J. Lee and D. Shemilt, "A Scaffold, Not a Cage: Progression and Progression Models in History," in *Teaching History* 113 (2003), 14.

[20] Ibid.

[21] Aldrich and Dean. p.108 claim that SCHP was 'based upon what were widely believed to be examples of current good practice.' Laura and Alison both talked about working with boxes of artefacts from their respective county advisory services and using the local environment as a source.

[22] SCHP, *Detective Work: The Mystery of Mark Pullen* (Holmes McDougall, 1976). This pack was mentioned specifically by Simon, Allan, William, Mark and David. This formed part of the *What is History?* series aimed at 13-year-olds.

wallet. Students were asked to examine the evidence and create a timeline of the victim's last day alive. The focus here was explicitly on students investigating for themselves, using sources not only to extract information but also to weigh up the strength of different evidence claims and to form substantiated judgements.[23] Far from the transmission of an agreed narrative, this was an opportunity for independent, student-led knowledge-construction. Mark (in this case a history teacher from 1976 rather than the victim) summed up the general feeling:

> It was a great exercise and it got the boys and obviously yourself, you know, really thinking about the difficulties of evidence, and that then became a focus throughout the school and I should imagine that from about the late '80s onwards, possibly early '90s onwards, source questions stopped being near comprehension, which you could in a sense have answered on anything, and became genuinely evaluative and I think we have to thank Schools History Project and the new history, the stuff that Trinity and All Saints did and all that stuff.

There was a move towards encouraging students' evaluation of historical evidence. It is difficult to put a precise date on this change, but in the decade after Mark Pullen was published in 1976, use of this exercise was specifically mentioned by five out of the eleven teachers in the sub-sample. These teachers were not necessarily fully subscribed to the SCHP approach, but they had identified a resource that would be useful in the classroom. One point worth noting with the Mark Pullen exercise, however, is that there was no substantive historical knowledge involved. This focus on the 'skill' of the historian, as a separate entity from substantive historical knowledge, would later become a criticism of the early GCSE materials.[24]

Patrick told a strikingly similar story to Allan concerning the impact of the SCHP on his history teaching, especially considering his early teaching experience was several counties away from Allan's school. He, like Allan, was an immediate and willing convert to the SCHP approach in the later 1970s:

> I don't think there was much use of them [sources], but on the other hand where I was, was unusual, S— School in B—shire generally in those days was actually quite cutting edge because it was one of the first areas to adopt in a big way the Schools History Project, which had just started, and we were very much involved in that.…It was new to me, it hadn't really come up in the training. Our training had been very little use of sources, it would be much more knowledge- and content-based. We did do a little bit, but very, very little [*So did SHP change your teaching, as a teacher, as a*

---

[23] I have distinctive memories of undertaking this activity myself as a first year at secondary school. I particularly remember the frustration when the teacher couldn't reveal the 'true' answer as to how Mark Pullen died.

[24] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon cover this critique of SCHP approaches on pp.161-62. It is discussed again later in this chapter where Laura raises her own concerns in response to the introduction of GCSE.

> *history teacher?*] OK, I think it became more me. It was really good because it was much more the sort of history that I was interested in anyway. Because it was the first teaching I'd done apart from teaching practice I'm not sure it made that much change. What it did mean was it got me very much into the idea of seeing history teaching as I always have, as a, a sort of voyage of discovery, of working things out, rather than just a body of knowledge. I've never ever seen history as a body of knowledge, so it was really good in that sense.

Patrick was unusual in explicitly articulating the move in history teaching from a transmitted body of knowledge to a more constructed form of knowledge. For him, the only real exposure to a content-heavy approach was on his PGCE. Patrick did however recognise that his school's faithful adherence to the SCHP approach felt unusual at the time. He even described the school as cutting-edge because it was involved in the project.

Both Allan and Patrick presented a sense of belonging to an SCHP movement. This was something new and exciting of which they were proud to be a part. The changes described here by Allan and Patrick, among others, related to a changing epistemology of the subject. The changing place of sources in the classroom and the use of key questions to structure learning were part of an enquiry approach that marked a fundamental shift in the way teachers thought about and approached historical knowledge. There was a change here in what it meant to *know* history. SHP advocates described it as a change from '*knowing*' history to '*doing*' history.[25] These deep-rooted changes were fundamental to the core of the subject and didn't occur unanimously or uniformly. Indeed, Allan said:

> It was really quite divisive in the history community at the time. There were the project teachers and the non-project teachers.

He suggested it wasn't until the late 1980s or early 1990s that the divide narrowed:

> It was probably GCSE that began to bridge that divide and the National Curriculum did so further as it incorporated so much of SCHP.

Allan's observation on the significance of GCSE in changing some teachers' practice was supported by Phillips. However, Phillips also claimed that, while SCHP represented a radical attempt at reforming secondary school history, perhaps it was 'too radical for the majority of teachers' in the early 1980s.[26] Phillips went on to quote a

---

[25] See J. Fines, "Evidence: The Basis of the Discipline?," in *Teaching History*, ed. H Bourdillon (Buckingham: Routledge, 1994) for a definition of 'doing history.'

[26] Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*, 18.

study by Holmes, written in 1986, that found only 12% of schools followed the SHP *What is History?* course through to examination.[27] There was a similar proportion of strong SHP proponents in this study, with Allan and Patrick being the only ones that identified with SHP from the late1970s onwards, numbering only two of the eleven teachers in the sub-sample.

So far, two ends of a mid-1980s continuum of history teaching have been explored. While, as Allan said, there were clearly two camps, the project teachers and the non-project teachers, interviews with these teachers suggested that many classrooms at that time saw a variety of practice which would have fallen between those two camps, providing evidence of various weightings of dual practice. This finding was supported by Holmes who found that SHP was having 'direct and indirect effects on the aims of history departments', including those who were not using SHP materials directly.[28]

In terms of the grand narrative of history teaching, this may have been a confusing time as 'old history' gave way to a 'new history' just as these teachers were beginning their careers.[29] While Allan and Patrick, described above, took an epistemological stand about what and how they were going to teach, others proved more opportunistic, possibly led by availability of resources. Simon came to the interview with a variety of SCHP texts from the early 1980s and remembered:

> There was the discussion at the beginning of the '80s, because I think it had already started in the 70s, about skills versus content, which was a huge thing. And I remember in my early years doing a lot of that 'what is history?'

And yet Simon admitted that most teaching in the department was of a more traditional approach:

> I think you still had an awful lot of the old-fashioned chalk and talk, because there wasn't the technology to, you know, to deal with the things that are available now...there was [sic] a lot of exercises from textbooks which I know still happens today of course, and you know you had your sort of worksheets.... I think I probably would have used these [referring to the SHP textbooks on the table]. I remember doing the Mark Pullen for example and the Tollund Man and so on, and they worked very well actually... and the students loved them, you know, working with all that evidence from the Mark Pullen pack...I suppose what I'm saying is that there'd be a

---

[27] B. Holmes, "History within a Locality," in *Teaching History* 46 (1986), 17. However, Phillips, 18, suggested that by the time of the NC debate in the late 1980s it accounted for just over a quarter of GCSE syllabuses.
[28] Ibid.
[29] These terms are explained more fully in the context chapter, chapter 4

balance between chalk and talk and question and answer and the things that go on all the time and the sort of sources-based, skills-based, evidence-based stuff that was quite popular at the time.

'Tollund Man' was also entitled 'Detective Work' and explored the discovery of a body preserved in peat since the Iron Age.[30] The emphasis in both SCHP resources was on investigation, particularly the use of sources to explore and discuss events, then to come to substantiated judgements based on the evidence. It is therefore noteworthy to see Simon using such approaches alongside a chalk-and-talk approach in other lessons.

William substantiated this dual practice saying that in his second school, where he taught between 1980 and 1987, there was a co-existence of SHP approaches or 'new' history resources alongside traditional teaching pedagogies. He explained:

> In Year 9 we did separate history and geography and yes we started with SHP. We started with Mark Pullen and Tollund Man and did that...the typical lesson was to go to the filing cabinet, find the worksheet, give them the worksheet. The worksheet had a load of material and with some comprehension questions at the end and that's typically what they would do.

Asked in a later interview whether he would describe himself as an 'SHP teacher' he explicitly said 'No.' It was the resources themselves that led him into SHP territory, but he then reverted, almost comfortably, to the typical departmental worksheets. It is tempting to describe William, at this early point in his career at least, as a 'traditional' teacher:

> I'd be very ashamed to teach as I taught when I started teaching now... As you got further up the school, so a little bit more concentration on history then, as a way of working and thinking, we would introduce some sources and look at some, but typically, I would often kind of credit the success of the lesson on how many times I would lap the circular blackboard, you know, how many times did we actually go round the board.

Those laps of the circular blackboard at first suggest a didactic approach where the students might be copying or taking notes. In the later interview, however, William clarified this description:

> I've always used a process of Socratic questioning, so even when we were filling the board, we were filling the board as a result of the dialogue.

Therefore the blackboard was used not to record detail, but to record a dialogue between teacher and students. Despite separating himself intentionally from the work of SHP,

---

[30] SCHP, *What Is History? Mystery of the Tollund Man* (HarperCollins, 1976).

it's clear that William's practice was not on the traditional side of the continuum. This was supported by a description of a typical lesson towards the start of his teaching career in 1977:

> A lesson would typically start with, call it a starter, but some kind of visual source at the beginning which would set up some intrigue in the minds of the students. They'd be engaging with a visual source that would make them question and think 'Why? What's this thing about? What's the reason for it? How's it connected to what we've done, or what I might have learned so far? How can I interpret this? What are the messages behind it?

This description supports William's reference to Socratic questioning. He may not have used the language of SCHP, but he was using historical sources in an enquiring manner, going beyond engagement of interest to provoke independent thought. William's example suggests that such practice existed independently of SCHP in the early 1980s.[31]

William was not the only teacher who could be positioned towards, but not on, the SCHP side of the continuum. Where he described his approach as 'Socratic', Diane described hers as 'active'. She recalled the mid-1970s when she began teaching:

> It was quite active I suppose then, so I would always use some sort of stimulus to start off – be it an object or a piece of writing or whatever. So, in that way, that hasn't changed.

William and Diane's use of 'Initial Stimulus Material,' to use the phrase coined by Phillips, went beyond factual recall and placed thought-provoking source material at the beginning of the history lesson long before the Key Stage 3 strategy demanded an engaging starter.[32] David was explicit about this:

> The three-part lesson was nothing new and you know, the introduction, the body and the bringing it together was something that was very clear to me at the outset. I was always keen on using original sources and images and goodness knows what else, so I wanted kids to do the history. The problem was of course that it was a matter of starting pretty much from scratch...I think it is partly because of the influence of the archaeology and the interest in architecture and archives was the enquiry process. The doing the history was something that I was keen on getting stuck in with.

Here sources were being used on a regular basis as stimulus material to engage students and inspire their curiosity. These teachers did not identify themselves as SHP teachers,

---

[31] Aldrich and Dean (1991) suggested that the Project was based upon what were widely believed to be examples of good practice in the mid-1970s, so it is sensible that other examples of good practice could exist independently of SHP.

[32] R. Phillips, "Making History Curious: Using Initial Stimulus Material (ISM) to Promote Enquiry, Thinking and Literacy," in *Teaching History* 105 (2001). The Key Stage 3 Strategy was introduced by the Labour government in 2001 as part of a raft of measures to raise standards. The impact on history teaching is explored in Chapter 7. A key part of the Key Stage 3 strategy was the three-part lesson that began with a 'starter'.

but they were using methods that were part of the alternative, 'new' history, SHP approach. David identified his interest in sources and his desire to follow the enquiry process as stemming from his interest in archaeology.[33] He was not the only teacher to raise the challenge of finding appropriate sources to share at this point in time.[34]

Beyond Simon, William and Diane, there were several other teachers who recalled using more 'active' or 'new history' approaches in conjunction with more traditional teaching practice. Laura and Alison, in particular, talked of local trips out and the use of artefacts. Laura described a topic box that the local library services would provide:

> They would have the library services and they would bring along, say you were doing something on the Romans they would bring along a topic box with books and artefacts and models of artefacts and pictures.

She also integrated a number of local trips into her school curriculum, dating their occurrence as before the arrival of the National Curriculum in 1991:

> The other thing that I did with them, when we did local history, the nineteenth century, I did a big local tour round S_____ [the local town]. S_____ is not exactly the workshop of the world… We would look round at the buildings and see around. I wanted them to see that history was alive and well and that we could see it. We took trips to Canterbury and the whole year group went and we walked round the city walls, we went to the top of Dane John, we went into the Cathedral, we went into the Cathedral workshop centre, we went to Rochester Cathedral, we did graveyard surveys to see when people were dying… what the common names were. We used to clean things off with toothbrushes.

Such trips would have enabled students to use the local environment as an historical source that could be analysed and evaluated and questioned. This went beyond history as a body of knowledge that needed to be absorbed. Accordingly, many SHP principles were at play in the teaching of Diane, Laura, William and Simon as evidenced by the focus on sources, the local environment and the '*doing'* of history. There was also evidence of dual practice. All four of those teachers described some more 'traditional' approaches, and importantly, explicitly denied they were 'SHP teachers'. [35] This trend is supported by Sylvester who argued that by the middle of the 1980s teaching in many schools had changed significantly. He suggested that this was by large extent due to the

---

[33] He reported during the interview that his degree was in History and Archaeology

[34] Patrick and Simon both commented on the quality of early source material, that it was difficult to read and therefore hard to engage students. Patrick also commented on the challenges of finding original source material to support his desire to teach about Mughal India.

[35] It is possible that this denial of being an 'SHP' teacher is linked to choice of exam specifications. Perhaps some teachers chose to teach SHP O-level and GCSE and therefore were identified more with SHP than others who chose to teach Socio-economic history or Modern World history. Certainly, the four teachers mentioned here did not teach SHP history at GCSE.

History 13-16 Project's materials, particularly the '*What is History?*' pack that 'found its way into the majority of schools'.[36]

If, as Patrick suggested, there were groups of SHP teachers and non-SHP teachers, it would appear that there was also a third group of history teachers in the 1980s. They bridged both traditional approaches and methods of the 'new history', providing a more opportunistic approach, using the resources available to them to engage and excite students. Therefore, among this small sample of history teachers, and possibly in the population of history teachers more generally, different groups or categories could tentatively be identified in the mid-1980s.

Figure 4 sets out this tentative grouping within a table.

Figure 4: Groups of teachers categorised by teaching approach in 1985

'Traditional' history teachers	Alison, Edward, Mark, Richard
SHP devotees	Allan, Patrick
Pragmatists with a 'dual practice' approach	Diane, Laura, William, Simon, David
(not teaching at this point)	Nicholas, Dana[37]

The first group were the traditional history teachers, using story and teacher-talk, closely supported by textbooks, to share an enriched singular narrative with students. This narrative might have been alleviated by occasional use of sources or trips, but there is no evidence these were used to explore history as a construct. Alison, Edward, Mark and Richard would appear to fall into this group, four out of the eleven teachers in the sample teaching in the mid-1980s. A second group could be defined as ardent SHP devotees, using a range of SHP resources, enquiry questions, belonging to SHP support networks and teaching to the SHP external examinations at O-level. Allan and Patrick, from this sample, would easily be identified in that group in the mid-1980s, two from the sample of eleven. The remaining teachers could be defined as pragmatists, using the resources around them and their own ideas to create a dual-practice history teaching.

---

[36] Sylvester, 17.
[37] See Participant Summary Table, Figure 1.

Diane, Laura, William, Simon and David would appear to fall into that centrist group, five out of the eleven teachers in the sub-sample. Indeed, in his study of history departments teaching the SCHP course in Oldham in the early 1980s, Holmes concluded that:

> The reasons given by teachers for adoption of History 13-16 tend to be governed by pragmatism rather than theory. The provision of a common examination course at CSE and O-level, the revitalisation of pupil interest in the subject, the influence of a new head of department seem to have been more important considerations than that History 13-16 is skills-based, relevant to adolescent needs and can be adapted easily for the less able pupil.

That pragmatic attitude was certainly evident among a large proportion of the teachers interviewed for this research. However, Allan and Patrick had moved beyond the pragmatic to a lifelong ardent support of the underlying epistemology.

Approaches to content before the National Curriculum (1985-91)

When Mary Price famously wrote that history was 'in danger' in 1968, a key point was that history syllabuses remained 'obstinately a survey of British history'.[38] In 1967 the Department of Education and Science issued a pamphlet entitled *Towards World History* which called for 'a new relationship between British history and that of the world as a whole.'[39] Sylvester suggested that developments taking place in women's studies and Black studies began from 1975 onwards to affect school history.[40] Aldrich and Dean pointed to the large-scale societal changes in post-war Britain and suggested that race, gender and class were three issues that achieved particular prominence. Schools responded to this in different ways. According to Aldrich and Dean, 'some history teachers in secondary schools reorganized their syllabuses around such themes as "Oppression" or "Who are the British?" Others embraced the ethos of the Schools Council History Project.'[41] There substantive topics could be found that reflected the political and social developments of the early 1970s: the Irish question, the Arab-Israeli conflict, the move to European unity, the rise of Communist China.[42] Many of the history teachers interviewed for this research shared their own way of broadening

---

[38] M. Price, "History in Danger," in *History* 53 (1968).
[39] DES, "Towards World History (Pamphlet 52)," ed. Department of Education and Science (London: HMSO, 1967), 36.
[40] Sylvester.
[41] Aldrich and Dean, 107.
[42] Ibid., 108.

historical content, but the grand narrative of British history still held a strong position in many history classrooms in the mid-1980s.

If the range of teaching approaches employed by history teachers in the mid-1980s could be described as a continuum, the choice of substantive content appeared to have had more of a common core, with certain teachers adding their own individual or departmental choice of historical topics to that core. As Edward put it, 'I think they do need the history of, you know, the British Isles, so we were always teaching that anyway.' Several times in the two interviews, William suggested that in the schools he arrived at in the 1980s, 'history stopped in 1900 at the Straits of Dover.' In 1976 Laura arrived at her first school of employment at the same time as the school opened. There was only one year group in the school, of 11—12-year-olds and Laura was the only history teacher. It fell to her to decide what history to teach. As Laura explained:

> I think it was very traditional. It sort of started at the beginning and tried to get as much done through the year. [When you say traditional?] It was a chronological approach. From what I remember, in the first year, Year 7 we started off doing a little bit about Stone Age, Bronze Age, not in great detail, but we did a little bit about that. We did Ancient Civilizations, touched on Greece, but Rome and Egypt – we did Ancient Egypt. Following Rome we did a little bit on Saxons and invasions and medieval times. [That was all in Year 7?] Yes, from what I remember it was in chronological order. And then in the next year there followed Tudors and Stuarts and then in Year 9, I don't know quite what happened to the eighteenth and nineteenth century, but we concentrated more on the social history, the industrial revolution, the big changes and the First and Second World Wars and tried to bring it up to post-war as well.

This can be seen as a chronological extension of the traditional core that was taught in English schools throughout the twentieth century, focusing mainly on a history of the British Isles (mainly England), with diversions in places to consider Ancient Civilisations.

Beyond the core of British history which all interviewed teachers covered, there was, however, quite a variety of practice. Laura was quick to elaborate on some of her intentional planning nuances:

> It wasn't through the eyes of famous men or political stuff… I think my particular interest and my expertise in history is nineteenth century political and social history. I don't know if that's because I was brought up in Birmingham with the Black Country museum and Coalbrookdale. I used to like the stories about ordinary people and I still do.

Creating this curriculum in 1976, Laura was influenced by academic historians of the era. She spoke of being influenced at university by the ideas of 'people like E.P. Thompson'. When she first came to teach in Kent she built on his ideas about the history of the working classes, teaching 'a lot of local history.'

A similar desire to diversify the history curriculum experience can be seen in the planning of several other teachers interviewed about this period before the National Curriculum. For Patrick, teaching in a girls' school in the late 1980s, this wish to represent the diversity of society manifested itself in the inclusion of more women in the history schemes of work.[43] As he explained:

> When I took over as head of history at H— which was a girls' school, I made a big part of the 11—14 syllabus women's history….We did do the suffragettes, but we also did Victorian working women. Basically, we took in some ways fairly sort of mainstream topics, we tried to build women into the heart of it. So, we did the role of medieval women. It was just trying to change the emphasis of what we did.

For William, his aspiration to represent diversity in his choice of content could be seen in the beginning of his integration of African history into his classroom in the late 1980s. He recalled:

> I started to do some work in A— with the little bits about the history curriculum particularly to do with African history… we did a little after school club on African history, we had a little booklet from the uh, from the GLC. I had it here not so long ago, and we just used this little booklet, we had no knowledge of this stuff at all, but we thought it was important and we had a little after-school group and we started to do that.[44]

Although this particular work took place after school, William's agenda to teach a history beyond the British Isles began to be realised at this time. This will be discussed further later, but for now it suffices to place this particular choice of curriculum topic against a background of 1980s multicultural and anti-racism education, in a similar way that Patrick's choices of women's education can be placed against a backdrop of second-wave feminism. Although Patrick identified himself as an SHP teacher and

---

[43] Patrick also spoke about wanting to teach Mughal India after particular CPD sessions around the time of the Swann report in the late 1980s, but he struggled due to a lack of resources. This is explored further in chapter 8. This would have been teaching beyond the context of the school as he was teaching in a coastal school with an almost complete 'white student' profile at this point in time.

[44] In the 2016 follow-up interview, William clarified that this booklet came from ILEA, and gives some more detail about it. 'In the late 80s there are things coming out of ILEA and the anti-racism movement. I remember a little colourful booklet. Very thin. Each page had a description of that element of African history.'

William didn't, in their choices of content they both fulfilled one of the original SCHP aims for students to 'understand the world in which they live.'[45]

Several teachers spoke of the importance of engaging their students through the content they chose to teach. For Allan this was achieved by teaching about South American civilisations. Diane said she shared with students her parents' experience of being a mixed-race couple in Apartheid South Africa. For David, one motivation was to choose content which helped explain current world events:

> The Russians had just moved in [to Afghanistan in 1979] and I had a mate who'd been on the magic bus to India and he'd come back with two pistols and I'd just read a book called *The Signal Catastrophe*, which was about the invasion of Afghanistan in the 1840s. I'd read it of course because the Russians were moving in and I was interested and just picked it up, and I thought right well, we'd better do something on this. One of the things I was very keen on was to relate what we were doing every so often with the contemporary. So, I borrowed the pistols. They were fascinating because they were real, but the pistols were percussion cap pistols which was interesting because they were coming in in the late 1830s, 1840s. They had a Tower mark on them, they'd been bought in Kabul and I was brandishing these things with the kids and saying these are the things that quite possibly picked up from a battlefield.… It was this whole business again about using the stuff, using the sources, getting objects into the classroom.

David substantiated the practice of Patrick and William in selecting some historical content for its relevance to explaining the contemporary world. All of these examples suggested considerable freedom and choice around planning decisions prior to the introduction of the National Curriculum for history in 1991 and this was particularly true of the history taught to 11—14 year-olds, unconstrained by the specifications of external examinations.

In the late 1980s teachers had autonomy over the historical content taught in their classrooms, particularly for the 11-14 age group. Different groups of history teachers were able to prioritise different interests and areas that they personally believed to be significant.

---

[45] SCHP, *A New Look at History*, 12.

Figure 5 sets out tentative groupings of the teachers interviewed according to the historical content they explicitly prioritised at this point, before the introduction of GCSE in 1986.

Figure 5: Suggested groups of teachers according to content prioritised in 1985

Teachers explicit about the importance of teaching geographically beyond core British history	William, Allan, David, Diane
Teachers explicit about the importance of teaching a diverse version of British history in relation to ethnicity, gender or class	Laura, William,[46] Patrick, Simon
Teachers explicit about the importance of the British core	Edward, Richard, Mark, Alison
Not teaching at this point	Nicholas, Dana

Seven of the eleven teachers (in the sub-sample who were teaching at this point) spoke specifically about their efforts to teach beyond the traditional British core. Some of these approaches were more radical than others, with David's interventions on Afghanistan, Allan's on the Arab-Israeli conflict, William's move to integrate black history and Patrick's overarching focus on women's history standing out as examples of independent innovation in this period of freedom.[47] It is worth noting that two of these teachers were Allan and Patrick who were strongly influenced by the SHP movement.

O-level and CSE examinations

For students over the age of 14, examination specifications meant that content, and to some extent teaching approaches, were more prescribed. Even so, evidence from this group of history teachers suggests that there was a wide variety of approach and content to choose from before the introduction of the GCSE exam, first taught in 1986. Most of

---

[46] William is included twice in this table due to speaking passionately about teaching both a more ethnically diverse version of British history and the inclusion of African history.

[47] Allan's decision to teach about the Arab-Israeli conflict and his letters to the PLO and Israeli embassy are considered in the next section.

the teachers interviewed taught both O-level and CSE simultaneously, with some teaching the same content to different groups and others teaching completely different courses.[48] For example, Simon and Laura both taught British socio-economic history for both qualifications. Diane and William taught Modern World History. William described how, 'there were different sections of the paper and I think you chose which section you answered. So there was a Latin America section, a China section and so on.' In the early 1980s such topics would also have given students the opportunity to learn about a wide range of issues, if teachers selected such content.

The CSE qualification also provided some opportunities for differentiation in the way it was assessed. William explained the difference, describing a Mode 3 approach that existed in the school he taught in, but that he never personally taught:

> It was the same Modern World History [as taught at O-level]. One of the major differences was the coursework component and effectively the Mode 3 had a project. Mode 1 was set by the exam board. Mode 3 were designed by the schools. It was a very general kind of history project. I didn't have a lot of respect for it. I don't actually remember teaching a Mode 3 group. It wasn't very rigorous history… things like the Mode 3 CSE were developed so that students could have access. That was very inclusive, but the problem then being that there was a cap to the achievement of students and there was really a cap to their experience as it did dilute their history experience.

Alison was the other teacher to describe teaching the Mode 3 CSE approach which, as she said, 'you could put together yourself.' She continued:

> Mode 3, local church studies…the local church was the starting point, because it has got tombstones from God knows when and it's got architectural features – And you can walk to it and walk back, and in those days when I did, you don't have to get 92,000 pieces of paper as a risk assessment filled in, you could just say, we are going down to the church, we will come back by...

Here Alison had designed a Mode 3 project that put the local church at the heart of the historical project. Mode 3 CSE enabled teachers to retain autonomy over what their students were taught, how they were taught and how they were expected to present information for assessment. The examples given here do not necessarily present the qualification in the most positive light. In her interviews with history teachers, Sheldon

---

found that it was 'a popular option for enthusiastic and innovative teachers.'[49]   The point remains that until 1986 it was possible for teachers to retain autonomy over what and how students were taught in the history classroom from 11 through to 16.

In 1976 SCHP brought in a new version of the history qualification that broadened further the range of approaches available to teachers.[50] In his first year of teaching, in 1976, Allan taught a Tudor and Stuarts paper for both O-level and CSE. A year later, his head of department decided to change to the SCHP approach for both qualifications. The syllabus framework for 14—16 years is set out in Figure 6.

Figure 6: Syllabus framework for SCHP 14-16

Syllabus framework 14-16 years	Educational uses of history for students
1. Studies in Modern World History	It helps to explain their present
2. Depth study of some past period	It helps them to understand people of a different time and place, and this is a widening and therefore valuable social and educational experience
3. A study in development of some topic	It provides material for the understanding of human development and change in the perspective of time and also of the complexity of causation in human affairs
4. History around us	It contributes to leisure interests[51]

Although Allan was not explicit about all the content choices, he did talk about teaching 'Medicine through Time', which formed the 'Development through Time' study and the 'Arab-Israeli conflict', which covered the 'Study in Modern World History' requirement. Where most teachers talked about teaching the same syllabus across the department, Allan suggested there was occasionally even teacher autonomy over content at this age-group. As he explained:

> One thing about teaching GCSE and the Schools History Project that had its four different units and within each unit there were options. So, for example, for the modern world study, in the early days [O-level and CSE], you could do Communist China, you could do Northern Ireland and you could do the Arab-Israeli conflict and in my school we allowed some degree of teacher choice. I would teach Elizabethan

---

[49] N. Sheldon, "History Examinations from the 1960s to the Present Day," (2011), http://www.history.ac.uk/history-in-education/project-papers/topics.html.

[50] Sylvester argued that the deliberate initiative taken by the project to develop an examination course based on its ideas was crucial in spreading its philosophy as at that time no other project had linked its development to public examinations.

[51] SCHP, *A New Look at History*, 19.

England, but another teacher would teach the American West. I would teach the Arab-Israeli conflict, but another teacher would teach Northern Ireland.

As with David and the choice to teach about Afghanistan, Allan's decision (along with that of his department) to teach this contemporary conflict emanated from a desire for students to understand contemporary issues:

I can't quite remember what drove us to teach that back in 1978/79 when I was teaching in B—, it was certainly in the news a lot, you know the amount of attacks at airports and things like that that were going on.

Allan was certainly aware of the sensitive nature of the topic (which he continued teaching until his retirement from the classroom in 2012), but took careful measure to avoid any accusation of bias. He remembered:

The general cultural feeling at the time was that the PLO [Palestine Liberation Organization] were terrorists and I remember writing off at the time to the offices of the PLO and the Israeli embassy for teaching materials and I got an envelope back from the Israeli embassy. I got boxes of stuff from the PLO. Lots of display materials and I remember being very careful in the display I mounted at the back of the classroom, to measure it all carefully so as to have a fifty-fifty split so that I wasn't seen as favouring one side or the other. And I was actually quite worried about parental pressure that somehow we were encouraging terrorism.

Allan's letters to the PLO and the Israeli embassy potentially speak of a lack of available resources to teach this recent historical content. He was inventive in his approach to acquiring new material, but he wasn't the only teacher to struggle to find suitable resources.[52]

By the mid-1980s, therefore, there was substantial choice available to history departments over what was taught to 14—16-year-olds and how that history was approached. For those choosing to offer CSE, there was a remarkable amount of autonomy given to schools in how to plan and assess at this level. For those teaching O-level, there was choice over both content and approach. The introduction of GCSE, first taught in 1986 and first examined in 1988, was intended to provide equal access for all students, rather than capping certain students at a lower qualification. Be that as it may, through the introduction of compulsory coursework and a major focus on evidential understanding, the introduction of GCSE can be seen to have disenfranchised the more

---

[52] David mentioned this above, that he was very keen to teach everything from primary resources, but that resourcing that was challenging. Patrick also mentions that he wanted to teach Mughal India, but found resourcing it too hard in this period.

traditional wing of history teachers. From 1986 'sourcework' would take a compulsory place within the history classroom, challenging the position of any grand narrative.

The experience of GCSE History

The General Certificate in Secondary Education (GCSE) was introduced in 1986 for first examination in 1988, replacing the split 14+ examination system of O-level and CSE. The Schools Council had recommended a common examination in 1976, but such was the 'caution among politicians' that GCSE was not introduced until 1986.[53] The examination included 20% coursework which was to be marked by individual teachers using levels-related criteria. It was intended to assess students, not only on their recall of historical knowledge, but also on their ability to 'evaluate and select knowledge' and 'deploy' it in a coherent form. Pupils were to be encouraged to empathise through the 'ability to look at events and issues from the perspective of people in the past'.[54]

In some parts of the history education community the introduction of the GCSE was a contentious decision, with dissent from certain more traditional teachers. Chris McGovern, head of history at Lewes Priory Comprehensive School in East Sussex, famously led a campaign to keep the O-level, and tried to subvert the final decision by offering tuition in the Scottish O-Grade history exam.[55] Two of the teachers involved in the dissent were sacked from the school, accused by their school governors of 'insubordination and mutiny.' In contrast, Phillips collated the findings of various surveys of teachers' views on GCSE in the early 1990s to conclude there was an overwhelmingly positive response to the changes which the GCSE had brought about.[56]

Considering the range of practice in history teaching in the mid-1980s, it was understandable that some teachers welcomed the move to GCSE more than others. Edward was one of the more traditional teachers described above in the pre-GCSE era.

---

[53] Keating and Sheldon, 11.
[54] Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*, 20.
[55] C. McGovern, "The Day East Sussex Became East Germany — When I Joined Thatcher in Predicting a GCSE Fiasco," http://www.conservativewoman.co.uk/chris-mcgovern-day-east-sussex-became-east-germany-joined-thatcher-predicting-gcse-fiasco/.
[56] Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*. R. Brown, "Teacher Perceptions of GCSE History Examinations - Responses to a Historical Association Survey," in *Teaching History* 55 (1989). For example, the report concluded that 'most respondents felt that the examination has been beneficial and successful as far as their students were concerned' (p.35) The respondents to this survey were readers of *Teaching History* which might have led to some bias in response.

For him, 'coursework was certainly a big change from the O-level.' Asked whether the introduction of GCSE changed how he taught, he answered:

> Yeah, I was very slow about that, I mean the source-based, evidence-based work was much more important than it was with the O-level, I mean the O-level that I taught was really about essay skills…

For others, such as Patrick, more orientated along SHP lines before the introduction of GCSE, there was less of a shock:

> GCSE was a change that I was very supportive of. [*Would you put that down to your SHP background?*] Yes and also I liked the idea of one exam for all students. I think history got it right in terms of being the only exam without tiers.

Patrick's earlier attempts to meet the needs of all his students were perhaps more easily achieved when they could all be entered for the same examination.

Some experienced the move to GCSE as a bigger leap than others. Simon described teaching socio-economic history for O-level and CSE and struggling with text-heavy textbooks which included topics like Jethro Tull and the seed drill. GCSE brought the opportunity for radical reinvention. For Simon's department, the introduction of GCSE coincided with a decision to change the content being taught to 14—16-year-olds. This involved a conversion to SHP under a new head of department, and Simon also seemed to have experienced it as a personal conversion. He described the situation in 1986:

> A new head of department being appointed and a new GCSE being started with SHP where we did medicine, modern China, a history around us study and the head of department was well into all this. Presumably he had done some of it before. It was a huge learning curve for me. I don't know how many schools would do this now, but you were given a topic to teach. So, I wasn't doing any medicine, but I was doing modern China. So, suddenly I was having to mug up on something I knew nothing about and suddenly it was like this is how we're going to do history now, with the head of department coming in and all his new ideas. And I think that sort of grounded me, if you like in the idea that history can be done in all sorts of different ways. Like in the old days you would, I mean I was taught very much from a textbook and you made notes and you went away and learnt it and wrote an exam. *[So, what was happening in your SHP lessons if it's not that?]* Well it wasn't that, it was very much using a lot more source material, looking at different types of reliability of sources, the type of thing that is now second nature to lots of history exams, so it was very different and I don't really remember being taught like that for my PGCE either.

All teachers would have had to make some changes when O-level and CSE specifications changed to GCSE. In Simon's case, however, the new policy led to a significant change in his department's approach to history teaching, far more so than with Patrick. Simon suggested that this particular period had longer term implications

for his own practice. Whereas up until this point he had been something of a pragmatist, using SHP resources alongside more traditional approaches, with the introduction of the SHP GCSE by the head of department, Simon came to associate himself as an SHP teacher.

The introduction of GCSE was one of the first examples within this 1985—2011 period of government prescription leading to changes at classroom level.[57] It is particularly interesting to note that it seemed to be the change in external assessment, from O-level to GCSE, that acted as the motivating agent for these significant changes. All of the topics and approaches Simon's department chose had been available before under the SHP banner, but the introduction of GCSE gave the opportunity for a radical rethink and provoked change. Simon's department didn't make these changes as a direct result of government policy. Yet it is clear that government policy, in the introduction of GCSE, provoked and prompted this change in approach. Simon was the not the only teacher to experience a shift in practice based on the introduction of the GCSE examination. A Historical Association survey of history teachers was conducted in July 1988 to explore the early impact of GCSE. It reported that the attitude of many of the respondents was characterised by this statement:

> Learning is definitely biased towards real understanding rather than the acquisition of a pile of detailed information.[58]

The report went on to state that 'the most obvious change in teaching strategies employed by respondents lay in the areas of the uses of evidence' and that though many schools had already adopted such an approach through SHP, the move had necessitated a 'less didactic and more "open" approach to teaching and learning'.[59] The introduction of GCSE therefore saw evidence-based approaches made compulsory for students over 14.

The only teacher within this sample who was explicitly negative about the move to GCSE was Laura. She did acknowledge the improvement in inclusion:

---

[57] Phillips has noted that the introduction of the GCSE saw the beginnings of the government's involvement in the debate over the teaching of history. Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*, 19.
[58] Brown, 34. The history teachers surveyed were all readers of *Teaching History*
[59] Ibid.

I think that in the early days the fact that all of them would take the same exam was good in some ways because you didn't really make the choice and if you entered some people for CSE in the past, it was almost saying something like you're only good enough for CSE, so I think GCSE made it less obvious.

However, Laura soon became disenchanted with the new qualification:

[It became] about the source rather than about the richness of the history and I think there was a big divide there. I think it became very boring for kids to do it and it lost for a time the interest of history… I think the Schools History had a real skills, source-based overkill…. I used to go back to Unstead and say read that chapter it will tell you what happens, it's really fun. You know, they loved it… I felt I think a bit anxious that I was doing about skills and they had no knowledge on which to pin it. It wasn't fun. It was boring going through sources. They didn't want that.[60]

Laura did not identify with being an SHP teacher before the introduction of GCSE or after. She had shown sympathy with the ethos of new history, integrating local history trips and bringing to prominence the voices of a variety of people in society through a focus on socio-economic history. However, she did not seem to make an easy transition to teaching GCSE History and she was not alone in her concerns. Worth has pointed to 'murmurs of mutiny among some teacher practitioners' in the early 1990s against 'certain (perhaps unintended) consequences of the SHP "evidence revolution"'.[61] Byrom in particular wanted students to read and build fuller syntheses rather than relying on isolated source 'exercises'.[62] Laura seemed to agree with this perspective, giving her students the narratives of Unstead to read instead of, or perhaps as a scaffold for, 'sourcework'. The phrase 'read that chapter, it will tell you what happens' could imply there had been little shift in Laura's epistemology from knowledge-transmission to knowledge-construction. It could also suggest, however, that she recognised the vacuum of substantive knowledge created by isolated 'sourcework' and wanted to fill that with a necessary narrative. For the first time with the introduction of GCSE, the nature of the knowledge in the history classroom was prescribed. Evidential understanding, known as 'sourcework' was at the heart of the new qualification. It was at this point that Laura found herself able to reflect on the previous autonomy that had been taken away:

---

[60] Laura was teaching the socio-economic GCSE rather than the SHP GCSE, but seems to equate GCSE, in its emphasis on sourcework at least, with SHP. Unstead was a prolific history textbook author writing from the 1950s to the 1980s. Haydn quotes a passage that summarises his narrative intentions. 'I have tried to describe simply the chief events and personalities in England's history.' T. Haydn, "The Changing Form and Use of Textbooks in the History Classroom in the 21st Century: A View from the Uk," in *Analysing History Textbooks: Methodological Issues, Yearbook of the International Society of History Didactics*, ed. S. Popp (Schwalbach: Wochenschau Verlag, 2011), 27.

[61] P. Worth, "Evidential Thinking: Language as Liberator and Gaoler," in *Masterclass in History Education: Transforming Teaching and Learning*, ed. C. Counsell, K. Burn, and A. Chapman (London: Bloomsbury, 2016), 82.

[62] J. Byrom, "Working with Sources: Scepticism or Cynicism? Putting the Story Back Together Again," *Teaching History* 91 (1998).

> I can see students now throughout my career that had CSE carried on that Mode 3 would have been far better than any GCSE that's done because how I would have arranged it.

It wasn't that Laura was opposed to the idea of working with sources in the history classroom, but she wanted to retain some autonomy in how she approached them. While that was theoretically possible, the fact that GCSE quickly became a high-stakes examination with the advent of league tables in 1992, meant teachers like Laura felt the need to spend time preparing students for the precise source requirements of the examination, taking time away from more innovative or potentially more authentic approaches.[63]

A further criticism of GCSE that reached the national newspaper headlines was the focus on empathy. The idea of empathy, seeking to understand the attitudes and ways of thinking of people in the past, was considered an important part of historical thinking. Indeed, Ashby and Lee concluded that 'the acquisition of a disposition to empathize and to understand why empathy matters is perhaps the most important task in the teaching of history.'[64] However, empathy tasks came to be seen as lacking a clear conceptual focus, especially where 'the distinction between historical imagination and literary invention became obscured.'[65] Laura recalled:

> And the other thing that has gone… it was empathy. You used to have everyday empathy and true empathy… At first it was 'Imagine you were…' and people were saying you can't imagine that,' but then it was 'how do you think a soldier would have felt?' It was part of the coursework. [66]

Allan was able to give a specific example of the empathy debate that related to his teaching. He recalled:

> There was a big controversy anyway about the introduction of GCSE…This controversy crystallized over empathy because the critics said that empathy epitomised all that was wrong about the teaching of the new history. And they particularly picked on a question in one of the exam papers that was on the Arab-Israeli conflict and they had asked students to imagine they were a PLO terrorist. It wasn't the greatest of questions and actually quite a lot of the exam boards went in for this 'imagine you were…' sort of approach which seemed to suggest that students

---

[63] This theme of teaching towards the GCSE examination is explored further in Chapter 7.

[64] E. A. Yeager and S. J. Foster, "The Role of Empathy in the Development of Historical Understanding," in *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies*, eds O.L. Davis, E.A.Yeager and S.J.Foster (Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001), 17.

[65] R Harris, K Burn, and M.C. Woolley, eds, *The Guided Reader to Teaching and Learning History* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013), 163.

[66] In 1993 I took GCSE History and for my coursework I visited Ypres and the First World War battlefields. The assessed question I answered was 'How did it feel to be a soldier in the trenches of the First World War?'

didn't need any sort of historical knowledge at all, that they were just going to let their imagination run riot.

Allan chose to pick up on the place of historical knowledge here, and how, in the settings of some examination boards, it seemed to have been replaced by letting 'their imagination run riot.' This could be considered as part of a broader movement away from the dominance of detailed substantive knowledge present in the O-level examination.

For some departments though, like Simon's, GCSE was an opportunity. There was the possibility of mediating and moulding this new qualification, that some found threatening, to suit certain students and contexts. William, always keen to teach a more diverse view of the past, found a historically appropriate place for empathy in a coursework role-play:

> It was very much about exactly what angle would the individuals, Malcolm X or George Wallace have taken on the Civil Rights Act. It was debating the Civil Rights Bill, the Kennedy administration's idea of putting forward a Civil Rights Bill. And it was videoed and it was interesting, it became an event for the students… I carried it into my new school and we were doing it through the 90s. We were still doing that role play as part of coursework up to about 1995 and then you couldn't any more as the exam board changed the regs [regulations]….Initially the exam board said you could present the assessment in a range of ways, so we were able to acknowledge the debate, the actual live debate. You could credit the students for their participation in the discussion. So not just their speech, but the way that they interacted with the other people. Their response, in role, to the other people, reflected their understanding of the issues. We used to send the video to the moderator, and they accepted it, they never questioned it…They were mixed ability classes and everybody took part.

Here William and his department took a topic they were passionate about, the American Civil Rights movement, and found a place for it within the first GCSE specification, first taught in 1986. Beyond that, they integrated the need to show a development of empathy by students performing a role-play, getting into character and sharing how their particular character would have related to the idea of a Civil Rights Bill. Here, empathy was more than an exercise in imagination as the role-play would have demanded substantial contextual knowledge about the period, the politics and the particular individuals. While Laura feared a certain emptiness in GCSE teaching around this time, William took the opportunities provided and created a rigorous assessment.

Some, such as Chris McGovern, might have argued that GCSE was the beginning of a slippery slope which marked the demise of rich, contextual, substantive knowledge in the history classroom.[67] The story at classroom level was not so simple, however. It depended on what specification was being taught before and after the new curriculum and how closely teachers were choosing to teach to such specifications. Where 'source' papers came into existence for some, 'knowledge' papers continued to exist. GCSE was, in effect, an examination for the dual practice generation. There was the freedom in the mid-1980s to have little focus on learning substantive historical knowledge in the classroom. While exercises such as Mark Pullen may even, unintentionally, have encouraged such practice, the teachers in this sample do not seem to have pursued such a path. Equally, it was probably possible to keep a knowledge-rich classroom after the introduction of GCSE, but it would not have been possible to leave out evidential skills, as it was before.

The level of change experienced by teachers at the introduction of GCSE often appeared to depend on their prior experience. For Allan and Patrick, ardent, long-term supporters of SHP by this point, GCSE ushered in few changes. For Simon, with a new head of department, this point was remembered as a big shift in practice and an opportunity for learning. More traditional teachers such as Edward, and even Laura, perceived a larger and more uncomfortable shift in practice at the inception of the GCSE. William, however, showed his ability to accommodate the new qualification into his own personal agenda of teaching more Black and African history. For all history teachers, however, the introduction of the GCSE was a significant turning-point in terms of autonomy. It was no longer possible to opt out of an evidential approach in teaching history to students beyond the age of 14. Due to the universal nature of the GCSE qualification, external examination boards now had significant power to influence both historical content and approaches to teaching.

Collaboration

One very positive aspect of this period of history teaching was the opportunity for teachers to work with Local Education Authority (LEA) history advisors and collaborate on planning with other teachers. The teachers were unanimous in supporting

---

[67] C. McGovern, interview by Nicola Sheldon, 28 August 2009.

this development, quite nostalgically, and suggested that this level of support had disappeared quite quickly in the early 1990s. Several teachers talked about going away on residential weekends with other teachers from their LEA. Teacher development centres were set up with this in mind. Allan described the sessions run by the history advisor from the LEA:

> What we had at E— was a nice mixture. We had some sessions that were like workshop sessions. We had some sessions where teachers were actually working together, preparing materials to use in the classroom. There were some local history materials… So there was that going on and then we'd also have our keynote speakers — these top national figures on our doorstep talking to us so Chris Culpin, Ian Dawson… .

Allan dated such sessions as between 1988 and 1992, so very supportive of early versions of the GCSE examinations and the introduction of the National Curriculum. Patrick spoke of similar sessions, but located them in the 1980s. He recalled:

> CPD was really good both in B—shire and S— and it did depend on the local network.[68] We had the local advisor who in B—shire was a very dynamic woman. We'd even go away for the weekend… to share ideas, to share best practice really. We weren't in anything like such a competitive environment. The same thing happened in E—. Certain areas were marginalised and others didn't even know each other existed. But a lot of the schools in the area would actually work together and share good practice. And we didn't see ourselves as competing with the school half a mile away. If we could help we would, and if they could help us they would.

Both teachers here gave examples of teacher-to-teacher sharing and preparation of resources across schools. The teachers themselves were treated as experts in planning, with the role of the local advisor to organise and support. It is noticeable that, although the meetings of teachers would have been across a range of schools from the locality, the experts mentioned by Allan were key figures in the SHP community.

These communities outside the school were also seen as an opportunity to gather new resources and become more expert in new areas. For Laura, teacher meetings were an opportunity to collect ideas on local history:

> We had local meetings of history teachers quite a lot. I think that is lost. I think there are now a lot of meetings within schools to discuss teaching but we used to meet a lot with local schools and talk about what we were doing and how we were doing it…We thought [the LEA history advisor] was marvellous. He would know all sorts, like really good local history. 'If you want to go round M— I've done a pack.' So there

---

[68] CPD, or Continuing Professional Development, referred to any development opportunities teachers encountered beyond their initial training.

was that aspect, and people would share trips that had worked well and maybe the curriculum.

Laura felt it was important to share the value of such community meetings. Mark also reminisced about the quality of such local meetings, but chose to describe the national conferences that he would attend, praising in particular those which put history academics at the fore. He recalled:

> The Historical Association, with its summer schools and its annual conference in the spring, they were fixed events on my calendar and I would go to a summer school. In 1992 there was one at Sheffield, where of course the great man himself was running a course, Ian Kershaw. All the work came straight back to here, and we taught bang up to date interpretations of the topic, couldn't be better. The year before I think, I went to Exeter. We were doing nineteenth century political history and there was an expert on Disraeli, Peel, and I brought all that stuff back

In these examples Mark particularly valued the up-to-date knowledge of historical scholarship that he gained at such conferences. Some of the teachers spoke of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) opportunities offered by agencies outside the school or local authority such as museums or examination boards. Patrick remembered a course back in the 1980s that had some impact on the way he approached content selection in the history classroom:

> Some where you come away and think that's a really, really good idea. I did a long course one year… shortly after the Swann Report[69] came out on multiculturalism, and we went and visited schools in Haringey and that sort of thing. It certainly influenced my practice and became part of the way I looked at curriculum planning, trying to build in some of those elements, the Black British experience or that sort of thing… trying to make sure it wasn't just slavery all the time…this is where the idea of doing stuff like India first came from [*In the '80s?*] Yeah, but then it sort of disappeared before it really got going.

Here Patrick is clear that at least some of the CPD he attended in the 1980s affected his practice. A large proportion of the teachers interviewed raised the importance of such courses at this early point in their career. It is also clear that there was provision at both a local and national level for subject-specific development courses and that teachers could opt into the courses that they preferred according to their own choice.

There was one counter-example to this general narrative of autonomy and collaboration in the pre-National Curriculum era. William described how, in the particular LEA he

---

[69] DES, "Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups," (London: HMSO, 1985).

was working in, he felt a direct challenge to his autonomy.

> In B— in the '80s, there was a lot of direct challenge to people through INSET activities [in-service training], but it was kind of challenge matched with a very strong sense of surveillance, so actually these were things that you had to do, you had to change, and that's probably the, that experience of the '80s is probably the strongest sense of change with surveillance that I've experienced as a teacher, far stronger than the National Curriculum changes. There was a very strong sense of you were being watched, prior to Ofsted

In the second interview, William expanded on this experience:

> In the late '80s there are things coming out of ILEA[70] and the anti-racism movement. [*Why is ILEA doing that in the '80s?*] It's the whole anti-racism movement. It was disproportionately powerful in different boroughs… each time I moved it seemed like the new borough I was in was at the same point as the one I had joined before….[*You talked about a lot of direct challenge to your practice that was matched with a strong sense of surveillance*] So it wasn't passive aggressive, it was aggressive. It was very forthright and it was very in your face. Someone might say something in a lesson – it might be a throwaway remark, but it could be reported to someone. A teacher might say, oh, I'm not that interested in African history (well you might as well say I'm not that interested in Russian history), but that would be reported to a senior teacher or a senior inspector might pick up on that. People felt they couldn't really say anything. You had to be very guarded. And sometimes some of the materials and some of the things being produced were really not very high quality, but you couldn't criticise them. It would be expected that you did follow through with certain things… It was the inspectors. There was a unit established within the borough. A couple of people from that unit were attached to each school. And they didn't necessarily always teach, but they would be advising people how to teach

William therefore experienced a very particular form of prescription well before the other teachers interviewed in this research. It seems to have been quite particular to certain inner-city boroughs at the time.

Aside from William's less typical experience, the 1980s appear to have been a relatively liberal time in educational terms in comparison with later years. Teachers were free to make planning decisions about content and pedagogy, and they were supported and encouraged in those decisions through a network of local authority advisors and the availability of both historical and educational expertise. Patrick's point about a collaborative, rather than a competitive culture appeared strikingly evident. Teachers had nothing to lose and everything to gain from sharing their resources and planning ideas with the schools down the road. In this way expertise in history teaching could be shared and valued and encouraged. Laura made a powerful contrast between

---

[70] ILEA was the Inner London Education Authority

this outward collaboration and the later tendency for teachers to meet within schools. In the former system it was history teachers meeting together and sharing practice, building and sharing disciplinary knowledge. Different teachers might have taken part in different professional networks with different expectations. Mark was looking for historical scholarship whereas Laura was looking for resources. Nevertheless, both of them desired subject-specific support. The role of the LEA history advisor is worthy of note here. Before the creation of Ofsted he or she acted as a helpful facilitator. This role became more difficult to achieve in the post-1992 accountability age.

Conclusion

In 1989, Richard Brown summarised history teachers' responses to a survey about the new GCSE examination. He concluded that 'educational change is always difficult to implement successfully' and pointed to the experience of SHP, suggesting it showed that 'curriculum development is a slow process' and 'teachers have been strung out wide apart along the "learning curve.".'[71] Both of these points were supported by the memories of history teachers in this research. A wide variety of practice was evident in their memories of teaching in the 1980s. Different teachers had different approaches and attitudes towards the 'new history'. However, by 1990, with the introduction of GCSE, it was evident that there had been a marked shift for all the teachers interviewed. Not only was the government, with the advent of GCSE, now fully involved in the world of history education, but teachers had lost the freedom to opt-out of evidential approaches to the subject.

All told, the future for school history looked positive. In 1991, Aldrich and Dean signed off their summary of the history of history education with the conclusion that the 1988 Education Reform Act had begun the process of 'rescuing' history from its 'parlous state' by making it a foundation subject across the age range of compulsory schooling.[72] The evidential approach of SCHP was embedded in the GCSE examination. Teachers at this point still retained autonomy over the younger secondary students. Fears were, however, growing over what the National Curriculum would bring. Its introduction and development will be the focus of the next chapter.

---

[71] Brown, 35.
[72] Aldrich and Dean, 110.

Chapter 6   Enacting the National Curriculum

The Education Reform Act of 1988 brought about the introduction of a National Curriculum. The Reform Act was far from popular, with Chitty suggesting that 'it attracted more bitter and widespread opposition than any piece of legislation passed since the introduction of the NHS.'[1] The history curriculum was contested with the personal involvement of the Prime Minister, Margaret Thatcher, well documented.[2] With the appointment of a rather traditional History Working Group, the teaching community expressed some fears about the content and assessment structures that might be imposed on them.[3] There were some problems from the outset in terms of implementation, particularly in terms of 'the overwhelmingly overloaded content' and 'the difficulties of the assessment stages and targets.'[4] However, Bowe et al. have suggested that the very language of 'implementation' was used to make the process of introducing a curriculum appear simple. They argued that in reality there was 'a complex and sophisticated process of accommodation' between the National Curriculum texts and existing assumptions.'[5]

This chapter seeks to extend the broadly chronological narrative begun in the preceding chapter, starting with the introduction of the National Curriculum in 1991. It explores the extent to which history teachers found their practice was becoming prescribed and to understand how they enacted these curriculum changes. Examples of teacher autonomy or teacher mediation of policy in this period will be highlighted. While prescription may well have increased across the period, this was not a simple, linear process. A complex picture emerges of where prescription came from and how history teachers experienced and responded to the prescription. Some teachers feared the restrictions of content in the Programme of Study; some had their own pre-existing professional agenda to realise and feared the National Curriculum would impede those personal goals; a small minority minimised the impact of the National Curriculum and focused only on the changes in assessment. For each of these groups the process of accommodation was different. This chapter considers the impact of the National Curriculum on history

---

[1] Chitty, 51.
[2] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon; Phillips, History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics.
[3] See Phillips, pp. 54-6.
[4] Cannadine, Keating, and Sheldon, 199.
[5] Bowe, Ball and Gold, 88.

teachers through a consideration first of content, then historical approach, then finally assessment.

Autonomy before the National Curriculum

Several commentators have pointed to the comparative autonomy that teachers enjoyed before the introduction of the National Curriculum. Gleeson and Gunter suggest a period of 'relative autonomy' from the 1960s to the mid-1980s, compared to a 'controlled autonomy' in the 1980s—1990s and a 'productive autonomy' from 2000 onwards.[6] Phillips quotes Dale in articulating a shift from 'licensed' to 'regulated' autonomy.[7] In his 1991 study of 180 history teachers and 21 heads of history, Phillips found that a major concern was that the National Curriculum would undermine autonomy. He quoted one head of department in particular who found her perception of her own importance and her sense of job satisfaction was defined in terms of her ability 'to determine her choice of curriculum.'[8] In his later book on the introduction of the History National Curriculum, however, Phillips argued for the importance of teachers' *perceived* autonomy during this period, suggesting that professional autonomy with regard to the selection of historical content was connected with creating the 'chemistry' for effective learning.[9]

Significantly, the teachers interviewed in this research project, looking back over twenty-five years of teaching, felt they had more opportunities to act as autonomous professionals at the beginning of their careers, in the late 1970s and early 1980s, than after the introduction of the National Curriculum in 1991. This early autonomy related to content, pedagogy and, to some extent, choice of examination. All the teachers interviewed put some level of personal hallmark on their choice of historical content or pedagogy in this early period, whether through visits to the local church or inclusion of particular topics or schools of history. A small, but significant, number of the teachers interviewed, including Patrick and William, went a step further, taking their own school contexts as inspiration for selecting particular historical topics. The introduction of

---

[6] Gleeson and Gunter, 142.

[7] R. Dale, *The State and Education Policy* (Open University Press, 1989), 38.quoted in Phillips, "National Curriculum History and Teacher Autonomy: The Major Challenge," 21.

[8] Ibid., 22.

[9] Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*. See also Haydn, T. (1993) "The chemistry of history lessons, teacher autonomy and the reform of National Curriculum History," in *Welsh Historian,* 22, 7-10.

SCHP approaches and resources showed that history teachers and history departments in the 1970s and early 1980s had autonomy over what history was taught and also how that history was defined and conceptualised. While such decisions may have been made partly in response to the availability of resources and in the interest of student engagement, these teachers had the freedom to define the purpose and sense of progression within school history. There was room for professional choice, multiple approaches and subject-specific support in the form of the local authority history advisor. Significantly, assessment before the age of 16 was not mentioned by any of the teachers in discussions about teaching before 1991. While external examinations for 16-year-olds were discussed by most participants, assessment leading up to such exams or further down the school was simply not raised in discussions of teaching in the 1980s. This is significant, as when assessment was raised in discussions of practice after 2000, it typically came to dominate the discourse.

Enacting the first National Curriculum

The National Curriculum for history was introduced for first teaching, to Year 7 only, in September 1991, three years after the 1988 Education Act announced its creation. It was not a popular document.[10] When the detailed documents arrived in schools they were presented in large white folders with purple print. As the document set out on page 1, 'The Programmes of Study specify the matters, skills and processes which are required to be taught to students.'[11] From the inception of the National Curriculum the teacher was conceived of as a compliant practitioner who was expected to teach that which was 'required' by the new curriculum mandates.

Among the teachers interviewed for this study, there was the sense that the National Curriculum wasn't popular, but that it was tolerated. Eleven of the thirteen teachers interviewed were teaching in the classroom in 1991, with six working as heads of history.[12] When Patrick was asked how his department had responded to the first

---

[10] See Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State*, pp.115-7.
[11] DES, "History in the National Curriculum (England)," (London: HMSO, 1991), 1.
[12] Although Dana was teaching in 1991 and experienced the introduction of the National Curriculum, she was teaching English. She began teaching history in 1993. By 1991 David was working as an LEA advisor. Richard and Diane were teaching history, but Richard's school was 13+ until around 2000 so the National Curriculum had less impact and Diane returned from maternity leave in 1991 to be a part-time history teacher.

version of the National Curriculum he replied, 'Not positively, not positively, we didn't like it, no.' He was consistent with this in the second interview:

> None of us liked it. One of our main criticisms of it was, we felt that it was being imposed, but we felt all schools weren't the same and that therefore the same curriculum wasn't necessarily appropriate for all schools.

Patrick was particularly disturbed by the uniformity of the curriculum. He had created a bespoke history curriculum offer for the female students in his single-sex school when the document was published. He was not ready to concede that they would benefit from learning the same selection of historical topics as every other school in the country.

Emerging from a context of autonomy in choices of content and pedagogy in the 1980s, the introduction of a National Curriculum in 1991 was a major turning-point in terms of prescription. The very word 'prescribed' was used by several of the teachers interviewed. As Allan succinctly put it, 'for the first time schools were being told by government *diktat* what topics to teach in Years 7 to 9.' Patrick elaborated on this:

> I can see it as a turning-point. It was the first time really that you had any sort of prescription outside those laid down by the exam boards... I do remember because I was head of department at the time it came in. We had to do an awful lot of planning and an awful lot of work, it created all sorts of issues in resources...When it was introduced we had this massive ring binder which was so detailed, it was so prescriptive, particularly in terms of content but also in terms of how it had to be taught, that very soon turned out to be utterly impractical.

Patrick clearly resented the imposition of the National Curriculum in 1991, perhaps particularly because he was so proud of the innovative curriculum he had already developed in his own department. Other teachers were less passionate in their emotions, but still clearly shocked. Nicholas remembered the restriction of autonomy:

> You could do basically anything you wanted before the National Curriculum. Suddenly, bang, you've got teacher assessment, this is prescribed, you must do this… It was kind of a culture shock.

Simon agreed, emphasising the new division in content between primary school and secondary school history, 'no Greeks, no Vikings, no Egyptians, and it was very prescriptive.' For some teachers the dislike of the National Curriculum mandates stemmed from the amount of detail prescribed. As Nicholas put it, 'there was always the knowledge that the National Curriculum was unworkable.' Although the interviews were carried out twenty years after the initial National Curriculum was introduced, the shock at this imposition still carried in the voices of these teachers. Unlike the

introduction of GCSE, where only Laura had stated disapproval of the focus on evidential work, this was a larger group of irritated voices that came from across the continuum of history education.

The National Curriculum Programme of Study set out a detailed list of topics to be taught with five Core Study Units and three Supplementary Study Units.[13] A detailed assessment framework was also set out which, by division into 'Attainment Targets' for evidence, causation and interpretations could have had a great deal of impact on the way teachers approached the historical content.[14] However, the majority of participants, in talking about how the introduction of the National Curriculum changed their practice, chose to talk about the extent of change in the content they covered. Despite the opportunities for new content in the Supplementary Study Units such as 'Black Peoples of the Americas' or 'Mughal India,' the prominent language used to talk about the content of the National Curriculum in 1991 was one of restriction or loss. Diane summarised this view:

> I would say that the National Curriculum has restricted it because you had far more choice over picking what you did [before it was introduced].

Several teachers chose to highlight, like Simon, the shift of several ancient civilisations to the primary school history curriculum. Alison said:

> We used to do ancient civilisations for Year 7, you know, Ancient Greece, Ancient Egypt... Ancient Rome that got cut down to just Ancient Rome. We used to spend some time looking at the Celts and Celtic Britain and that's gone so we just do a 'what is history?' course, which we put together, then we go into Ancient Rome, Roman Britain, and then there's a gap between the Black Death and 1485 that we don't cover at all.

Although the list of potential topics in the Key Stage 3 Programme of Study was actually quite wide-ranging (and certainly more wide-ranging than the previous schemes of work teachers had described), most of these teachers chose to remember the introduction of the National Curriculum as a period of limitation.[15]

---

[13] DES, "History in the National Curriculum (England)."
[14] Ibid.
[15] There were nineteen supplementary study units included in the original Key Stage 3 Programme of Study. These included Castles and Cathedrals, 1066-1500; Culture and society in Ireland from early times to the beginning of the twentieth century; The Neolithic Revolution and Black Peoples of the Americas: 16th to early 20th centuries.

When the teachers interviewed had talked about teaching experiences during the 1970s and 1980s, time restrictions were not mentioned as an issue. Suddenly, for the teachers in the sample, the implementation of the National Curriculum led to a feeling that there wasn't enough time to fit everything in. When Alison was asked why she ended local history and visits to local churches after 1991 she replied:

> Because the National Curriculum doesn't really allow it and you have to race to get through things. If you're lucky you can give them a sense of chronology before you miss out a couple of hundred years and whizz on to the [next thing].

Diane gave a similar impression, that once the National Curriculum arrived, she felt a need to comply and fit everything in:

> Well when we started. .. I can remember when I first started teaching [in 1978] I used to miss great bits out if I didn't think it would be that interesting. Whereas you can't now. You go through it all regardless.

If 'it' can be taken to refer to the National Curriculum it is clear that Diane felt that she had more autonomy to select and omit content before 1991. Nicholas was quite explicit about not being able to fit the demands of the curriculum into the time allocated for it. He recalled:

> Back in 1991, one of the first jobs that I did when I came as a trainee teacher, once I got the job, was to do a Roman Empire unit, or Roman Britain booklet for the then head of department, because that's what we were going to lead off with. Year 7 was Roman Britain and then we did 1066 half-way through the year. Well, that meant that you would have needed to still be teaching the National Curriculum in Year 10 to get to whatever it was at the other end.

The first version of the National Curriculum included more content than the History Working Group initially intended. The Programme of Study was designed for history as a compulsory subject until the age of 16.[16] The last-minute decision to make history optional after 14 put new pressures on content-coverage for the history community and that pressure was remembered by many of the history teachers interviewed, twenty years later.

While a general disgruntlement with the implementation was shared among all the teachers interviewed, with unanimous concerns over limitations of time and complexities of assessment, there was a diversity in how the teachers responded to those challenges. Several possible groups can tentatively be identified here. Alison and Diane

---

[16] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon.

form the first group, compliant with the letter of the curriculum and therefore frustrated. The extracts from interviews above include the phrases 'you can't now' and 'the National Curriculum doesn't really allow it.' The curriculum became the reason behind limitations in practice. A second group could tentatively be identified in Mark, Edward and Laura. They each downplayed the impact of the National Curriculum on their teaching. Mark said:

> I wasn't opposed to the National Curriculum as such, I didn't have any kind of great concerns about what it did and I thought it was very well sort of prepared in lots of ways… I mean, there's no question that we haven't done it, we haven't subverted the National Curriculum or anything like that.

Mark tolerated the introduction of the National Curriculum; he was compliant, but unlike the first group, he did not appear frustrated by its demands. Edward also downplayed the impact of the policy:

> In terms of content, it wasn't like some people predicted that we were teaching all this amazing stuff pre-National Curriculum and then suddenly we have to do what we're told…. I think they do need the history of the British Isles, so we were always teaching that anyway. We dropped certain things like Anglo-Saxon Britain I can remember doing that when I first started, so we moved it…, but you know the Roman Empire in Year 7, 1066 and all that, the kids liked that in Year 7 and they still do.

A sense of continuity emerges here among these teachers; that the National Curriculum did not have a fundamental impact on teaching. Laura, in struggling to remember the changes inherent in the curriculum, also finds a place in this group.

There was, however, a third group of teachers. Their practice was not fundamentally changed by the introduction of the National Curriculum, but they were somehow more vociferous in their concerns and claimed to be more proactive in mediating the curriculum to suit their personal agenda. Allan, Patrick and William all spoke about how prescriptive they felt the National Curriculum was, and yet then continued to describe how they found a way to accommodate the topics they wanted to teach.

Allan was one example of this proactive accommodation. At first he was concerned that his department could no longer teach the Aztecs as the topic had moved to the primary school curriculum. Allan recalled:

> I remember one topic that we did here in Year 8. We always did a topic on European voyages of exploration. And then we did a unit looking at the impact of the arrival of

> Europeans in a certain part of the world and the topic that we always did here had some very good resources was Cortes and the Aztecs – which of course the National Curriculum made a Key Stage 2 topic. So, for a couple of years we sort of did transitional arrangements because we weren't allowed to teach the Aztecs anymore, so what were we going to do? For a couple of years we taught the Aztecs and the Incas and we built up resources until the Incas gradually took over from the Aztecs. So that's one example of where we dealt with the change in content.

Instead of letting this directive restrict the curriculum offer, Allan found another, similar topic in the Incas and gradually planned that civilization into the schemes of work. It satisfied his desire to teach students about a South American civilisation; it meant more work in the creation of resources, but it enabled compliance with the curriculum policy. Allan had forged a compromise between the restrictions of the National Curriculum and his own definitions of school history. It may be something about the way Allan framed his memories of this period, but unlike Alison and Diane in the first group, he wasn't going to let his frustrations with the new curriculum stand in the way of the historical content he believed was important.

Patrick and William provided similar examples of accommodation, finding a way to continue topics that they were passionate about before 1991. Patrick believed his previous bespoke schemes of work, focusing in particular on women's history, were curtailed by the imposition of the National Curriculum. He recalled:

> When it first came in, it specified what topics you had to teach and it specified the content that had to be included in that, and it [their previous version of women's history] didn't really fit. I think we still did do a bit of the suffragettes, but also when you had to get through so much more, you couldn't fit everything in. I felt at the time of the National Curriculum we actually lost quite a lot of good teaching because we had topics and we had schemes of work that worked really, really well and got the students really engaged and it might be quite a long-term thing. With the National Curriculum you had to do that topic in three lessons...we had no choice but to comply really, but …we tried to bend it as much as we could to what we wanted.

Patrick did display frustration here, and a reluctant compliance but took a step further than Alison and Diane in suggesting that his department 'bent' or mediated the curriculum to suit their own agenda. Unlike Alison and Diane, he was not passively accepting of limitations. Although the policy was seen as prescriptive, it was possible to be pliant in response to that policy. Patrick and his department had the space, autonomy and confidence to use existing materials and ideas within the framework of the new curriculum.

At the same time, William was teaching in a multi-cultural setting and, like Patrick, was keen that the curriculum taught in his department should reflect the makeup of the school cohort in order to heighten engagement and provide a more rigorous historical experience. By 1991 he had already developed a series of lessons teaching African history. He was concerned about the prescription in content of the National Curriculum, but seemed to have been able to navigate a way through it. He reminisced:

> I remember with the National Curriculum coming out, I remember fretting for months thinking, are they going to destroy the opportunity of doing this multicultural history? Because there was all sorts of talk that this was going to happen and what, what it was going to be like... and being so relieved when the report came out because they had a unit, Black peoples of the Americas. I'm thinking OK. And it's not so prescriptive that you can't build in African empires here as well as slavery, you can do that. And so one of the first things I did at S— when I went there, and it's twenty years ago this autumn, was I started with Year 9. I did a unit on Black peoples from Africa to America and it started with the empire of Ghana and Mali, and then we went into the slave triangle and went to the Caribbean and so forth. And I remember plucking up the courage to tell the headteacher what I was doing at this point. We were walking, he would take a customary walk around the grounds sometimes… and I started to tell him a little bit and he said 'yeah, it's all very well but uh, don't do too much of it.' That was his comment.

The teaching of African empires was something that William felt passionately about and it was a freedom that he had fought for in the 1980s.[17] Here he saw the opportunity to squeeze African history into a relevant supplementary unit. Like Patrick, he had some initial anxiety about the level of prescription, but he found a way to teach the topics that were important to him and his community. Somehow, he had the professional confidence to make that decision. It was noticeable, however, that William did seem to feel the need to include his headteacher; informing him of the decision rather than requesting permission.

While there was an overarching sense of discontent and frustration concerning the imposition of the National Curriculum, teachers appear to have responded in different ways. Where Alison and Diane were compliant and shared their frustrations, teachers such as Allan, Patrick and William chose to share a more confident narrative of how, despite their frustrations, they had managed to accommodate their own agenda within the constrictions of the National Curriculum.

---

[17] See chapter 5 for details of this period and the surveillance experienced by William.

The 1991 Programme of Study was more than a list of topics. Content had not been the only contentious issue in the debates of the History Working Group and the Final Report rejected an Attainment Target specifically concerned with knowledge.[18] On the contrary, the three Attainment Targets in the document set out a clear, but controversial philosophy of progression which was quite removed from the acquisition of knowledge, yet the general concern among teachers in relation to the document seems to have been about content and 'fitting it all in.' This conception of the National Curriculum as a new model of progression from its inception in 1991 was rarely mentioned by the teachers interviewed. Mark made passing reference:

> Well I think the National Curriculum endeavoured to provide a structure, which does contain some idea of progression and was in its first incarnation content-rich.

Here was a teacher who seemed to understand the dual purpose of the curriculum, and again showed he was quite positive about its inception. As quite a traditional teacher, his choice of language is worth noting. Mark uses 'content-rich' where others, perhaps focused on limitations of time to cover everything in the document, implied it was 'content-heavy.'

The exception to this general focus on content, however, was Simon, who took the introduction of the National Curriculum in 1991 as an opportunity for completely reforming practice. He chose to highlight the introduction of the National Curriculum as one of the headline changes over the course of his career. He moved to a new school in 1991 and was responsible for setting up the new schemes of work. Simon recalled:

> In '91, I did that with a bit of help from somebody else but pretty much it was me, and the old programme of study [1991 version] was very rigorous…, with all those Attainment Targets and all those Levels and all those statements I remember at the time thinking it was very prescriptive.

He substantiated this in the second interview, emphasising again the coherent nature of his planning, integrating the Attainment Targets with the content demands of the Programme of Study.

> I was very much a one man band, so I pretty much wrote the whole scheme of work and used the NC Attainment Targets to try to fit everything together. And I'm sure I made loads of mistakes because I didn't really have anyone to bounce off.

---

[18] J. Slater, "History in the National Curriculum: The Final Report of the History Working Group," in *History in the National Curriculum*, ed. R Aldrich (London: Kogan Page, 1991).

Simon was motivated by the introduction of the National Curriculum to revise his approach to the subject as well as his choice of content, comparing a 'title' approach pre-curriculum to a 'key question' approach post-curriculum. He recalled:

> I mean obviously the government with the National Curriculum changes made you think about your practice and think about your schemes of work. I think probably schemes of work prior to the National Curriculum were very much like titles, you know, we're doing the Romans this term, but you know I think probably the National Curriculum made you think about how you were going to do the Romans…I remember thinking you know, how would you set out a scheme of work, so, we have things like key questions. There might be six boxes at the top, key question, description of lesson, or, suggestion for lesson, because obviously I was never a head of department who wanted to dictate, you know what I mean?

Where the use of titles might have encouraged a transmission of knowledge, the key question would have inspired an enquiry-led approach. It might be that Simon had particular freedoms and particular motivations here; starting in a new job and a new school as head of department he had a motive to innovate. This approach to the subject, using key questions and promoting evidential understanding, would not have been new to Simon. He previously stood out from other teachers interviewed in talking about how the introduction of GCSE had changed the practice of his previous department. Using an SHP approach at GCSE would have introduced him to the idea of planning around enquiry questions and key concepts. The introduction of the National Curriculum (along with a new job) gave him the momentum to expand this practice to a younger age group at Key Stage 3 and embed it firmly within departmental schemes of work.

In the space of five years, from 1986 to 1991, the entire 11—16 history curriculum had become prescribed, with the introduction of, first, GCSE courses for 14—16-year-olds and then a National Curriculum for 11-14 year olds. There was still some room for manoeuvre and mediation within these policy frameworks, but teachers generally viewed them as prescriptive and restrictive. History teachers responded to the challenge of the National Curriculum in different ways. These are summarised in Figure 7 before being explored further below.

Figure 7: Suggested groupings of teachers according to relationship with the National Curriculum in 1991

Compliant with the letter of the National Curriculum and frustrated by perceived constrictions	Alison, Diane
Downplayed the impact of the National Curriculum on their teaching	Mark, Edward, Laura
Proactive in mediating the National Curriculum to suit personal agenda	Allan, Patrick, William
Took introduction of National Curriculum as an opportunity to reform own practice	Simon
Not included in this categorisation[19]	David, Nicholas, Dana and Richard

A distinct group of professionally confident teachers emerged here in response to those changes. Those teachers such as William, Patrick and Allan who designed innovative ways to approach historical content before the National Curriculum were the same teachers who found ways to mediate the prescriptive Programme of Study. Simon, a more recent SHP convert, used the inception of the National Curriculum as a positive turning point for him and his department. For Diane and Alison, who perhaps provided a less nuanced articulation of school history in the 1980s, the National Curriculum was presented as more of a frustration that needed to be complied with. Bowe and Ball, writing in 1992, suggested that the context and background of teachers affected a difference in the way they responded to, or enacted, curriculum texts. They wrote:

> Low capacity, low commitment and no history of innovation results in a high degree of reliance upon policy texts, external direction and advice, which in some circumstances verges on panic or leads to high uncertainty and confusion and a sense of threat…high capacity, high commitment and a history of innovation may provide a basis for a greater sense of autonomy and writerliness with regard to policy texts, a greater willingness to interpret texts in the light of previous practice and a greater likelihood therefore of 'reconciliation' and 'mutation'[20]

Alison and Diane, with little history of innovation before 1991, can be seen to have responded to the introduction of the National Curriculum with a high degree of reliance on the text and some sense of threat if they were not to comply. Allan, Simon, Patrick

---

[19] David became an LEA advisor in 1991. Nicholas began teaching in 1991 and Dana began teaching history in the UK in 1992, so their reaction to the National Curriculum is not included. Richard's school was 13+ entry at this point, meaning the National Curriculum had less initial impact on his practice.
[20] Bowe, Ball and Gold, 118.

and William, with evidence of commitment and innovation before 1991, can be seen to have interpreted the National Curriculum in the light of their previous practice and therefore reconciled themselves to the policy in a more constructive, confident fashion.

Further programmes of study 1994-2008

The Dearing Review of the National Curriculum, published in 1995, for first teaching to all three years of Key Stage 3 in 1995, led to less prescribed content but such content was still expected to be taught in broadly chronological order.[21] From 2000 the Programme of Study for History was more flexible and specifically encouraged the use of overview and depth to cover a range of content.[22] In their 2003 review of eight history departments, Husbands, Kitson and Pendry found that the 2000 version of the National Curriculum was met with a mixed, though broadly positive response in schools as prescription was reduced and departments and teachers were left to interpret terms like 'major features' and 'significant events' as they saw fit.[23] While a thematic approach was theoretically possible from 2000, from 2008 this approach to the past was strongly encouraged in the National Curriculum Programme of Study.[24] The 2007 document suggested, 'The study of history should be taught through a combination of overview, thematic and depth studies.'[25] It continued in this broad and overarching style:

> The choice of content should ensure that all students can identify and understand the major events, changes and developments in British, European and world history covering at least the medieval, early modern, industrial and twentieth-century periods.

The only events specified and therefore given some sort of compulsory status were:

> The nature and impact of the two world wars and the Holocaust, and the role of European and international institutions in resolving conflicts.[26]

There was also reference to the development of trade and the British Empire, with specific reference to 'the nature and effects of the slave trade and resistance and decolonisation.'[27] Summaries of the different Programmes of Study can be seen in Figure 3 and they are explored in more depth in Chapter 4.

---

[21] DFE.
[22] QCA, "The National Curriculum for England: History."
[23] Husbands, Kitson and Pendry.
[24] QCA, "History Programme of Study: Key Stage 3," (QCA, 2007).
[25] Ibid., 115.
[26] Ibid., 116.
[27] Ibid., 116.

Between 1991 and 1995, when the second version of the Programme of Study was published, there were significant changes to the status of history as a school subject. While the original intention at the inception of the National Curriculum was for History to be compulsory to 16, from 1991 it became optional from the age of 14. From the original intention for statutory testing of all subjects at 14, this was reduced to a focus on English, mathematics and science from 1993. This significantly reduced the pressure on history teachers as they no longer had to prepare Key Stage 3 pupils for external assessment.[28]

While such details of assessment procedures were not mentioned by any of the teachers interviewed, memories were shared of a definite sense of relief around the time the second Programme of Study was introduced. As Nicholas said:

> The Roman Empire went within two years [of 1991]. I think the government said, well you haven't got to do that any more.

Patrick spoke of a similar experience:

> they started to realise I think themselves it was over-prescriptive, and once you got much broader headings it was then much easier, you could then go back to what, your own way if you like.

Conversations with teachers about this period in the early 1990s once again seemed to centre round prescription of content. While Dearing brought less detail in the content that was prescribed, there was in some, comparative way, a more prominent place for the 'Key Elements.'[29] In this second Programme of Study they were consolidated on one page and therefore, demonstrated a sharp move away from 45 statement Level Descriptors as featured in the original version. The term 'Key Elements', however, was not used by any of the teachers interviewed.

A sense emerged from the interviews that the National Curriculum documentation became less relevant to practice from the 1994 Dearing review onwards. As Mark said, they weren't intentionally 'subverting' it, but neither were many of the teachers

---

[28] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon.

[29] When I trained as a history teacher in 1998, using this version of the National Curriculum Programme of Study, the language of 'Key Elements' was unavoidable.

particularly aware of the more subtle changes in the 2000 and 2008 Programmes of Study. As the policy itself became less restrictive between 1995 and 2008, giving more freedom for planning according to individual school contexts, this freedom did not always translate into practitioner practice. As Edward put it, talking about all the different versions of the Programme of Study since 1991:

> Well, our curriculum, our schemes of work haven't particularly changed in that time…if something's not broke, I don't fix it.

Allan supported this, suggesting a reason why close attention to the detail of the National Curriculum was not necessarily the focus of every teacher. Asked whether later iterations of the Programme of Study had affected teaching in his department, he replied:

> Not really, apart from reassurance that the content is being freed up a bit and it's a bit more flexible and there isn't going to be a National Curriculum police slinging history teachers in jail for not having covered an element of the Programmes of Study. I mean I suppose, to be fair, in a school like this our major focus and our major concern has always been A-level and GCSE, so sticking to the exact letter of what the National Curriculum prescribes has always been lower down on our list of priorities.

From 1995 onwards, Allan was teaching in a selective 11—18 school. There were some rapid changes to specifications for GCSE and A-level teaching in this decade and sometimes, as with Curriculum 2000, such changes fell at the same time as National Curriculum changes. It is understandable that Allan would prioritise a focus on the changing nature of the specifications for older students, where more was at stake. Beyond the earliest versions of the National Curriculum, however, what was remarkable about the interviews with the teachers was the lack of weight placed on changing versions of the National Curriculum as an agent for change in their practice. The removal of external assessment at the end of Key Stage 3 may have borne some relation to this process of prioritisation.

Nicholas, in referring to the lack of Ofsted focus on curriculum coverage in school, supported Allan's views that the National Curriculum had become less important:

> Oh crikey, we don't take any regard to the National Curriculum so I mean we...well, there are whole lumps that are not taught. We don't do, oh I can't think what we don't do, but it's what's left I think is probably a better one to look at....We've been Ofsted'd I think four times now, nobody has ever asked me about the National Curriculum.

Nicholas was speaking in 2011 after a substantial curriculum revision in his department a few years earlier. When he referred to 'huge lumps that are not taught' it is difficult to know to what he is referring as there was little substantive content detailed in the 2007 Programme of Study. That language however, 'there are whole lumps that are not taught,' suggested that Nicholas, despite being head of department, was unfamiliar with the 2008 National Curriculum Programme of Study. Mark gave a similar impression when he spoke of 'some of these topics you feel you've got to do just for form's sake, really.' Indeed, for the teachers in this research, the later changes to the National Curriculum played little part in their presented narratives of change. If changes to curriculum policy had any impact on changing approaches to teaching it was through whole-school approaches to the 'flexible curriculum,' which had a major impact on a minority of teachers in the sample, particularly after 2008.

Freeing up the curriculum 2000—2010

For some departments though, the idea of 'freeing up the curriculum' that started in 2000 and took on more vigour after 2008, was to result in fundamental changes to the taught curriculum. Some schools introduced a 'condensed' Key Stage 3 which resulted in the entire Programme of Study being taught in two years rather than three. The Historical Association survey report of 2011 revealed that 11.7% of responding schools were in this position.[30] Ofsted raised concerns about this approach in 2008, suggesting it marginalised the subject and that a spread of discrete depth studies could appear to students as 'an unconnected journey.'[31] Other schools introduced a variety of cross-curricular approaches which, while often including history, tended to limit the conception of the subject to substantive detail, minimising the disciplinary approach. In their 2011 review of inspections of history departments in the previous three years, Ofsted offered a stinging rebuke of such approaches:

> Satisfactory or inadequate teaching was frequently associated with curriculum changes. In some schools, these meant that history was no longer taught as a discrete subject by specialist teachers…most of the less effective teaching was observed in lessons in Years 7 and 8 where history was being taught as part of a thematic, cross-curricular, or generic skills course, which did not focus adequately on subject-specific knowledge, thinking and understanding.[32]

---

[30] Burn and Harris, "Historical Association Survey of History in Schools in England," 3.
[31] Ofsted, "History in the Balance: History in English Schools 2003-07," 23.
[32] Ofsted, "History for All: History in English Schools 2007-10," 21.

However, in the 2011 version of the Historical Association's survey of history in schools, it was found that only just over 5% of schools (of those responding to the survey) taught history as part of an 'alternative' curriculum.[33]

Of the thirteen history teachers interviewed for this research, ten were still teaching in the history classroom in 2008. Of those ten, five had experience of significant curriculum change for history from 2008 or before, either from a competence-based curriculum, a shortened Key Stage 3, or both. [34] Patrick, one of those five, wasn't teaching Key Stage 3 history at this time due to senior management responsibilities. However, he taught in a school which had introduced a cross-curricular approach for Year 7 from around 2005.[35] Attitudes to these radical changes in curriculum varied across this group of five teachers. Dana was unusual in her welcoming and encouraging response; Patrick was tolerant of the bespoke approach adopted by his department. However, Diane, Edward and Alison were angry and despondent about the systems imposed on them.

There was a great deal more flexibility in how the history curriculum could be approached after 2008. While some departments waited to respond to school policy, others took the opportunity to do something different. Here, three different approaches will be explored. First Diane, whose school introduced a competence-based curriculum at Year 7. Second, Dana, who initiated the development of a cross-curricular *Opening Minds* programme for Year 7. Third, Patrick who passed comment on similar developments in his own school.[36]

Diane, speaking in 2009, was the least positive of the three teachers concerning this initiative, but she was also the least involved, and the requirements of the particular

---

[33] Burn and Harris, "Historical Association Survey of History in Schools in England." This could be slightly misleading data as one of the concerns Ofsted raised was the use of non-specialist teachers to teach such programmes. Non-specialist teachers would be less likely to respond to a survey targeted at membership of the Historical Association.

[34] Two of the three no longer teaching had moved into teacher education by 2008 and one was an advisor for an LEA, so all still had significant experience in schools and history departments to comment upon. For full details, see Participant Summary table, Chapter 3.

[35] The school in question invested heavily in this approach, building new school buildings with classrooms for sixty pupils and giving teachers time to plan collaboratively due to co-teaching across subjects.

[36] See this website for further details of competence-based curricula and their impact in the history classroom Historical Association, http://www.history.org.uk/secondary/categories/488/resource/2795/skills-based-curriculum.

course were clearly imposed on her by the senior management of the school. This type of skills-based programme was often based on the RSA Opening Minds project or similar 'Learning to Learn' packages and particularly emphasised the skill-sets students would need to use for different tasks. For Diane, who was asked to teach history through a 'competence-based' curriculum from 2006, there wasn't significant change in her teaching approach, possibly because she was resisting the original intentions of the course. Interviewed in 2009, she recalled:

> History was expected to be just a vehicle for the skills… I just taught the same topics I was teaching and I'm afraid I just taught it in the same way. I mean, the children's thinking, because they do all this thinking skills…. And I was, didn't you expect the children to think before? Were they just cabbages sitting there?

So, the introduction of a competence-based curriculum did not have much impact on Diane or her teaching. She resented the rather generic notion of 'thinking skills.' It is noticeable that when GCSE and the National Curriculum were brought in Diane was compliant, but this prescription at school level was resented and resisted. She resigned from the school in 2009, shortly after this interview took place, and found a history teaching role in a selective school with a more traditional curriculum.

The other two teachers involved in an 'alternative' curriculum were much more positive about the experience. Dana appears unusual among the history teachers interviewed in volunteering to set up a project-based learning scheme. What others saw as prescriptive, intrusive and academically questionable, Dana seems to have embraced. She recalled:[37]

> We brought in Opening Minds[38] a few years back, the former head of geography and I, four, five years ago [2006-7], we did a pilot, where we did one very Opening Mind-type project-based learning topic that had geography and history elements and everything to it, and then we presented to the governors and they went for it. So, we did the Opening Minds, which is just, it's not just project-based learning but it's all about enterprise skills and that sort of thing, and evaluating your work and, what type of learner you are and that sort of thing. So that's all come into the history part.

A more detailed description of one of the projects revealed what she valued about the scheme:

> My present Year 10s were part of the guinea pig group, and I will show to anybody the best film I have ever seen kids make on transportation to Australia. Its puppets, finger puppets, and it is absolutely brilliant. And that was Opening Minds, because it

---

[37] This positive attitude toward the cross-curricular approach could relate to her American, social sciences training. This will be explored more in chapter 9.

[38] RSA, http://www.rsaopeningminds.org.uk/about-rsa-openingminds/.

> gave them the bottle to actually try it. But I said to them, don't write me a newspaper article, do me something that's interesting 'cos I get bored too easily, so make it interesting, and they had the guts to do it.

Here Dana praised the variety of opportunity in presenting information and the use of creative methods in constructing a narrative. Any comment on the disciplinary nature of history or sense of progression beyond the accumulation of knowledge and communication skills was absent from this description. By introducing 'enterprise skills' and 'evaluation of work' the progression model had become more generic. It is not clear why the lesson needed to be taught through a cross-curricular approach or how the students really benefited from that. Such creative lessons often need a large allocation of time. One benefit Dana may have secured for her students through this cross-curricular approach was more time to focus on historical topics. The sacrifice, however, may have been in the broader, disciplinary history that was clearly described in the National Curriculum. After several years of creativity with the Opening Minds curriculum, Dana and her colleagues seem to have come to the same conclusion:

> The Opening Minds is gone because I said to them I cannot achieve what you want me to achieve… how can I get those skills, and at the same time, I've got to get these kids interested.

Dana's school ended this curriculum experiment in 2011. This coincided with the introduction of the English Baccalaureate by the coalition government which gave a higher priority to history and geography GCSE grades.[39]

Patrick provided the third example of an alternative curriculum. He spoke about the cross-curricular approach in his school that involved every subject in Year 7, despite having taught on it very little due to his senior management responsibilities confining his teaching to GCSE and A-level. He explained:

> What we do here at Key Stage 3, it's done as part of P— curriculum so it's theme-based. …It's an integrated approach to learning where you have a variety of different subjects taught using one overarching theme or topic as the guideline.... One of them is freedom, for instance, and the history content of that will be slavery and the slave trade. But you may well have situations then where you've got two teaching groups together with two subject teachers from two different disciplines, and the focus of each of those will be a different issue, so it will include a bit of maths maybe, maybe led by a maths teacher, maybe led by an English teacher, maybe led by a historian or a geographer.

---

[39] More detail on the English Baccalaureate is provided in the next chapter.

Unlike the Opening Minds approach which several schools used, this approach had been designed by teachers within the school. The topic 'freedom,' and several other topics, had been carefully chosen with the intention of integrating topics usually found on a Key Stage 3 history scheme of work with other subjects. The scheme was redesigned by teachers annually to improve it and some years subjects like history and maths were also given discrete lessons. Patrick seemed tolerant of this approach. There was no sense here that it was actually prescribed, but more something the teachers wanted to offer. With dependence on non-specialists, however, it may have been a challenge to maintain a disciplinary approach to the subjects. To keep student progression and rich historical content at the heart of lessons would have required expertise and experience in history teaching. Patrick commented:

> I think we have found that it makes it more difficult to embed the historical skills, yeah, I do think it has, which is why we're now using a three-year Key Stage 4.

Different attitudes existed towards the idea of cross-curricular approaches and competence-based curricula. This could partly be explained by the level of involvement in designing the course on the part of the individual teachers.

As the 2008 Programme of Study itself provided more freedom, there seemed to be less curriculum time actually available to the history teachers in school, perhaps reflecting the lower status of the subject on the whole-school curriculum at this point in time. There was a growing trend towards the 'three-year GCSE' in the late 2000s and early 2010s. In the 2011 Historical Association survey, 11.7% of respondents identified this practice in their school. By 2015 it was practice in 'around a third of schools.'[40] As Burn and Harris put it, this policy 'automatically reduced by a third the time that is allocated to history for all those young people who choose not to continue with the subject at GCSE.'[41] As a result of this policy, Edward and Alison found themselves having to crunch three-year schemes of work into two. Edward explained:

> There's a different, not accelerated curriculum. History and geography are compulsory in Year 7 and 8, pupils opt to do it in Year 9, so two-year National Curriculum Year 7 and 8, where we have to cover as much as we can. I dragged my feet on that for the first two years…unless I've got to do something I don't do it. So, I re-wrote the schemes of work this year, so this will be the first time, this year's Year 8, will do something about war in the twentieth century.

---

[40] Burn and Harris, "Why Do You Keep Asking the Same Questions? Tracking the Health of History in England's Secondary Schools," 55.
[41] Ibid.

Alison, teaching in the same department as Edward, substantiated this description:

> If the children don't do history in Year 9 then they don't do any modern history at all… We do give them home learning projects…so we cover our backs by making the third term's home learning project a twentieth-century project. But otherwise you reduce what we do for Tudors and Stuarts so much that again it becomes a mishmash.

Edward and Alison were teaching history in a challenging school context in the late 2000s and this will be explored further in the next chapter. One school-level decision that had a major impact on the status of history in the school was the decision to move to a two-year Key Stage 3. Both of the history teachers interviewed from the department were furious about this decision. With the reduced time-scale for teaching the subject they seem to have struggled to adapt the schemes of work. As a result, some pupils would have completed their history education chronologically before the industrial revolution, not studying any part of the nineteenth or twentieth century in a secondary school history lesson.

Dana faced similar challenges, but approached the challenge of limited time in a more innovative fashion. Dana's department taught Opening Minds to Year 7. Her school had also introduced citizenship as a compulsory subject on the Key Stage 3 curriculum, taking lesson time away from history. This left much less time to cover the Key Stage 3 Programme of Study which had been designed for three years of study. Dana decided to move her department towards a thematic approach, a suggestion made in the 2008 Programme of Study.[42] Dana recalled:

> We did [teach thematically] with Year 8 because of being crunched down to such a little bit of time. So, we went with the idea of change in the power of the king, change in the power of the people. So, we're kind of walking through, so we started with the Normans, and then we went to the Tudors, and then we go into the Victorians, so we're looking into the changing of the life and everything. So, it's not just power of the people but where the people lived and how they lived and that sort of thing, so we went, so we did it that way. I don't like it that much but...I just think kids lose chronology.

Dana identified a problem in the limited time her Year 8 had to understand a broad range of history. Unlike Edward and Alison, she chose to change schemes of work and innovate with a thematic approach in an attempt to solve this 'chronology problem'. She was also reflective enough to find the flaws in the thematic approach.

---

[42] Dana told how she was inspired to move towards a thematic history curriculum by a 2007 history course held with the local authority advisor and several other well-known representatives of the Historical Association.

Despite the limitations of a two-year Key Stage 3 for those pupils not opting for history, this approach did have the potential to open up Year 9 as a year for freedom and innovation, unhindered by any imposed curriculum. In the very small sample of teachers that had this opportunity, different approaches can be identified. Edward explained what happened in Year 9:

> Year 9 will do, continually doing all the things that I think they like doing…this is mostly twentieth-century history, so we will look at the Second World War, the era of the two world wars and Stalin's Russia… Not so much on Germany because we put a lot of that narrative in Key Stage 4.

So, Edward and Alison decided to take quite a traditional approach with this Year 9 opportunity, teaching twentieth-century topics that may have been on their previous schemes of work. These topics would, however, have provided a useful contextual backdrop for the study of Nazi Germany at GCSE. In contrast, Patrick's department decided to teach a completely different 'Project Qualification' to Year 9. The students undertook their own choice of research projects as part of the year, developing rich skills of analysis and evaluation in an authentic historical context. Patrick explained:

> We'll enter them in Year 11 now for the final exams. What we're doing is, Year 9 we're now using as a sort of foundation year, to work on the skills that we think are lacking and we're also at the moment doing it as a half GSCE project-based qualification. Then we're starting the GSCE course at the beginning of Year 10, we're doing it as the standard two year [course]

Echoes of the investigative skills of SHP could be heard in this GCSE project, which was awarded half a GCSE. The supportive context of Patrick's school, explored further in the next chapter, could also have played a part in this different approach. Edward was angry about the change. He resented the imposition of a new curriculum structure far more than the changes made for GCSE or the National Curriculum and, although he finally complied, was reluctant to change his schemes of work. Again, this could relate to the culture of prescription and surveillance within his school that will be explored further in the next chapter. Dana took a more proactive approach to the new flexibility, welcoming innovations, but possibly sacrificing some disciplinary integrity in the process. Patrick was tolerant of his school's approach, perhaps finding a way with the project qualification to make up for the less disciplinary approach students would have experienced lower down the school. This is a very small sub-sample of only five teachers experiencing such alternative curricula from around 2008, but the range in approaches and attitudes come across clearly.

The National Curriculum can therefore be seen to have caused some level of change in teaching practice. The first Programme of Study led to the most change in content over the 1985—2011 period. While some teachers were unhappy about the level of prescribed content, most resigned themselves to it and welcomed the reduced prescription that the Dearing Review brought in 1995. There was no evidence of resistance or subversion to National Curriculum content. More confident teachers, such as Patrick, William, Allan and Simon found ways to mediate the requirements of the document to fit their own agenda. It was from 2008 that more radical curriculum changes were introduced. Unless teachers were involved in designing and running these approaches, they were much more likely to be resentful and dismissive. Curriculum policies imposed at school level did not have the same support as previous national policies. The school-level policies were more likely to be cross-curricular or generic and this clashed with the disciplinary nature of the subject that had become embedded by this point. Patrick's department stood out as one where a rigorous, investigative approach to history attempted to co-exist within a whole-school, cross-curricular approach.

Assessment in the National Curriculum

Four stages can be identified in the development of assessment between 1985 and 2011. The first of these was the stage prior to the National Curriculum where teachers retained autonomy over how and when assessment happened in non-examined courses. Bowe and Ball have suggested that the 1970s onwards saw teachers move away from the use of summative tests towards new forms of assessment, including those which were 'formative and diagnostic'.[43] Dickinson supported this shift within a history context, arguing that teachers considered 'formative assessment to be an important and illuminating part of their work.'[44] The teachers in this research, however, did not choose to share their assessment practices at this point, formative or otherwise, perhaps suggesting assessment was low status. The second stage began with the introduction of the first National Curriculum in 1991. The initial intention was for uniform national tests in every subject for students aged 7, 11 and 14. Bowe and Ball found, in talking to

---

[43] Bowe, Ball, and Gold, 103.
[44] A. Dickinson, "Assessing, Recording and Reporting Children's Achievements: From Changes to Genuine Gains," in *History in the National Curriculum*, ed. R. Aldrich, The Bedford Way Series (London: Kogan Page 1991), 75.

teachers around this time that 'fear, loathing and dread' were the normal reactions to this plan. By 1993 it was decided that national tests would be limited to the 'core' subjects of English, maths and science. History, therefore, was left with a complex system of assessment by Attainment Targets, linked to particular second-order concepts.[45] The Dearing review of 1994 saw the introduction of a third stage in the development of assessment as the Attainment Targets were simplified to one set of nine 'Level Descriptors.'[46] The expectation was that students would be given a Level at the end of a key stage, so for secondary students, this would just be at the age of 14, at the end of Key Stage 3. The 2000 version of the Programme of Study still declared that 'the level descriptors provide the basis for making judgements about students' performance at the end of key stages.' The final development for assessment within the History National Curriculum document was a re-worded Attainment Target in 2008. It is important to note, however, that any history assessment at Key Stage 3 was internally governed within schools. Results were not to be compared locally or nationally, so the eventual assessment framework was far less threatening than the national test that was originally proposed.

The reality of teacher experience seems to have diverged increasingly from the government-published policy across this period, particularly in the first decade of the twenty-first century. The teachers interviewed rarely chose to speak about methods of assessment early in their career. This was in contrast to descriptions of more recent practice, where assessment often dominated the interview discourse. A few teachers compared current and previous methods of assessment. Mark, for example, saw vast progress in the quality of assessment over the twenty-five years he had been teaching:

> One thing that has changed I think is the quality of assessment…. I believe now that students get a lot more guidance because of the National Curriculum Levels[47] on how to improve their work… the first type of marking would be a mark out of 20, which would pretty well be random.

Edward substantiated this change, describing using a 'mark out of 10' system in the department until 'a couple of years' before the 2011 interview. At the same time, however, the department gave a National Curriculum 'Level' to each student at the end

---

[45] See Chapter 4 for a full summary of National Curriculum Programmes of Study and assessment measures.
[46] DFE.

of Key Stage 3, aged 14, in accordance with the policy. This numerical marking, with no particular criterion attached to different marks, was commonly used in the pre-National Curriculum period, but Edward and Mark suggest that in some schools, it was used much later than this. Edward found this the simplest way to give a mark to students for each piece of work, and only stopped the practice in around 2009 when senior management told him it wasn't in line with the school marking policy. Teachers therefore had a significant amount of autonomy over how pieces of work were marked and how students were assessed in the pre-National Curriculum period and there would have been a variety of practice across schools.

The teachers interviewed for this research did not have fond memories of the first set of assessment criteria in the original National Curriculum. Edward put it bluntly: 'when they first came out they were just, absolutely appalling.' Simon remembered some of the challenges in following this policy:

> I think we probably had quite a few difficulties, shall we say, assessing all the different statements and all the different attainment targets because there were three of them.

Certainly, for many teachers coming from a system where assessment was localised and informal before the age of 16, this focus on Attainment Targets must have come as rather a shock. William, however, in a London school at the time, found a new head of department used these three Attainment Targets to clarify practice and ideas of progression. He recalled:

> One of the things we did in H—, back in the kind of, it would have been about '93, I think. We had a new head of department come in and I was working a lot with her and the team, our little team of three teachers. We produced a booklet, this was for the first National Curriculum, a profile book for history and it had continuity and change, it had causation, so we had looked at evidence handling, we had looked at the concepts at that point and we'd actually profiled them for the students…we spent a lot of time on developing that kind of minutiae of assessment.

In some departments then, this new approach to assessment had a significant impact on how content was approached. In William's department the second-order concepts were brought to the fore and students were given specific profiles to help support progress in such areas. However, the system William described did not last long:

> Within a few years we realised actually this is just, you can't do it. I mean it's one thing setting this up, but if you want to just teach good history as well, you don't want to be bogged down and driven by assessment.

At this point in time, in the early 1990s, his department's approach to assessment appeared unusually precise, but was soon discovered to be restrictive.

In 1995 a new version of the Programme of Study was launched, bringing the three Attainment Targets into one, with nine different Level Descriptors. At this point it appeared to be common practice across the interviewees to give one 'Level' at the end of Year 9, in alignment with the policy. Laura described some of the challenges of making an accurate judgement:

> You were looking at such a wide range of skills, and you're trying to come up…. with this broad fit, or best fit of where they are, and you may well find students who are really, really good at one element but very weak at another so yeah, I think that was difficult.

Dana remembered the moderation process used in the late 1990s, in comparison with assessment methods she used in 2011 at the time of the interview

> I can remember that we only really reported Year 9, obviously, and when I think about how we did that, my God what would we do today? We'd literally sit there with the end of year exam and say, if they have achieved this, then this has to be a Level 6, and literally had a broadsheet, all handwritten and drew the line across and said these are your Level 7s, they've got this, this is your Level 6s, it was really, really, I wouldn't say hit and miss because there was, there was some system to it… You worked on your gut, on your gut feeling, you knew your kids.

Teachers were working together, within departments, and making judgements about what Level was appropriate for which child. This was, for the first time, a national system, where comparisons could be made across schools and areas of the country.[48] The quotation above suggests judgements were based on an end of year exam, but here, and in other schools, additional classwork would also have been taken into account. Nicholas substantiated this view:

> I remember keeping portfolios of work, top, middle and bottom that we had put in filing cabinets ready for Ofsted to come see what we were doing.

There were government publications to support such judgements and these would have come into departments around 1996. However, the very purpose of assessment in schools was beginning to change towards the end of the 1990s. Nicholas, above, provided a sense of this development. He wasn't keeping portfolios of work in filing

---

[48] Substantial materials were produced to help teachers make such judgements e.g. SCAA, "Exemplification of Standards in History: Key Stage 3," (London: School Curriculum and Assessment Authority, 1996). None of the teachers interviewed made reference to such documents.

cabinets so that the department could reference them for future moderation judgements. He was keeping the work 'ready for Ofsted.'

At this point in time practice seems to have started diverging from policy. At some point around the turn of the century, teachers moved from giving students one 'Level' at the end of Key Stage 3, as stated on the curriculum documentation, to marking several pieces of work a year (if not all pieces of work) according to the same Level Descriptors.[49] The very broad, generalised Level Descriptors were not intended for such use. Burnham and Brown wrote a *Teaching History* article in 2004 that encouraged history teachers to stand up against pressures for frequent 'levelled assessment' from senior leaders.[50] Lee and Shemilt also published a stinging rebuke to such practice, arguing that assessment should provide 'a scaffold, not a cage.'[51] Simon gave examples of this in his practice:

> For about the last 10 or 12 years probably it's been part of the assessment. The enquiry question, why did William win the Battle of Hastings? Or, how effective was the Roman army? You know, those enquiry-type questions, and then you assess the children based on National Curriculum Levels as a result of that.

Here, Simon described students writing a series of essays across the school year, in response to a series of overarching enquiry questions. This was seen as good practice at the time, based on articles in *Teaching History* and specimen schemes of work produced by the government.[52] The difference was that Simon was using the longer pieces of work produced by students in response to such questions as assessments to be graded with a National Curriculum Level Descriptor. This was not the policy of the National Curriculum, which still clearly stated in 2000 that 'level descriptions provide the basis for making judgements about students' performance at the end of Key Stages.'[53]

---

[49] Teaching in the Midlands from 1999 to 2001 I marked all Key Stage 3 work with a grade from A to E according to my own criteria. Moving to London in 2002 general classwork was graded A to E, but students would produce around six pieces of work a year that would be ascribed a 'Level.' Students were quick to ask, 'will this work be levelled?' suggesting a difference in effort between work that was and work that wasn't. As I was leaving in 2006 the school was just introducing a 'split-level' policy of 5a, 5b, 5c that could be awarded for each piece of work.

[50] S Burnham and G Brown, "Assessment without Levels," in *Teaching History* 115 (2004).

[51] P. J. Lee and D. Shemilt, "A Scaffold, Not a Cage: Progression and Progression Models in History," in *Teaching History*. 113 (2003).

[52] M. Riley, "Into the Key Stage 3 History Garden: Choosing and Planting Your Enquiry Questions," ibid.99 (2000).

[53] QCA, "The National Curriculum for England: History." DfES, http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/content/20040117024809/http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/schemes2/secondary_history/?view=get.

Several teachers devised 'student-friendly' guides to the Level Descriptors to assist with progression. Edward and Mark both shared examples of sheets which showed students what they would need to do on certain assignments to achieve certain levels. Mark recalled:

> We give them a little sheet which helps them to understand their progression. So, for Level 5 we're doing this, for Level 6 we're doing that, and so on, and that is reflected in the marking for the students.

Not every department would have moved to this more regular form of National Curriculum assessment at the same time. Edward described assessing against Levels only at the end of the key stage until 'a couple of years' before he was interviewed in 2011. He gave the impression that more frequent assessment against the Levels was the policy through the rest of the school, but his department was holding out for as long as they could against a whole-school policy that they didn't agree with.

For most of the teachers interviewed, however, this regular use of the nine Level Descriptors (six of which were seen as appropriate for secondary students) to inform marking throughout Key Stage 3 was generally seen as a positive approach. Mark added:

> It's not as if, you know, what was happening years ago is wrong, but I suspect that not all students understood how to improve on a kind of ladder of accessibility thing. And I think the fact that they have now got more idea about what to do, well has encouraged numbers.[54]

Mark believed that the move from marking out of 20 in the 'random' way he previously described, to marking according to a set of criteria, would have made it easier for students to determine some of the things they needed to do 'to get better at history'. As Lee and Shemilt had pointed out though, this potential scaffold could easily become a restrictive cage.[55]

A new version of the Attainment Target published in the 2008 curriculum documentation did not seem to have a great deal of impact on the teachers interviewed. Edward recalled:

---

[54] Here 'numbers' refers to the number of students opting to take History GCSE at the end of Year 9.
[55] Lee and Shemilt.

> The Ofsted guy two years ago when he saw this [student friendly Level worksheets] said, oh you're using the old ones, we went and looked on the National Curriculum and we couldn't tell any difference between the old and new ones.

However, many of the teachers described taking this use of the Attainment Target one step further. Teachers were asked to give students a 'split Level' several times a year, using 4a, 4b and 4c to denote progress between Level Descriptors. This was an internal school policy adopted by most schools around this period. As this was not a government policy, it did not come with convenient exemplar material. While this precise marking may have enabled a sense of progression, it may not have reflected the complexity of developing historical understanding. As Counsell put it in a *Teaching History* editorial, responding to this practice in 2004:

> Those who then advocated dividing up Levels horizontally as well as vertically (level 5a, 5b, 5c) no doubt felt they were creating more 'precise' instruments (but to technicise Levels deliberately designed to be *im*precise renders the judgements made against them an inevitable lie.)

By 2011, regular 'levelled assessment' had become a core part of assessment for many of the teachers interviewed. Some teachers admitted they were using 'split-levels' as part of the performativity game. Richard described the practice in his school:

> The whole school system here is that every boy has a termly assessment and there's a grade that goes onto the database so we track them academically, very closely. For example, in the current class I've just been teaching, they will have three assessments in a five week-rotation. To be perfectly honest with you, I don't really understand it to be honest… I speak to the head of geography all the time because he's a mate of mine. So, I said, so what's the difference between a 6b and 6c apart from the fact that 6b is his target grade…. Say for example the computer's down, can you remember what the kids' grades are, what you're actually going to give, if you saw that piece of work without knowing what the target grade was, what would you give it?

Richard appeared disillusioned with this imposed system, especially as it made little sense for helping students progress in his subject, but he appeared to find it easier to 'play the game' and input the appropriate Levels. He was not the only one to take that approach. Nicholas shared a recent conversation with the 'data manager' in his school.

> I had big argument last week, the poor lady, she was a nice woman. She's fully employed now, just to be in charge of the Levels and target grades. She's got a little office over there. I put the sub-level on there… so they're supposed to go up… two sub-levels every [year] and she was complaining that the way I'd originally done it was, that that kid wasn't going to get that [target] Level. I said, yes they will. She said why? Because I'll give them the Level, and, she says you can't do that. You've got to take it seriously. I said why?

This resistance to a whole-school assessment policy was much stronger and more blatant than any reaction to national policies during this period.

William supported the idea of placing a lower value on assessment:

> The department basically attempts to pursue...good assessment with integrity that is genuinely looking at some kind of thinking that the student's doing and then we'll work out what Level. You know, we'll give them Level 6 for that but, I mean obviously you have to comply. You comply with the regime that you're presented with, but your, the integrity is with the learning that you're trying to let the students enjoy.

In this example William showed that teachers placed limited value on this form of assessment. Richard, Nicholas and William, among several other teachers interviewed, found themselves having to play their role in this prescribed and limited assessment system. They had to input Levels or 'split-levels' for each student whenever such data was requested. Yet they did not appear to ascribe any significant value to this form of assessment and data-checking. Apart from some student-friendly assessment sheets on 'how to achieve the next Level', they did not describe any examples of such data affecting their teaching. In 2004 Counsell wrote an editorial for *Teaching History* that set out history teachers' experiences of assessment since 1991. She suggested that the initial 45 statements in the 1991 version of the National Curriculum had the perverse effect of '*stopping* teachers from thinking about what it meant to get better at causal thinking or using sources or whatever, when (presumably??) it was designed to get this going'. This can also be seen to be true in 2011. The teachers in this research were keen to talk about how they were attributing Levels and either subverting or complying with the system. What was missing from the conversations was any talk about progression outside the system of 'Levels' of which they complained.

Assessment, at Key Stage 3 in particular, was part of a fundamental shift between 1985 and 2015. From a position of total teacher autonomy, where teachers could assess and award marks in any way they wished, assessment moved to a periodic, but national framework in the early 1990s. This enabled comparison between schools and accountability of schools. As more weight was placed upon the importance of student progression and 'value-added measures', schools, and therefore teachers, came under more pressure to prove progression. As the Attainment Target measures existed across all National Curriculum subjects, and students were 'expected' to move two 'sub-levels' every year, the Level Descriptors naturally became the regularly used measure for attainment and progress. However, the Level Descriptors in history, at least, were not fit

for this purpose.[56] Some teachers, such as Dana, could explain this when interviewed, but still used them in every lesson in quite an unquestioning way. Others, such as Edward, Nicholas and Richard, did not like the system, but complied. While there was a great deal of disillusionment about this system of split-levels among the teachers interviewed, there were no examples of subverting the policy.

Conclusion

The period 1985—2011 can be closely identified with increased prescription and as a corollary, a loss of teacher autonomy. The National Curriculum, as a policy, played some part in that process, but after its first iteration, was not perceived as a restrictive force. After the initial shock of prescribed content in 1991, teachers seem to have settled into a tolerant relationship with the policy. Few were aware of the details or nuanced changes in later versions. At the start of the period, issues concerning content dominated the discourse. Later in the period this focus shifted to assessment. Surprisingly though, teachers did not focus on the key concepts within the documentation and how those had come to be integrated into their teaching.

The teachers who were most confident in articulating the disciplinary purpose and nature of the subject seem to have been those who were strongest in mediating or resisting unpopular change. This can be seen in Allan, Patrick, William and Simon in the way they reacted to the first version of the National Curriculum, mediating it so that they could include the content they felt passionately about. It can also be seen in William's intent to value curriculum over assessment. For teachers such as Dana, trained in a more generalist, social science background, there were different motivations; student enjoyment of the subject or the meeting of target grades were higher on the agenda. Dana, for example, appeared more susceptible to school-level developments and valued the language of GCSE mark schemes and National Curriculum Attainment Targets over the language of the second order concepts. Edward, Nicholas and Richard seemed to chart their own course through content, responding to curriculum requirements when needed, resisting the pressure to be concerned over Key Stage 3 targets. There was room for teacher autonomy during this period; not in the absolute freedom of the 1980s, but within a framework of curriculum

---

[56] Ibid.

and assessment limitations, teachers had plenty of room to establish their own purpose and interests in the subject. Not all of them took up this opportunity. For some, though, autonomy became more severely restricted towards the end of the period, particularly as school-led initiatives were imposed. Some of these initiatives will be considered in more detail in the following chapter.

Chapter 7   Enacting policy

The educational policy context is never simple and it became increasingly more complex across the period 1985-2011. In this period teachers and schools were expected to respond to a number of complex, possibly overlapping, even contradictory policies. Ball et al. produced a detailed study on the way New Labour's policy of 'raising standards' 'works' through a public technology of performance – made of up league tables, national averages, comparative and progress indicators, Ofsted assessments and benchmarks.[1] According to Ball, this 'policy technology' of performance created a set of pressures which worked 'downwards' through the education system from the Secretary of State to the classroom.[2] As Ball et al. have exemplified elsewhere, 'policy is done by and done to teachers; they are actors and subjects, subject to and objects of policy.'[3] This chapter therefore explores the experience of history teachers as policy is enacted around them, to them and by them. Its focus is on the policies beyond the curriculum.

In chapter 5 the experience of history teachers in the period before the National Curriculum was explored. Gleeson and Gunter have highlighted the 'professional emphasis on ethical commitment' during this early period.[4] Between 1988 and 1994, however, Levin has identified an 'epidemic' of government policy reform affecting education.[5] Tomlinson has suggested this led to teachers becoming 'a technical workforce to be managed and controlled rather than a profession to be respected'.[6] By 2006 Perryman argued that the accepted discourse presented by government and the media was that teachers were 'in need of reform' and this reform needed to be 'monitored by increased surveillance'.[7] Up to the late 1980s history teachers were relatively free, within the context of their department, to select content, approach, assessment, progression model, pedagogy and even to choose between external examinations. Previous chapters show how the introduction of GCSE and the National Curriculum began to limit that autonomy, especially in terms of content and approach.

---

[1] Ball, Maguire, and Braun.
[2] S.J. Ball et al., "Assessment Technologies in Schools: 'Deliverology' and the 'Play of Dominations'," in *Research Papers in Education* 27, no. 5 (2012): 514.
[3] Ball, Maguire and Braun, 3.
[4] Gleeson and Gunter, 140.
[5] B. Levin, "An Epidemic of Education Policy: What Can We Learn from Each Other?," in *Comparative Education* 34, no. 2 (1998).
[6] S Tomlinson, *Education in a Post-Welfare Society* (Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2005), 41.
[7] J. Perryman, "Panoptic Performativity and School Inspection Regimes: Disciplinary Mechanisms and Life under Special Measures," in *Journal of Education Policy* 21, no. 2 (2006).

This chapter further develops that theme of lost autonomy, focusing in particular on the late 1990s and the decade after 2000. Twenty interviews were carried out with thirteen history teachers to further explore these issues and influences. Their recollections of this later period were distinctive from earlier memories in that there was much less spoken about specific historical content and disciplinary approach and much more spoken about assessment and generic pedagogical approaches.

The way a teacher responded to policy reform could be affected by the nature of the policy itself; by his or her own professional experience and by the context of the school.[8] Ball et al. have suggested the existence of both technical and authentic professionals. This could be different teachers responding to policy in different ways, or the same teacher responding to different types of policy. According to Ball, whereas the 'technical professional' is created by the policy artefacts of data collection, analysis and measurement,[9] the 'authentic professional' is 'required to bring judgement, originality and passion to bear upon the policy process'.[10] Ball's division into 'technical' and 'authentic' professionals provides a useful means to broadly categorise the teachers involved in this study, although it is argued that there is the potential for teachers to have both technical and authentic tendencies. All the history teachers interviewed for this research can be seen to have enacted policy as 'technical professionals' at some point across this period, whether in chasing better examination grades or setting targets for individual students. However, many of the teachers appeared conflicted in their practice. There are examples among the teachers of a more 'authentic professional', perhaps a more disciplinary professional wanting to be released to practice in a more autonomous manner. How far the authentic professional could co-exist alongside the requirements of the technical professional and the performative context seems to have depended not only on the particular school, but also the dispositions and previous experiences of individual teachers. This is supported by Priestly and Biesta's work on ecological approaches to teacher agency, focusing not only upon teachers themselves, but also the policy context in which they find themselves.[11] A minority of the teachers interviewed were able to retain a level of professional confidence, maintaining the ability to act as more 'authentic professionals' within this climate of competition,

---

[8] For an ecological account of teacher agency that explores these factors, see Priestly, Biesta and Robinson.
[9] Ball, Maguire, and Braun, 5.
[10] Ibid., 94.
[11] Priestly, Biesta, and Robinson.

finding their own way to enact policy in a way that prioritised the historical learning of their pupils.

In 1997 Tony Blair led New Labour to victory in the general election after eighteen years of Conservative Party rule. He immediately renewed and intensified the emphasis on education in government policy, famously promising the three priorities of 'education, education and education'.[12] This rhetoric was transformed into practice through the 'raising standards' agenda. Every teacher in the country was involved in enacting this policy of 'raising standards'.[13] This radical cultural change from the relative autonomy of the 1980s towards a demand for ever-higher standards led to changes in the experience of the teacher as a professional. Ball in particular has highlighted the changes education reform brought about, from the previous policy technologies of 'professionalism and bureaucracy' to new policy technologies of 'the market, managerialism and performativity'.[14] He defined performativity thus:

> A technology, a culture and a mode of regulation that employs judgements, comparison and displays as means of incentive, control, attrition and change…. The performances (of individual subjects or organizations) serve as measures of productivity or output, or displays of 'quality', or 'moments' of promotion or inspection. As such they stand for, encapsulate or represent the worth, quality or value of an individual or organization within a field of judgement. [15]

In a secondary school setting, this culture of performativity could be witnessed in response to the existence of league tables, Ofsted inspections, target-setting and the surveillance culture encompassed within and beyond observations.[16] History teachers' experiences of each of these will be explored further in this chapter.

A number of the teachers in the sample showed an awareness of the broader context of marketisation in education and chose to talk about this when asked about how their experience of teaching had changed over the course of their careers. While they were unanimous that a shift in culture had taken place, there was little precision or agreement over the exact timings of the change, suggesting an evolving and asynchronous process. In the teachers' descriptions there was a sense of 'before and after' or 'then and now.'

---

[12] Chitty.

[13] Ball et al.

[14] S. J. Ball, "The Teacher's Soul and the Terrors of Performativity," in *Journal of Education Policy* 18, no. 2 (2003): 215.

[15] Ibid., 216.

[16] League tables are explained in more detail later in the chapter

They did not give a precise chronology to this shift, but rather a retrospective overview. When they talked about changes in teaching practice or assessment, I often asked what caused that change or where the change came from. Some of the responses are presented here. Diane, for example, explained the difference in culture from her perspective:

> I think it's external and that's because the role of schools and teachers in society has changed and has altered... we now produce the goods. Do you know what I mean? I think, in a way, we're producing the goods for industry. [*And what did you do before?*] I think we were just educating before – an education for education's sake. For example, you went to school and if you learnt things like poetry you were learning it for its own sake.

The theme of 'producing goods' that Diane raised was supported by Dana who saw the introduction of a target-setting culture as a transfer from the business world:

> I think the whole thing of setting targets, well that's business, that's where it came from, and I think we have become much more business-orientated.

Patrick agreed, giving examples from the world of education where principles of the market had been imposed:

> I think they've been pushed from the whole sort of marketisation thing that came in with Ofsted and National Curriculum and league tables and I think schools do feel very much under pressure to, to get results.

Laura substantiated this experience, providing a sense of the competition culture and how that had affected teachers at the chalk face:

> I think it's because you publish the statistics, performance management goes on it, you're compared in a department, the history department's done this, this and this, you're compared across teachers, so I think that has killed it.

These extracts show experienced teachers at the end of the first decade of the twenty-first century had an awareness of the broader context of competition and how market forces had acted as an agent of change over the previous twenty years of their teaching experience. Perryman has pointed to teachers' sense of emotional dissonance as they lost their sense of professional independence in this new target-setting culture.[17] The teachers interviewed for this thesis showed an evident discomfort with the shift in culture. However, as Perryman found in her research on English and maths teachers,

---

[17] Perryman et al.

there was little that they could do to resist it; their only recourse appeared to be to evade or accommodate where possible.[18]

The impact of league tables

In 1992 the government began publishing school league tables that summarised GCSE attainment in each state-funded secondary school in England.[19] Leckie and Goldstein, among others, have argued that the tables formed 'a fundamental component of the government's school accountability-by-results regime.'[20] Ball has supported this viewpoint, arguing 'League table positions, both locally and nationally' formed 'a constant backdrop to policy accounts within schools'…'non-human actants, such as reputation and performance form part of the network of policy enactments.'[21] Schools' performance in such tables played a large part in substantiating judgements by Ofsted. Poor judgements in inspections could lead to closer surveillance, takeover by other schools or ultimately closure. Accordingly, placement in league tables and high-profile display of examination results became an increasing source of pressure for schools and therefore for departments and individual teachers.[22] The intensification of league tables from 1997 onwards with the introduction of New Labour's 'raising standards' agenda and then further from 2002 when value-added measures were introduced, appeared to result in a performative culture that changed the place and value of assessment.[23]

The first, and possibly most far-reaching impact of league tables for history teachers in this research was on the status of history as a subject within the school curriculum. The period 1992—2010 saw a gradual erosion of the status of history as a subject in the secondary school, particularly in the 2000s. From Kenneth Baker's original intention for history to be compulsory to 16, Kenneth Clarke moved the goalposts in 1991, enabling students to drop history at 14 years of age. Cannadine et al. have referred to

---

[18] Ibid.

[19] League tables ranked pupils according to the number of pupils gaining five GCSEs at grade C or above.

[20] G. Leckie and H. Goldstein, "The Evolution of School League Tables in England 1992-2016: 'Contextual Value-Added', 'Expected Progress' and 'Progress 8'," in *Bristol Working Papers in Education* (Bristol: Graduate School of Education, University of Bristol, 2016), 4.

[21] Ball, Maguire and Braun, 36.

[22] A grading of 'unsatisfactory' in an Ofsted inspection would lead to being put under 'special measures' with more regular visits from Ofsted. Failure to improve could lead to the school being closed down.

[23] See Leckie and Goldstein above.

this as a 'deeply unfortunate decision' and suggested it had long-term consequences for the status of the subject.[24]

With the introduction of league tables in 1992, GCSE results became increasingly important, especially the attainment of a grade C or above. This can be seen to have affected choice of specification, quasi-selection of which students could take the subject beyond the age of 14 and the intense focus on particular groups of borderline students once they were studying for the qualification.[25] From the mid-1990s onwards, pressure for the best examination results possible could affect teachers' choice of GCSE specification. Nicholas recalled:

> The SHP GCSE was being taught in this school when I first came and we kept that up until the changes in '97 or something and then we went over to the Modern World, still from SEG at that point. Then we went to OCR which we still teach today….Modern World B. We loved the Schools History Project, but really did change it because we thought increasingly it was difficult, the kids were finding it difficult… increasingly with the eyes of the management on league tables and performance, we changed…because it was more relevant they would find it more accessible and therefore grades would probably improve and they did, they jumped significantly on that change.

Here Nicholas and his department prioritised attainment over authenticity. The departmental 'passion' for teaching the SHP specification was side-lined due to new priorities of 'accessibility' and 'performance.'

Attaining a C grade at GCSE, in particular seems to have become the deciding factor in various policy enactments. Whereas, before 1988, teachers would have taught O-level to some students and CSE to others, league tables led to the temptation for selection based on probable future achievement. Harris and Haydn provided copious evidence of senior management teams in the early 2000s pointing students to a vocational pathway, benefiting the school's position in the league tables.[26] However, this thesis identified some history teachers discouraging some pupils from taking the subject beyond Key Stage 3, particularly if they were not likely to achieve a C grade or above. Laura, who left the classroom in 2006, was the clearest about this practice, suggesting it had been departmental practice since at least the early 2000s. She recalled:

---

[24] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon, 197.
[25] See Ball, Maguire and Braun pp.81-5.
[26] Harris and Haydn.

> You don't want your results to suffer because they're published so you would discourage people who aren't going to get a C. [27]

Richard and Simon, heads of department for around twenty years, remembered similar practices in their department in the 2000s. Richard explained:

> I think the problem with history is that, if you don't have sufficient writing skills you can't access it, you can't [access] the exam. You can still do the course and that's what I say to kids. Look, I know you love history and you can do the course, but it's a question of what you want to get out of it at the end of it… We don't officially put anybody off, but we do sometimes advise kids, look, I'm not being funny here, but you're just not going to get anything out of it.

Simon substantiated this, with a slight difference:

> I suppose we try to wheedle out the really poor ones and I mean poor in terms of writing skills. It's about whether they can really access the subject at GCSE.

Here was a subject that, in 1991, the Secretary of State for Education had intended every child to study to the age of 16. While some students personally chose not to take it beyond the age of 14, others were actively discouraged from the late 1990s onwards, even by history teachers themselves. The factor behind this decision was an arbitrary grade boundary dictated by the policy of league tables. Some history teachers, at least, were swept up in the pressures of a performative culture which prioritised the attainment of higher grades by the department over the access to history education for a larger number of students.

Within the groups of students who did opt for the subject, the emphasis on achieving five C grades or above sometimes led to undue focus on students predicted to achieve at the C/D borderlines.[28] Ball et al. suggested the 'culture of performance' drew attention to the 'improvement' of almost all students. However, while none could be 'neglected entirely,' some 'improvements' were 'strategically more important than others'.[29] Laura remembered this practice from the early 2000s:

> I do also remember that it was the C/D borderlines that everybody threw everything into. I think there was a problem with that.

Diane substantiated this experience, speaking about her school in 2009:

---

[27] Laura left school teaching in 2006 so she was referring to her practice in the years before that. It is interesting to note in the quote the use of 'your results' – that the results seemed to belong to the teacher, rather than the student.
[28] Government league tables measured what percentage of students in a school attained five GCSEs at C grade or above. It was therefore in the interests of the school to focus on students at the C/D borderline to give them the best possible chance of attaining a grade C rather than a D and therefore boosting the league table position of the school.
[29] Ball, Maguire and Braun, 81.

> They are obsessed here because our C/D borderline is not good. So here they just seem worried about the mark. The mark as a C as opposed to a D and I find that now the students are thinking in that way because they're obviously getting it from everybody that we're aiming for and then you've just got to get a C. My Year 11 now, we've just got to get our C. But I think that's the atmosphere. And I just think I want them to do their best, and if their best means they get a D then I'll be glad for that.

Diane's example showed a change of culture for some students, where achieving a C grade was all that mattered. By the late 2000s the sense that some 'improvements' were more important than others had filtered through to the students.

This move to limiting students from taking GCSE was not consistent across all teachers or all schools. Nicholas was reasonably adamant that any student who wanted to would be able to take GCSE History in his department. When asked if any student could opt for the subject, he explained:

> Pretty well, yeah. I mean there are, there are small ways that we, we've used the shortened course a little bit to, to fend off the odd student that just isn't motivated, but never for purely, well sometimes purely for ability if they just can't cope with a two-year course but never just to improve grades, it's not worth it, we don't have enough students.

There could also be different pressures in different contexts. Simon suggested that, while he remembered a period in the early 2000s when students were encouraged to achieve five A-C by taking 'easier' qualifications, this policy did not last long. He mused:

> Students were encouraged to multiply to five A-C with easier qualifications…. At this school we haven't got a very forward looking senior management. They're reactive rather than proactive. They've left me alone. I don't think it's a good thing for the school, but it might have been a good thing for me, for history.

The context of the school and the approach of senior leaders to GCSE attainment had some impact on the status of history as a subject and therefore the ability of individual teachers to broaden access to the subject. In their 2009 report for the Historical Association, Burn and Harris found a concerning gap between different types of school in terms of GCSE uptake for history, suggesting that among academies a fall in number was much more likely than an increase.[30]

---

[30] Burn and Harris, "Findings from the Historical Association Survey of Secondary History Teachers."

Harris and Haydn explored this issue in detail in a paper on what happens to a subject in a 'free-market' curriculum.[31] This research used teacher voice to explore Ofsted's 2007 comment that 'the biggest issue for school history is its limited place on the school curriculum.'[32] Harris and Haydn concluded that this was not a 'considered attack on history as a school subject by policymakers'. It was rather that 'little thought was given to the unintended effects of some recent curriculum initiatives'.[33] One example they gave of this phenomenon was the increasing place of vocational education initiatives at Key Stage 4.[34] This, alongside the focus on value-added grades for English, maths and science from 2002, then the mapping of five A*-C GCSEs including English and maths from 2006 saw an intensified focus on the 'core' of English, maths and science at the expense of 'foundation' subjects such as history. Perryman found that the 'rivalry' and 'resentment' from departments outside the maths and English core intensified in this period as 'English and maths results affect the whole school in such a high stakes way.'[35]

Across this period, from 1992 to 2011, but particularly in the 2000s, GCSE grades gained more significance for the school, the department and even the individual teacher.[36] Patrick gave an overview of the changing status of history as a GCSE subject:

> I think the status has definitely declined [*When did that begin?*] I think it began with the introduction of league tables and with the drive particularly on the five-plus A to Cs. I think it started with that because a lot of schools then decided, we've got to do English and maths and science, the easiest thing to do is then to do four ITs and a couple of media studies. [*Did the school that you taught in go down that line?*] For some children, yes. History then began to suffer because it was perceived as a difficult subject and not seen as worth doing. The results were pretty good, but it was a difficult subject and the results often didn't look as good in comparison with some of the others. There's also a problem of perception that as it started to be seen as a difficult subject, you got fewer students opting to do it at GCSE and then I think it got squeezed again when you started to get an increased focus on English and maths…

---

[31] Harris and Haydn.

[32] Ofsted, "History in the Balance: History in English Schools 2003-07."

[33] Harris and Haydn, 19.

[34] Vocational subjects offered at GCSE ranged from Business Studies to Travel and Tourism, but also included new ICT initiatives that provided the equivalent of four GCSE qualifications in the government league tables.

[35] Perryman et al., 188.

[36] Leckie and Goldstein (2016) summarised the changing details of school league tables across this period and the consequent impact on school policies. League tables measuring the percentage of students aged 16 gaining five A-C grades came into existence from 1992. In 1994 an A* grade was introduced. In 2006 two of the five GCSEs had to include English and mathematics. Some of the consequences of the policy included teaching to the test at the expense of teaching a broader curriculum, concentrating efforts on students at the C/D grade borderline and the practice of entering students for 'easier' qualifications. Leckie and Goldstein also describe the 'value-added' measures used in league tables between 2002 and 2011. In this assessment, Key Stage 2 results from the last year of primary school were used as baseline data.

and you might have students being pulled out of history for an extra English session or an extra Maths session, so we'd say we're trying to prepare them for an exam as well and we can't pull them out of an English lesson to do that.

Patrick identified several different ways in which history was squeezed as a curriculum subject after the introduction of league tables in 1992 and more particularly after 2004. First was the perception that, in the competition to achieve five GCSE grades of C or above, some subjects were easier than others. This led to some schools encouraging certain students (usually those perceived as less likely to achieve a C grade or above at GCSE History) to take a qualification in ICT that gave four GCSE grades, an example of the vocational initiatives mentioned above. Patrick suggested that both the challenges of history as a school subject, and the further perceived challenges, led to fewer students opting for the subject. A further squeeze on history came after 2004 when the league tables specified the inclusion of a pass in English and maths at GCSE level. This renewed focus on those two subjects led to more lessons on the timetable for those subjects alongside extra-curricular teaching, including taking students out of history lessons to teach them maths. This suggestion of reduced status was supported by Harris and Haydn who found in 2012, that:

> Recent emphasis on the core subjects and ICT, in terms of national strategies, assessments and testing arrangements, and the focus of Ofsted inspections was felt to have downgraded SMTs' treatment of humanities subjects and pupils' views of the status of such subjects.[37]

By 2007 such policies had resulted in only 31.4% of students nationally taking history beyond the age of 14.[38]

In the late 2000s there were further threats to the status of history in some schools. The previous chapter detailed the rise of the two-year Key Stage 3 in order to enable three years to be spent on GCSE courses. This could be seen as a direct result of performance pressure, as earlier options gave more time to GCSE courses and 'core' subjects, with the perhaps unintentional result that those students not opting for history (on average 70% of the cohort) lost out on a year of studying the subject. In some schools, this was the period where vocational subjects were encouraged at GCSE level. In their 2009 report for the Historical Association, Burn and Harris found that a third of 93 schools

---

[37] Harris and Haydn, 3.
[38] Ibid., 7. They found that, despite this average, there was wide national variation. Where some schools had 80% of the year cohort entered for GCSE History, others had very few entries and one school did not timetable history at all at GCSE. The research took place across two local authorities between 2003 and 2006.

responding to the survey, that had seen a fall in numbers opting for history GCSE put this down to history now being 'in competition with a greater range of subjects, some of which were regarded as being easier'. A quarter of respondents pointed specifically to the introduction of vocational courses which, in many cases, lower-attaining students were being compelled to take – effectively barring them from continuing with the study of history.[39] Diane explained her thoughts on this in 2011:

> We constantly feel we have to justify ourselves up against other things – other subjects and it's like, you know, with business studies and things like that it's got to be something for a job – something specific. And I don't like that and I think history has suffered because of that and I think also because it requires higher thinking skills. I'm sorry, people in the PE department and business studies, but the students that study those subjects will tell you that those are easier subjects to do and to get their head round at GCSE.

Edward was furious that the reduced status of history in his school meant he had lost his classroom to Business Studies, but saw the light at the end of the tunnel in the new policy of the English Baccalaureate.[40] He explained:

> Over there now, over there now the rooms over there were designated one for business studies and one for geography, I have no problem with the geography so much but the business studies I have an issue with…that's the change, business studies and lots of the sort of vocational stuff. And, of course, the head was caught out by this because last summer the English Baccalaureate thing was brought in and he's had meetings with me since, right, now, how would you push the numbers up? I don't think he was interested particularly in history as a scientist himself. I feared that when I went it would become humanities rather than history and geography, they would just merge the two. I don't know if he would. I don't think he'll do that now.

The English Baccalaureate (EBacc) was a new policy introduced by the Conservative government in 2011 which saw a new measure introduced to league tables, for the first time favouring the place of history on the curriculum.[41] The immediate response of Edward's headteacher to this policy shows the power of league tables to affect the status of a subject.

From 1997, the 'raising standards' agenda alongside the published league tables seems to have intensified pressures for the highest possible grades at GCSE and resulted in history, perceived as a challenging subject, being marginalised in many schools. Policies emanating from league tables were difficult to avoid in schools, and intensified

---

[39] Burn and Harris, "Findings from the Historical Association Survey of Secondary History Teachers," 8.
[40] According to www.gov.uk, the English Baccalaureate, or EBacc, is 'a school performance measure. It allows people to see how many pupils get a grade C or above in the core academic subjects.' It was introduced in 2010.
[41] The English Baccalaureate measured what percentage of students gained a C grade or above in five subjects: English, maths, science, a language and a subject from the humanities. History was therefore in a stronger position.

in the period 2006—10 as Ofsted pressures grew. The growth in popularity of vocational option choices at this time was a parallel threat to the subject of history. Aside from channelling certain pupils away from the study of history after the age of 14, it also put pressure on teachers to select more accessible specifications in order to attain the best possible grades. When Allan and Patrick spoke about teaching the SHP O-level in the early 1980s, the choice was related to authenticity of the subject and the need to replicate the methods of the historian in the classroom. Allan chose to teach the Arab-Israeli conflict as it related to current affairs; Patrick enjoyed the voyage of discovery inherent in the SHP approach. From the mid-1990s onwards, however, teachers seemed to have a different set of criteria for selecting the most appropriate GCSE course. These were centred on the pressure of attracting students and, most importantly, making the subject accessible to enable students to attain the highest possible grades.

While some teachers in the sample were affected more than others by the marginalisation of the subject, they don't seem to have been able to do much about the policy other than accept it. Edward and Alison seemed frustrated by the move to a two-year Key Stage 3; Nicholas and Diane could see problems with it, but they did not speak of any form of resistance, more a compliant accommodation. While teachers seemed frustrated by policies that focused on English, maths and science at the expense of history, or that restricted students from taking history to GCSE level, they didn't seem to question the prominence given to English and maths as core subjects. Patrick was rather more eloquent than other teachers in the sample in explaining how students' perceptions of history had changed; that due to the league table culture the subject was perceived as difficult which contributed to its declining status on the school curriculum.

A culture of target-setting

In an educational world of 'more, higher, better', markets and competition became central to the life of schools.[42] While government league tables were introduced in the early 1990s, the importance of data intensified under New Labour. Ward, in an overview of educational politics, has written that under New Labour, assessment and school league tables were strengthened with the setting of targets at all levels, 'from

---

[42] Ball, Maguire and Braun, 74.

national government to schools and individual students.[43] The decade after 1997 therefore saw a particular move towards data and pupil-tracking until, in 2015, Ball could proclaim, we are now 'governed by numbers…. We are subject to numbers and numbered subjects.'[44] The system of performativity that existed in schools in the 2000s relied on the collection and analysis of data. As Ball has argued, these then generated 'taxonomies,' which made possible the measurement of quantities and the 'analysis of movement' that is 'improvement'. These policy artefacts and devices contributed to a new kind of technical professionalism which was articulated within the procedures and manipulations of assessment.[45]

From 1997 onwards, numerical targets were set at Key Stage 3 based on the National Curriculum Attainment Targets. When studying at GCSE students would be given a target final GCSE grade. These targets were set based on student attainment in the previous key stage, so target Levels for the end of Key Stage 3 were based on students' attainment in English, maths and science SATs tests at the end of primary school. In some schools a target-culture came to exist, with targets regularly shared with students or visible on the front of an exercise book. The regular setting and sharing of targets with students became a distinct way that history lessons changed in the decade after 2000.

As discussed in the previous chapter, from the late 1990s many history departments organised their assessment around a set of common assessment tasks. This enabled the gathering of National Curriculum Attainment Target data, commonly known as 'Levels' from the Level Descriptors in the National Curriculum documentation. Dana explained this practice:

> We started quite a number of years ago, before I took over… so we're doing common assessment tasks every other term, so we could start getting National Curriculum Levels.

Laura, teaching in the same department at the time, was frustrated by this policy. She recalled:

---

[43] S. Ward, "Education Policy and Politics," in *A Student's Guide to Education Studies*, ed. S. Ward (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008).
[44] S. J. Ball, "Education, Governance and the Tyranny of Numbers," in *Journal of Education Policy* 30, no. 3 (2015).
[45] Ball, Maguire and Braun, 85.

> You had to do teacher assessment of Levels. This is the other thing that got me mad. These Levels were supposed to be at the end of Key Stage 3 and when we went down the road of, as soon as they came into the school after six weeks you were giving them a Level [*Can you date that?*] I suppose it was probably mid to late nineties. At the end I remember teacher assessment at the end of Key Stage 3 and you knew there was sort of value-added at GCSE so you just give them a lower Level. And why not? And they could be a Level on this because they're quite good at that, but on this one they can't really get their head around the Bolsheviks/ Mensheviks so it's lower.

Here Laura realised that she could manipulate the system. The data had to be provided to the central school system, but as far as the school was concerned, it was a low-stakes subject.

This manipulation of the system continued into the early 2000s. Individual teachers found their own way to comply with the technical system while in reality only paying lip-service to its intentions. Diane explained how she learnt to play the performativity game:

> At S—, so from 2003 onwards. Split-levels, so 4a, b, c etc. And because it's mad for history anyway, so to be honest you'd always just do a best fit, but it was always quite meaningless. And where they were always obsessed with children making progress…it sounds awful…but you had to ensure you never made it too high from the start because otherwise you're stymied in the end in terms of their target. They could never accept that kids could do one good piece of work, but then dip and once they've shown that you're stuck. So, through experience, you don't make yourself hostage to fortune.[46]

Edward described a similar evasion of policy at a similar time, over a hundred miles away:

> In the 2002 inspection, I had to have an interview with the inspector. Nice bloke, nice bloke. I felt sorry for him, because at that stage Key Stage 4 targets were based on history at Key Stage 3. So, I kept the Key Stage 3 results down so that we'd look better at value-added at Key Stage 4. I knew what I was doing, and he picked up on it. They're very low aren't they? So, I brought in loads and loads of evidence. We had loads of filing cabinets. Would you like to take that home and have a look at it and see if we're not marking properly? I knew what we were doing. The poor bugger. Oh yes, you're not marking high enough, you have to raise them. So, the next five years, they gradually went up, because it no longer matters at Key Stage 4. I play the system, you've got to, you know, I'm not stupid.

Nicholas and Richard provided similar examples of ticking boxes to accommodate the system, as explored in chapter 6. This roguish attitude to target-setting at Key Stage 3 was universal among the teachers interviewed in the late 1990s and early 2000s.

---

[46] Schools often followed a policy of not letting the student's Level move 'down' so on paper it often looked like a gradual improvement, despite different topics and different aspects of history being taught.

Teachers were enacting the target-setting policy, but managing to maintain a level of realism within the constant pressure for higher standards.

From the mid-2000s though, for a significant number of teachers in this sample, targets took a more central role in classroom discourse. Counsell has linked this to the prominence of 'Assessment for Learning principles' and the way the policy was harnessed to the idea of teaching to Levels and assessing with Levels and talking about Levels in every lesson 'all in the name of a well-intentioned desire to make things transparent or explicit to pupils.'[47] For the teachers in this sample, this more regular use of Levels and targets, based on the National Curriculum Attainment Target played out in a variety of ways. Dana claimed this practice began around 2005:

> The kids have in their exercise book at the beginning of the year when they get a new book, they have a thing in the front of book. We never would have done that back in the 90s. This is what my grade means, you know.

Edward explained a similar process in the department he shared with Alison:

> Do I care about National Curriculum Levels? Not especially, I mean it's worse in this school because they get target grades, these stickers on the back [*shows the back of a student exercise book*].

Mark shared a similar practice in 2011. Significantly, out of ten practising teachers interviewed in 2011, five specifically mentioned targets written on stickers on the front of exercise books.[48] The policy of target-setting had acquired a constant presence in the history classroom.

When teachers came to describe their current practice during the 2011 interviews, assessment dominated the discourse, particularly in the case of Dana and Diane. In the most extreme example, Diane described attributing each of her lesson objectives a National Curriculum Level so that students could see what they were aiming for in terms of Key Stage 3 targets within every single lesson. She said:

> So. if they come in I've got things I'll always do. I've got my objectives. I've got to put my Levels up on the board. But that's a department thing. The head of department said that's what we do, so that's what we do and I will do that, but it takes ages writing them out and I'm thinking blimmin' heck.

---

[47] C. Counsell, "Editorial," *Teaching History* 115 (2004): 2.
[48] Although there were 13 history teachers in the sample, two had moved to work in ITE by this point and one worked as a Local Authority advisor.

Diane seemed reluctant to adopt the practice, and yet she was compliant. As Perryman et al. found in their study of English and maths teachers, it was virtually impossible to 'resist the policies around attainment.'[49] The Levels refer to the National Curriculum Attainment Target, intended to be assessed at the end of three years' history work. In this example, students were expected to know their current Level and work according to their target in each lesson. The historical learning was couched in the language of assessment in order to optimise the number of students reaching their target Level. Dana, teaching in a similar school, was also fluent in the language of assessment and targets. She described a typical lesson in 2011:

> That table over there all my kids who are heading for Level 7, those were my 6s over there, these are my high 6s, these are my 5 going into 6, and these are my 5s, and that's getting them out of 4.

Thus, the Level Descriptors of the National Curriculum became the tool used for differentiating between pupils' historical attainment. Dana explained how she would assess the Level of students by oral, as well as written, contributions:

> I remember that I asked him a question and he was able to do more than just explain, he would be able to analyse why.

Dana's language of 'explain' and 'analyse' here comes directly from the 'Level 6 Descriptors' of the National Curriculum Attainment Target.[50] Here the analytical elements of the subject are separated from the substantive content. Dana and Diane's model of progression in history became limited by this constant use of Level Descriptors in every lesson. As Counsell put it, 'a puzzling closing down of thinking about progression in history, and, instead, a pressing of the Level Descriptors into inappropriate service.'[51] Counsell was describing the regular use of Level Descriptors in 2004. Over the next seven years, in some schools more than others, the inappropriate use of these descriptors intensified to such a degree that it came to dominate the discourse of teachers such as Diane and Dana in their conversations about the teaching of history.

Many of the teachers in the sample appeared frustrated by the target-setting culture. Ball et al. have written of the 'discomforts' of the system; that not all teachers were

---

[49] Perryman et al., 190.
[50] DFE.
[51] Counsell, 2.

convinced by the 'rhetorics of performance' and that many teachers found it 'difficult to establish a clear ethical position in relation to the *techne* of performance.'[52] Within the conversations with this sample of teachers, dissent and discomfort about target-setting policy were readily apparent with many of the teachers. Perhaps the benefit of not being a high-status subject within the school was that history teachers felt the freedom to interpret the assessment criteria in this way. GCSE targets for history in 2011 would have been based on English, maths and science results at Key Stage 3, so Key Stage 3 history results were less crucial to overall school success. Ball, Maguire and Braun refer to some specialist teachers being central to some policies, but peripheral to other policies. 'There are spaces in schools where some kinds of policies do not reach or are relatively insignificant.'[53]

There are four teachers not represented in this section. Allan, Patrick, William and Simon did not talk about target-setting or use of Level Descriptors at all in their interviews. William had left the classroom in 2008 and Patrick was not teaching Key Stage 3 in 2011. Even so, the silence is remarkable. The data collected for this study does not allow a judgement to be made on whether this silence related to individual beliefs or school context. While some teachers appear to have allowed their discourse to become dominated by assessment, whether through context or personal preference, others seem to have been able to retain a focus on curriculum rather than assessment, a more authentic experience of history, at Key Stage 3 at least. Noticeably, three of these four teachers have been identified earlier in this study as being strongly influenced by the Schools History Project.

History teachers seem to have had a roguish attitude to target-setting since its inception. They complied with the policy, setting the targets and gathering data from students to show that targets were being met. In the late 1990s and early 2000s the teachers in this research do not seem to have allowed target-setting or limited progression models to inhibit their practice. From the mid-2000s, however, some schools seem to have raised the status of assessment, and therefore encouraged the frequent presence of Levels in the history classroom, possibly in response to 'Assessment for Learning' priorities. By

---

[52] Ball, Maguire, and Braun, 89.
[53] Ball, Maguire and Braun refer to some specialist teachers being central to some policies, but peripheral to other policies. 'There are spaces in schools where some kinds of policies do not reach or are relatively insignificant.' 97.

this time, half the teachers in the sample had stickers on students' books where their target Level was recorded. For many teachers there seems to have been a widespread attempt not to let the meeting of targets interfere with pre-existing forms of teaching and to set targets as low as possible so that progression would become more obvious. Diane and Dana became swept up in enacting part of a whole-school assessment policy where National Curriculum Levels dominated every lesson. The focus on target-setting can be seen to have given an undue weighting to assessment of second-order concepts and possibly therefore reduced the weighting given to assessment of substantive content.[54] Beyond this, all the targets set were based on a questionable, linear progression model that was not intended for such frequent use.[55] Both the prioritising of assessment over curriculum and the nature of the assessment suggest a move away from the 'authentic professional' who could make more disciplinary choices about teaching and progression models towards the 'technical professional', limited by systems that were difficult to avoid. The broad-brush language of the Level Descriptors, intended for general, summative assessment, came to dominate discussions about student progress within individual lessons, thus limiting the language used to discuss the subject and potentially teachers' ability to articulate the micro-level of student progress seen at a lesson level.

The power of examination boards

A consequence of league tables and the marketisation of education was that GCSE examinations became ever more important. Perryman et al. suggested teachers from different subject departments responded to the pressures of high-stakes examinations in different ways.[56] This section explores some of the specific reactions of the history teachers in the sample to the pressure of GCSE exams and the influence such examinations had on their wider teaching. Several of the history teachers in the sample explained how GCSEs had an impact on the way they taught. For example, Alison was insistent that the GCSE specifications changed her teaching at their inception, back in the late 1980s:

> In GCSE, it happened when the GCSE began because there were sources on the paper, even in the first GCSE. So, we had to do more source-based stuff, and students finding out for themselves.

---

[54] K. Hammond, "Substantive and Disciplinary Knowledge," in *Masterclass in History Education*, eds C. Counsell, A. Chapman and K. Burn (London: Bloomsbury, 2016).
[55] Lee and Shemilt.
[56] Perryman et al.

This may reveal Alison's practice before GCSE as more narrative-based than source-focused, but she marked the introduction of the GCSE examination as a clear agent in her change of teaching approach. Edward agreed. Asked whether the introduction of GCSE changed how he taught at Key Stage 3 he replied:

> Not immediately, no, because the penny, it took me, I can be a bit dense sometimes, it took a couple years, probably when I came here, when I came here [in 1991].

This practice, from the early 1990s onwards, of adapting Key Stage 3 teaching to fit the demands of GCSE examinations, placed significant agency and power with the examination boards. Not only were GCSE specifications informing the *what* and *how* of history being taught to 14—16-year-olds, they were informing how history would be approached and taught across the whole 11—16 period.

As league tables and target-setting were brought in during the 1990s, the perceived importance of preparing pupils for GCSE became apparent and the power of the examination boards to affect teaching practice intensified. It may have been an unintentional outcome, but as teachers began to prioritise the language and assessment criteria of GCSE there was an impact on the way teachers' modelled progression in history and, perhaps, the very purpose of studying history prior to 14. Alison explained the shift in her teaching pedagogy, comparing the early 1990s with practice in the 2000s:

> I mean it used to be short questions, short answers and essays. And now it's enquiry-based, it is source-based. We gear our questions, even for Year 7, very much along with lines of GCSE-type questions so that they get used to that formula....The bigger influences were the Exam Boards, and what they required obviously because you know, you've got to get kids used in Year 7 to what's likely to come their way in Years 10, 11, 12 and 13.

Here, Alison specifically named the exam boards as agents in changing her practice to a source-based approach. Edward's practice was clearly influenced by the examination boards, down to his choice of language in the classroom. He explained:

> The focus at OCR changed slightly. Colin Shephard was pushing the key thing they wanted all the time was the purpose of the source, so we pushed purpose, there's that word all the time, have kids ingrained in it.... I know they discredited it thank God, but when empathy was a big thing, we did empathy.[57]

---

[57] Colin Shephard was Director of Schools History Project and Chief Examiner for OCR GCSE Modern World History. This suggests Edward had been on courses provided by examination boards

Although in theory the introduction of GCSE only limited teachers' autonomy in imposing evidential approaches to the subject, in practice, particularly from the mid-1990s onwards, the language and pedagogy of lessons was heavily influenced by what was found on GCSE exam papers, in mark schemes and information shared by the powerful chief examiners.

Moreover, as value-added measures were introduced and the pressure on GCSE grades intensified, from 2006 onwards, GCSE mark schemes began to have an even more precise influence on the teaching of history. Simon and Patrick, both GCSE examiners since 1991, spoke of GCSE mark schemes changing in the early 2000s so that there was no longer any discussion about them and they became more formulaic. This technical knowledge that the teacher needed to ensure success in external exams could then be shared with the students. Richard gave an honest account of this context:

> Certainly, at both A-level and GCSE I tell them exactly how to do it. My GCSE revision session tomorrow, it won't be on how to revise Nazi Germany, it will be on how to do question one. This is what they're asking for, this is how to answer it and make sure you do that. And at A-level even more so…. It's basically a game that you have to play and you've got to know the rules of the game. It's not always writing good history. It's prescriptive, formulaic and the guys who've got really good arguments, who take questions and turn them on their head, I say you can try that, but don't do it for an exam because it's very difficult to score well. They don't like it.

Richard was not prioritising the historical content in this revision session. Rather, he was teaching examination technique. Like many of his peers in the previous section, he was in a position where he could not resist the policy of raising standards, so he found a formulaic way of supporting his students to achieve the best possible examination success. This is an example of the 'surface-level teaching' of which Ball et al. have written:

> With some exceptions, the emphasis of interventions is on a very *constrained creativity.* They involve a *predictable inventiveness* and almost always focus on 'strategic teaching' and 'strategic learning' with little attempt at 'deep learning'. That is, an emphasis on forms of teaching and learning that are firmly oriented to the requirements of examination passing, that is short term knowledge and surface learning.[58]

This is not to argue that this was typical of Richard's teaching, but it was clear that this technical language and expertise in examination success had become a crucial part of the history teacher's craft in the mid-2000s.

---

[58] Ball, Maguire and Braun, 85.

From the mid-2000s onwards the very precise language of GCSE mark schemes also came to influence teaching lower down the school. Dana provided an example of this 'exam expertise' in 2011 as she took the exact wording from the GCSE examination papers to structure her history teaching lower down the school, in this case for Year 7:

> I need to make sure that at Key Stage 3 I'm preparing them for Key Stage 4... we're setting up a new homework programme. For next year, I said to them, in terms 1 and 2, you're focusing for Year 7 on 'describe'. They gotta build up that describe, and start using exam-style questions, so that they can link to that when they do get to the exams. And my Key Stage 3 exam for Year 9, was a GSCE exam. So, I'm hitting it there, because I've got to prep 'em, I've got to get 'em ready. And the amount of time that you've got available to get them ready seems to be getting less and less and less.

Here, Dana appeared to be planning backwards from GCSE to enable her younger students to make 'progress' against GCSE specifications. Like Alison, above, she used the exact exam-style questions to frame learning from the very beginning of Year 7. In this situation, the exam boards had a significant power in affecting change in secondary level history education. For five years of secondary education in history, students would be working towards the rather narrow, specific aims of the GCSE examination taken at 16. Goudie and Foster are among several that have commented on the problems related to this practice, concerned particularly with 'the difficulty of securing progression from Key Stage 3 to GCSE given the restrictive narrowness of both the specification and assessment rubrics.[59]

Dana summarised the power of the exam boards in effecting change in her teaching. When asked whether it was government policy, textbooks or exam boards that made a difference in her teaching she interrupted, emphasising the power of the examination boards in directing her decisions:

> It's got to be, it's got to be, I don't necessarily agree with it but it's got to be because they're the ones who are producing the exam that my kids have to take, and I'm being measured based on my exam results, so I gotta, I gotta go with what they're doing.

Mark also recognised the importance of this influence, both in the need to react to the nuanced changes that examination boards brought in on a regular basis, but also in the

---

[59] R. Foster and K. Goudie, "Shaping the Debate: Why Historians Matter More Than Ever at GCSE," in *Teaching History* 163 (2016): 17.

pressure this put on teachers. He looked back on the influence of the examination boards on his practice over the twenty years before the 2011 interview:

> The number of changes of specifications that have gone on in the last twenty years, I mean they, it's almost a year, a year doesn't go by which means something changes for GCSE or to an AS level… you're always having to sort of keep juggling balls, keep finding resources. The essence hasn't changed of what you're trying to do, but they're always sort of just slightly moving the goal post here and there. …They changed slightly the emphasis of one of the questions a year or so ago, and another one you know, and you always have to keep up with all of sort of that sort of thing so you're constantly having to sort of re-examine what you're doing, re-evaluate what the kids are doing as well.

Within the broader policy context of league tables, the standards agenda and the increasing requirements of data, GCSE examinations took on a disproportionate role. As with the Key Stage 3 targets described in the previous section, assessment rather than substantive content played a dominant role in teachers' descriptions. The language of mark schemes in particular, alongside the perceived need for progression towards a GCSE endpoint, influenced history teaching from the very beginning of secondary school. In the late 1980s and early 1990s the requirements of the GCSE examinations may have moved teachers such as Alison, Edward and Mark towards evidence-based teaching, but by 2005 GCSE was having a more restrictive effect. The false teleology of GCSE grades narrowed the approach to content, assessment and even teaching at Key Stage 3.

In general all the teachers interviewed showed their teaching had become more constrained by examination board specifications during the 2000s. This was certainly true at GCSE level as examination questions and mark schemes appeared to drive and inform their teaching. Due to space constrictions this section focused on a small group of teachers who typified the general trend. Dana and Alison stood out in particular for allowing the principles of GCSE teaching to dominate their practice at Key Stage 3.

Experiencing surveillance

During the period 1985—2011 a surveillance culture gradually emerged in some schools, but it differed in its place, intensity, origin and purpose. The Oxford Dictionary defines surveillance as, 'close observation, especially of a suspected spy or criminal'. One might not expect such as a tight system of observation to be necessary within a

state-funded education system, but the development of accountability measures and a decline in teachers' professional status led to levels of observation and checking of work that could be described as surveillance. There is a distinction to be drawn between supportive, welcome observation that develops the practice of the teacher (and the observer) and high-stakes checking of practice, through detailed observation against generic criteria, open-door policies where teachers' practice is critiqued on 'learning walks', frequent 'marking scrutinies', and the constant use of data to question teacher practice. The latter is defined here as 'surveillance' and Perryman's work on a school in 'special measures' that shared many such experiences will be explored below.[60] William described the surveillance that he faced in the 1980s as a history teacher in an inner-London borough. This was particularly focused around anti-racism measures and was explored in chapter 5. While there were observations of teaching across the course of these teachers' careers, the nature and tone of observations in some schools changed substantially from a supportive, low-status, perhaps subject-specific focus in the 1980s, to more technical, generic high-status observations by the 2000s.

The context in which teachers worked played a significant part in how intrusive the surveillance was and how teachers reacted to it. Perryman researched the experience of a particular school classified by Ofsted as in 'special measures' in 2006.[61] In her study she gave a convincing account of Bentham's panopticon and suggested that even if the school wasn't being officially inspected 'the dark central tower' of Ofsted was always watching. Perryman claimed that 'the exercise of continuing surveillance through the process of monitoring and evaluation means that those concerned also come to anticipate the response…and therefore come to discipline themselves.'[62] None of the schools that the sample of teachers were teaching in, or had taught in, were in special measures. However, there was increasing evidence in the interviews of the perceived presence of the 'dark central tower' of Ofsted from 2000 onwards.

This section falls into two parts, first exploring the direct contact with Ofsted as a form of surveillance, and second considering other examples of surveillance and prescription as pressure for data intensified. After 2001, and again from 2006 the pressure to

---

[60] Perryman.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Harland (1996:101) quoted in ibid., p154-55

conform to a set of expected principles set by Ofsted substantially increased. When Ofsted inspections began in 1992, teams of up to fifteen inspectors were sent into secondary schools with six-weeks' notice to observe as subject specialists over four to five days. From 2001 the inspection system began to change and smaller teams of four would go into school, with only 48-hours-notice, for two to three days. Elliott has argued that the reduction in the amount of teaching observed led to judgements about schools being increasingly based on performance data.[63] From 2005 there was a further major change in the inspection regime as schools were expected to complete a self-evaluation form that inspectors could read before arrival at the school. Crucially, the judgements headteachers made in this report had to be substantiated with evidence collected within the school. In 2006 a White Paper was published, 'The Schools White Paper: Higher Standards, Better Schools for All', which encompassed this continuing policy of raising standards, 'standards must keep rising in the globalised world in which we now live. High standards must be universal to every child in every school in every community.'[64] Ball has described this standards 'discourse' as a 'vision of what schooling is and should be – more, higher, better'.[65]

In the 1980s teachers in the sample, other than William, all described relative autonomy in their teaching experience, which was accompanied by little observation or control of pedagogy. Richard gave a variety of examples of being observed across the course of his career. The first was back in the mid-1980s, included here for the purpose of comparison with the later higher-stakes observations. Richard remembered the lesson in question:

> My first observation was by the head of department, a lovely guy, Mike, who has since passed away. He was there at the back of class and he was writing loads of stuff and I thought oh, don't know if I'm doing well or not. So, at the end of it I sort of said well, what do you think Mike? And he literally turned and he said, well he said um, 'B blank A blank F' and you're doing six across. He'd been doing the crossword during my [observation], and that's what it was like.

Richard may have selected this particular example of early observation to emphasise the difference with more recent practice, but it highlights the low stakes of lesson observations early in this period.

[63] A. Elliott, "Twenty Years Inspecting English Schools - Ofsted 1992-2012," in *RISE Review* (London: RISE, 2012).
[64] DfES, "Higher Standards, Better Schools for All: More Choice for Parents and Pupils," ed. Department for Education and Skills (Nottingham: DfES Publications, 2005).
[65] Ball, Maguire, and Braun, 74.

Other teachers took a positive view of observation across their career. Patrick in particular:

> [*And when did you start being observed?*] I always have been actually. I was quite used to it. [*So, before performance management?*] Oh, long before. I was observed in my first year of teaching as an NQT by local, LEA inspectors [*Did the tone of the observation change?*] Yes, they were very much supportive. They would go through stuff with you and give you feedback. I don't remember terribly well. It was very different from an Ofsted observation. As you know, they don't really give anything back at all, but we got very used to observation with or without performance management.

Here, and in descriptions of later observations, Patrick displayed a distinct and unusual professional confidence. He was unusual in having been observed throughout his career, but also unique among the teachers interviewed in describing the observations as positive and supportive.

Ofsted came into existence in 1992. Diane suggested this was the first time she was observed as a teacher beyond her teacher training course:

> The first time I was watched was when the first round of Ofsted came in and that was when they gave you half the term to prepare for it, when you knew the dates they were coming in. [*Mid 1990s?*] That was at A— School. And I remember the guy coming in and he watched a Year 7 lesson and one of the kids in the class said, because he was looking at their books, and the kid said 'don't interrupt, Miss is talking.' [*Would your lesson have been graded?*] Yes, it was graded and you were given it on a piece of paper and that was a 'good'. I can remember there was that big panic, that you knew they were coming.

This early stage of Ofsted inspections was not necessarily perceived as positive, but it was personal and the memories stood out for this sample of teachers. Richard recollected:

> I was called a dinosaur by the first HMI inspector. He said, you teach like an old man. I said, yeah I know, but you know it works, it works for me. I don't teach like that anymore, I have changed…. This was the last stage of my very first Ofsted where the wheel had turned, it was group work again. This guy said, you know you don't use group work. I said well there is a group of twenty-six of them and there's me, and he didn't think that was very funny but, I said was it a bad lesson? He said no. I said, so what's the problem then? He didn't criticise me. He just said it was a great lesson, but it's not a great Ofsted lesson, and I said that's good enough for me.

Perhaps this was Richard reminiscing a little about lower-stakes inspections, but even here in the mid-1990s there was a sense of performance about the inspection, that

lessons might be presented in a different way when there was an inspector in the classroom. However, for some, these early Ofsted inspections provoked a change in approach. Alison was asked why her practice changed to become more student-led. She answered:

> It was after our first major inspection, so when inspections first started – [*Early 1990s*?] Yes, and our results have always been pretty good here in history, some of the better results in the school, but the Ofsted inspector slated us for talking too much in the lessons…. And then you began to realise, that to me is teaching, that to [Edward] was teaching, because we know the anecdotes, we have accumulation of knowledge, the kids lap it up, and then you start them off on their research. We had to suddenly start thinking. We don't even give them much of an introduction now, it's you know there's the resources, there's the questions, seek and you will find.

For Richard, Alison and Edward, the focus of these early Ofsted inspections appeared to have been moving teachers away from a didactic approach towards a more student-led, learning focus. They responded in different ways; Richard slightly more defensively, but he was quick to assure that he eventually changed; Alison marked the feedback as a key turning-point in her teaching career. The Ofsted inspectors they referred to, although not spoken of in the same respectful terms as LEA advisors, were subject-specialists, observing full lessons and giving feedback to individuals.

After 2005 Ofsted inspections themselves underwent a period of major reform. One of the most far-reaching changes was the introduction of a Self Evaluation Form (SEF) that headteachers had to complete before the arrival of the inspection team. Simon told a long anecdote about a recent inspection:

> There's a story from the last Ofsted actually, which is quite telling. 2014, I think.[66] I was a bit nervous because I don't mark my books very well. We had a massive pre-Ofsted scrutiny where an inspector came in and looked at English books and then came to us because of the literacy thing and said 'they're not marked properly, you can't just put a tick on the page' and I thought, my goodness, because I'm not going to change for Ofsted. So, we then got the notice that Ofsted were coming in, they gave us the notice on the Wednesday that they were coming in on Thursday and Friday. And people were going mad marking books and people were here until 9 o'clock at night preparing lessons. I went home at 4 as I normally do, I did the odd lesson and prepared what I was going to do. And I was really annoyed when nobody came to observe me in the morning, lessons 1, 2, 3, 4 because I had prepared what I thought were reasonably decent lessons. And then they came 10 minutes into my period 5 so I was even more annoyed. And I was doing a lesson on the Battle of Britain with Year 9 so it was a Year 9 class that were eating out of my hand, no problem, but I didn't think it was particularly exciting. There was a bit of question and answer, the usual things

---

[66] Although in 2014 this is strictly outside the bounds of this research project, this is included as an example of later inspection regime

you try and do, but I didn't give the inspector a lesson plan – I thought if they want one they should come and ask for one; being rather revolutionary, and it was a joint observation with one of the SLT. And at the end of the day we had a parents' evening which made it even doubly difficult to have Ofsted and at the beginning of the parents' evening the member of SLT came up to me and said, by the way Simon, do you want to know what you got? And I basically just looked at her and said, not really. She said, the Ofsted inspector and I were sat down for quite a while and we were cogitating for quite a while on whether or not it was 'outstanding', but it ended up being 'good'. So well done. And I said I thought it was a bit safe, to be honest, I couldn't imagine it being 'outstanding.' But isn't it strange that you know, all those people that had been here working hours and hours the night before… And on the Thursday apparently we had been close to being 'unsatisfactory' and lessons like mine actually helped and then on the following day the head convinced the team to go and see teachers he actually recommended, so he went to see all this lot *(points in the direction of the history department)*, and they all got Outstanding and they saved the school as it were. But on the Thursday evening virtually the whole of SLT came up to me and said 'well done Simon, thanks very much for that' and I thought this is just a nonsense, isn't it?

There are many points of note within this story, several of which will be picked up later. However, it serves well as a comparison with earlier descriptions of the Ofsted inspection. Here, the inspector did not arrive at the beginning of the lesson as full lessons no longer needed to be observed. He/she was observing alongside a member of the school leadership team, but neither of them were subject specialists. There was a lot of panic in the school the night before the inspection due to a perceived need for marked books. Simon had a rather alternative attitude to the inspection which will be considered later, but taught what he described as a 'safe' lesson and received praise for it.

It wasn't always the Ofsted inspections themselves that effected change, but a certain fear surrounding impending inspections and what Ofsted 'might' be looking for. Alison described her school's situation in 2011:

> They perceive that is what Ofsted will [want]...Because there are four other schools in the area and they have all got 'outstanding' and we haven't. And we also have a new-ish head who, thought he could turn round the school in less years than it's taking. And they're panicking. We, we go through various initiatives, as I'm sure other schools do, to tick boxes [*So they think they might be put on special measures, or, unsatisfactory, or –*] Um, I don't think we'll ever be down as 'unsatisfactory' as our, our results are going up and they've never been, overall they've never been bad, but the English, maths and science things, they matter the most –

Here, the dark-tower of the panopticon that Perryman wrote of comes to mind; constant rounds of generic initiatives imposed by a senior management team keen to please their Ofsted masters.

Such fears, alongside the demands of the SEF for evidence, led to a more rigorous lesson observation schedule in schools between Ofsted inspections. Allan described this experience:

> It started off being very supportive, I think and then 2008-2009, perhaps it was just a new headteacher taking over and interpreting what Ofsted wanted in a much more draconian way, which led to half-termly observations for every teacher. So, the head of department had to observe teachers and had to be observed himself by senior management. It was quite a lot and because they had a tick-list of what they were looking for it discouraged innovations. I mean, you're not going to experiment when you've got your lesson being observed, because by the nature of experimentation, sometimes it works, sometimes it doesn't.

The schedule Allan described would have seen all teachers in the school having formal lesson observations six times over the course of a year. This was much more a surveillance, performative culture than had previously existed in the school. When Allan was asked whether the 'tick-list' he mentioned was subject-related, he responded:

> They were generic, very much generic that teachers should not be at the front of the class doing whole class teaching for more than about 15% of the lesson time [*So that, I imagine is quite a change from your previous approach?*] Absolutely, absolutely and that's not really my style. I like to be at the front and leading discussions – breaking off and going into discussion groups for a few minutes and then coming back. [*So did you take that on board, that advice, or did you mediate it in some way?*] I tried to mediate it, but what I did do, I was observed by the head teacher and I exceeded the 15% quota and was marked down and despite being an Advanced Skills Teacher my lesson was not graded as outstanding.

Curiously, the examples from Allan here, but also from Alison and Richard earlier in the chapter, were all about the amount of time devoted to teacher talk in a lesson. Thompson has suggested that the need for teacher talk to be curtailed to 'free students to learn' is 'one of the bigger myths surrounding Ofsted and others who observe lessons.' He cited Hattie saying, 'it is likely that there will be more teacher talk in history at the start of a topic so that deeper learning can then follow.'[67]

Laura, having left the classroom in 2006, was quite nonchalant in her description of lesson observations, but shared Allan's concerns about the generic approach from senior leaders:

> [*Do you remember anyone coming round and observing you?*] Occasionally somebody from senior management. Maybe because I'm stroppy and I'm a historian, I could argue that black is white if I wanted to…..I felt like they were observing to

---

[67] For the opinion of one history advisor on this. see N. Thompson, "Teacher Talk in History Lessons" https://www.keystagehistory.co.uk/opinion/teacher-talk-in-history-lessons.

> catch you out almost, and they didn't have the subject knowledge to…. That was the issue.

If the observers were not subject-specialist and valued a generic approach to structuring lessons, without specialist knowledge of what the teacher might be trying to achieve in a history lesson, then observations could become a scene of conflicting approaches.

In some schools there would be a more relaxed and collaborative attitude to observation. Patrick described this approach:

> One of the things I liked about H— was that it was very open and one of my colleagues who was in charge of teaching and learning would send a variety of people in to observe - those learning to teach or new teachers – to observe a particular skill. If he thought certain people were particularly good at certain things… I was regarded as very good at question and answer, so I would be observed. If he had someone who was a bit weaker on that they would come in and watch one of my lessons. I had a very good relationship with K— (the head of history in the school). K— knew that I didn't always plan every lesson absolutely to the letter, but equally she knew that I always did have a plan if it was an observation and that if I didn't she knew the lesson would actually be planned, but like I said to her, it's in my head.

Again here, it is Patrick who stands out as having a different attitude to observation. He welcomed not only his head of department, but other younger teachers in to observe his lessons and learn from his practice. This was observation for the purpose of collaboration rather than surveillance. Although Patrick was an assistant headteacher and that could have influenced his experience, the context and culture of the school also played a part.

For many of the teachers interviewed, the sense of observed lesson as 'performance' was rife at the time of the 2011 interviews. Diane:

> So, if they come in I've got things I'll always do. I've got my objectives. I've got to put my Levels up on the board. But that's a department thing. The head of department said that's what we do, so that's what we do and I will do that.

Alison supported this experience, recalling the focus on the generic aspects when her lesson was observed, particularly the use of technology:

> If they don't see you using any technology in the class then it's a bad lesson, it's an unsatisfactory lesson. So, there's ways around that if you can get the lesson objective up on the board using the projector. It's easy enough to get round, but, you know it's annoying. And the same with lesson objectives, they have to go up on the board… whether you've got bottom Year 7s, who wouldn't understand what the phrase 'lesson objective' meant in a month of Sundays, it still has to go up on the board. So, yes, if I

> don't, if I don't use some form of technology in my class then my lesson will be
> unsatisfactory before I've even opened my mouth.

This is an extreme example from Alison, but the particular school she and Edward were teaching in seems to have been under some pressure to 'perform.' Unlike Patrick or even Simon, who were remarkably relaxed about observations at this stage in their career and experience, Alison and Edward seem to have been caught up in a school culture of performance, and they shared their discomfort with this external pressure.

Increasingly, from around 2005 onwards, there was a wider variety of methods used to observe and scrutinise teachers' practice in the classroom. These developments all took away from the sense of teacher as professional. Alison and Edward again, gave one of the most extreme examples of surveillance when they talked about being observed from outside their classroom window:

> Some people have their view of history without finding out exactly what goes on. For example, in the last two years, SLT managed to walk by outside here, not come in, and then call [Edward] and say, there's no active learning going on in your lesson. When they haven't even had the good manners to come in and find out whether it is an input part of the session. We both, well the three of us, like our classes to come in and be quiet to begin with. But that's not to say that they're not doing group work later on in the lesson. We've had, the three of us, on one day, all our lessons judged by someone standing outside, not even coming in here, and deciding that we're, you know we are the dinosaurs of the school.

The interviews with Alison and Edward were carried out in their departmental office at the back of the school grounds. All of the history classrooms were in prefabricated buildings with the classroom doors facing into a collective porch area. The observations Alison refers to here took place through the window, as the senior teacher walked past outside. Judgements were made about the subject and its teachers in this way and the teachers were expected to change their teaching in response to such judgements. This was far removed from the subject-specific, professional approach Alison described twenty years earlier or that Patrick was experiencing at a similar time. Although the school Alison and Edward taught in had been graded 'good' by Ofsted, there were distinct echoes of the panopticon described by Perryman in the failing school.[68]

There were other examples of increased surveillance. In the story that Simon told about Ofsted and his surprisingly good lesson, he started by talking about a 'pre-Ofsted

---

[68] Perryman.

scrutiny' where an inspector (presumably a private consultant) suggested to Simon that his books had not been marked properly. Dawn spoke of, not only departmental inspections within the school, but also of regular 'marking scrutinies:'

> When I marked piles of books and left them there, I knew that he [the head of department] would have looked through my books. But I would rather that then when people say, 'I'd like three sets of books on Tuesday please.' What happens now, when they say we're going to do an assessment review, everyone is doing it (*marking the books)*. You'd have to have a pea-brain not to do it. And I'd rather they had a whole set of books anyway, because if they ask for three books you can guarantee that they will pick the one that isn't marked to look at.

In Diane's later interview in 2016, having moved to teach in a selective school, she described a new method of surveillance, which was becoming common in other schools:

> So, we now have an 'open door' policy all the time which the kids don't like at all. It's disruptive. They don't like people coming in and out. It actually doesn't worry me. I forget the door is open.

This was the final part of the jigsaw of the panopticon. The senior team did not have to enter the classroom to form a judgement on what was happening and teachers were expected to conform to the expectations of the senior team at all times, just in case one was passing the open door.

By 2011 teachers were being formally observed on a regular basis. Between Ofsted inspections, those who observed would often be senior teachers or outside consultants who used generic tick-lists, rather than subject-specific criteria, to pass judgement on teachers. For many, however, the surveillance went further, with marking scrutinies and open-door policies so that teachers' actions could be checked at all times. There was a sense of always being watched, and as a result, a need to be compliant with other policies discussed above. Perryman has described 'life in the pressure cooker' for teachers of English and maths having to respond to the pressure of league tables.[69] The pressure of surveillance for many of the history teachers in the sample suggests that their experience was little different. The majority of teachers did not talk about the impact of this level of surveillance on the specific nature of their history lessons. There was no encouragement at the time to articulate such subject-specificity. A generic discourse had taken over the discussion of teaching at this point. For the teachers interviewed in 2011, history teaching was less about the substantive content and more

---

[69] Perryman et al.

about the generic pedagogy and levelled assessment. The generic nature of the observations may have had most effect on classroom teaching in history, in a time where the National Strategies were held up as the most recent way to raise standards. Patrick seemed immune to this level of surveillance and others such as Mark and William do not mention it at all. It therefore seems to have existed more in some schools and cultures than others.

The impact of the National Strategies

The policy context grid in Appendix 1 shows the acceleration and promotion of government policy on education from 1997 onwards under the New Labour government.[70] In the late 1990s, under the banner of the overarching aim of raising standards, National Strategies for Literacy and Numeracy were introduced, initially to the primary sector. These policy documents set out guidance on pedagogy, down to the detail of lesson timings and student groupings. Until this point government policy had tended to focus on curriculum and what was taught to students. The National Strategy was extended into secondary schools in 2001, with an initial focus on the 'core' subjects of English, maths and science, followed by the 'foundation' subjects, including history. The final report of The National Strategies, 1997—2011 concluded that it was 'one of the most ambitious change management programmes in education'.[71] History is not mentioned at all in this concluding report, perhaps giving some impression of the status attributed to the subject at the time. However, conclusions for the impact of the secondary English programme give some idea of the aims of the programme:

> Planning is based on learning objectives that ensure progression in skills…. The English teachers' repertoire now includes a wider range of interactive approaches…. Assessment, based on detailed criteria…is more consistent and accurate and used to inform teaching and feedback to students and parents.[72]

The emphasis on learning objectives, three-part lessons and tracking students' achievement gave a new focus to previous observation and management schedules. The period 2001—11 in particular, was a complex policy environment in education (see Appendix 1), but the impact of the National Strategies came through clearly in the comments of teachers in the interview sample.

---

[70] See chapter 4 for this figure.
[71] DfE, "The National Strategies, 1997-2011: A Brief Summary of the Impact and Effectiveness of the National Strategies," ed. Department for Education (London: Department for Education, 2011), 2.
[72] Ibid., 16.

In most of the schools explored in this research, prescription of pedagogy can be seen to have become more intrusive in the twenty-first century. For the foundation subjects, such as history, the imposition tended towards the generic, particularly lesson structure and sharing of objectives, without much regard for the existing experience of the teachers. Richard was one of the few teachers who specifically mentioned an element of the National Strategy, although he needed prompting to name it as the Literacy Strategy. He recalled:

> When they did that big push, a few years ago now, on how to get kids to write properly and [*The Literacy Strategy? 2003?*] Yes, that's it. The non-fiction writing. And the English department came and told us how to do it and we were sitting there as history teachers saying I'm a grandmother and I'm not sucking my eggs at the moment. This is ridiculous. This is what we do every day. Why are you telling us how to do it? Can we give you an INSET on how to write persuasively because that is what we do?

Richard, in resenting learning a generic approach to teaching writing from the English department, also promoted the value of the subject of history.

Nicholas spoke of another element of the National Strategies, the three-part lesson. He shared his experience of an imposed lesson structure:

> There was an article released in 2006 which talked about pig-weighing, and whether schools were pig-weighers. It kind of mirrors exactly what the management of this school was saying at the time… They were very nervous about the way that teaching was going in the school but they were really advocating a process that this article said really should be only for failing schools [*What is that process?*] That was a very prescriptive lesson, the starter, the three-phase lesson, the plenary at the end, everybody doing the same, because Ofsted would fail anything else [*So, the school didn't go down that route?]* No, the school did go down that route, but needn't have done in hindsight....I don't think they did it because of the teaching in the history department....I think it was a whole school thing, because as there still is today, very different kinds of performance across the school

Perryman has written in depth about the intensive inspection regime applied to schools deemed to be 'failing' by Ofsted and the prescriptive demands of senior managers in such schools.[73]

---

[73] Perryman.

It would seem that a wider range of teachers experienced such measures. Patrick spoke of similar prescriptions which were no longer in place by the time of his interview in 2011:

> I didn't have any objection to lesson planning as such, but I did feel that they became, as pressure for results mounted, increasingly prescriptive and increasingly one size fits all. So, at H— we were all expected to use the same lesson plans, whatever the subject, whatever the department, we were all expected to follow the same one [*Could you put a date on that. Was that 2003?*] It was certainly after that. They came up with something soon after that, [*When you say 'they' who do you mean?*] The leadership of the school [*But you were in the leadership of the school!*] I know, I know [*You did speak before about plans being something that the lowest common denominator in the school might need*]. Absolutely, which is why I didn't object at all, but it needed to be…in the end it came down to autonomy. I could do lesson plans very easily if I needed to. [*But would anyone pick you up for not using the proforma?*] Only if I was being observed. If I was being observed I'd make sure I had one.

Here Patrick, who previously had spoken only positively about observation experiences, showed that the culture of performativity also crept into his more relaxed context. The encouragement of a generic, consistent approach is clear here. Patrick, however, was able to link this imposition of a technical, structured approach to lesson planning to his own frustrations, perhaps as a more 'authentic professional'. He said:

> One of the things I found I didn't like about some of the lesson plan structures we were having to follow, like having to put the objective up on the board, well this lesson is a voyage of discovery. We'll find out what we've learnt at the end of it. I'm not going to tell you before what we're going to learn. So, then you can ask what have we learnt today and why have we learnt it?

Here Patrick showed unease with the imposed lesson plan structures and in particular the use of learning objectives as he felt it limited his enquiry-led approach to learning. His complaint about the imposition was specifically historical. He stood out from the other teachers interviewed, however, in being able to articulate exactly why the imposition of generic structures limited his practice as a disciplinary history teacher.

Patrick was not the only teacher in the sample to dislike the use of lesson objectives, although most others complained about the idea of the objective having to be written up on the board, or worse, copied down by all students. Richard explained:

> Well, writing objectives on the board and so on, maybe we did. But I used to say to kids – write your own objective, because I think it's a stupid thing. I've written a title. What's that? Oh, is that the objective sir? Ok, let's go with that then shall we? [*So you're not necessarily subverting the policy, but mediating it?*] I'm doing it in a way that makes it relevant to the boys. I think if you go too far down that road and think,

I've got to have a starter, I've got to have a plenary, where do you go with that? You just become boring.

While Richard managed to mediate the policy, Diane took a more compliant approach:

[*When were you first encouraged to use lesson objectives?*] I would have said that would have been about the mid-2000s. [*And did you get your students to write it down?*] (She nods) and it takes ages when they're less able [*But you did it?*] Yes, because that's what they expected to see. How useful is it? I don't think it's remotely useful. I always think, when I'm doing something, I don't write what it is I'm doing at the top to make me focus!

Despite doubting the usefulness of the objective, Diane complied with the policy and wrote the objectives on the board for students to copy down. Allan, although never asked to do this himself, substantiated that the practice existed in many of the schools he visited as an AST:

Another one I came across in many schools, which I'm sure you do and once again came in, as I understand it, from a misunderstanding of Ofsted requirements, was spending the first fifteen minutes of the lesson laboriously writing down the lesson objectives. I don't think we were ever required to do that in my school, but a lot of the schools I went into had that…

Laura corroborated the idea of a widespread policy from her later experience in university-based teacher education:

I despair when I go in [to a school] and a child puts their hand up and says 'you've haven't put the learning objective on the board' or 'what's the learning objective?'

Dana, like Diane, took the compliant approach and found a way to be positive about the policy, despite her doubts:

I can see the point of the learning objectives and all that stuff being up on the board. I think it's a bit of a pain and a waste of time sometimes as far as the kids writing it down, but the kids have to have it down. I can say to them, but you've just done this, tick that objective off you've achieved it, and that has its benefits.

This example of writing lesson objectives on the board, raised by at least five of the teachers in the sample, was not a popular policy. And yet, despite their discomfort, the teachers seem to have complied. While most of the doubts related to the time the objectives took to write, Patrick was the one who raised specifically historical doubts related to the enquiry approach he wanted to take.

The impact of the National Strategies could also be seen in assessment approaches. Elements of that have been explored earlier in sections on target-setting and the impact

of examinations. Some schools, however, adopted whole-school approaches to assessment in an attempted move towards 'consistency.' Alison described her experience in 2011:

> What's really affected it recently, and the way that we assess to some extent, not the way we assess the history content, but the way we assess literacy and things like that is SLT directives. You will do this, you will do that. And this was thrown at us this term. We've always done old-fashioned marking and we very often spend more time writing about what your spelling needs to be, what your grammar is. But rather than write that out explicitly now we have to just write these silly abbreviations. Which, if you ask the kid, what does it mean if I write W2 at the bottom of your work. 'Dunno'. [*So it's an attempt in some ways to speed up marking*] It's an attempt to have consistency, that's their aim, consistency around the class, and to point out to some staff who weren't really aware that literacy affects all subjects.

Alison went on to link this to surveillance, suggesting that such codes made it easier for senior management to check on whether such marking policies had been implemented. This was a central policy, aimed at improving literacy, but Alison claimed that the centralised approach detracted from the subject-specific focus on literacy that already existed in departmental marking. A further example of this centralisation of policy was given by Alison. She described the implementation of a rewards policy:

> We've always had merits and commendations. So, we used to have lovely colourful stickers with historical figures on… Now we have DARE points. We give points for determination, activity, reflection and enquiry… Now what's happening is we enter these points that the kids have so the 'powers that be' [*senior leaders in the school*] can go online and they can see how many DARE points I've given. Fortunately, I've managed to keep up with the average there, but the next thing that will be, we haven't had it yet, but I will lay money on it, oh Alison, you haven't given many 'active' points, they all seem to be 'enquiry'.

This was another subtle way of attacking the status of history as a subject within the school; reducing the identity formerly promoted through the simple tool of history stickers. The department had chosen their own way of rewarding students for subject-specific effort, but even this had been replaced by a generic, school-wide system.

A wide range of teachers therefore recalled the imposition of lesson plans and pedagogical principles, such as learning objectives, usually from the years around 2003—07. The imposition of such generic pedagogical principles caused discomfort in most of the teachers who commented, but they all spoke of being compliant. This prescription of pedagogy existed in parallel with the heightened culture of surveillance and the 'generic tick lists' mentioned earlier would have encouraged such compliance. Some teachers, such as Diane, felt the discomfort, but did not seem to be able to

articulate what the problem was, beyond time taken. Patrick stood out as more able to articulate his discomfort with the policy of lesson objectives and even generic lesson plans, from the standpoint of an authentic history teacher. Allan was similar in insisting upon talking for more than 15% of his observed lesson, despite knowing he would be downgraded.

By the time of the interviews in 2011, such pressures for generic lesson planning had dissipated for many of the teachers interviewed. Alison and Edward, in a school struggling to compete in the local context, found themselves subject to increasing prescription. They were expected to comply with a whole-school policy on assessment. Earlier, Patrick had been expected to use a whole-school lesson plan. Richard talked of whole-school literacy policies and workshops. The generic nature of these structures around planning and assessment seem to have restricted opportunities for history teachers to articulate the specifically historical elements of pedagogy and assessment.

Conclusion

In the mid-1980s history teachers were in a relatively autonomous situation where they had choice over the content they taught and the teaching approaches they used. Over the next decade, there was some erosion of this autonomy due to the creation of a unifying GCSE examination and the imposition of a National Curriculum. However, the government policies of league tables and the 'standards' agenda, particularly from 1997 onwards, had more impact on the practice of history teachers than these curricular changes. The impact of GCSE examinations in particular, within the context of league tables and value-added data, led to a narrowing of the teaching of history in terms of who it was taught to, what was taught and how it was taught.

This chapter on policy enactment has to be read in conjunction with those surrounding it, particularly chapters 6 and 8. While the technical professional was created by the 'policy artefacts' of target setting, teaching to the test and compliance with generic policies in a culture of surveillance, there was sometimes room for the 'authentic professional' to flourish. The exciting work of William on Black history, or of Patrick with his use of music in the classroom, both instilled with passion and originality,

showed that disciplinary history could still exist within this broader prescriptive context. While it was not possible for teachers to resist pressure to 'raise standards' and monitor achievement in prescriptive ways, it does seem to have been possible to teach an exciting, innovative, disciplinary history in spite of, or in parallel with the enacting of those policies. Whether or not teachers retained the will or freedom to continue with curricular innovation depended on their personal disposition, but also, most importantly, the context in which they were working. In schools where professional contributions were valued, for example, with Patrick, William or Nicholas, history teachers and their departments were more likely to innovate and continue to develop disciplinary practice. However, in schools where the context became prescriptive and surveillance was pronounced, innovation became stifled and teachers more reluctant to experiment.

This sample of history teachers started their careers feeling autonomous and with high ideals, wanting students to learn about the past in order to understand and contribute to the world around them. In a world of league tables and target-setting, their roles became more pressurised. The teachers, despite a feeling of discomfort, tried to adapt to the new culture of marketised education. As the pressure became more intense in some schools, however, the teachers responded in different ways. Some became increasingly frustrated as their sense of authentic professionalism became curtailed. For Diane, Edward, Mark and Allan this resulted in the decision to leave their jobs in 2011. Others decided to try to ignore or avoid new policies for as long as possible. Simon and Patrick gave examples of such avoidance. Others found a way of continuing to make their contribution in the history classroom. Nicholas, as shall be seen in the next chapter, took on the ideas of a younger member of his department and changed his pedagogical approach. A number of teachers found ways of gaming the system so that they could conform only as far as necessary.

Chapter 8   Professional learning

There were radical and far-reaching changes in the way history teachers approached a lesson between 1985 and 2011. Teachers described lessons taught in 2011 that were very different from those taught at the beginning of their career. A range of factors acted on teachers to instil such changes in their practice. Where chapter 6 considered the impact of curriculum reform and chapter 7 focused on teachers enacting government policy, this chapter explores the impact of other agents of change. These include the role of history teaching communities, textbooks and the development of technology. The huge variety of resources increasingly available in the twenty-first century created many opportunities for innovative practice among history teachers. Resources, at their best, were a site for professional learning, either in providing substantive content for teachers to learn or pedagogical approaches. The second part of this chapter will explore communities of history teachers and changing opportunities for professional learning. The seemingly parallel decline in opportunities for professional learning and interactive discourse outside the history department meant that teachers needed a strong professional filter to identify the best resources available.[1]

Resourcing

There were significant changes in both resources and the way they were used within the history classroom between 1985 and 2011. This section of the chapter will chart the developing use of textbooks, the introduction of worksheets and the development of technology as teaching tools across this period, taking a broadly chronological approach.

Interviews started with teachers talking through their career timeline. Following this, the first main question was to ask for headlines of what had changed in their experience of history teaching across their careers. While five of the thirteen teachers immediately prioritised the introduction of the National Curriculum, another five prioritised changes in resources, whether textbooks or technology.[2] There were changes not only in the

---

[1] The Historical Association report on "Teaching Emotive and Controversial History" (2007) argued that in many schools planning was dictated by the particular resources already available and suggested that if these were of poor quality, content selection, planning and pedagogy could be dull.
[2] Two others said "It's become more structured" – and went on to talk about three-part lessons and target-setting. The last managed to circumvent the question and not give a straight answer.

nature of the resources, but how they were used in the classroom. Some changes in resource were influenced by changes in policy. For example, textbook publishers responded to the introduction of the National Curriculum in both content and approach. In addition, the funding and prioritising of technology in schools was in response to government policy. Not only did teachers change how and which resources they used, but resources themselves led to changes in teaching practice.

The textbook traditionally held a great deal of power, particularly in the history classroom. The selection of narratives within a text was a powerful, but subtle, tool of interpretation. Apple raised questions over whose knowledge becomes socially legitimate in schools. He argued that texts were not simply delivery systems of facts, but the results of 'political, economic and cultural activities, battles and compromises… They are published within the political and economic constraints of markets, resources and power.'[3] Foster and Crawford have pointed to the power and importance of history textbooks, arguing that 'in any given culture they typically exist as the keepers of ideas, values and knowledge.'[4] As the role of the textbook and technology changed in English history classrooms in the first decade of the twenty-first century, this power could be called into question. There was the potential for teachers to take a stronger role as the 'keepers of ideas, values and knowledge'. However, pressure for examination results and time limitations meant that history teachers did not always take the opportunities for innovation available to them.

Changes in the nature and role of history textbooks began before 1985 due to improving technology and the demands of changing approaches to the teaching of the subject.[5] Textbooks shifted from a general dependence on a text-heavy single narrative to using a wider variety of approaches. Haydn has argued that until the 1980s history textbooks in the UK 'generally told one story about the past'.[6] Allan brought some textbooks to the interview that he had used at the beginning of his career in the late 1970s. He described them:

---

[3] M.W. Apple and L. Christian-Smith, *The Politics of the Textbook* (London: Routledge, 1994), 1-2.
[4] Foster and Crawford, 1-2.
[5] These changing approaches are detailed in chapters 4 and 5.
[6] T. Haydn, "The Changing Form and Use of Textbooks in the History Classroom in the 21st Century: A View from the UK," 27.

> I started off with textbooks and I thought I would bring one or two things along for you to see. You might not have seen archive volumes like this. I mean, this was a fairly standard textbook. *(Allan picks up 'Portrait of World History by Geoffrey Williams.'[7])* And I mean textbooks were textbooks – the emphasis was on text with the occasional picture… So, it was all very knowledge-based stuff with occasional pictures. Colour-based textbooks, of course, didn't really come in until the National Curriculum. *(He opens another book)* These were the books that you tended to use with the weaker students in comprehensive schools, so double-page spread, couple of photographs, comprehension questions, crosswords, word searches. Not particularly inspiring, but this was the state of the art in the '70s for low-ability students. Text, black and white pictures. This was published in 1970 and you look at the things to do and again they're mainly copying information or transferring information or writing a sentence about a topic; explaining the meaning of terms.

Allan's experience substantiated Haydn's argument that, until the 1980s history textbooks promoted a single narrative, which supported the purpose of many history lessons of the time.

During the late 1970s and 1980s there was some diversification of resources. Cannadine et al. linked the expansion of school textbooks and the development of new courses, such as SCHP, to changes in the content and format of textbooks. They highlighted the growing market for more vividly-illustrated books deemed appropriate for the 'CSE pupil' and also publishers' provision of packs of facsimile documents, most famously the *Jackdaw* series.[8] As explored in chapter 5, five of the teachers interviewed for this research specifically talked about using the 'Mark Pullen' pack of resources in their history classrooms at this time. Haydn has suggested that increasingly, in the 1980s, history textbooks included sources alongside a narrative presentation of the past; 'the past was problematized and it was made explicit to pupils that more than one story might be fashioned from historical sources.'[9] Textbooks, therefore, promoted the move towards teaching a 'new history' that was later made explicit and compulsory through the GCSE examination and the introduction of the National Curriculum.

In the decade following 1985, while textbooks remained crucial in most classrooms, there was a move away from dependence on one textbook, towards a wider range of resources. This marked a change in attitude towards resources which different teachers

---

[7] G. Williams, Portrait of World History: Rome to Renaissance, (London, Edward Arnold, 1961)

[8] Cannadine, Keating, and Sheldon. The *Jackdaw* series mentioned included *The Voyages of Captain Cook, Clipper Ships and the Cutty Sark* and *Massacre at Glencoe.*

[9] Haydn, "The Changing Form and Use of Textbooks in the History Classroom in the 21st Century: A View from the UK," 70.

experienced at different points in the decade. Teachers had the opportunity to move away from a reliance on textbooks thanks to photocopiers becoming more common in schools. Cannadine et al. suggested that teachers became less dependent on textbooks when they could mass-produce worksheets that were customised to both the content chosen and the ability of pupils. They argued that the 'worksheet revolution' portended the end of 'chalk and talk' classroom instruction as it enabled pupils to work at their own pace.[10] However, Farmer and Knight, writing a handbook for history teachers in 1995, suggested 'there is the danger that many pupils endure daily the pain of "death by a thousand worksheets"'.[11] Richard gave changing resources as a key headline change in his teaching career:

> The big things are the resources… when I first started here we had no photocopier, no IT, chalk and talk was a lot of stuff. I used to make Bandas, do you remember those? Literally, you write something out, and I spent hours and hours preparing lessons in that way…

William shared a particular anecdote about the lengths he went to in creating visual resources for his students in the days before the school purchased a photocopier. Asked how he shared visual sources without access to a computer or photocopier, he gave the following response:

> So, in the '80s there was no photocopier in the school. The next available shop that had a photocopier was in the high street, so you had to run down the road to the photocopier, come back, do the heat stencil, put it on the Gestetner and I remember several times doing that because I had a sudden idea I wanted to use. So, it would be technology that enabled you to do so much source work. And we were doing that all the way through the 80s as we were trying to give the students visual sources.

The emergence of the photocopier as a tool within all schools made a significant difference to the way teachers approached planning and resourcing their lessons. Nicholas, Edward and Patrick all pointed to filing cabinets full of photocopied worksheets during the course of their interviews. However, contrary to Cannadine et al.'s claim, Patrick suggested that it was possible to use worksheets and be teacher-led in approach. He recalled:

> We had filing cabinets like this and there was a worksheet for every single lesson really, and you just worked through those…They'd be a mixture, we did, there were quite a lot of single word answers. There'd be a bit of maybe exam-type questions depending on the year group you were teaching, but looking back on it, it wasn't, I think, very challenging. It was an awful lot of teacher-led stuff and then the students filled in these worksheets.

---

[10] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon, 163.
[11] A. Farmer and P. Knight, *Active History in Key Stages 3 and 4*, ed. C. Chitty, Quality in Secondary Schools and Colleges series (London: David Fulton, 1995), 40.

By the late 1980s, therefore, the technology existed for creating more independent resources and this seems to have enabled the use of sources in the history classroom.

The diversification of resources went beyond the use of textbooks and worksheets, as technology brought further opportunities for innovation to the history classroom in the decade following 1985. Patrick was the type of teacher who became involved with new initiatives. From the mid-1980s he was part of a project to see what early personal computers could bring to the history learning experience. He explained:

> In E—, one of the first 'IT in History' working parties we had, half a dozen of us from different schools… we had the old BBC micros that you had on a trolley and wheeled around. There were databases and things like census returns. Mostly it was trialling history-specific software that a few manufacturers had produced. It was trialling things that made history a little bit different…one was a Norman castle building programme. You had to build your castle in ten days and if you didn't get it up in time you got massacred. There was one on planning a trip across the American plains, but it took a long time. [*Did the students like it?*] They did, but it tended to be used more as a reward; if they'd finished their work they could have ten minutes on the computer. This would be the early '90s.

David took a different approach in the early days of the computer, far more dismissive of the opportunities of the BBC B computer. He recalled:

> I wouldn't be bothered with computers to begin with. I just thought it was too much mucking around with them you know with the BBC Bs, some of the programmes were very crude, a lot of them were very time-consuming and I couldn't see my way through. I got grabbed by the IT really with the internet.

These were the only two teachers in the sample that mentioned the use of ICT in history in this early period, before 1990. This corresponds with a government report from 1988 stating that only 23% of secondary history teachers were making any use of ICT in their classrooms.[12] Patrick's working group may not have been a common experience, but it offered him the opportunity to meet other history teachers outside the department and articulate the advantages and concerns with particular software.

The introduction of the National Curriculum in 1991 had a substantial impact on the publication of history textbooks. Cannadine et al. suggested that the National

---

[12] DES (1986) Statistical Bulletin Issue No 18/86: Results of the survey of microcomputers in schools: Autumn 1985, Darlington, DES cited in T. Haydn, "The Use of Information and Communications Technology in History Teaching in Secondary Schools in England and Wales 1970 - 2003" (PhD Thesis, University of London, 2004), 98. This thesis explored the wide variety of statistics available on computer use in this period, but the conclusion was that, despite being increasingly available, they were not widely used.

Curriculum generated an unprecedented demand for new textbooks.[13] Mohamud and Whitburn, among others have commented on the way the first National Curriculum influenced the textbooks published in the early 1990s and therefore had an impact on how content and pedagogy were approached. They provided the example of the unit on the Black Peoples of the America, where 'the course outline became the foundation of a number of textbooks for secondary schools'[14] Haydn has pointed to the inception of the National Curriculum and its new focus on assessment leading to a change of balance in textbooks between pupils' knowledge of the substantive past and pupils' understanding of history as a discipline.[15] He described the two-page spread common to many textbooks around the early 1990s as problematic, quoting the editor of a series of history textbooks as saying they consisted of 'just random stuff plonked together'.[16] Although Haydn claimed that the textbooks quickly improved, teachers continued to mediate their use of textbooks. Simon said:

> I think they started to realise that they can't just have a content textbook which is going to be used in a classroom. They have to make it look attractive and exciting and interesting, and different… Some of the F— ones that we use are very creative. They have some good ideas, and again, we wouldn't go from page 1 through to page 150 whatever through a year but you'd certainly dip in.

When Richard was training to teach with the old army major and his runny nose in 1984 he was asked to teach what was on page 38, neatly following the work on page 37 that had been covered in the previous lesson.[17] A linear approach using a single textbook was common at this time. However, by the early 1990s teachers were using a far wider range of resources. Simon described his experience of the shift:

> When I first started it was very much a set text for Year 7, for Year 8, for Year 9, certainly that changed. Maybe that changed a lot with this sort of skills stuff and the National Curriculum, because now and certainly over the last twenty years, I don't think I've ever stuck to a set text. I think you have all sorts of different resources that you find useful, and you might still go back thirty years to something like this and adapt it.

That linear approach of using one textbook for a year group and simply enhancing it with teacher-led discussion was replaced by an increasing plethora of resources by the early 1990s. 'Books' declared the History Working Group in 1990, 'remain the most

---

[13] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon.
[14] Mohamud and Whitburn, 6.
[15] Haydn, "The Changing Form and Use of Textbooks in the History Classroom in the 21st Century: A View from the UK."
[16] Ibid., 71.
[17] See chapter 5 for this quote

important single resource for learning history.'[18] As Farmer and Knight claimed in 1995, 'Published textbooks are the staple of the history classroom.'[19]

Simon marked the introduction of the National Curriculum as the time he stopped using one textbook per year group. Allan remembered the textbooks from the original National Curriculum era as full of colour. As teachers faced new topics to plan and the introduction of new forms of assessment, textbooks that supported this approach would certainly have been useful. It may be that, just at the time when technology was providing the opportunities for teachers to plan more independently, the textbooks supporting the National Curriculum Programme of Study offered too much support to be ignored. Chapter 5 showed how many teachers felt constrained by the demands of the National Curriculum. It's possible that the existence of the National Curriculum led to a continued dependence on textbooks at a time when technology was providing other opportunities.

Textbooks could act as a site for professional learning. Haydn has commented on a change in the 'job to be done' by history textbooks in the UK, moving from the telling of single narratives to helping students 'develop an understanding of why accounts of the past might differ'.[20] For some teachers the role of the textbook went a stage further, in introducing teachers to an alternative pedagogy, in particular encouraging an enquiry-approach to learning and teaching history. Textbooks were not necessarily enough by themselves to change practice, but where there was a willing teacher who wanted to change, the textbooks could help with development and modelling of new approaches. For Simon and Allan the particular change described was the use of enquiry questions. Simon recalled:

> I think it was Longmans that introduced that set of textbooks, um, *Medieval Minds*, *Minds and Machines*, and they were very thematic….[21] But they do have this enquiry question sometimes, why did William win the Battle of Hastings? You know, we're going to look at it from these three viewpoints, perspectives. Maybe the enquiry question came from, it obviously didn't come necessarily from the textbook, but it helped adapt people's lessons. I think it did help me with that.

---

[18] NCHWG, "Final Report of the History Working Group," (London: DES, 1990), 177.

[19] Farmer and Knight, 32.

[20] Haydn, "The Changing Form and Use of Textbooks in the History Classroom in the 21st Century: A View from the UK," 72.

[21] This was a series of history textbooks aimed at Key Stage 3, starting with J. Byrom, C. Counsell and M. Riley, *Medieval Minds: Britain 1066-1500* (Harlow, Essex: Longman, 1997).

These books were part of a series published between 1997 and 2007. They were quite different in format to most textbooks at the time, particularly in their use of large colour pictorial sources and cartoons. Each chapter was organised around a thought-provoking, historical enquiry question with this being directly linked to a substantive activity at the end of the chapter. Simon's distinct memory of these books suggests that for him they played a substantial role in altering his practice, not only in offering a choice of student-centred activities, but in helping him with the use and construction of historical enquiry questions. As he explained, the initial idea for enquiry questions may not have come from the textbooks (in fact he mentioned in chapter 6 using enquiry questions to plan his schemes of work in 1991), but the series of textbooks helped him to adapt and develop this pedagogical approach.

Allan had a similar experience with enquiry questions, as Ian Dawson[22] was his editor when he first authored a textbook. He remembered work for a textbook he wrote in the late 1990s:

> I was very lucky to have Ian Dawson as my editor and he was very much into enquiry questions so having a big overarching enquiry question and having small enquiries to contribute to the overarching question. [*Was that the first time you'd come across the idea?*] I think so yes, I mean we always had enquiry questions for particular lessons, but for a sequence, for a whole term's work [*Did it affect your practice?*] Yes, and the other thing that came through in it was to make clear to the students what their objectives were, what they're investigating right from the start of a chapter, or the start of a lesson. Don't teach information and sources about a topic and then tell students what they're going to do at the end, you know, have their thinking focused at the beginning of the lesson, tweak your materials so that it's helping them to develop the ideas [*So becoming a textbook author affects your planning?*] Yes, yes. It certainly put my teaching on its head, so rather than explaining to students the task they had to do at the end of the lesson, when I'd taught the topic, you'd do it at the beginning of the lesson.

Allan was, from the start of his first interview, a keen supporter of the SHP approach. Here in the second interview, he described authoring a textbook for the SHP brand that was first published in 1999. There were two key lessons that he learned from the process, and they were very similar to those described by Simon above. First, that enquiry questions should be overarching for a series of lessons. Second, that students should know from the start of the enquiry the objectives for that enquiry. In Allan's case, it was the process of authoring the textbook that changed his practice in these two significant areas of planning. This compares to Allan's description of the senior

---

[22] Ian Dawson was Director of the Schools History Project from 1982 to 1989 and Publications Director for SHP 1999-2010.

manager coming into his classroom and limiting his time for teacher talk to 15% of the lesson. Allan described that generic, prescriptive approach with frustration, but this earlier, subject-specific approach from a trusted leader in the field was remembered fondly.

In the mid-1980s textbooks had power over what was taught in the history classroom and how each topic was approached. After the introduction of the National Curriculum and the publication of a wider range of books covering a narrower range of content, these teachers seem to have taken advantage of the choice. A range of textbooks were kept and used for new material, different approaches and new activities. In the twenty-first century there seems to have been a move for many teachers at Key Stage 3 towards an ever-broader range of resources. For some this meant a move away from textbooks, especially as classrooms became furnished with interactive whiteboards, overhead projectors and internet access. Technology alone did not lead to changes in teaching practice. Different teachers in the sample responded to the opportunities provided by the technology in different ways. For William, above, running down the high street in order to be able to share particular visual sources with students, or for Patrick, wanting to share music with his students to broaden their understanding of a historical period, technology was an enabler.

In the 2000s government policy favoured the use of ICT in schools. From 1997 Blair had prioritised technology in education as a way of developing the international competitiveness of the British education system. Selwyn has estimated that £5 billion was invested in educational ICT during the 1997 to 2007 period.[23] Teachers were more than encouraged to include ICT within their teaching. The Ofsted report on history in schools published in 2007 mentioned the need for ICT in the history classroom several times, including urging the 'better use of ICT for research and communication'.[24] For teachers in this sample, this investment, alongside the availability of technology, seems to have had some impact on the way they approached their teaching. The government policy of promoting ICT use in schools transformed the resources available to teachers and, to some extent, the experience of the students.

---

[23] N. Selwyn, "Realising the Potential of New Technology? Assessing the Legacy of New Labour's ICT Agenda 1997-2007," in *Oxford Review of Education* 34, no. 6 (2008).
[24] Ofsted, "History in the Balance: History in English Schools 2003-07," 29.

For some this developed use of technology led to a complete move away from textbook use. Interviewed in 2011, Patrick described his approach, at Key Stage 3 at least, as beyond the use of the textbook. He described the frequent use of music and computer software to enhance his teaching:

> I always think we're in a post textbook era now, where so many resources have been web-based, so it may be now that it will be easier to find the materials you need for slightly more obscure topics or less mainstream ones… we're much less book dependent now with IT, mostly stuff now will be on the screen, and it gives us, I think far more, far more variety, I think it's much quicker now, you do far more activities.

Technology therefore enabled teachers such as Patrick to introduce a wider range of topics beyond the British core at Key Stage 3. Allan had also changed his practice in the use of textbooks in the classroom:

> Actually, I don't use textbooks in the classroom. I did when I started because I needed a crutch – I needed something to lean on. I will use textbooks for cover work when I'm away. I use textbooks for homework outside the classroom. But inside the classroom I usually produced my own materials, my own circumstances.

Many of the teachers highlighted the role of technology as one of the biggest changes in their experience of teaching history. This fits with the research of Haydn who found, of thirty-seven teachers surveyed in 2009—10, ten estimated that they used textbooks in '10% or less' of their lessons; sixteen respondents estimated that they used textbooks in between 50—70% of lessons and only three respondents reported that they used textbooks in over 70% of their lessons.[25] Haydn pointed to a very broad continuum in the use of textbooks, which seems to have been reflected by the teachers in this sample.

The first decade of the twenty-first century witnessed a proliferation of online resources aimed at the history teacher. In Haydn's study, the majority of heads of department interviewed thought textbooks had become less influential as a resource for history teaching due to a replacement by PowerPoint and data projectors. Haydn raised a concern over whether the over-reliance on the use of textbooks and worksheets may have been replaced by 'a "new orthodoxy" in history classrooms', where all or most lessons were built around the use of PowerPoint presentations.[26] However, the evidence from this small sample suggests that the new technological resources, rather than

---

[25] Haydn, "The Changing Form and Use of Textbooks in the History Classroom in the 21st Century: A View from the UK," 73.
[26] Ibid., 83.

changing the disciplinary approach of the teacher, exacerbated pre-existing trends. Various examples are included below in support of this claim. First Patrick, who presented other examples in chapters 5 and 6 of using sources in a creative way and 'ploughing his own furrow', described how technology supported him in using music sources, in particular, in his classroom. Then Richard, who several times promoted the importance of narrative and storytelling, described his use of video clips. Finally, Diane, who had previously prioritised students' enjoyment in selecting content, described her use of technology.

Patrick in particular enjoyed the opportunity to use music sources in the classroom and the availability of computer software supported him in this practice.

> If I'm thinking of a recent lesson, a typical lesson, the way I would normally do it, I would be looking for much more stimulus material first of all. I'm very, very keen on using pictures or music. Music's one of my big things… sometimes it might just be a song that links in quite nicely to what you're doing. The other week I happened to be teaching the Black Death and there's a Gwen Stefani song on the Black Death if you YouTube, which is really, really good. Or we might have Lady Gaga on the French Revolution.... It may be using them as little clues, or it may be that I'll build a whole scheme of work around it, as when we're doing civil rights, where I use a lot of music from the era, to trace civil rights through from Bob Dylan to Sam Cook to Marvin Gaye.

Here, in 2011, Patrick appeared to be planning his lessons around a wide range of historical sources. YouTube and Google were now vital to this autonomous, evidential and potentially engaging approach, but it was a development of his previous approach, using innovative computer software in the 1990s or designing his own worksheets in the 1970s and 1980s. Patrick's epistemology of the subject was sustained, sending students on an enquiry through available material in order to construct knowledge.

In comparison, Richard described his approach to technology early in his career in the mid-1980s, 'I had a TV, and I managed to get some videos together and that was it.' Television documentaries could well have supported the narrative approach that Richard admitted he was taking at the time.[27] By the time of the first interview with Richard in 2011 his range of resources had increased, partly due to the technology available to him. He recalled:

---

[27] This is the man the Ofsted inspector referred to as a dinosaur in the late 1980s.

I've got film, any little clips of anything I'd want to do really basically... I mean I always try to get the latest DVDs. I try to get as much as I can from BBC website and things like that, but YouTube, if you just haven't got anything, even you know five minutes before, let's look at that. Oh wow, I've got something on the Berlin Wall… I can 'google image' anything and that makes my job so much easier. Because kids are visual. They expect more these days because everything is in front of them on a phone or whatever, so if you don't have a picture, well they expect it. I can stand there and tell stories for 40 minutes if you want, but let's back it up.

To the unwitting observer, Richard's approach may have looked very similar to Patrick's – the use of images and video alongside teacher intervention in the history classroom. However, their underlying purpose in teaching the subject is quite different. In comparison to Patrick, using music as 'clues' or 'stimulus material,' here Richard was using the images in a more illustrative manner to 'back up' his narrative approach. Richard needed to teach GCSE and A-level history specifications, so evidence and interpretations did appear in his classroom. He described his use of a Fergal Keane documentary on Northern Ireland with his A-level class:

Film and film clips, I use them all the time. Not long clips... two- or three-minute clips and sometimes it can say what you want to say, but so much better....Using it as a different voice. [*Do you ever get them to critique that voice?*] Not so much what Fergal does, but he has experts on there. So, you might say, here's a view of the famine that's given by — this is an Irish economic historian, do you agree with his interpretation of British involvement in the famine?

The idea of using technology to support the narrative, or offer an alternative narrative, comes through again here. While he did expect students to critique the voices of historians, he did not expect them to critique the documentary itself.

This continuity of pedagogical approach, despite the addition of new technology, can be witnessed in other teachers. William, always keen to share a broad range of historical topics with his students, took full advantage of the technological resources available to him in the twenty-first century. He recalled:

So, they'd be in their groups, discuss this issue, discuss this and then they might write. They'd write some notes down and then we'd have a group discussion within five minutes or so. We'd start to discuss what the source is telling us. What's the intrigue? What do we want to know about? And then we'd start to work through that. Quite often we'd try to use video clips that I've edited, not straight from YouTube but usually from either programmes that I've got at home that I've used and edited on the computer. So, in a sense where they're actually kind of dealing with some kind of exposition of history, it's often from the point of view of a programme of some kind.

Diane described how her use of technology had developed:

The technology has improved how I can deliver the lessons. We've moved from a Banda machine to a photocopier. I used to do different colour Banda papers – that was the thing. Having a photocopier is wonderful in that way. Films and TV and having the whiteboard, what I can deliver and how I can deliver it I think is better. But in a way, it's a vicious circle. I sometimes think I could re-enact World War II out in the field and they'd still go – is it time for lunch yet? They expect it all. On the D-Day landings they had *The World at War.*[28] They wanted to watch *Saving Private Ryan*,[29] but I said you've got footage of the real thing! We're not looking at Hollywood. And the chap was saying there were people with the heads missing and arms missing and the kids said, why haven't they shown you the heads off – and I said, do you think an actor's going to volunteer to have his head cut off just so that...and I sometimes think that possibly having that it feeds it. We give them this and then they want more.

Here, although Diane spoke positively about the role of technology in improving her teaching, the engagement with students seems more of a concern than the construct of *The World at War,* or other 'Hollywood' films as historical interpretations. The use of an interactive whiteboard linked to the internet may have provided a certain ease for showing clips of *The World at War,* but it did not seem to lead to a change in her teaching approach.

Alison and Edward talked of using a bank of laptops in her history classroom. Alison explained how she used them:

We've got an internet connection so we can do research. They can put together very speccy pieces of work. I talked about storyboard and things like that, the things the kids can do on those, it has to be seen to be believed. We use them practically for things like controlled assessment, 'cos we stop them having access to internet. We can store their work and they can easily alter it and it can be read by the examiners.

Alison gave a convincing account of the frequent use of laptops in her history lessons. This was a change in her available resources and the access to the internet for research would have been of great benefit to her students. Beyond that, however, the laptops appear to be used for word-processing tasks, a continuity of Alison's traditional teaching approaches. The use of laptops was a pragmatic extension to resourcing, rather than a tool for transforming teaching approaches.

While the use of PowerPoint proliferated between 2005 and 2011 with the spread of interactive whiteboards, the teachers interviewed did not tend to talk about PowerPoint or their use of PowerPoint beyond the odd reference to sharing resources or encouraging

---

[28] J. Isaacs, *The World at War*, (Thames Television, 1973).
[29] S. Spielberg, *Saving Private Ryan*, (DreamWorks Pictures/ Paramount Pictures, 1998).

groups of children to present PowerPoints on a particular topic. Dana, however, differed from the group in talking passionately about the power of the software. She expressed a fundamental change in her history teaching as the move from 'chalk and talk' approaches of her earlier career, to the use of PowerPoint. When asked about whether PowerPoint just enabled a new form of chalk and talk, she answered:

> The PowerPoint has actual activities within it [*give me some examples*] Um, turn to page so-and-so, study source A, and then the questions. Here's the comparison, that sort of thing. For some kids I will turn and say do question 1 and 2. The group over there I expect you to do these questions. So, I can actually easily say this to them. The big thing is this linking in. I can link in to so many things, using the PowerPoint. I stick in film clips and that sort of thing. It's not as chalk and talk certainly, as it was … I can use a lot of picture sources, and it's just the sheer colour, and that sort, and the animation and that sort of thing, to catch their attention

Dana was excited by the opportunities PowerPoint provided for sharing a wider range of sources with students. Rather than a change in teaching approach to the discipline of history, the advent of PowerPoint seems to have provided her with variety and colour.

Technology therefore provided new opportunities for the history teachers, especially with the advent of internet connectivity in the classroom and the use of overhead projectors to share this with students which became more common through the decade after 2000.[30] Teachers were unanimous in their excitement about this development and their willingness to use the technology in their classrooms. This growth of technology and the parallel proliferation of information did not appear to have changed history teachers' disciplinary approaches to the subject. Rather, it acted as an enabler. For Patrick, seeking to take students on a voyage of discovery, the internet was the tool he needed. For Richard or Dana, seeking to share narratives with students, the internet provided a wider range of voices.

Despite this time of opportunity at the beginning of the twenty-first century, with wider access to technology, for GCSE specifications in particular, the role of the individual textbook became more powerful. From 2003, Pearson came to own a controlling stake in Edexcel, leading to a more complex relationship between textbooks and examination boards. If, as argued above, textbooks could be effective in changing the practice of

---

[30] In the 'ahead of its times' London school I taught at we were given interactive whiteboards and internet access in every classroom in 2003. When I moved to work in Devon in 2006 this approach had spread to some schools. When I moved to Kent in 2008 it was the norm in the vast majority of history classrooms I visited.

teachers, then the link between textbooks and examination boards increased the power of examination boards to effect change in the classroom. Crawford and Foster set out the impact that the examination system had on the publication of school history textbooks in 2006. They interviewed representatives from seven educational publishing houses in the UK in 2003. One shared their justification:

> I would say the UK is particularly driven by the examination system at the moment....They need to have specific textbooks in line with specifications so we are making it easy for the teacher to buy the textbook for the course and from their point of view to have something that fits perfectly with ensuring success for their pupils.[31]

This was supported in 2011 by one of the heads of department in Haydn's study on the changing use of textbooks, where 'one head of department expressed concern about the recent practice of examining boards bringing out textbooks for particular exam specifications, with the possibility of giving a possible advantage in the examination to departments purchasing those texts.'[32] Chris Hinton, interviewed for Cannadine's History in Education project, spoke of the 'dubious link between chief examiners and textbook writing and the all-pervading Ofsted and league table regime.' He gave various examples of teaching to the exam, using the chief examiner's book, then argued:

> The skills v. knowledge debate is there, but actually, if you play this other game as well it is almost as big an influence on the way you teach now as those two elements.[33]

Patrick, who had always created his own resources rather than use textbooks at Key Stage 3, admitted to more of a dependence on them at GCSE and A-level. He said:

> It's [*the textbook is*] there as a fall back, it's there as a tool. Obviously, you're going to need it for exam preparation because those are the texts that have largely been [*designed for the exam*]. The exam papers tend to be based on the published textbooks and when they're asking for knowledge, which they do in a history paper it usually means, can you find it in one of the textbooks?

In the previous chapter, Patrick described a rather unusual culture of freedom in his school where he welcomed observation and rarely felt prescribed in his approach. Within a context of progression, achievement and league tables, however, Patrick was constrained by the need to use the textbook published for the examination.

---

[31] K Crawford and S. Foster, "The Political Economy of History Textbook Publishing in England," in *School History Textbooks across Cultures: International Debates and Perspectives*, ed. J. Nicholls, Oxford Studies in Comparative Education (London: Symposium Books, 2006), 96.

[32] Haydn, "The Changing Form and Use of Textbooks in the History Classroom in the 21st Century: A View from the UK," 77.

[33] C. Hinton, interview by J. Keating and N. Sheldon, 2010, https://www.history.ac.uk/history-in-education/sites/history-in-education/files/attachments/interviewees_talk_about_history_textbooks.doc.

Resourcing in the history classroom was the biggest tangible change that history teachers talked about in these interviews. The move to more exciting textbooks and a broader range of textbooks provided more choice for teachers. The advent of the internet and the purchasing of technology enabling it to be shared with students, gave teachers much more freedom in the historical topics they could cover. In the 1980s, Patrick had been inspired by the Swann report to want to teach about Mughal India in his south-coast school. He couldn't find the resources so he shelved the idea. By the 2000s this lack of resources was no longer a restriction. Just at the time when the National Curriculum was providing more freedom and flexibility and a wide variety of resources was easily accessible through the internet, history teachers should have felt the autonomy to teach whatever they wanted. Indeed, interviewed at the beginning of the 2000s, the history teachers in Husbands, Kitson and Pendry's study were excited by the opportunities and curricular flexibility ahead of them.[34]

There were, however, other restrictions. The teachers in this study suggested that this excitement and autonomy rarely transpired. Other factors, discussed in previous chapters, such as the imposition of National Strategies and the pressure of examination boards, came to act as a heavy brake on such autonomy in the 2000s, just at the time when the curriculum provided it. Teachers should have had full choice of whichever resource suited their own teaching approach and the needs of their students. The rise of the 'examination textbook', however, meant that freedom was restricted.

Rather than transforming teaching approaches, the proliferation of technology appears to have substantiated existing practice. Where Patrick had a disciplinary approach to the subject, carefully instilled in him through his early years with the SCHP, he was able to use the technology available to him to enhance this approach. Where Richard preferred to share a narrative with his students, technology provided a wider range of easily available narratives. Technology did not, by itself, enable Patrick to develop a more narrative approach or Richard a more disciplinary approach.

---

[34] Husbands, Kitson and Pendry.

Working with others

The history teachers interviewed praised opportunities for working in collaboration with other history teachers and lamented the decline of such opportunities in the 2000s compared with the 1980s and early 1990s. When the teachers spoke of positive interactions with colleagues, they all gave examples from the history education community, whether this was through CPD sessions put on at Local Authority level or conversations within their own department. This contrasted with the less positive language used to describe impositions and innovations from school senior teams. No teacher chose to speak about the positive influences of senior leaders in their school on their changing practice in the classroom, unless that senior leader was also a history teacher.

There was a range of sources of support for professional learning over the period 1985 to 2011. In parallel with shifts in government funding away from the Local Authorities and towards individual schools, the balance of support shifted away from external providers towards school-based professional learning.[35] Pendry et al. have distinguished sources of support for professional learning internal to the history department, primarily the expertise of existing teachers, and those external to the department.[36]

There has been substantial research on the opportunities for professional learning within departments. In 1995, Lieberman suggested that people, including teachers, learn best through active involvement and by thinking about and articulating what they have learned.[37] In 1998, Pendry and Husbands pointed to the role of the history department in the process of professional development and learning, 'since the department potentially plays a key role both in professional development that focuses on classroom teaching and in enhancing pupils' achievement'.[38] Childs et al. have researched the role of the subject department office as a site of learning. They built on the work of Hargreaves in

---

[35] A. West and H. Pennell, "How New Is New Labour: The Quasi-Market and English Schools 1997 to 2001,"in *British Journal of Educational Studies* 50, no. 2 (2002).

[36] A. Pendry, C. Husbands, J.Arthur and J.Davison, *History Teachers in the Making: Professional Learning* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1998).

[37] A. Lieberman, "Practices That Support Teacher Development: Transforming Conceptions of Professional Learning," in *Innovating and Evaluating Science Education: NSF Evaluation Forums 1992-94*, ed. F.I. Stevens (Division of Research, Evaluation and Dissemination, 1995).

[38] Pendry et al., 125.

finding both collaborative and individualistic cultures; in the history department studied they found an 'elective individualism' where the experienced teachers approached similar topics in different ways and rarely shared resources as they weren't deemed appropriate to their style or method. In studies of science and geography departments there was a more collaborative culture, with day-to-day interactions around the sharing of ideas and resources, modelled by the head of department.[39]

This section takes a chronological approach, exploring the setting for professional learning in the period from 1985 to 1995 and then comparing it with opportunities for professional learning in the 2000s. Some of the teachers reminisced about the transformative power of their own heads of department in the early part of their careers in the 1970s and 1980s. As discussed in chapter 5, Allan and Patrick remembered their first heads of history as the people who had introduced them to SCHP. Allan recalled:

> It was my head of department. Bless her, though I cursed her at the time because I'd just finished my first year of teaching.

Patrick was also introduced to SCHP by his department, but remembers the heightened subject-specific debate concerning the practicalities of teaching the specification:

> I do remember we had quite profound philosophical debates between P—, the deputy head and a real SHP man, who insisted it had to be pure, and myself and the head of department saying no, we've got to edit them, we've got to simplify them, we've got to make them accessible, so that was quite interesting.

Simon remembered a later head of department introducing new specifications in a similar way in the late 1980s. The introduction of GCSE had led to a change in head of department; the new head of history brought with her SHP GCSE specifications and therefore a new focus on local history. He said:

> It was a big change for the head of department, and he retired and a new head of department came in and I remember doing quite a lot with the history around us, visiting local places like Osterley Park and Hatfield House and [doing] field studies on those which was very interesting. I mean that was a very different way.

As chapter 5 details, these changes of teaching approach were significant turning-points for the teachers involved. However, they were remembered in a positive, even fond, way. Patrick described the philosophical debates as 'interesting', Simon used 'interesting' and 'creative' to describe this approach to GCSE teaching. Allan chose the

---

[39] A. Childs, K. Burn and J. McNicholl, "What Influences the Learning Cultures of Subject Departments in Secondary Schools? A Study of Four Subject Departments in England," in *Teacher Development* 17, no. 1 (2013).

word 'valuable'. These were significant, imposed changes, but they came from within the history department and the memories were approving. The particular opportunities Patrick remembered of debating the minutiae of pedagogical approaches to teaching suggest opportunities to articulate practice.

Between the late 1970s and the mid-1990s there were also substantial external opportunities for subject-specific professional development for teachers. These could come from subject-specialist Local Authority Advisors, or local networks of teachers or from subject networks such as the Historical Association or Schools History Project. SCHP specifically developed a range of regional and national teacher networks to support the ongoing development of the programme and these 'drew a strong following from local authority advisors.'[40] In the early 1990s there were subject-specific meetings of teachers to discuss the implementation of the National Curriculum. Phillips has suggested that at the local level there was a period of 'intense activity at INSET meetings to interpret the requirements of the Statutory Order.'[41]

Such gatherings of history teachers were a distant, but strong memory for many of the participants and over half the sample raised them as examples of what had changed.[42] Allan remembered being an advisory teacher for a year in the early 1990s, to support the implementation of the National Curriculum:

> I mean as we discussed a few minutes ago, networking, history teachers sort of meeting up. And I mean in K— we used to have a conference centre at E—. And when I was an Advisory teacher for a short time, one of the things we used to do was to run regular three-day courses. Often with between fifty and a hundred history teachers over 3 days that you could really immerse yourself in developing curriculum materials and working together. That's a big loss I think. That's a big loss.

Allan was an advisory teacher for a year around the introduction of the National Curriculum in 1991. He may have been describing the height of school-to-school engagement, but it was subject-specific and collaborative, and several teachers commented upon its decline. Laura substantiated this view:

---

[40] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon, 162. Interviews with LA advisors and teachers are cited in support of this.
[41] Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*, 115.
[42] This issue is also discussed in chapter 5, where a range of teachers refer to the excellence of county advisory services and HA CPD.

> In the early days the way that the county was set up was that there was a history advisor linked to the county. I can remember when I first started it was Dr H— and he was a historian and he knew what good history looked like.

Mark spoke of a similar decline in opportunities to meet local history teachers from other schools, organised by the Local Authority advisor:

> [There was] support from the advisory service and regular meetings and meetings on site, as it were, not to mention the sessions at E—. So you'd go to R— Castle, and P—[the LEA History Advisor] how do you teach R—? And that sort of thing. And then you carry it through, follow it through. It was excellent. You did get humanities teachers coming together and you got little local clusters of history teachers and even though the schools are different, there was still some common agenda on, for example, marking coursework or something like that. I feel that that has slipped away.

Dana substantiated this recollection:

> [His] courses, I mean just because, he just gets you going, doesn't he? He's just so full of information, so many, you know, I still use it all the time with the kids all the time. Three castles that were down the A249, where are they? Why are they there? Think about it! What's the importance? What does that tell you and that sort of thing and the kids have gone out to find where the castles are so, you can't do better than that.

Both of these teachers spoke passionately about local experts supporting them with some substantive knowledge and historical approaches on how to engage pupils with local history. Patrick, having taught in a range of different local authorities, also spoke positively about local authority advisors:

> We were much more collaborative, when I was working both B_____ and in E_____, we had very, very good history advisors, many of whom have disappeared now haven't they? And we were regularly meeting with colleagues. In E_____, one of the first IT in history working parties we had, half a dozen of us from different schools… It was quite exciting though, that was quite good.

There was apparent enthusiasm from these teachers about the provision of collaboration by the LEA advisors in their early years of teaching, and disappointment that this had diminished or disappeared gradually through the 1990s. However, with the introduction of grant-maintained schools in the mid-1990s that directed government funding away from the LEA and directly to some schools, there was a decline in the provision by the Local Authorities and subject-specific support was often the victim.[43]

One significant opportunity for subject-specific professional learning for history teachers came from involvement with initial teacher education courses. The 1990s in

---

[43] G. Walford, "Sponsored Grant-Maintained Schools: Extending the Franchise?," *Oxford Review of Education* 23, no. 1 (1997).

particular saw substantial development in the partnership of schools with higher education providers. Brooks reported that the 1990s were 'a particularly turbulent period in the history of ITT'. Government policy moved to ensure schools became 'full partners' in higher education. There was a substantial increase in the amount of time that students were expected to stay in school and teachers were expected to take a 'joint responsibility' for the planning and management of courses.[44]

Several of the teachers interviewed mentioned their involvement in initial teacher education, usually as mentors.[45] There was a significant difference between the mentors described by the teachers in the sample when they were training to teach and their own experience as mentors. William, for example, recalled a huge independence from his mentor in the 1980s:

> My mentor as you would now call the person, it was just the history teacher, it was a mixed grammar school in Croydon and, I never saw the head of department. Once I was in there that was it, he was gone. What he did, I don't know, but he never stayed in my lessons, he never observed me.

Richard's example, given in chapter 5, of his mentor with the runny nose suggesting teaching what was on page 38 of the textbook, shows William was not alone in this experience.

In contrast, the 1990s saw much deeper involvement from teachers in teacher education. Simon could describe twenty years of experience as a mentor, first with two universities in London and then with one in the Home Counties from around 2000:

> As a teacher and as a person, one of the things I've picked up, speaking to people such as [*names three consecutive PGCE course leaders*] and the range of students that we've had over the years as a result of joint observations and things like that, it allows me to become more attuned with current thinking in history. So very often if you went to a session run by [*the university tutor*] you sort of got into that mind-set of what was going on at the moment, what were students being told, which can only be good because it can sort of refresh your own ideas…

This description of university mentor meetings at the end of the 1990s shows regular subject-specific input on professional learning from the universities at this point.

---

[44] V. Brooks, "A 'Quiet Revolution'? The Impact of Training Schools on Initial Teacher Training Partnerships," *Journal of Education for Teaching* 32, no. 4 (2006).

[45] All of the teachers in the sample were identified through my connections with PGCE tutors

Beyond that, there was a feeling that the communication with student teachers led to new approaches coming into the department. For Nicholas:

> We always used to think having students was a great idea because quite frankly they kept you up-to-date with what's going on…. You always bump into new ideas that way I think yeah, that's a big single way I would have thought [of getting new ideas].

Similarly, for Dana, who had mentored with a university partnership since the late 1990s, when asked if she thought being involved in teacher education had added to her development she answered:

> Oh hugely. I wouldn't know what's going on half the time, you know going on in college and that sort of thing, and about developments and such without these student teachers. Because they bring it in fresh, you know, and we don't always have the time, as much as I would love to be able to sit down and read all of the you know, the educational research and everything that comes out, seeing them bringing it in and then just, the fun as I said of modifying and showing what you can do, you can add this to it, a little bit of old way but new way and stuff and let's go forward and see where we can go with it.

Simon spoke of working with student teachers as a way of developing himself as a reflective practitioner:

> I think probably becoming a mentor makes you think even more about your own practice and I think that, well, because you get people in and you're seeing what they're doing, and you're being constructive with them, and hopefully not destructive, um, and then you're seeing, hang on a minute, that's a bloody good idea, why don't I think of that? I like to think that I've always been very reflective about things.

William, who was working in initial teacher education by 2011, gave a specific example of how a particular story and related teaching approach had been passed on several times in his school and then passed out through a meeting of PGCE mentors:

> I'd just learned it myself. I'd found it in a book. I had taught the story to the head of department, some five years earlier, who then taught it to T— [the student teacher]. And we were actually mirroring the way that African tradition itself works. I think we had about eighteen, twenty mentors at the last mentor day and T— taught the lesson to the mentors and we did two hours on Black history at S—, explaining the way in which it had developed and stuff. And we had people going away saying, 'oh, can I have that story, you know' in house.

Again, any discussion of new ideas coming through student teachers or university partnerships was shared in very positive terms. Such ideas weren't imposed and teachers could select what suited them, but many acknowledged involvement with mentoring as a way of developing their own practice and learning new ideas.[46]

---

[46] Two of the teachers interviewed had been mentors on the university History PGCE course where I was the course leader.

A further external form of professional development came from employment as an examiner for GCSE or A-level exams. In this sample, only Patrick and Simon talked of doing this, but their experience was similar. Patrick spoke about the amount of time provided each year to train as an examiner:

> Firstly, in the early 1990s. Then you used to get a whole weekend away to discuss the mark scheme…. First it was a weekend in Lincolnshire, then it was a day in Oxford.

Simon remembered that this time was used in productive discussions in comprehending and agreeing interpretations of mark schemes:

> When I started examining [*in the early* 1990s] there were very flexible, interesting mark schemes provided by the SHP – because I started marking medicine when I first started. We used to sit around and talk about what marks we were giving and why we were giving them and the mark schemes were a wonderful creations.

Both of these teachers talked of the opportunities for professional discourse in a subject-specific environment. However, by the mid-2000s the amount of time given to training examiners was limited to an afternoon and discussion about or interpretation of mark schemes was discouraged.

In the decade from 1990 to 1999, therefore, there were still many opportunities for subject-specific professional learning and professional discourse external to the school. While such opportunities continued to exist into the 2000s for those that sought them out, there was a decline in subject-specific LEA support over the decade, examination meetings became shorter and less discursive, and opportunities for mentoring student teachers and subject-specific contact through universities became more limited due to the growth in school-led initial teacher education.

Opportunities for learning internal to the history department seem to have stayed strong into the 2000s, especially in departments and schools where there was a collaborative culture that supported the learning. Opportunities for subject-specific development external to the school, however, were in rapid decline in this period. This had a significant impact on opportunities for subject-specific learning. The Historical Association stated in a 2007 report that 'there is no subject-specific support for history left in most local authorities and the training that teachers are allowed to go on tends to

be either generic or for 14—19, which is run by awarding bodies and geared to getting pupils successfully through existing specifications.'[47] The 2011 Ofsted report, *History for All*, pointed to access to training for history as an increasing concern for all history teachers.

> In 28 of the 64 secondary schools visited in which this aspect was specifically inspected, access to subject training was only satisfactory and in 10 of the schools it was inadequate. In one in every five schools visited, training by the examination board was, and had been for several years, the only type of out-of-school subject-specific professional development for history teachers.[48]

Although examples of good practice in training within history departments were presented in the report (e.g. membership of the Historical Association or sharing of high-quality, external, subject-specific training) under half of the departments inspected had engaged with such training in any way at all in the four years leading up to 2011.[49]

The ability to leave school for a day and attend a course about the teaching of history did not seem a familiar event for the teachers in the sample. Edward, for example, found that it was difficult to get out on professional development courses, and that when they could, the department would prioritise courses provided by the examination boards, promoting a technical rather than substantive knowledge of the subject:

> [*Do you go out on uh courses and things like that?*] Uh (laughs) when we can, money's very tight [*And what would you prioritise?*] Exam Board courses, always.

For some, the competition agenda in raising standards led to a lack of desire to share good practice.

> You see I only know us. I'm very insular. I'm paid to be a teacher here. I wouldn't join in this federation thing [that was set up to] share ideas and practice. I'm not telling [others] how I teach A2 because there are loads of people doing Hitler, the Nazis, Edexcel, 'oh don't know how to teach it.' Well I do. I'm not bloody telling them, you know. I did do those parts in my MA and I was taught by Ian Kershaw, you know at Manchester. I know the Nazis inside out. I'm not telling some other bugger. I'll tell B—, you know, I'll tell A— [other members of department] how to do it. I'm not telling some people we're in competition with.

None of the other teachers in the sample spoke about their practice in quite such an insular way, but others did speak of other challenges of collaboration. Simon gave an

---

[47] Historical Association, "Teaching Emotive and Controversial History 3-19," (London: Historical Association, 2007), 14.
[48] Ofsted, "History for All: History in English Schools 2007-10," 44.
[49] Ibid.

example of a history teacher from a local school trying to set up a regular meeting of history teachers:

> A while ago, a lady at St C—'s, tried to sort of organise a network of history teachers which, well, it was very difficult as you can imagine, people getting to meetings and stuff. It was good, because you did swap ideas and share practice you know. We did bring along, there was one particular session I remember she said, can you bring along some examples of GSCE lessons or work and we can just discuss them and see what we do, and that was interesting.

Although Allan was employed as an AST one day a week, he struggled to create the kind of community he remembered:

> The AST work that I do you see, I enjoy working with teachers face to face, rather than impersonally sending out emails, but the senior inspectors at [county advisory service] don't seem to be in favour of single-subject professional development.

Allan also remembered one attempt, in 2008, to bring together all the secondary teachers in the city where he worked:

> What we did have last year which was tremendous I thought... the C— high schools had a common training day for all teachers. About 300 teachers all descended on C— and then we had various workshops to go to including subject based workshops where history teachers could meet together… This was the first time in years that history teachers in C— had met together, and it was mainly dealing with the pressure of curriculum change.

Allan seemed to provide this example to show how unusual it was for teachers to come together outside their schools, and even more unusual for there to be subject-specific workshops. In the 2000s, challenges of marketisation, time and the focus on generic approaches to teacher development seemed to stand in the way of subject-specific collaboration for many history teachers. While there were sporadic examples of opportunities for history teachers to come together to collaborate or share practice, this was far diminished from the regular meetings and courses organised by local authorities in the 1980s and 1990s.

Dana stood out from the other history teachers interviewed in her very positive memory of CPD courses. The first she remembered related to the move to thematic, rather than chronological history encouraged by the 2008 version of the National History Curriculum.

> I did go on a course, God I can't remember how long ago that was, and that had everybody who was brilliant in there. It was at A— International Hotel, and Ian Coulson was there, and Ben Walsh was there, and Ian Dawson was there, and they did

a lot on thematic [approaches]. And that kind of pushed me in that direction because there were things that we did and such that I could see, oh I could do that and it might solve the chronology problem.

Dana remembered another positive experience of professional development provided by a London museum:

> A really big one I can think of is when, when we had to begin teaching the Holocaust by Year 9, in Key Stage 3, and I went on a course up at the Imperial War Museum, which was a brilliant course… looking at the resources they had, and the audio sources and such that they had, and, that really, really had a huge impact. We, you know, it gave us the ability to know what sources to look at that were suitable for kids at that age and that sort of thing.

These are impressive examples of history teachers exploring historical content from a range of expert sources outside their school, museum education officers or experts from other LEAs. However, out of the twenty-one interviews carried out, where every teacher was asked about CPD opportunities that had affected their practice, these were the only four examples offered for the decade after 2000, outside what was provided by examination boards.[50]

The relationship of history teachers with examination boards seemed to undergo a change during the 2000s. For the examiners themselves, Patrick and Simon in this sample, their experience of training days became more one of compliance than discussion and professionalism. Patrick compared the discursive weekend he experienced in the early 1990s with his experience in the late 2000s:

> Now it's just half a Saturday online. I've given up even trying now. In the end, you just have to do what the mark scheme says. [*Did it have any effect on your teaching, on your professional confidence?*] Yes, it did. You felt you knew very much what the exam boards were looking for, so yes, it did make you feel as if you knew what you were doing and you could take the course in the right direction. You knew what students needed. Whether or not you could actually drum that into them was another question altogether.

Simon substantiated this change. In comparison to the 'flexible, interesting mark schemes' of the early 1990s he found:

> Now mark schemes are very formulaic. Basically, a mark scheme is telling you what you have to do and if I was to show you a mark scheme for the last ten years of medicine papers they would be virtually identical. The question would be different, but the mark schemes would be identical. There's no discussion anymore, about why

---

[50] This could reflect the age-profile of the interviewees. Perhaps they would be more likely to elect younger members of the department to go out on courses.

can't we give something if they go off at a tangent there – oh no, this is what they need to say.

Even contact with examination boards for teachers, rather than examiners, seemed to have moved online rather than face-to-face by the end of the decade. In 2008 Allan described his concerns:

What Edexcel are trying is online CPD which a member of my department did the other day. But it's a bit isolated isn't it, you know. Individuals dotted around?

Mark, however, appreciated the online support from the examination boards:

Another thing that's changed is, you know, the complete cradle to the grave back-up you get from the exam boards, where you get questions analysed and, what do they call them? Grade studio and things like that.

As discussed in chapter 7, the power of the examination boards grew exponentially in the 2000s in the content of league table pressure. While teachers like Mark may have appreciated the 'cradle to grave' support, this appears to have been a prescriptive, rather than discursive form of professional learning.

There was, however, evidence from this sample that professional development internal to the department remained strong into the 2000s. Several teachers in the sample described the sharing of resources and teaching strategies with colleagues within the department and particularly with student teachers. Patrick explained:

If I have a particularly good lesson, I write a plan afterwards… we're very good here at sharing resources, we'll then put them on the database we keep, and say, you know, this one really worked really well, you might want to try doing this. K— and I do a lot of sharing resources.

Richard mentioned the importance of a faculty area for developing communication within his history department:

We have a faculty area. It's great 'cos I was with the head the other day, a new head, and he was saying, so how are your department meetings going? And I said, well, to be honest, we do department meetings and we write minutes down and stuff, but I said we talk all the time. Well, what have you got on this? Because we've got obviously now shared resources on the computer system, everything's up there, if you do anything it goes up there, and we've got a little PGCE folder which we will raid as well you know, I mean everything goes up there...oh wow, what was that you did, oh great, can I try that?

Simon agreed that student teachers could be useful for new ideas:

> I've seen that happen, with students taking ideas from me, or Dave or Pete [other members of the history department] or people in the past and obviously, with very good students, you see it the other way around, which is wonderful really.

Diane suggested that teachers in a department learnt from one another through informal observations of practice or student books:

> I would hate the thought of going in and observing someone's lesson, but you go in and out anyway and you see what's going on. When heads of department see what you're doing that way I think it's far more effective. And when I marked piles of books and left them there, I knew that he would have looked through my books.

The informal sharing of resources and ideas was therefore valued among the history teachers interviewed and as new ideas were shared around, this could be a method of effecting change in teaching practice.

The most powerful example of this learning with the department came from Nicholas, who had described himself as a long-standing traditional teacher before Chloe entered the department. First, he described the need for change in the department, citing Ofsted and the three-part lesson as motivating factors and the pressure of A-level and GCSE teaching as reasons why these changes had not taken place before this point.

> I think the biggest single change to our department was when a colleague came about five years ago [2006] on the back of the new Ofsted chunk lesson starter, three-piece lesson and all the rest of it. Now we were being dragged kicking and screaming into that, purely because you had quite a traditional department from their point of view…. Our schemes were very un-prescriptive. I mean we would simply have Year 7, medieval realms, with some ideas about how to do it, but really just a list of topics…and you could do it as you wanted. Now I must admit, for people with lots of exam work, that tended to be dashing around the day before, an hour before, thinking 'how did I do this last year', 'oh I've lost those bits of paper', and doing it as we always did.

Here, Nicholas described the situation in his history department in the early 2000s where schemes of work were 'un-prescriptive' and 'really just a list of topics'. Nicholas described the impact of a new member of the department who decided to change the teaching approach at Key Stage 3:

> When this colleague came in she really did make us sit down and think about what the modern idea of a scheme of work was, and we've now gone wholly over to a system where all our schemes of work are lesson by lesson, with all the resources stored, with all the starters and plenaries stored on the computer…. She was experienced and she's now become an AST.[51] It wasn't without its friction, in fact an existing member of

---

[51] Advanced Skills Teacher

staff left, maybe partly because of the changes that were being instigated. I must say I saw the wisdom of it.

Chloe came from within the history education community, bringing new methods not only for teaching history, but for organising and planning the teaching. She wasn't simply putting forward generic ideas for three-part lessons. She was bringing along a new understanding of enquiry-based learning and second-order concepts and created practical activities such as card-sorts to pedagogically support this understanding. Nicholas had moved from 'lists of topics' as schemes of work planning lessons centred around second-order concepts. He spoke positively about the change:

> There's no doubt they're getting a better deal now. We did a Jack the Ripper lesson the other day [*With Year 8?*] That was with Year 7, under the heading of significance. We did a whole load of people, explorers, a lovely lesson on comparing Christopher Columbus with Neil Armstrong. Really good lesson. We did Galen, compared with Pasteur I think, and then we did a lesson on Jack the Ripper and it was a really terrific lesson.[52]

Nicholas also emphasised the 'collaborative' nature of the planning within the department and, in a brief visit to the department office, showed me the shared schemes of work pinned to the wall. One difference is clear is this example. Nicholas described the department as 'dragged kicking and screaming' into the generic three-part lessons of the Key Stage 3 strategy, imposed in a top-down way. However, (apart from the teacher who left), the department was much more positive about the transformative and far-reaching changes brought to them by a history teacher. While they were resistant to change from above, they welcomed change from within the history teaching community.

Conclusion

The focus on resources in the first half of this chapter shows that history teaching became enriched in the latter part of the 1985 to 2011 period. The wider range of colourful textbooks and the later availability of the internet meant that teachers could access virtually any sources they needed in their classrooms. The flexibility of the National Curriculum after 2000 and more so after 2008 should have ensured that history teachers had full autonomy over what content was taught in their classroom and how it was approached. However, many of the prescriptions detailed in the previous chapter

---

[52] This lesson stands out from others described by teachers in this research in two ways. First, it was not chronological, comparing historical characters from across completely different time periods. Second, the lesson sequence was explicitly organised around the second-order concept of significance.

acted against these potentially positive developments. The examination culture in particular restricted content and pedagogical approach for many teachers.

In parallel to these changes, support for professional learning seems to have become less subject-specific and more generic across this period, particularly after 2000. The power of the examination boards over professional development also intensified. Just at the time when history teachers could have benefited from high-quality subject-specific professional development to help them make the most of the opportunities available to them, particularly in disciplinary use of ICT, these opportunities became limited, mostly due to the decline of the LEA provision and the more generic definitions of development built into the National Strategies.

Teachers responded differently to these changes in resource and provision, but many spoke of restrictions. Patrick, usually innovative in his approach, felt the need to use the examination-based textbook at GCSE and felt limited by the lack of discussion in examiners' meetings. Allan was very nostalgic about the opportunities history teachers had to come together earlier in his career. Despite the huge changes in resourcing and technology across this period, the potential for transformation was not always realised and, in this sample at least, teachers' individual approaches to teaching history remained remarkably consistent.

Chapter 9 Discussion

This study set out to explore changes in history teaching between 1985 and 2011 and in particular to focus on the perceptions and experiences of history teachers who taught across this period. Thirteen history teachers took part in this research and all were interviewed between 2009 and 2011. An oral history approach was employed alongside a career timeline to explore the changing experiences of these teachers. Seven teachers took part in second, follow-up interviews in the summer of 2016. The findings presented in chapters 5 to 8 provide evidence of a dedicated group of teachers who experienced and enacted sweeping curriculum and policy changes across the course of their careers. They were universally pragmatic and resourceful in their responses to and enactment of such changes. Their memories of the period add a rich layer of detail, perceptive insight and an affective dimension to the existing literature in this area.

Several research questions underpinned this study and each of these will be addressed before implications for future research, policy and practice are offered. Three research questions were considered:

- How did history teachers perceive, experience and enact curriculum and policy changes 1985-2011?
- How did history teaching in English secondary schools change between 1985 and 2011?
- What agents acted on teachers to effect change over this period?

In response to these questions and in bringing together the evidence presented in this thesis, this conclusion explores three inter-related themes. First, the shifting nature and place of knowledge in the history classroom; second, the place of teacher agency in an era of prescription and third, the changing role of professional development for history teachers.

A shift in the nature of history teaching.

There was a dramatic shift in the nature and place of knowledge in the history classroom between 1985 and 2011, most notably in the first years of this period. Teachers interviewed spoke of didactic approaches and fixed narratives still in existence in some classrooms in the mid-1980s. Many teachers followed a pragmatic, 'dual practice' approach in this period, including 'new history' principles of source analysis

and evaluation alongside more traditional approaches. It was the introduction of the GCSE examination from 1986 that meant such traditional approaches were no longer enough in the history classroom. While some teachers had changed their approach earlier than this due to involvement with SHP, derived resources or other evidence-based approaches, GCSE was the catalyst that meant single-narrative, traditional approaches to history teaching were no longer sufficient. It was no longer possible to teach history to 16 without teaching pupils to consider the provisional nature of historical knowledge. While many history teachers were well prepared in their methods and approaches for the evidential approach of this examination, a significant minority, such as Edward and Alison in this research, were more reluctant. Many of the teachers in this study acknowledged a necessary shift in their epistemology at this time.

Smith has used the recent literature by Young and Counsell to define the New History movement that was epitomised in the GCSE as 'disciplinary' or 'social realist'.[1] If, as Smith sets out 'powerful knowledge' is not a list of core knowledge that every school child ought to know, but a knowledge of 'powerful disciplinary and procedural concepts', then it was through the introduction of GCSE and the assessment criteria of the National Curriculum that such 'powerful knowledge' became expected in history practice.[2] However, as explored in the later section on agency, such changes were neither linear nor unanimously embraced by all teachers. Twenty years after the National Curriculum was introduced, the specific disciplinary language of the History Programme of Study was not at the forefront of these teachers' discourse about their practice.

Beyond this shift in the nature of knowledge in the history classroom, there were several changes in the place and status of historical knowledge on the school curriculum. The decision in 1991 to make history a 'foundation' subject on the National Curriculum, optional beyond the age of 14, began a decline in the status of the subject in the curriculum of many schools. The increasing value placed on vocational subjects such as business studies and ICT in the later 1990s and early 2000s, due in no small part to the increased importance attached to government league tables, led to a weaker value

---

[1] Smith. He cited Counsell, "Disciplinary Knowledge, the Secondary History Curriculum and History Teachers' Achievements." He also cited M. Young, *Bringing Knowledge Back In: From Social Constructivism to Social Realism in the Sociology of Education* (London: Routledge, 2008).
[2] Smith, 6.

placed on historical knowledge which in turn led to a lower status for the subject in many school curricula. Consequently, fewer students chose to study history beyond the age of 14 and timetabled lessons for history were reduced for students aged 11 to 14.

Patrick and Edward spoke eloquently about the damage done to the status of history within their schools by such changes, but such changes appeared difficult to resist. Some teachers may even unintentionally have contributed to the declining status of their subject within the school curriculum by discouraging weaker students from opting for it at GCSE, as in Laura's case, or encouraging cross-curricular initiatives, as Dana did. The impression of history as a 'difficult subject' seems to have emerged after the introduction of GCSE and league tables and been exacerbated by increased moves towards vocational subjects. However, as fewer students came to 'opt' for GCSE, the impact was that fewer students were given access to that 'powerful knowledge'. Moves in certain schools in the 2000s towards project-based learning or a two-year Key Stage 3 further exacerbated this problem. The history teachers interviewed here seem to have been able to do little to avoid such changes. They were rendered relatively passive observers as opportunities for 'powerful' historical learning became limited to certain pupils or curriculum time for history became increasingly limited.

Chapter 7 showed some evidence of a shift in all the teachers in this study from 'authentic professionals', concerned with the development of substantive historical knowledge in the 1980s, to more 'technical professionals' with a rather different discourse by the 2000s. The intensified focus on examination results, particularly in the 2000s, led to an emphasis on technical knowledge of how to succeed in examinations and progress through National Curriculum 'Levels' that in some cases seemed rather to displace an earlier substantive focus. Patrick's description of how GCSE mark schemes became standardised and Dana's use of the language of the National Curriculum Levels show teachers felt increasing pressure to teach to assessments. The chapter showed the impact the constant fear of Ofsted had on history teachers and also demonstrated the constraints this 'fear' placed on the 'authentic professional.'

A further shift in the place of historical knowledge, and arguably a further move towards the 'technical professional' came through the National Strategies and accompanying 'surveillance'. The perceived need to promote 'activities' within the classroom led to many of the teachers interviewed feeling under pressure to speak less from the front of the classroom. Pedagogical methods of objective-setting and target-related language were encouraged through observations by senior management teams. Such pressures to reduce the voice of the teacher, alongside a rise in technology, often led to YouTube taking the place of the teacher's voice in sharing substantive knowledge. The teachers interviewed in this survey were reluctant to make some of the changes that the National Strategies promoted. They appeared to resent the imposition of pedagogical strategies. There were examples of a minority of teachers resisting this move to the technical, instead focusing on their own authentic history teaching. These will be explored further in the next section on teacher agency.

According to the evidence provided by these teachers, history teaching in 2011 looked very different to that in 1985. Teachers described an autonomy in this earlier period and such autonomy enabled a diversity of approach. This thesis describes different groups of history teachers who, in the mid-1980s, appeared able to prioritise the historical interests and areas that they personally believed to be significant and appropriate. By 2011 there was far more standardisation across classrooms, with objective-setting, use of sources, YouTube links and assessment criteria common practice across all the teachers interviewed. While there was still the theoretical opportunity to choose substantive content and even one's historical approach, this choice seems to have become limited by concerns over examination success. This apparent reduction in teacher autonomy will be developed in the following section.

Teacher agency in an age of prescription

A further research question focused on history teachers' perceptions, responses and enactment of curriculum and policy across this period. One fundamental change in the experience of teachers interviewed was the reduction in autonomy that all of them experienced and chose to talk about. In 1985 teachers could choose the content that they wanted to teach across the whole of history and select their own pedagogical and epistemological approach to teaching the subject. This autonomy was gradually eroded,

first by the introduction of GCSE and the National Curriculum, but to a far greater extent by the National Strategies and the surveillance and data pressures that came with them in the 2000s. Not to be able to choose how a lesson is taught, for how long the teacher can talk and whether or not to write objectives on the board was seen by the teachers interviewed as a far greater intrusion into teacher autonomy than GCSE and National Curriculum innovations.

While 'authentic' examples of autonomy, agency and mediation of policy were present in the evidence of teachers interviewed for this study, such examples were more apparent where teachers had strong disciplinary knowledge and professional confidence alongside working in departments or schools which offered pedagogical freedom. What happened in the history classroom over this period became increasingly prescribed in terms of content, pedagogy, assessment and the status of the subject on the curriculum. Pressure to constantly improve examination results led to a climate of fear in some history departments. Some history teachers and departments were seriously affected, feeling they were compromised in the way they taught the subject due to the demands of senior managers, exam boards and Ofsted. Harris et al. found that some schools were able to 'resist' such pressures for constant innovation, 'confident enough to ignore certain policy initiatives'. Others, however, felt the 'need to embrace, or even be seen to engage with, a raft of initiatives'.[3] It is possible that the same could be argued for individual teachers in this research. While some (such as Dana, Diane, Edward and Alison) saw the need to put into place every initiative and policy according to the letter, others (such as Patrick, Allan, William and Simon) felt more able to resist and mediate the way they enacted the policy, perhaps putting the disciplinary and learning needs of students before the need to conform to initiatives from senior management.

To take two contrasting examples from the teachers interviewed, Dana seemed to respond to and enact initiatives. For example, she developed the project-based-learning course within her school. She also used language derived from the National Strategies and the National Curriculum Attainment Target throughout her interviews and talked about having target Levels on the board, knowing the target Level of every student and differentiating accordingly. Despite agreeing, when prompted, that the 'key concepts' of

---

[3] Harris, Downey and Burn, 415.

the National Curriculum were all on the departmental schemes of work, she did not use the language of causation or significance at all in her interview. It is worth noting that Dana had a broad social science background before becoming a teacher in the USA. In comparison, Patrick, who admitted to his own love of reading around history and his interest in the *Annales* School, seemed to prioritise the discipline of history throughout his interview (and his career). At the time of interview, he was also teaching in a school where project-based learning formed a significant part of the history curriculum. Patrick, in comparison to Dana, however, was more able to articulate the advantages and disadvantages of the programme for historical learning. His descriptions of teaching in the 2000s were dominated, not by assessment criteria, but rather how he had used technology to access a richer range of musical evidence to stimulate and engage the historical thinking and understanding of his students. There were several examples throughout Patrick's interview of where he was able to put school policy into perspective and focus more on the substantive or disciplinary elements of teaching history.

Further research could be used to distinguish between 'resisting' teachers in high-initiative schools and teachers who were simply resisting as part of the culture of their school to resist. How far was Dana caught up in a school policy of taking lots of initiatives in order to improve results and please Ofsted? How far was Patrick able to focus on the curriculum due to the more laid-back nature of his senior team or the position of his school as a successful comprehensive rather than a struggling secondary modern? Such questions could be related to Priestly and Biesta's ecological approach to teacher agency.[4] The authors suggest policy has tended to focus on raising individual capacity while not addressing the structural and cultural changes that might constrain or enable teacher agency. This has implications for history teacher training and the focus of continuing professional development. The impact of innovative, disciplinary teaching is limited if the teachers' environment places severe restrictions on who they teach and the way they teach.

Different levels of policy enactment emerge in this thesis. At the top level are those authoring the policy; at another level are the teachers interpreting and enacting the

---

[4] Priestly, Biesta and Robinson.

policy in the classroom. Between those two extremes, however, different mediators enacted and communicated the policy. The teachers in this study seem to have reacted in a different way to different mediators. When policy was communicated through trusted, respected LEA advisors in the late 1980s and early 1990s, then discussed and mediated by local subject-specialist networks, the teachers in this study seemed to have been emboldened by such initiatives and happy to continue enacting the policy in their own classrooms. When policy was translated through school management teams, most often in a generic or cross-curricular form, for example in the National Strategies in the early 2000s, the history teachers interviewed seem to have been more reluctant and frustrated. This has distinct implications for policy-makers and further policy studies. The history teachers in this study had a more positive attitude to policy initiatives and innovations when they were translated through the medium of their own subject-specific networks. It is, therefore, worth considering how far school senior management teams understand the nature of historical learning. Further research and development in this area could help a more mutually-agreed development of practice in history departments, rather than the frustrating imposition of 'talk less' policies that Edward, Alison and Allan experienced.

There was a distinctive difference in the discourse teachers used to describe teaching in the 1980s and teaching in the 2000s. The assessment-focused language of the technical history teacher appears to have been particularly a product of the twenty-first century. Stories from these interviews about teaching in the 1980s were full of descriptions of substantive content or approaches to teaching such as resource boxes and trips. Laura and Alison were excited about the possibilities of local history; Patrick talked of the theme of women's history running through his schemes of work; William looked for opportunities to teach African history. Noticeably, there was virtually no mention of assessment outside the formal examinations of O-level and CSE. Descriptions of the 2000s, particularly the later part of the decade, however, were dominated by talk of assessment. This significant change in discourse suggests a change in priorities for the history teachers interviewed. Discourse analysis was not the purpose of the study or the method used to explore data, but this shift is nevertheless noticeable and concerning. For the majority of teachers interviewed, the experience of teaching history had changed from a passionate exposition and sharing of the substantive content they valued to a vehicle for examination success. This is a tentative claim as it is based on the

experiences of only thirteen history teachers, but it is worthy of further research and investigation as this significant shift in purpose and discourse could explain related issues around job satisfaction and retention for history teachers. A small minority of teachers in the sample interviewed seem to have been able to resist such a shift in discourse, and their experiences are explored further below.

Tentative groupings of teachers

It was not the intention of this study to make generalisable claims about all history teachers over the period 1985 to 2011. However, trends were identified. In chapters 5, 6 and 7, tentative groupings of teachers were also put forward. These have been collated in one table, seen in Figure 8 below.

Figure 8: Collation of different groupings of teachers identified across 1985-2011[5]

	1985 approach to teaching		Relationship with National Curriculum 1991		How teachers responded to target-setting policies in 2000s	
Traditional/ conservative approach - reluctant to embrace change	'Traditional' teachers	Alison Edward Mark Richard	Downplayed the impact of the NC on teaching	Edward Mark Laura Richard	Some mention of use of Level Descriptors in practice (alongside avoidance of policy)	Alison Diane Edward Mark Nicholas Richard
Pragmatists	Pragmatists using SHP resources and traditional approaches	Diane Laura William Simon David	Compliant with letter of NC and frustrated	Alison Diane	Discourse dominated by talk of Level Descriptors and how it influenced their practice	Dana Diane
Well informed about disciplinary model and able to resist unpopular change	SHP devotees	Allan Patrick	Proactive in mediating the NC to suit personal agenda/ took opportunity to reform own practice	Allan Patrick William Simon	No mention of use of NC Level Descriptors in their practice	Allan Patrick William Simon

---

[5] Various teachers are missing from this table at different periods. The reasons for absence of individual teachers are given in the original tables, Figure 4, Figure 5 and Figure 7.

When it came to policy enactment, different groups of history teachers appear to have responded in different ways. Teachers such as Edward, Mark and Richard who could be identified as 'traditional' in their approach in the 1980s, and who downplayed the impact of the National Curriculum on their teaching, were also those who felt compelled to use the National Curriculum Level Descriptors in the 2000s, but resented this imposition of policy. Alison, Diane and Dana, compliant with the detail of the National Curriculum in the early 1990s, and therefore frustrated by it, also tended to be the teachers whose discourse was dominated by talk of the National Curriculum Level Descriptors and how their practice was influenced by them when they came to be interviewed in 2011. In complete contrast to this, there was a third group of teachers who did not seem to be so limited by the detail of assessment policies. Allan, Patrick, William and Simon gave many examples of their proactive, disciplinary approach to teaching the subject, with innovative planning to fulfil their own personal, historical agenda through creative enactment of policy. While some of them may have seen the National Curriculum initially as a threat, they had the knowledge and professional confidence to overcome that threat and recreate a curriculum that mediated policy through their own disciplinary lens.

There was something quite distinct about this third group in comparison to the other teachers surveyed. Those in this group appeared to be able to resist or mediate some of the more performative policies around assessment. As discussed previously, their context may have had a large role to play.[6] It is well worth noting, however, that three out of the four teachers had a very close relationship with the Schools History Project from early in their careers. All four of these teachers described the history departments they worked in early in their careers, telling of discussion and debate around the subject of history and approaches to history. It is quite possible that such opportunities to articulate and define their approach to the subject early in their careers had a long-term impact on their approach to teaching and the enactment of policy. This was a small, but convincing group of teachers who could be worthy of future research. Smith has written of an 'epistemological introspection' that seems to have provided these teachers with a rather more resilient, resistive approach to enacting policy.[7] It was not unique to Allan

---

[6] See Priestly and Biesta and their ecological approach to teacher agency.
[7] J. Smith, "Discursive Dancing: Traditionalism and Social Realism in the 2013 English History Curriculum Wars," in *British Journal of Educational Studies* (2017): 325.

and Patrick, the initial SHP devotees, but these teachers were noticeably more articulate about history as a discipline in comparison with many other teachers in the sample. This suggests that further longitudinal research about experienced teachers and their career trajectories could inform policy for initial teacher education and early career teachers. The opportunities teachers are given to articulate and define their understandings of the subject within subject-specific groupings could prove fundamental to the way they are able to teach, lead and enact policy long into the future. This in turn could provide for a more engaged, contented and resilient long-term teacher workforce.

Agents of change

A third research focus considered the agents of change in the history classroom between 1985 and 2011. To what extent did the National Curriculum and subsequent changes to Programmes of Study have an impact on practice in the history classroom? Evidence from these teachers suggests the main driving force behind changes in history teaching has been pressure for success in external examinations rather than the Programmes of Study of the National Curriculum. The vocabulary of GCSE mark schemes and National Curriculum Level Descriptors were far more prominent in the language used by teachers than the language of the 'Key Concepts and Processes' or 'Key Elements' that have made up the disciplinary focus of the National Curriculum and where the definitions of 'powerful knowledge' seem to lie. These teachers' experiences of the National Curriculum therefore seem to follow Chapman et al.'s reading of the documents with a primary focus on content, rather than Counsell's attention to the minutiae of changes in the various 'Key Elements'.[8] This, therefore, suggests many teachers needed more than curriculum documentation in order to effectively teach the 'powerful' or 'disciplinary' knowledge that was explicit within the pages of the National Curriculum. Ongoing subject-specific communities would appear essential for teachers continue developing and sharing their practice.

Other literature claims that many history teachers in England, practising during these twenty-five years, had developed a more sophisticated vocabulary to describe history teaching that could be associated more with the disciplinary frameworks set out in the

---

[8] This refers to two articles which are explored further in the literature review, chapter 2: Chapman, Burn, and Kitson; Counsell, "Disciplinary Knowledge, the Secondary History Curriculum and History Teachers' Achievements."

National Curriculum 'Key Concepts and Processes'. Fordham undertook a citation study of the professional journal *Teaching History* to illuminate the growth of professional knowledge among history teachers across the 2004 to 2013 period.[9] Counsell suggested in 2011 that history teachers' published theorising had developed principles of disciplinary practice over the past twenty-five years.[10] Such articles and the pages of *Teaching History* do allude to some history teachers not engaging in this way with researching and refining disciplinary practice. It is clear that the discourse of the teachers interviewed for this thesis was markedly different to that set out in the pages of the professional journal. While second-order concepts have come to frame much of the published discourse in history education in England, especially in the twenty-first century, this discourse was not explicitly shared by the teachers interviewed in this study. Biesta has written recently of teachers' vocabularies.[11] Smith argued for the need to articulate epistemological frames in order to resist undesirable policy change.[12] The teachers in this study did not appear to use the language of *Teaching History* or even the clearly articulated disciplinary language of the 2008 National Curriculum, but rather the language of GCSE mark schemes, Bloom's taxonomy, the National Strategies and the National Curriculum Attainment Target. The details of the disciplinary syntax appeared low on the priorities of these teachers, unless they were linked to assessment. This has significant implications for a variety of stakeholders. Fundamental questions need to be addressed concerning how educational theory in history teaching is disseminated to and habituated in the widest possible range of teachers of history. Attention needs to be paid to the precise language used in textbooks, examination mark schemes, CPD materials and online teacher networks. Teachers need to be given the opportunity to attend subject-specific development throughout their careers, beyond that offered by examination boards, in order to be able to develop and define their understanding of the discipline.

Driving forces in changing approaches to history teaching can be seen in changing resources, particularly textbooks and technology. These were high on the priority list for teachers interviewed to talk about. However, as chapter 8 shows, they do not seem to have promoted changed approaches, but rather emphasised and provided new tools for

---

[9] Fordham.
[10] Counsell, "Disciplinary Knowledge, the Secondary History Curriculum and History Teachers' Achievements."
[11] G. Biesta, M. Priestly and S. Robinson, "Talking About Education: Exploring the Significance of Teachers' Talk for Teacher Agency," in *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 49, no. 1 (2017).
[12] Smith.

teachers to accentuate the approaches they were already taking. Simon and Allan gave examples of particular textbooks supporting their development of overarching enquiry questions, which was critical in their development as history teachers, but this move did not happen in isolation. The support of teacher networks and conversations with other professionals played a significant role in professional development. Patrick's opportunities to meet with other history teachers in sampling new technological approaches in the history classroom substantiate this idea that the resources were not enough to provoke change unless they came as part of a package of professional development.

All the teachers interviewed spoke with one voice about the decline in opportunities for subject-specific development in comparison to their early-career experiences. From the late 1990s onwards, opportunities for subject-specific development seem to have been limited, with generic development opportunities linked to National Strategies more widely available internally to schools. There were two exceptions to this. The first was the opportunity to meet other teachers through development opportunities provided by examination boards. Simon and Patrick, however, were adamant that opportunities for discussion had become limited at such events. Teachers welcomed the opportunity to work as mentors for initial teacher education courses. However, diminishing quotas for history teachers and the development of school-led teacher education programmes had also limited the opportunity to work with universities and other subject-specific teachers in this way. Virtually all the teachers in the sample had been involved with university ITE provision at some point over their careers.[13] They spoke positively of the opportunity to share ideas with student teachers and 'keep in touch' with the wider history education community through university mentor meetings. The policy of moving teacher training into schools and away from universities had implications for more than just the student teachers themselves. Interactions with university courses were one of the very last remaining links many of these teachers had to wider subject-specific communities and discourses.

Within this broader generic scenario, subject-specific knowledge therefore became limited to individual departments. Some of the teachers interviewed showed how their

---

[13] This is unsurprising as I identified the sample through my contacts in the community of history teacher educators.

thriving departments provided opportunities for innovative thinking and reframing of schemes of work. For Nicholas, the presence of Chloe, a recent addition to his department, had transformed his teaching, thinking and disciplinary vocabulary. This has implications for teacher education and the movement of ideas between and within history departments. Chapter 5 showed several teachers moving to SHP approaches because of other teachers in their department or local area. Teachers such as Patrick and William were clear that their personal reading of history texts affected their teaching and kept them up to date with new ideas. The potentially transformative networks of local history teachers that were led by local authorities in the 1980s and early 1990s, however, were not replicated in the decade after 2000. Evidence from the teachers interviewed suggested that such influence, time and finance had moved into the hands of the examination boards which contributed to the assessment-led experiences of teaching described above. Many of the teachers interviewed described the influence of their local authority advisors and groups of history teachers influencing practice when the National Curriculum was first introduced in 1991. Perhaps a continuation of such networks could have helped a long-term promotion of the disciplinary methods promoted in later iterations of the National Curriculum. While evidence from the Historical Association and SHP shows that opportunities for subject-specific development continued to exist, teachers in this research spoke of limited time and finance to be able to 'get out' to such activities.

Implications for policy, practice and further research

Limitations to this research inevitably exist and are explored in more detail in chapter 3. This sample of teachers consisted of a certain generation of teachers, only one of whom was promoted as far as deputy head. There is the danger that this sample considers a certain 'type' of history teacher that was particularly passionate about staying in the history classroom or was not considered management material. Another similar sample of history teachers from the same generation who went on to become headteachers or similar, might have told a different story. There are suggestions within this research that there could be gender differences in how history teachers of a certain age respond to policy. The interviews considered here show Dana, Diane and Alison being very compliant with policy, but becoming rather frustrated. On the other hand, the 'third group' of seemingly more resilient teachers who are better able to articulate their disciplinary frame are all male. Extending this research to explore further how female

teachers respond to and enact policy could reveal a need for different support approaches.

The major area for further research stemming from this project, however, would be to explore how better to support more experienced teachers in the classroom so that they can avoid the frustrations that many of the teachers interviewed here expressed. The nostalgia these teachers offered concerning local networks of history teachers may suggest one possible way forward; certainly, the valuing of continued subject-specific development for history teachers beyond of that offered by examination boards would be one recommendation for school senior management teams. Several of the teachers in this study commented on what a cathartic and unusual experience the interview had been. They weren't used to being listened to or being offered a voice or for their experiences to be valued. If the problems of teacher retention in schools are to be addressed, then offering a voice to experienced, older teachers through research or otherwise is crucial. Harris et al. suggested further research was needed into senior management teams' perspectives of history teachers and the role they play in the school. This research suggests that there needs to be more of a dialogue between senior leaders and older, experienced teachers who can offer an alternative perspective on new initiatives.

The teachers in this research responded to policy initiatives in different ways. Early involvement with SHP seemed to strengthen teachers' ability to articulate disciplinary methods and mediate imposed policies through a disciplinary lens. Considering the size of the sample, this can only be offered as a tentative claim. It would therefore be interesting to undertake a study into a wider range of teachers who were involved in the SHP movement in the early stages of their career and compare them with those who were not. If differences continued to emerge this could inform policy in both initial teacher education and support for early career teachers. Considering that William formed part of this resilient group, but did not identify as being an 'SHP teacher' suggests that it was not just membership of SHP that helped teachers' early development, but being part of a wider, subject-specific grouping where articulation of the discipline was expected and encouraged. Priestly and Biesta, in their work on ecological approaches to teacher agency, created a network map of teacher contacts for

their participants.[14] This would have proved a fascinating addition to this research study. Allan, for example, working as an Advanced Skills Teacher and retaining close contact with the Schools History Project throughout his career, would have had a wide network of teacher contacts. Edward, working in one school for over twenty years with a very stable department, and not being involved in mentoring or examining, would have had a far narrower network map of teacher contacts.

This study has much to offer in terms of methodological approaches. Although oral and life history are now commonly used in educational research, it is less common to use oral history specifically to extract a study of change a particular subject area. Much of the research in history education is limited to documentary analysis or pedagogical approaches. The pages of *Teaching History* reveal many innovative and exemplary approaches to the teaching of the subject in a way that would develop 'powerful knowledge' among students. It is, however, crucial to listen to and explore the teachers' experiences in detail if we are to understand and overcome the barriers to developing such practice in all history classrooms.

This thesis began by setting out the paucity of research focused on the impact of the National Curriculum in history teaching. It hopes to offer policy-makers an insight, not only into the way the Programme of Study has been enacted over the long term in English history classrooms, but also the way that policy can be waylaid and altered according to alternative priorities such as raising standards and the concomitant power of examination boards. Assessment has become so powerful in English secondary schools, that it is the language of GCSE mark schemes and specifications that has come to dominate and command the way history is taught across 11—16 schooling. Teachers need support from senior leaders, subject-specific networks and peers to develop their own professional and disciplinary confidence to see beyond the limitations of GCSE examinations. At the same time, examination boards need to take the responsibility that comes with power to ensure their specifications and professional development encourage the best possible experience of school history for all teachers and learners.

---

[14] Priestly and Biesta

Conclusion

This study set out to explore changes in history teaching from 1985 to 2011 with a particular focus on the perceptions and experiences of history teachers. Thirteen teachers were interviewed using an oral history approach. Teachers were encouraged to describe their teaching at the beginning of their career and compare it to more recent approaches. They were also encouraged to identify the agents that acted on any change in pedagogy.

There were dramatic changes in history teaching over this period. During the interviews, teachers did not choose to focus on changes in the substantive historical matter taught in their classrooms. Instead, their focus was on change in pedagogy, autonomy and epistemology. All of the teachers interviewed noticed a shift over their careers towards a more evidential approach where history was defined in a more provisional manner.

All the teachers interviewed experienced a loss of autonomy over this period. Many described the 'imposition' of a National Curriculum and some resented the approach to source-work imposed by the GCSE examination. However, it was the imposed pedagogies emerging from the National Strategies that teachers described as most prescriptive. A minority of teachers, particularly Patrick and Allan, were able to articulate the limiting impact such imposed pedagogical approaches had on the way they taught history. The decade after 2000 also saw a shift in the discourse of many of the teachers towards a generic language of assessment, particularly surrounding target-setting and the National Curriculum Level Descriptors.

This thesis also presents a more tentative claim, that history teachers who were more exposed to the language and construct of a disciplinary frame early in their careers were more able to mediate policy in the interests of their subject. There was a small group of teachers within the sample who, in that way, seemed more able to resist less popular innovations. Their interviews were not dominated by the language of assessment or focused on exasperations with curriculum prescription. Instead they seemed to

prioritise the historical understanding of their pupils. Patrick was excited to share his work on music as a source of evidence. William was passionate about approaches to teaching African history. Simon and Allan talked of planning overarching enquiry questions. Three of those teachers associated themselves with SHP from an early point in their careers. The fourth was involved in a range of London history departments. These four teachers stood out from the others in their articulation of their vision for a disciplinary history education which surmounted pressure from school management to teach in a particular way. In comparison, many of the other teachers who had found themselves taking a more technical approach to the subject, with a language of target-setting, assessment and attainment, appeared frustrated or limited by their circumstances.

Several implications result from this research. The first of these is methodological. This thesis reveals the rich data source that the teacher's voice can provide, particularly the voice of experienced teachers, as they are able to provide a longitudinal account of change. Experienced teachers should therefore be given more opportunity to share their accounts of change across their careers as this could prove very informative in policy formation. Second, this study provides evidence of the power examination boards held in effecting change in the history classroom, particularly since the mid-1990s. For some teachers, vocabulary, historical approach, resources and assessment methods were dictated by the vagaries of examination boards, not only for GCSE classes, but across the 11-16 age-range. The exam boards, especially within the context of league tables and the 'raising standards' agenda, appeared a far stronger agent of change than new iterations of the National Curriculum Programmes of Study. It is not unreasonable to suggest, therefore, that examination boards should be held to account in terms of encouraging a broad and balanced history curriculum across the secondary experience. At the same time, teachers need subject-specific support and guidance to move pupils beyond the limitations of examination board mark schemes. Accordingly, school senior leaders should be encouraged to understand and support this need. Third, this study has identified different groups of teachers who have navigated change in different ways over the course of their careers. Those with more professional confidence, who appeared able to enact policy in a creative way that suited their discipline, seem to have been provided with rich opportunities for subject-specific early career professional development. Many of these teachers also had invaluable opportunities to articulate and

define their understanding of the subject, often through SHP. This finding emphasises the importance of such networks and opportunities for beginning history teachers today, particularly those trained outside university networks. This research also suggests that a need exists to promote relationships between teachers and university ITE departments and broader history education networks. Senior leaders and policy-makers need to realise the positive implications of this for all teachers of history in their schools.

Finally, the frustrations and disillusionment experienced by many of the teachers in this research point to the need to continue to engage experienced and long-serving teachers in subject-specific development, rather than imposing upon them generic teaching and learning policies. The voices of these experienced history teachers revealed a lifelong and knowledgeable passion for their subject that they wished to share with their students. In this the teachers were unanimous and consistent. This passion and knowledge needs to be recognised by senior leaders and policy-makers both for the enhancement it gives to students' historical understanding and, more broadly, for the implications it has for policy, curriculum and the future of history education.

Bibliography

Abrams, L. *Oral History Theory*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2010.

Adriansen, H.K. "Timeline Interviews: A Tool for Conducting Life History Research." *Qualitative Studies* 3, no. 1 (2012): 40-55.

Ajegbo, K. "Diversity and Citizenship in the Curriculum: Research Report." DfES, 2007.

Aldrich, R. and D. Dean. "The Historical Dimension." In *History in the National Curriculum*, edited by R. Aldrich: 93-113. London: Kogan Page, 1991.

Apple, M.W., and L. Christian-Smith. *The Politics of the Textbook*. London: Routledge, 1994.

Appleby, J., L. Hunt, and M. Jacob. *Telling the Truth About History*. London: Norton, 1994.

Baker, M. "What History Is For." BBC, 2002.

Baker, M. "History Study Needs Facts First, Analysis Later," *The Guardian,* 18 January 2011.

Ball, S. J. "Education, Governance and the Tyranny of Numbers." *Journal of Education Policy* 30, no. 3 (2015): 299-301.

———. "The Teacher's Soul and the Terrors of Performativity." *Journal of Education Policy* 18, no. 2 (2003): 215-28.

Ball, S. J., M. Maguire, and A. Braun. *How Schools Do Policy: Policy Enactments in Secondary Schools*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2012.

Ball, S.J. *The Education Debate*. Bristol: The Policy Press, 2008.

———. *Education Reform: A Critical and Post-Structural Approach*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1994.

Ball, S.J., and R. Bowe. "Subject Departments and the 'Implementation' of National Curriculum Policy: An Overview of the Issues." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 24, no. 2 (1992): 97-116.

Ball, S.J., and I.F. Goodson, eds. *Teachers' Lives and Careers*. London: Falmer Press, 1985.

Ball, S.J., M. Maguire, A. Braun, J. Perryman, and K. Hoskins. "Assessment Technologies in Schools: 'Deliverology' and the 'Play of Dominations'." *Research Papers in Education* 27, no. 5 (2012): 513-33.

Barker, B. "Values and Practice: History Teaching 1971 - 2001." *Cambridge Journal of Education* 32, no. 1 (2002): 61-72.

Batho, G. "History: A Most Crucial Element of the Curriculum: LEA Guidelines for the Teaching of History 5-16." *Teaching History* no. 42 (June 1985): 3-5.

Biesta, G., M. Priestly, and S. Robinson. "Talking About Education: Exploring the Significance of Teachers' Talk for Teacher Agency." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 49, no. 1 (2017): 38-54.

Black, J. *Britain since the Seventies: Politics and Society in the Consumer Age*. London: Reaktion Books, 2004.

Black, P., and D. Wiliam. "Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards through Classroom Assessment" edited by Department of Education & Professional Studies, King's College London. London: GL Assessment, 1998.

Booth, M. "History." In *The Multicultural Dimension of the National Curriculum*, edited by S.A. King and M. Reiss, J. London: Falmer Press, 1993.

Bowe, R., S. J. Ball, and A. Gold. *Reforming Education and Changing Schools: Case Studies in Policy Sociology*. London: Routledge, 1992.

Bracey, P., and A. Gove Humphries. "An Evaluation of Pupil Perceptions of Ireland, Irish History and Its Contribution to History Teaching in Our Multicultural Society." *The Curriculum Journal* 14, no. 2 (2003): 201-15.

Braun, A., M. Maguire, and S. J. Ball. "Policy Enactments in the UK Secondary School: Examining Policy, Practice and School Positioning." *Journal of Education Policy* 25, no. 4 (2010): 547-60.

Brooks, V. "A 'Quiet Revolution'? The Impact of Training Schools on Initial Teacher Training Partnerships." *Journal of Education for Teaching* 32, no. 4 (2006): 379-93.

Brown, R. "Teacher Perceptions of GCSE History Examinations: Responses to a Historical Association Survey." *Teaching History* 55 (1989): 30-35.

Burn, K., and R. Harris. "Findings from the Historical Association Survey of Secondary History Teachers." London: Historical Association, 2009.

———. "Historical Association Survey of History in Schools in England." London: Historical Association, 2011.

———. "Why Do You Keep Asking the Same Questions? Tracking the Health of History in England's Secondary Schools." *Teaching History* 163 (2016): 49-56.

Burnham, S. and G. Brown. "Assessment without Levels." *Teaching History* 115 (2004): 5-12.

Byrom, J. "Continuity and Progression." In *Past Forward*, edited by R.J. Harris and M. Riley. London: Historical Association, 2003.

Byrom, J. "Working with Sources: Scepticism or Cynicism? Putting the Story Back Together Again." *Teaching History* 91 (1998): 32-35.

Byrom, J., C. Counsell, and M. Riley. *Medieval Minds: Britain 1066-1500*. Harlow, Essex: Longman, 1997.

Cannadine, D., J. Keating, and N. Sheldon. *The Right Kind of History: Teaching the Past in Twentieth-Century England*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Carmichael, N. " Recruitment and Retention of Teachers: Fifth Report of Session 2016-17," edited by House of Commons Education Committee. London: HMSO, 2017.

Casey, K. "Why Do Progressive Women Activists Leave Teaching? Theory, Methodology and Politics in Life History Research." Ch. 7 In *Studying Teachers' Lives*, edited by I.F. Goodson. London: Routledge, 1992.

Cercadillo, L. "Significance in History: Students' Ideas in England and Spain." In *Raising Standards in History Education: International Review of History Education,* edited by A.K. Dickinson, P. Gordon and P. Lee. Portland, OR.: Woburn Press, 2001.

Chapman, A.J., K. Burn, and A. Kitson. "What Is School History For? British Student-Teachers' Perspectives." *Arbor: Revista de Ciencia, Pensamiento y Cultura* forthcoming (2017).

Charmaz, K. *Constructing Grounded Theory*. 2nd edn. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2014.

Childs, A., K. Burn, and J. McNicholl. "What Influences the Learning Cultures of Subject Departments in Secondary Schools? A Study of Four Subject Departments in England." *Teacher Development* 17, no. 1 (2013): 35-54.

Chitty, C. *Education Policy in Britain*. Contemporary Political Studies, Edited by John Benyon. 3rd edn. London: PalgraveMacmillan, 2014.

Clark, L. "Trendy Teaching Is 'Producing a Generation of History Numbskulls'." *Daily Mail*, 2 July 2009.

Clark, L. "Schools Told to Dump Churchill and Hitler from History Lessons," *MailOnline,* 13 July 2007.

Cohen, L. , L. Manion, and K. Morrison. *Research Methods in Education*. 6th edn. Abingdon: Routledge, 2007.

Cole, A.L., and J. G. Knowles, eds. *Lives in Context: The Art of Life History Research*. Lanham, MD: Altamira, 2001.

Coughlin, M. "Life History Influence on Teaching United States History." In *AERA*. Chicago, 2003.

Counsell, C. "Editorial." *Teaching History* 115 (2004): 2.

Counsell, C. "Disciplinary Knowledge, the Secondary History Curriculum and History Teachers' Achievements." *The Curriculum Journal* 22, no. 2 (2011).

———. "History Teacher Publication and the Curricular 'What?': Mobilizing Subject-Specific Professional Knowledge in a Culture of Genericism." In *Masterclass in History Education: Transforming Teaching and Learning*, edited by C. Counsell, K. Burn and A. Chapman, 242-51. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

———. "Interpretivism: Meeting Our Selves in Research." In *School-Based Research: A Guide for Education Students*, edited by E. Wilson. London: Sage, 2009.

Counsell, C., K. Burn, and A. Chapman, eds. *Masterclass in History Education: Transforming Teaching and Learning,* edited by S. Brindley. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

Crawford, K, and S. Foster. "The Political Economy of History Textbook Publishing in England." In *School History Textbooks across Cultures: International Debates and Perspectives*, edited by J. Nicholls. Oxford Studies in Comparative Education, 93-104. London: Symposium Books, 2006.

Creswell, J. W. *Qualitative Inquiry & Research Design*. 2nd edn. London: Sage, 2007.

Culpin, C. "GCSE History." In *Past Forward: A Vision for School History 2002-2012*, edited by M. Riley and R.J. Harris. London: Historical Association, 2003.

Cunningham, Peter. "Early Years Teachers and the Influence of Piaget: Evidence from Oral History." *Early Years: An International Journal of Research and Development* 26, no. 1 (2006): 5-16.

Cunningham, Peter, and P.L Gardner. *Becoming Teachers: Texts and Testimonies 1907-1950.* London: Woburn Press, 2004.

Dale, R. *The State and Education Policy*. Open University Press, 1989.

Davies, I., ed. *Debates in History Teaching*. 2nd edn, Debates in Subject Teaching series. Abingdon: Routledge, 2017.

DES.   "GCSE: The National Criteria: History." London: HMSO, 1985.

---------. "History in the primary and secondary years: an HMI view." London: HMSO, 1985.

———. "History in the National Curriculum (England)." London: HMSO, 1991.

———. "Key Stage 3 National Strategy: Training Materials for the Foundation Subjects." edited by Department of Education and Skills. London: HMSO, 2002.

———. "Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Children from Ethnic Minority Groups." London: HMSO, 1985.

———. "Towards World History (Pamphlet 52)." edited by Department of Education and Science. London: HMSO, 1967.

DFE. "History in the National Curriculum." London: HMSO, 1995.

———. "The National Strategies, 1997-2011: A Brief Summary of the Impact and Effectiveness of the National Strategies." edited by Department for Education. London: Department for Education, 2011.

DfES. http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/content/20040117024809/http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/schemes2/secondary_history/?view=get.

———. "Higher Standards, Better Schools for All: More Choice for Parents and Pupils." edited by Department for Education and Skills, 1-8. Nottingham: DfES Publications, 2005.

Dickinson, A. "Assessing, Recording and Reporting Children's Achievements: From Changes to Genuine Gains." Ch. 4 In *History in the National Curriculum*, edited by R. Aldrich. The Bedford Way Series, 68-92. London: Kogan Page 1991.

Dyer, M. *History in a Multicultural Society: Teaching of History Discussion Paper 2*. London: Historical Association, 1982.

Edgington, D. "The Role of History in Multicultural Education." *Teaching History* 32 (1982): 3-5.

Edwards, C. "Recovering History Education's Forgotten Past: Diversity and Change in Professional Discourse in England, 1944-1962." PhD Thesis, University of London, 2016.

Elliott, A. "Twenty Years Inspecting English Schools — Ofsted 1992-2012." In *RISE Review*, 1-4. London: RISE, 2012.

Elliott, J. *Using Narrative in Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. London: SAGE, 2005.

Eraut, M. "Non-Formal Learning and Tacit Knowledge in Professional Work." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 70, no. 1 (2000): 113-36.

Evans, R.J. "Prologue: What Is History Now?". In *What Is History Now?*, edited by D. Cannadine. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan, 2002.

Farmer, A., and P. Knight. *Active History in Key Stages 3 and 4*. Quality in Secondary Schools and Colleges Series, edited by C. Chitty, London: David Fulton, 1995.

Fines, J. "Evidence: The Basis of the Discipline?". In *Teaching History*, edited by H Bourdillon. Buckingham: Routledge, 1994.

Fordham, M. "Realising and Extending Stenhouse's Vision of Teacher Research: The Case of English History Teachers." *British Educational Research Journal* 42, no. 1 (2016): 135-50.

Foster, R., and K. Goudie. "Shaping the Debate: Why Historians Matter More Than Ever at GCSE." *Teaching History* 163 (2016): 17-24.

Foster, S. "The Painful Lessons of Introducing the National Curriculum in England." *The Educational Forum* 58, no. 4 (1994): 374-77.

Foster, S., and K Crawford, eds. *What Shall We Tell the Children?: International Perspectives on School History Textbooks*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2006.

Foster, S., A. Pettigrew, A. Pearce, R. Hale, A. Burgess, P. Salmons, and R-A. Lenga. "What Do Students Know and Understand About the Holocaust? Evidence from English Secondary Schools." London: UCL Centre for Holocaust Education, 2016.

Gardner, P. *Hermeneutics, History and Memory*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2010.

———. "Oral History in Education: Teacher's Memory and Teachers' History." *History of Education* 32 (2003).

Gibbs, G.R. "Software and Qualitative Data Analysis." In *Research Methods and Methodologies in Education*, edited by J. Arthur, M. Waring, R. Coe and L.V. Hedges. London: Sage, 2012.

Glaser, B.G., and A.L Strauss. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.

Gleeson, D., and H. Gunter. "The Performing School and the Modernisation of Teachers." In *The Performing School: Managing, Teaching and Learning in a Performance Culture*, edited by D. Gleeson and C. Husbands. London: RoutledgeFalmer, 2001.

Goalen, P. "The History Curriculum and National Identity: Exploring Children's Perceptions of National Identity." *Curriculum* 19, no. 1 (1998): 23-32.

———. "Multiculturalism and the Lower School History Syllabus: Towards a Practical Approach." *Teaching History* 53 (1988): 8-16.

Goodson, I.F. *Curriculum, Personal Narrative and the Social Future*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2014.

Goodson, I.F., and P. Sikes. *Life History Research in Educational Settings: Learning from Lives*, edited by P. Sikes, Buckingham: Open University Press, 2001.

Grosvenor, I. "History and the Perils of Multiculturalism in 1990s Britain." *Teaching History* 99 (1999): 37-40.

Guyver, R. "The History Working Group and Beyond: A Case Study in the UK's History Quarrels." In *History Wars and the Classroom*, edited by T. Taylor and R. Guyver. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2012.

Historical Association "Teaching Emotive and Controversial History 3-19." London: Historical Association, 2007.

Historical Association http://www.history.org.uk/secondary/categories/488/resource/2795/skills-based-curriculum.

Hammond, K. "Substantive and Disciplinary Knowledge." Ch. 11 In *Masterclass in History Education*, edited by C. Counsell, A. Chapman and K. Burn, 167-72. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

———. "Teaching Year 9 About Historical Theories and Methods." *Teaching History* 128 (2007): 4-10.

Hargreaves, A., and M. Fullan. *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School*. London: Routledge, 2012.

Harris, R., K. Burn, and M.C. Woolley, eds. *The Guided Reader to Teaching and Learning History*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2013.

Harris, R., and T. Haydn. "Pupils' Enjoyment of History: What Lessons Can Teachers Learn from Their Pupils?". *The Curriculum Journal* 17, no. 4 (2006): 315-33.

Harris, R., and K. Burn. "Curriculum Theory, Curriculum Policy and the Problem of Ill-Disciplined Thinking." *Journal of Education Policy* 26, no. 2 (2011): 245-61.

———. "English History Teachers' Views on What Substantive Content Young People Should Be Taught." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 48, no. 4 (2016): 518-46.

Harris, R., C. Downey, and K. Burn. "History Education in Comprehensive Schools: Using School-Level Data to Interpret National Patterns." *Oxford Review of Education* 38, no. 4 (2012): 413-36.

Harris, R., and T. Haydn. "What Happens to a Subject in a 'Free Market' Curriculum? A Study of Secondary School History in the UK." *Research Papers in Education* 27, no. 1 (2012): 81-101.

Hawkey, K. "History and Super Diversity." *Education Sciences* 2 (2012): 165-79.

Haydn, T. "The Changing Form and Use of Textbooks in the History Classroom in the 21st Century: A View from the UK." In *Analysing History Textbooks: Methodological Issues, Yearbook of the International Society of History Didactics*, edited by S. Popp, 67-88. Schwalbach: Wochenschau Verlag, 2011.

———. "History in Schools and the Problem of "the Nation"." *Education Sciences* 2, no. 4 (2012): 276-89.

———. "Introduction." In *Using New Technologies to Enhance Teaching and Learning in History*, edited by T. Haydn. Abingdon: Routledge, 2013.

———. " 'Longing for the Past:' Politicians and the History Curriculum in English Schools, 1988-2010." *Journal of Educational Media, Memory and Society* 4, no. 1 (2012): 7-25.

———. "The Use of Information and Communications Technology in History Teaching in Secondary Schools in England and Wales 1970 - 2003." PhD Thesis, University of London, 2004.

Helsby, G. *Changing Teachers' Work*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1999.

Helsby, G., and G. McCulloch, eds. *Teachers and the National Curriculum*, edited by G. Helsby and G. McCulloch. London: Cassell, 1997.

Hinton, C. "Interviewees Talk About History Textbooks," edited by J. Keating and N. Sheldon. *History in Education* (2010).

Holmes, B. "History within a Locality." *Teaching History* 46 (1986): 17-19.

Howells, G. "Being Ambitious with the Causes of the First World War: Interrogating Inevitability." *Teaching History* 92 (1998): 16-19.

Husbands, C., A. Kitson, and A. Pendry. *Understanding History Teaching: Teaching and Learning About the Past in Secondary Schools*. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2003.

Hutton, P. H. *History as an Art of Memory*. London, VT: University of Vermont Press, 1993.

Isaacs, J. *The World at War*. Thames Television, 1973.

Jenkins, E. "Legislating Philosophy and Practice: Teaching and Assessing Scientific Investigation." In *Teachers and the National Curriculum*, edited by G. Helsby and G. McCulloch. London: Cassell, 1997.

Jenkins, K. *Rethinking History*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Jones, M. "Positive Reflections: History Teaching in 2016-17," *Times Educational Supplement,* 26 August 2016.

Jordanova, L. *History in Practice*. 2nd edn. London: Hodder Education, 2006.

Keating, J., and N. Sheldon. "History in Education: Trends and Themes in History Teaching, 1900-2010." In *Debates in History Teaching*, edited by I. Davies, 5-17. Abingdon: Routledge, 2011.

Kitson, A., C. Husbands, and S. Steward. *Teaching History 11-18*. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2011.

Lawes, S., M. Ledda, and C. McGovern. *The Corruption of the Curriculum*. London: Civitas, 2007.

Lawton, D. *Beyond the National Curriculum: Teacher Professionalism and Empowerment*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1996.

Leckie, G., and H. Goldstein. "The Evolution of School League Tables in England 1992-2016: 'Contextual Value-Added', 'Expected Progress' and 'Progress 8'." In *Bristol Working Papers in Education*, 1-29. Bristol: Graduate School of Education, University of Bristol, 2016.

Lee, P., and R. Ashby. "Progression in Historical Understanding among Students Ages 7-14." In *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History: National and International Perspectives*, edited by P. Stearns, P. Seixas and S. Wineburg. New York: New York University Press, 2000.

Lee, P. J. "Putting Principles into Practice: Understanding History." In *How Students Learn: History in the Classroom*, edited by S. Bransford and J.D. Donovan, 31-78. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2005.

Lee, P. J., and D. Shemilt. "A Scaffold, Not a Cage: Progression and Progression Models in History." *Teaching History* 113 (2003): 13-23.

Levin, B. "An Epidemic of Education Policy: What Can We Learn from Each Other?". *Comparative Education* 34, no. 2 (1998): 131-41.

Lichtman, M. *Qualitative Research in Education: A User's Guide*. London: Sage, 2006.

Lieberman, A. "Practices That Support Teacher Development: Transforming Conceptions of Professional Learning." In *Innovating and Evaluating Science Education: NSF Evaluation Forums 1992-94*, edited by F.I. Stevens, 67-78: Division of Research, Evaluation and Dissemination, 1995.

Low-Beer, A. "School History, National History and the Issues of National Identity." *International Journal of Historical Learning Teaching and Research* 3, no. 1 (January 2003): 11-18.

Fordham, M. "Knowledge and Language: Being Historical with Substantive Concepts." In *Masterclass in History Education: Transforming Teaching and Learning*, edited by C. Counsell, K. Burn and A. Chapman. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

Malone, S. "Ethics at Home: Informed Consent in Your Own Backyard." *Qualitative Studies in Education* 16, no. 6 (2003): 797-815.

Marwick, Arthur. *British Society since 1945*. The Penguin Social History of Britain. Edited by J.H. Plumb. 3rd edn. London: Penguin, 1996.

McCrum, E. "Diverging from the Dominant Discourse —Some Implications of Conflicting Subject Understandings in the Education of Teachers." *Teacher Development* 17 (2013): 465-77.

———. "Teaching History in Postmodern Times: History Teachers' Thinking About the Nature and Purposes of Their Subject." unpublished EdD thesis, University of Sussex, 2010.

McCulloch, G. *Documentary Research in Education, History and the Social Sciences*. Social Research and Educational Studies Series, edited by R.G. Burgess Abingdon: Routledge, 2004.

McCulloch, G. *The Struggle for the History of Education*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2011.

McGovern, C. "The Day East Sussex Became East Germany - When I Joined Thatcher in Predicting a GCSE Fiasco." http://www.conservativewoman.co.uk/chris-mcgovern-day-east-sussex-became-east-germany-joined-thatcher-predicting-gcse-fiasco/

———. "Interview with Chris McGovern." By Nicola Sheldon. *History in Education* (28 August 2009).

Measor, L. , and P. Sikes. "Visiting Lives: Ethics and Methodology in Life History." In *Studying Teachers' Lives*, edited by I.F. Goodson. London: Routledge, 1992.

Mohamud, A., and R. Whitburn. *Doing Justice to History: Transforming Black History in Secondary Schools*. London: Trentham Books, 2016.

Muchmore, J. "Methods and Ethics in a Life History Study of Teacher Thinking." *The Qualitative Report* 7, no. 4 (December 2002): 1-19.

Nakou, I., and I. Barca. *Contemporary Public Debates over History Education*. International Review of History Education, edited by R. Ashby, S. Foster and P. Lee Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, 2010.

NCHWG. "Final Report of the History Working Group." London: DES, 1990.

Nias, J. "Primary Teachers Talking: A Reflective Account of Longtitudinal Research ". In *Educational Research: Current Issues*, edited by M. Hammersley. London: Oxford University Press, 1993.

———. *Primary Teachers Talking: A Study of Teaching as Work*. London: Routledge, 1989.

Nias, J., and K. Aspinwall. "'Composing a Life:' Women's Stories of Their Careers." In *Teachers' Stories*, edited by D. Thomas. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995.

O'Keefe, D. *The Wayward Curriculum: A Cause for Parents' Concern?* London: Esmonde Publishing, 1986.

O'Neill, C. "Implementing Key Stage 3 History: The View from the North-West." *Teaching History* 75 (1994): 13-14.

Ofsted. "History for All: History in English Schools 2007-10." London: Ofsted, 2011.

———. "History in the Balance: History in English Schools 2003-07." edited by Ofsted, 2007.

Oral History Society,. "History of Oral History." Department of History, Royal Holloway, University of London, http://www.ohs.org.uk/about/history-of-oral-history/.

Ozga, J. *Schoolwork: Approaches to the Labour Process of Teaching*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1988.

Pankhania, J. *Liberating the National History Curriculum*. London: Falmer Press, 1994.

Parkes, R.J, and M. Vinterek. "History Curriculum, Geshichtsdidaktik, and the Problem of the Nation." *Education Sciences* 2, no. 2 (2012): 54-55.

Paton, G., "National Curriculum Being 'Dumbed Down'," *The Telegraph,* 4 January 2010.

Paton, G. "Simon Schama: Schoolchildren 'Shortchanged' in History Lessons." *Daily Telegraph*, 10 November 2010.

Pendry, A., C. Husbands, J. Arthur, and J. Davison. *History Teachers in the Making: Professional Learning*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1998.

Perks, R., and A. Thomson. "Critical Developments: Introduction." In *The Oral History Reader*, edited by R. Perks and A. Thomson. Abingdon: Routledge, 2006.

Perryman, J. "Panoptic Performativity and School Inspection Regimes: Disciplinary Mechanisms and Life under Special Measures." *Journal of Education Policy* 21, no. 2 (2006): 147-61.

Perryman, J., S.J. Ball, M. Maguire, and A. Braun. "Life in the Pressure Cooker — School League Tables and English and Mathematics Teachers' Responses to Accountability in a Results-Driven Era." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 59, no. 2 (2011): 179-95.

Pettigrew, A., S. Foster, J. Howson, P. Salmons, R-A. Lenga, and K. Andrews. "Teaching About the Holocaust in English Secondary Schools: An Empirical Study of National Trends, Perspectives and Practice." London: Institute of Education, 2009.

Phillips, R. "'The Battle for the Big Prize.' The Shaping of Synthesis and the Role of a Curriculum Pressure Group: The Case of School History and the National Curriculum." *The Curriculum Journal* 3, no. 3 (1992): 245-60.

———. "Change and Continuity: Some Reflections on the First Year's Implementatio of Key Stage 3 History in the National Curriculum." *Teaching History* 70 (1993): 9-12.

———. "Government Policies, the State and the Teaching of History." In *Issues in History Teaching*, edited by J. Arthur, Phillips, R., 10-23. London: Routledge, 2000.

———. *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*. London: Cassell, 1999.

———. "Making History Curious: Using Initial Stimulus Material (ISM) to Promote Enquiry, Thinking and Literacy." *Teaching History* 105 (2001): 19-25.

———. "National Curriculum History and Teacher Autonomy: The Major Challenge." *Teaching History*, 65 (1991): 21-24.

———. "National Identity and History Teaching in Britain: English, Northern Irish, Scottish and Welsh Perspectives." In *Principles and Practice: Analytical Perspectives on Curriculum Reform and Changing Pedagogy Fron History Teacher Educators*, edited by A. Pendry and C. O'Neill, 22-28. Lancaster: Standing Conference of History Teacher Educators in the United Kingdom, 1997.

Pickles, E. "Valid Assessment of Students' Use of Historical Sources." *International Journal of Historical Learning Teaching and Research* 9, no. 2 (2010): 75-84.

Polkinghorne, D. E. "Validity Issues in Narrative Research." *Qualitative Inquiry* 13, no. 4 (2007): 471-86.

Price, M. "History in Danger." *History* 53 (1968): 342-47.

Priestly, M., G. Biesta, and S. Robinson. *Teacher Agency: An Ecological Approach*. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Pring, R. *Philosophy of Educational Research*. 2nd edn. London: Continuum, 2000.

QCA. "History Programme of Study: Key Stage 3." QCA, 2007.

———. "The National Curriculum for England: History." DfEE/QCA, 1999.

———. "National Curriculum Programme of Study: History (Key Stage 3) Document for Review." QCA, 2007.

QCA, DfEE. "The National Curriculum for England: Citizenship." London, 2002.

Riley, M. "Into the Key Stage 3 History Garden: Choosing and Planting Your Enquiry Questions." *Teaching History* 99 (2000): 8-13.

Riley, M., and R. J. Harris. "Introduction." in *Past Forward: A Vision for School History 2002-2012*. London: Historical Association, 2002.

Ritchie, D.A. *Doing Oral History*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Roberts, M. "Reconstructing the Geography National Curriculum: Professional Constraints, Challenges and Choices." In *Teachers and the National Curriculum*, edited by G. Helsby and G. McCulloch. London: Cassell, 1997.

RSA. http://www.rsaopeningminds.org.uk/about-rsa-openingminds/.

———. "Opening Minds." http://www.rsaopeningminds.org.uk/about-rsa-openingminds/why-was-opening-minds-developed/.

Samuel, R. "Raphael Samuel." In *Historians on History*, edited by J. Tosh. Harlow: Pearson, 2000.

———. *Theatres of Memory: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*. London: Verso, 1994.

SCAA. "Exemplification of Standards in History: Key Stage 3." London: School Curriculum and Assessment Authority, 1996.

SCHP. *Detective Work: the Mystery of Mark Pullen*. Edinburgh: Holmes McDougall, 1976.

———. *A New Look at History*. Edinburgh: HolmesMcDougall, 1976.

———. *What Is History? Mystery of the Tollund Man*. London: HarperCollins, 1976.

SCHP, Schools Council History Project: 13-16. *A New Look at History*. London: Collins, 1976.

Seixas, P., and T. Morton. *The Big Six Historical Thinking Concepts*. Toronto: Nelson, 2012.

Selwyn, N. "Realising the Potential of New Technology? Assessing the Legacy of New Labour's ICT Agenda 1997-2007." *Oxford Review of Education* 34, no. 6 (2008): 701-12.

Sheldon, N. "History Examinations from the 1960s to the Present Day." (2011). http://www.history.ac.uk/history-in-education/project-papers/topics.html.

———. "The National Curriculum and the Changing Face of School History 1988-2010." (2011). http://www.history.ac.uk/history-in-education/project-papers/school-history.html.

Shemilt, D. "The Caliph's Coin: The Currency of Narrative Frameworks in History Teaching." In *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History*, edited by P. Stearns, P. Seixas and S. Wineburg, 83-101. New York: New York University Press, 2000.

———. *Evaluation Study: Schools Council History 13-16 Project*. Edinburgh: Holmes McDougall, 1980.

Sikes, P. "Parent Teachers: Reconciling the Roles." *Teacher Development* 2, no. 1 (1998): 87-105.

———. *Parents Who Teach: Stories from Home and from School*. Teacher Development Series, edited by A. Hargreaves London: Cassell, 1997.

Sikes, P., and J. Everington. "'I'm a Woman before I'm an RE Teacher': Managing Religious Identity in Secondary Schools." *Gender and Education* 15, no. 4 (2003): 393-406.

———. "RE Teachers Do Get Drunk You Know: Becoming a Religious Education Teacher in the Twenty-First Century." *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice* 10, no. 1 (2004).

Silverman, D. *Doing Qualitative Research*. 4th edn. London: Sage, 2013.

Simons, H. "Teacher Professionalism and the National Curriculum." In *The National Curriculum*, edited by D. Lawton and C. Chitty. London: Kogan Page, 1988.

Slater, J. "History in the National Curriculum: The Final Report of the History Working Group." In *History in the National Curriculum*, edited by R. Aldrich, 8-38. London: Kogan Page, 1991.

———. *Teaching History in the New Europe*. London: Cassell, 1995.

Smith, J. "Discursive Dancing: Traditionalism and Social Realism in the 2013 English History Curriculum Wars." *British Journal of Educational Studies* (2017): 1-23.

Spielberg, S. *Saving Private Ryan*. DreamWorks Pictures/ Paramount Pictures, 1998.

Stearns, P.N., P. Seixas, and S. Wineburg. *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History*. New York: New York University Press, 2000.

Sylvester, D. "Change and Continuity in History Teaching 1900-93." In *Teaching History*, edited by H. Bourdillon. The Open University Postgraduate Certificate of Education, 9-23. London: Routledge, 1994.

Tedder, M. "Biographical Research Methods." In *Research Methods and Methodologies*, edited by J. Arthur, M. Waring, R. Coe and L.V. Hedges. London: Sage.

Thomas, D. *Teachers' Stories*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1995.

Thompson, N. "Teacher Talk in History Lessons." https://www.keystagehistory.co.uk/opinion/teacher-talk-in-history-lessons.

Thompson, P. *The Voice of the Past*. 3rd edn. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Thompson, S. "Where Do History Teachers Come From? Professional Knowing among Early Career History Teachers." Unpublished EdD Thesis, University of Sussex, 2010.

Thornberg, R. "Grounded Theory." In *Research Methods and Methodologies in Education*, edited by J. Arthur, M. Waring, R. Coe and L.V. Hedges. London: Sage, 2012.

Tomlinson, S. *Education in a Post-Welfare Society*. Maidenhead: Open University Press, 2005.

Walford, G. "Sponsored Grant-Maintained Schools: Extending the Franchise?," *Oxford Review of Education* 23, no. 1 (1997): 31-44

Ward, S. "Education Policy and Politics." In *A Student's Guide to Education Studies*, edited by S. Ward. Abingdon: Routledge, 2008.

Waring, M. "Grounded Theory." In *Research Methods and Methodologies in Education*, edited by J. Arthur, M. Waring, R. Coe and L.V. Hedges. London: Sage, 2012.

West, A., and H. Pennell. "How New Is New Labour: The Quasi-Market and English Schools 1997 to 2001." *British Journal of Educational Studies* 50, no. 2 (2002): 206-24.

Wilkinson, M. "The Concept of the Absent Curriculum: The Case of the Muslim Contribution and the English National Curriculum for History." *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 46, no. 4 (2014): 419-40.

Williams, Y. "If Education in 2017 Is So Good, Why Are Teachers Voting with Their Feet?" *Times Education Supplement (TES)*, 2017.

Winter, C. "Teacher Professionalism and the Changing Discourse of the Humanities Curriculum." *Teacher Development* 1, no. 2 (1997): 191-205.

Wood, S., and F. Payne. "The Scottish School History Curriculum and Issues of National Identity." *The Curriculum Journal* 10, no. 1 (1999): 107-21.

Worth, P. "Evidential Thinking: Language as Liberator and Gaoler." In *Masterclass in History Education: Transforming Teaching and Learning*, edited by C. Counsell, K. Burn and A. Chapman, 77-104. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

Yeager, E. A., and S. J. Foster. "The Role of Empathy in the Development of Historical Understanding." In *Historical Empathy and Perspective Taking in the Social Studies*, edited by O.L. Davis, Yeager, E.A., Foster, S.J., 13-20. Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield, 2001.

Young, M. *Bringing Knowledge Back In: From Social Constructivism to Social Realism in the Sociology of Education*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Young, M., and D. Lambert, eds. *Knowledge and the Future School*. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.

Zinn, J.O. "Introduction to Biographical Research." *Social Contexts and Responses to Risk Network* (2004). https://www.kent.ac.uk/scarr/papers/Introduction%20biographical%20research.%20WP%204.04doc.pdf.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Overview of education policies 1985-2010

	1985-86	1987-88	1989-1990	1991-92	1993-94	1995-96	1997-8	1999-2000	2001-02	2003-04	2005-06	2007-08	2009-10
External exams	1986 First GCSE teaching.	1987 Last CSE and O-level exams taken 1988 First GCSE exams taken				Cambridge History Project taken up by around 50 schools at A-level		Curriculum 2000 A-level reforms. AS and A2			2006 OCR GCSE Pilot introduced in a small number of schools		2009 GCSE coursework replaced by 'controlled assessment'
National Curriculum			1990 Publication of First National Curriculum	1991 First teaching of National Curriculum (to all of KS3 at once?)	1994 Dearing review	1995 NC mark 2 published – much reduced		1999 Third NC PoS published 2000 first teaching of version 3, flexibility over chronology				2007 Version 4 of NC published 2008 First teaching of version 4: emphasis on diversity	
Micro-policy e.g. KS3 strategy								2000 Exemplar SoWs for KS3 History published. 2001 *Literacy across the curriculum published*	September 2002 The Foundation Subjects strand of the Key Stage 3 National Strategy implemented	2003 *Every Child Matters* published.		2008 DCSF Assessment for Learning strategy published	
Broader education policy e.g. Ofsted/ League Tables/ Ed Acts		1988 Education Reform Act introduces GM schools and National Curriculum		1992 Education Act. Creation of OFSTED and League Tables	Education Act 1993 1994 Dearing Review of National Curriculum		1997 *Excellence in Schools* published 'specialist schools' and performance tables to show rate of progress		2001 White Paper: *Schools Achieving Success* 2002 Citizenship introduced as statutory	2002 First three academies opened; 17 by 2004 2004 BSF announced	2005 White Paper: *Higher Standards, Better Schools for All* New Ofsted regime – shorter inspections/ 2 days notice	2007 Ajegbo Report *Diversity and Citizenship* 2008 National Challenge launched – aim for 30% GCSE A* to C each school	2009 White paper: *Your child, your schools, our future* – removed central govt. prescription of teaching methods

Appendix 2: Pre-interview sheet

CAREER TIMELINE

Could you jot down any important turning points on this timeline, setting out when you trained, when and where you started teaching and any major changes of role or school since then? You might also like to include any major shifts in history teaching that you could identify e.g. the introduction of the National Curriculum. This doesn't need to be final – we can talk through it during the interview.

1976

1978

1980

1982

1984

1986

1988

1990

1992

1994

1996

```
1998 |
     |
     |
2000 |
     |
     |
2002 |
     |
     |
2004 |
     |
     |
2006 |
     |
     |
2008 |
     |
     |
2010 |
     |
```

Other questions during the interview will be grouped under five main questions. You might want to make some notes here before the interview or just have a think about the issues involved.

1. How has history teaching changed over the course of your career?

2. Could you describe a typical lesson at the beginning of your career? How might that differ from a more recent typical lesson?

3. Have your ideas about the nature and purpose of history education changed at all over the course of your career?

4. Of the changes that you would identify in your history teaching, why do you think these took place?

5. Do you think history teaching has improved over the course of your career? In what ways? Why?

Appendix 3: Interview Protocol

Change in history teaching: Interview protocol

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:1em;">

Name of participant: **Current role:**

Name and location of school:

</div>

Opening Statement:

Thank you once again for agreeing to help with my research. Before we begin, there are just a few things I would like to explain and to check with you.

First, let me properly introduce myself. I am Mary Woolley and I run the History PGCE at Canterbury Christ Church University. I am carrying out research for my PhD exploring how history teaching has changed over the last twenty years or so. We know quite a lot about how the curriculum and different policies have changed, but I'm interested in exploring change from the perspective of history teachers who have taught through that period. I'm hoping that understanding the teachers' perspective will help us influence future teacher development.

This has the potential to be quite a big area, but I've narrowed it down to five key areas for us to talk about as I don't want to take up too much of your time. These are the five areas that I sent you in advance and I'm going to try to keep the conversation focused around these. Obviously, the areas overlap and answers will build on one another, but that's not a problem. We should have some time at the end of the interview for you to raise any additional thoughts or questions of your own. The full interview has been designed to last about an hour.

In order to get the most out of this interview I'd like to record our full conversation but can I first just check that that is okay with each of you? The recording and any transcriptions later made from it are considered strictly confidential. All individuals and organisations will be made fully anonymous in any written text. It is also important that you know that your participation in this research is entirely voluntary – if for any reason you want to stop the interview or withdraw from the research, please just let us know.

If you have any concern, questions or queries after today, you can contact me at [email address given]. Would you like to ask anything before we begin?

Introductions

Could you talk me through your timeline, setting out when you trained, when and where you started teaching and any major changes of role since then?

A: Overview

This is a big overview question to get us thinking about change. **How has history teaching changed over the course of your career?**

Prompts: Do you think it has changed? What impact do you think the introduction of GCSE had? What about the National Curriculum in its first stages? And after Dearing and curriculum 2000? What about recently? Curriculum 2008?

Transition 1: Thinking first about your impression of history teaching in general… do you think it is the same now as it was before the National Curriculum?

256

Transition 2: What about your own history teaching? How has that changed?

Transition 3: Would you consider your experience typical among other history teachers?

B: Specific examples

Let's now move away from overview towards some more specific examples. Could you **describe a typical lesson** – or any particular lesson that you taught when you first began teaching?

Describe a **recent lesson** you have taught.

Are there differences?

Prompts: *(some of these may arise naturally, others can then be drawn out).*

- *Have your **resources,** or the way you use them changed?*

- *What about specific **teaching strategies**?*

- *Have there been any major changes to the **content** of what you teach?*

- *How about assessment? How has that changed?*

C. Nature and purpose

What do you think the purpose of history education is, at secondary school level?

Prompt: *If you had to justify to your headteacher why the subject deserved more time on the curriculum, what would you say?*

Transition 1: Have your ideas changed at all over the course of your career?

Transition 2: Have your ideas on the nature and purpose of the subject been challenged at all over the course of your career? If so, when? Who by? How did you respond?

D. Agents of change

Some of the changes we have discussed so far are X, Y and Z. Why do you think these changes took place?

Prompt: *What agents of change acted on you that led to you changing your practice in the classroom or your beliefs about the subject?*

Possible prompts: government policy, senior management, local advisors, CPD, reading, mentoring, colleagues, pupils.

Transition 1: Can you think of a specific example of when you have changed your practice as a result of one of the above?

Transition 2: Has anybody ever explicitly challenged you to change your practice in the history classroom? Who? When? Why?

Transition 3: Which of these groups would you judge as being the most significant in your changing practice?

Section E: Limitations

Do you think history teaching has improved over the course of your career? In what ways? Why?

Prompt: Do you think history teaching has regressed in any way?

Are you thinking about history teaching generally or your history teaching here?

Final Questions

We are nearly out of time, but before we finish recording, I wonder if you have any additional questions you want to ask or other points you want to raise?

Closing statement

Thank you very much again for your time. I'm going to switch off the recorder now. Please do contact me at the email address or phone number given if you have any later questions or concerns.

Interview end time:

Appendix 4: Participant summary table

Participant (Date interviewed)	Role at time of first interview	Prior teaching experience
Allan (2009, 2016)	Head of History at a selective 11-18 girls' school	Allan started teaching in 1976 and at the time of interview in 2009 was still teaching history. He began teaching in a non-selective, mixed 11-18 school, moving in 1986 to a head of history role in a selective girls' school, the post he still held at time of first interview. His timeline showed a parallel career in examination, publishing and advisory work. In 1979 he first set a CSE paper and by 1982 he was a regional coordinator for SHP. In 1991 he became a County advisory teacher to support the introduction of the National Curriculum. In 1999 he published a GCSE textbook under the SHP label and in 2002 published a Key Stage 3 textbook. In the same year he became an Advanced Skills Teacher, supporting history teachers in other schools in the county. By 2016 he was retired from his main teaching role, but still active in the history education community as a consultant.
Diane (2009, 2016)	History teacher at a Catholic 11-18 mixed comprehensive	Diane completed a BEd between 1974 and 1976. She gained her first teaching post in a 13+ non-selective girls' school teaching history and civics in 1976. Between 1984 and 1990 she had ten years away from teaching to look after a young family. Diane returned to work as a part-time history teacher in 1990. The school was initially 13+, but became 11+ non-selective in a re-organisation. At the same time she worked as a supply teacher in various schools. In 2000 she moved to be full time at an 11-18 Catholic comprehensive teaching history and government and politics. Diane included on her timeline all the Ofsted inspections she has been involved in – four at the time of the interview in 2009. Shortly after the 2009 interview she resigned from her post and gained a new job in a selective girls' school teaching history and politics. By the time of the 2016 interview she was teaching part-time and looking forward to imminent retirement
Laura (2010, 2016)	University ITE tutor	Laura graduated from university in 1976 with a degree in history and then completed a PGCE. In September 1977 she started work at a brand new school, leaving the same school thirty years later at the end of 2006 to join the LA advisory service as part of the NQT induction team. In 2008 she moved to a university ITE post working in particular with the Graduate Training Programme, (later Schools Direct) and having experience with students across all subjects. During her thirty years of teaching history she spent one year on sabbatical at a British School in Europe. In 2002 she was promoted to Advanced Skills Teacher in History, but as the need arose this was quickly changed to Advanced Skills Teacher in Initial Teacher Training. By the time of the second interview Laura was still employed at the same university, working in general ITE.

Mark (2010)	Assistant headteacher and teacher of history in selective 11-18 boys' school	Mark started teaching at a technical high school in 1973 and stayed there for four years. He then spent five years out of teaching pursuing an alternative career, but returned to the original school in 1983 and taught there until the end of 1985. He was appointed head of history in his current school, moving to a senior management post just a few years before the interview. He retired a year after the first interview and was therefore not available for second interview in 2016.
Simon (2011, 2016)	Head of history in 11-16 comprehensive boys' school	Completed a BA in History in 1981 and followed this with a PGCE. His first teaching post was for a year in a large school in the south-west of the country. This was followed by one year at a second comprehensive school and then five years between 1985 and 1990 at a Cof E comprehensive. He moved to his current school in 1991 as head of history and still retains the title. He became an examiner for GCSE in 1994 and has worked in this capacity since. He has also mentored student teachers for a range of institutions since 1994.
Dana (2011)	Head of history in 11-18 mixed comprehensive	Attended university in the USA, where she was born. Completed teacher training alongside her degree. Graduated in 1976 when there were few jobs available and started teaching in private schools, teaching social studies to pupils aged 10 to 14. Dana says she didn't particularly like the school so went into banking for a couple of years. She moved to England with her husband and found that her qualifications transferred. In 1989 she started doing supply teaching and then taught part-time to Key Stage 3 only as she 'still had her daughter at home'. She found she had to teach English for a while as a way in to teaching history, but in 1993 was teaching history in a 11-18 mixed comprehensive, the same one in which she is now head of department twenty years later. (It's the same school that Laura worked in for many years).
Patrick (2011, 2016)	Assistant headteacher and teacher of history in 11-18 mixed comprehensive	Patrick completed a PGCE in 1976 in Wales and gained a first post in a 13+ upper school in Bedfordshire the following year, teaching SHP. Three years later he became second in department at another school and in 1984 became head of history at a girls' comprehensive in East Sussex. In 1990 he was appointed Director of Studies at his current school where he now holds the title 'Director of Examinations and Assessment'. Patrick also notes on his timeline that he completed an MA in 1992 (but this doesn't come up in interview).
Nicholas (2011)	Head of history in 11-18 mixed comprehensive	After completing a history degree, his initial career was in the family business, selling shoes. This was followed by time as a 'house husband'. It was in 1990 that Nicholas trained as a history teacher and he started teaching in his current school in 1991. He became head of department in 1996, worked as an examiner for a year around 2004 and claimed schemes of work were first introduced to his department in 2006.

William (2011, 2016)	University ITE tutor	After a degree in International History, William completed his PGCE in 1976 and started teaching in a comprehensive on the south coast in the following year. In 1980 he moved to a multi-ethnic comprehensive in London as a history teacher and head of year. In 1988 he was appointed senior teacher in a 13+ school in the city and taught 'lots of economics'. In April 1991 he became deputy head with responsibility for curriculum at a further London school, teaching about 60% of a timetable. In 2004 he moved to an Advanced Skills Teacher role in the same school. William had also embarked on a parallel research career, completing a Masters in Curriculum Studies by 1992 and an EdD by 2007. At the time of this interview he had been working for about a year on an ITE university course teaching History PGCE students.
David (2010)	Local Authority advisor for history	After completing a PGCE in history in 1976 he started work at a boys' grammar school the following year. Three years later he moved to a non-selective boys' school in another part of the county. In 1984 he became head of history at a C of E girls' school. In 1987 he started work for the Local Education Authority as a teacher advisor for history and local history in the archives. Over the following twenty-five years he held a range of positions as subject consultant for history within the county and was involved in a range of local and national projects promoting both history and archaeology in schools.
Richard (2011, 2016)	Head of history, 11-18 mixed Catholic comprehensive	Richard undertook a PGCE in London. His second placement of this teacher training programme was in this school and he's been there ever since, gradually working his way up from mainscale teacher to head of history and assistant head. By the time of the second interview he was still teaching in the same school. Although there had been somebody else employed as head of history in the interim, in 2016 Richard still held the dual role of assistant head and head of history.
Edward (2011)	Head of history, 11-18 mixed comprehensive	Edward described how he started teaching in 1977 in a 'secondary modern school' in the south-west of the country. After a year he moved to a Catholic school on the outskirts of London due to 'a girl... I was infatuated'. That was 1979 and he stayed there for 10 years, completing a Masters in History towards the end of that period. He moved to his current school in B— in 1989 when he was appointed head of history. He worked with Alison in that department for over twenty years. He retired shortly after the 2011 interview.
Alison (2011)	History teacher and NQT co-ordinator at 11-18 mixed comprehensive	Alison has taught in the same school since she started in 1979 Head of history by 1981. Since 1985 has held a variety of roles: becoming head of year, head of humanities, co-ordinator for raising achievement at GCSE and finally NQT co-ordinator. Has acted as mentor for History PGCE students from local university over a number of years, briefly been a GCSE examiner and completed two modules of an MA in Education around 2000.

Appendix 5: Example of questions sent to participants for second interviews

Extract from the further questions sent to Richard (June 2016)

At the beginning of the last interview you prioritised the way resources and technology had changed over your career. Do you think the ease with which you can access YouTube etc. has limited the amount of stories you tell in the classroom? How about textbooks? To what extent have they changed the way you teach?

You made some interesting comparisons between the kind of history teaching encouraged on your PGCE and what you first encountered at College A. One of the things you mentioned was source comparison – another was the push on empathy. Can you tell me more about what you remember learning there? How it was different at College A and how you felt moving from one to another? Did you ever find yourself trying to put in place the ideas you had learnt on the PGCE rather than those seen in the school? Did the two approaches confuse?

You do give an example of this (see below), but I wondered if you could expand on that a bit e.g. Why did you feel the need to change the status quo in the school? What do you actually mean by 'skills' in this quote? Has the balance between 'sourcework' and narrative shifted in your lessons over the years?

> *I would try and get some sources from say something like I don't know the Battle of Little Big Horn or something like that or anything, just to make it a bit more different um, but the kids found that very strange to start with because they weren't used to that and I had to sort of coach them a little bit on well, start doing the skills which we now take for granted um, but I think yeah I mean my only lessons I was trying to sort of fit in with what the regime was here but also trying to push the boundaries a little bit to what I was interested in doing as well, but I've always told stories… I was called a dinosaur by the first (HMI?) inspector. He said, he said you teach like an old man, I said yeah I know but you know it works, it works for me, I don't teach like that any more, I have changed.*

Linked to the above quote, how have you changed and why did you change?

Appendix 7: examples of codes from first round of interviews

Free Nodes

Name	Sources	References	Created On	Created By	Modified On	Modified By
career progression	13	22	03/01/2012 21:31	M C	08/07/2012 22:28	M C
technology	13	17	04/01/2012 08:01	M C	08/07/2012 22:35	M C
agents of change	13	37	04/01/2012 13:02	M C	08/07/2012 22:53	M C
nature and purpose	12	19	04/01/2012 08:01	M C	08/07/2012 22:28	M C
change overview	12	27	04/01/2012 08:03	M C	08/07/2012 22:52	M C
assessment	12	35	04/01/2012 08:22	M C	08/07/2012 22:48	M C
national curriculum	12	34	04/01/2012 12:06	M C	08/07/2012 20:53	M C
background	11	16	03/01/2012 21:22	M C	08/07/2012 21:57	M C
regression	11	14	04/01/2012 13:26	M C	08/07/2012 22:55	M C
typical lesson	10	18	04/01/2012 08:22	M C	08/07/2012 22:44	M C
textbooks	10	21	04/01/2012 11:58	M C	08/07/2012 22:38	M C
knowledge	10	25	04/01/2012 11:59	M C	08/07/2012 21:06	M C
GCSE	10	23	04/01/2012 13:17	M C	08/07/2012 22:52	M C
shp	9	17	04/01/2012 11:57	M C	08/07/2012 14:22	M C
sources	9	19	04/01/2012 15:19	M C	08/07/2012 20:51	M C
teacher as expert	8	10	04/01/2012 15:54	M C	08/07/2012 22:41	M C
exam board	8	13	04/01/2012 16:15	M C	08/07/2012 22:42	M C
enquiry	8	10	04/01/2012 20:26	M C	08/07/2012 21:01	M C
NC levels	8	16	04/01/2012 20:48	M C	08/07/2012 22:55	M C
progression in teaching history	8	13	04/01/2012 08:19	M C	08/07/2012 14:36	M C
writing new SoWs	7	11	04/01/2012 08:21	M C	08/07/2012 14:43	M C
chronology	7	9	04/01/2012 08:34	M C	08/07/2012 20:54	M C
story	7	8	04/01/2012 12:03	M C	08/07/2012 14:22	M C
O level CSE	7	11	04/01/2012 12:46	M C	08/07/2012 20:56	M C
networks	7	11	05/01/2012 09:44	M C	08/07/2012 20:56	M C
mentoring	7	13	05/01/2012 20:26	M C	08/07/2012 22:30	M C
resources	7	12	09/01/2012 21:36	M C	08/07/2012 21:04	M C
pedagogy	7	17	23/06/2012 09:27	M C	08/07/2012 19:03	M C
department	6	11				M C

Interview 1 file 100319-003   Interview 10 file 111121-000

In   Nodes

M C   115 Items

Free Nodes — History Teachers 1 (NVivo 10).nvp - NVivo

Name	Sources	References	Created On	Created By	Modified On	Modified By
ofsted	6	10	06/07/2012 20:16	MC	08/07/2012 22:16	MC
government policy	6	8	04/01/2012 07:58	MC	08/07/2012 22:54	MC
teacher training	6	8	04/01/2012 08:02	MC	08/07/2012 22:10	MC
control	6	7	04/01/2012 13:26	MC	08/07/2012 14:57	MC
themes	6	7	05/01/2012 11:30	MC	08/07/2012 14:43	MC
compliance	5	9	04/01/2012 22:23	MC	08/07/2012 22:49	MC
the maverick is constrained	5	7	04/01/2012 08:28	MC	08/07/2012 22:45	MC
enjoyment	5	7	04/01/2012 08:30	MC	08/07/2012 14:35	MC
skills	5	6	04/01/2012 08:37	MC	08/07/2012 22:21	MC
low ability pupils	5	5	04/01/2012 12:10	MC	05/07/2012 15:16	MC
pressure for results	5	6	04/01/2012 12:11	MC	07/07/2012 20:41	MC
Learning Objectives	5	6	04/01/2012 12:54	MC	08/07/2012 22:49	MC
LOTC	5	7	04/01/2012 13:33	MC	07/07/2012 15:33	MC
skills v content	5	6	05/01/2012 09:52	MC	08/07/2012 22:21	MC
professionalism	4	4	04/07/2012 12:14	MC	08/07/2012 22:16	MC
further qualification	4	4	03/01/2012 21:36	MC	08/07/2012 18:54	MC
continuity	4	5	04/01/2012 08:23	MC	06/07/2012 11:33	MC
A level	4	7	04/01/2012 13:17	MC	08/07/2012 14:26	MC
PBL	4	6	04/01/2012 13:21	MC	05/07/2012 15:21	MC
traditional teaching	4	6	04/01/2012 20:23	MC	08/07/2012 22:45	MC
time for subject	4	7	04/01/2012 20:50	MC	05/07/2012 15:15	MC
CPD	4	6	05/01/2012 11:19	MC	06/07/2012 20:57	MC
dumbing down	4	5	05/01/2012 11:23	MC	06/07/2012 20:52	MC
film	4	7	05/01/2012 11:29	MC	08/07/2012 22:36	MC
cse mode 3	3	3	04/07/2012 12:13	MC	07/07/2012 15:33	MC
race	3	8	05/07/2012 15:05	MC	08/07/2012 21:05	MC
children	3	6	04/01/2012 08:34	MC	08/07/2012 22:46	MC
response to policy	3	4	04/01/2012 13:05	MC	06/07/2012 10:24	MC
progression	3	4	04/01/2012 20:26	MC	08/07/2012 18:31	MC

MC 115 Items

Free Nodes

Name	Sources	References	Created On	Created By	Modified On	Modified By
literacy	3	3	05/01/2012 11:25	MC	08/07/2012 22:46	MC
differentiation	3	4	05/01/2012 20:45	MC	06/07/2012 20:55	MC
visits	2	4	04/07/2012 14:31	MC	07/07/2012 15:34	MC
ISM	2	2	04/07/2012 22:21	MC	08/07/2012 14:29	MC
threat from other subjects	2	3	06/07/2012 12:14	MC	07/07/2012 15:44	MC
Change in expectation	2	2	06/07/2012 20:16	MC	07/07/2012 15:43	MC
impact	2	2	07/07/2012 20:50	MC	08/07/2012 14:46	MC
significance	2	3	08/07/2012 14:37	MC	08/07/2012 22:14	MC
competition for PGCE	2	2	03/01/2012 21:28	MC	07/07/2012 15:35	MC
choice of teaching post	2	3	03/01/2012 21:29	MC	12/06/2012 15:17	MC
roles beyond history teaching	2	2	03/01/2012 21:39	MC	12/06/2012 15:19	MC
active history	2	2	04/01/2012 08:36	MC	04/07/2012 22:21	MC
implicit practice	2	2	04/01/2012 12:13	MC	07/01/2012 10:10	MC
training teachers	2	3	04/01/2012 13:20	MC	07/07/2012 20:21	MC
diversity	2	2	04/01/2012 13:32	MC	09/01/2012 21:50	MC
intrinsic purpose	2	3	04/01/2012 20:37	MC	06/07/2012 20:18	MC
power of anecdote	2	2	04/01/2012 20:38	MC	07/07/2012 15:36	MC
Keeping knowledge up to date	2	2	04/01/2012 20:48	MC	06/07/2012 20:47	MC
flexibility	2	4	05/01/2012 09:47	MC	09/01/2012 21:53	MC
early entry	2	3	05/01/2012 10:13	MC	08/07/2012 14:33	MC
sharing ideas	2	2	05/01/2012 11:09	MC	07/01/2012 09:58	MC
being examiner	2	2	05/01/2012 11:23	MC	12/06/2012 15:19	MC
role of LA	2	4	07/01/2012 09:55	MC	06/07/2012 20:56	MC
women's history	2	2	09/01/2012 21:50	MC	05/07/2012 15:08	MC
interpretations	1	1	23/06/2012 09:38	MC	23/06/2012 09:38	MC
support	1	1	04/07/2012 14:28	MC	04/07/2012 14:28	MC
3 part lesson	1	1	04/07/2012 22:22	MC	04/07/2012 22:22	MC
management	1	2	05/07/2012 15:22	MC	05/07/2012 15:23	MC
value of subject	1	1	06/07/2012 11:45	MC	06/07/2012 11:45	MC
homework	1	1	06/07/2012 12:29	MC	06/07/2012 12:29	MC

History Teachers 1 (NVivo 10).nvp - NVivo

MC   115 Items