Geography teachers and curriculum-making in 'changing times'

Abstract

This paper explores the controls and influences over geography teachers' curriculum making. A tension is identified between the teacher's agency to 'make' a geography curriculum and a controlling social-economic climate of accountability, performance pressure and technological change which limits the teacher's agency. The paper argues that teachers are responding to this tension by the coping strategy of 'banding together' both at the school level and in wider communities. The extent of teachers' reliance on other people in curriculum making is such that curriculum making can be described as becoming 'hyper-socialised'.

Keywords

Curriculum, geography, teacher, control, society

Introduction

Much research that explores the relationship between the school curriculum and curriculum control suggests that there is a tension between the autonomous teacher as 'curriculum maker' and the curriculum control of wider society and economy. (See Hartley 1997, McCullogh et al 2000, Goodson 1998, Apple 2004, Kelly 2008, Fielding & Moss 2011, Giroux 2011, Morgan 2011 and Pring, 2013). This tension is explored in this paper through reporting on empirical research undertaken in four secondary (High) school geography departments in London, England. The research explores what controls and influences teachers' geography curriculum making and how

teachers are responding to the accountability and performance pressures, which (the literature suggests) control the curriculum.

The different ways teachers' curriculum work responds to the pressures of wider society and economy are revealed through exploring four case studies. These case studies suggest that individual teachers have some agency to make the curriculum, and that some geography teachers appear to be actively resisting the pressures of performativity and accountability by asserting their identities as *geography* teachers. But the case studies also reveal a common pattern of curriculum making – a striking level of sharing and collaboration, or teachers 'banding together'. This appears both within the department – by delegation and sharing on the department intranet, and outside - by drawing on 'invisible' teachers and other 'educators' who share materials through informal communities on the web. Serendipitous 'Googling', the news and popular media are strong influences and so the 'socialised' nature of curriculum making extends beyond teachers and professional educators.

The empirical findings from schools are discussed and explained by three key ideas in the literature which describe changed social and economic conditions of 'the times'. These ideas are, firstly, a new individualism in which young people are caught in a tension between a narcissistic individualism (to be a consumer) and a competitive individualism (to be a producer); secondly, globalisation in which life and work is highly fluid, fast-changing and information-rich; and thirdly a knowledge crisis in which the role of knowledge for society and economy is uncertain allowing instrumental purposes to dominate schooling.

The paper concludes by drawing together the three social-economic explanations and the empirical findings by the notion of 'hyper-socialised' curriculum making. I argue that 'hyper-socialised' captures the intensity of the new-individualism, globalisation and instrumentalist pressures felt by teachers and also captures the nature of teachers' response to the pressures by

'banding together'. The case study evidence shows teachers sharing and collaborating in school, and reliant on internet communities which share, recycle and re-contextualise curriculum material on the internet.

The teacher's curriculum making in the context of wider society

'Curriculum making' in school geography is an idea developed by Lambert and Morgan (2010) which emphasises the role of the teacher in curriculum decisions. Their curriculum making model (ibid) takes a view of curriculum as process to be enacted by the teacher rather than as a predetermined or fixed content to be delivered (see Kelly, 2008 and Roberts, 1996). The model encourages teachers to see curriculum as praxis - an ongoing enactment of the idea of 'curriculum making' as balancing three equally important educational 'pillars': the subject, the child's experiences and teacher choices (Biddulph at al, 2015).

Insert figure 1 here

Curriculum making offers a different perspective on geography curriculum to earlier literature in school geography. Geography 'curriculum planning' (Graves, 1979) and geography 'curriculum development' (Stenhouse, 1975) both argue that the teacher should be critically engaged in decisions over what to teach, but these earlier ideas see curriculum thinking as longer term planning. Curriculum making (Lambert and Morgan, 2010) is more fluid and argues for a dynamic, ongoing teacher's enactment of curriculum as process.

The research presented in this paper explores curriculum making with a focus on how teachers are working in a wider social and economic context. The curriculum making model (ibid) emphasises the teacher in deciding what and how to teach. But taken out of wider (social, economic and political) context, the model presents the teacher as a free agent, able to make curriculum decisions and exercising judgement with complete integrity. The existence of a national curriculum in England is a control over the teacher's 'local' curriculum making. Since its introduction in 1991 there have been several iterations of the geography national curriculum for England (GNC), with the most recent in 2014 reflecting a 'turn' to knowledge (see Young and Muller, 2010 and Lambert and Young, 2015). Roberts (1996) showed that a national curriculum in England did not produce the same geography curriculum for all, even though this was the intention of the government at the time. Rather, different approaches or "ways of thinking" (ibid) amongst geography teachers persisted that led to very different enacted geography curricula. Teachers "continue to teach in the way they want to teach" (Roberts, 1996:203).

A national curriculum is only part of the story of how curriculum making may be controlled. Far from being free to 'make the curriculum' through individual judgement, the teacher is controlled and regulated by an accountability regime (test results, school inspections and performance management) which has tightened as neoliberal economic forces have deepened across all aspects of society, including schooling (see Hartley 1997, McCullogh et al 2000, Goodson 1998, Apple 2004, Kelly 2008, Fielding & Moss 2011, Giroux 2011, Morgan 2011 and Pring, 2013). Such accounts expose and critique a growing dominance of 'social efficiency' as the single 'curriculum ideology' (Schiro, 2008, Walford 1981, Ross 2000 and Rawling 2001). Since the late 1970s, in response to a declining economy, the neo-liberal state has sought to induct young people into "mechanical obedience" (Goodson 1998).

An 'efficiency and effectiveness' narrative in schooling, has been shown by Rawling (2001) and McCullogh et al (2000) to de-professionalise subject teachers and downgrade their role to that of classroom learning technician, rather than curriculum maker. Goepel (2013) argues that teachers' professionalism is undermined by the withdrawal of trust in the teaching profession to self-regulate. Instead, regulation (and trust) has been placed with Ofsted (a school inspectorate contracted by the state), whilst teachers are increasingly expected to self-discipline, in order to conform to the external regulators. A Foucauldian notion of teachers subject to surveillance, regulation and self-discipline can be seen as a response to the intensified neoliberalism of today's society. (See Hartley, 1997 and Foucault, 1977).

The accountability pressure on teachers has an effect on curriculum. The teacher becomes concerned with 'delivery' of a given curriculum, rather than thinking of the curriculum as an ongoing process or questioning curriculum content through reference to a set of educational aims. Such 'deliverology' (Kelly, 2008 and Pring, 2013) is the antithesis of the praxis called for by Lambert and Morgan's (2010) 'curriculum making'. In the field of geography education, there has been much concern raised that teachers are neglecting critical thinking about *what* to teach, under pressure to teach any given content 'effectively' and ensuring that pupils are 'learning to learn' effectively (see Mitchell and Lambert, 2015). The critiques of neoliberal economy and society imply that the teacher is in a difficult position, trying to exercise judgement and integrity in the nuances of local curriculum making, whilst subject to outside performativity pressure to 'deliver'.

A 'dual individualism' and globalisation

The accountable teacher (concerned with 'deliverology' and performativity) can be seen as a manifestation of 'the times' and helps to explain teachers' relative neglect of curriculum

matters. At a deeper level, teachers' increasing accountability and pressure to perform can be understood by a shift in how society conceives the individual – how teachers think about young people and how young people think about themselves. Hartley's (1997) account of 're-schooling society' offers such an explanation, contending that there is a deep-rooted tension in society and economy playing out in schooling – a tension driven by two contradictory forces in the late capitalist world. The first is the drive to *produce*, more, better, faster – an economic imperative in a Post Fordist world. This drives a technical and competitive individualism needed for a highly skilled and effective workforce. The second is the drive to *consume*, as a self-centred individual – a cultural imperative in postmodern culture. This encourages a "self-centred and narcissistic individualism" in which the person is a consumer (Hartley, 1997:3). These two forces, affecting how the individual is conceived, are difficult to reconcile in many aspects of society, including schooling. Children are growing up into a world where they must be highly competitive and skilled for work, whilst at the same time they are invited (and expect) to be satisfied consumers.

The dual individualism helps to explain teachers' accountability and performance pressure because, not only are the 'individualised' pupils coming with raised expectations as consumers of the curriculum, but the teachers are themselves part of the individualised society – subject to increasing performance management and expected to 'produce' efficient lessons and results. A question raised here is how does the teacher respond to the tension of the dual individualism and performativity pressure in their curriculum making?

Hartley's (1997) ideas can be located in wider social theory which, since the 1990s presents a shifting 'outside' world, unsettling the place of the individual. There is raised expectation and choice, but accompanied by pressure to perform and a heightened sense of risk (Beck, 1992). The once 'solid' and dependable has become 'liquid' (Bauman, 2000). Boundaries between society and individual are blurred (Giddens, 2000). Globalisation has given us a 'network'

society (Castells, 2004) and an 'information-blizzard' in which ideas are recycled such that the reality and simulation are inseparable (Baudrillard, 1994). Schools are not immune from such shifts. The literature leaves little doubt that neoliberal society has permeated schools. But how is today's society reflected in teachers' curriculum-making, and significantly their *geography* curriculum-making?

A 'knowledge crisis' - changing views of subject knowledge in the curriculum

Geography is a broad, fragmented and changeable discipline. Beginning geography teachers can have very different knowledge bases, depending on the nature of their geography degree (see Mitchell and Lambert 2015). This may help to explain the long history of academic debate in geography education about curriculum content (see Walford, 2001). School geography offers a suitable context for research into teachers' curriculum making because subject content is so open (and as Huckle, 1985 and Morgan, 2011, 2012, point out, because geography can be presented through different political lenses). This raises a question about how *geography* teachers respond to the pressures of 'the times'. Faced with selecting from the great breadth of geography, questions arise such as, do teachers fall back on prescribed content (such as national curriculum) and 'official' texts (such as textbooks)? Do they trust in their individual geographical and educational understanding to make decisions, or turn to communities of geography teachers for guidance?

The curriculum making model (Lambert and Morgan 2010) suggests that teachers should make curriculum choices about which geographical knowledge and skills to teach by drawing on the discipline of geography. Young and Muller (2010) argue that many teachers have come to view the role of curriculum knowledge in a way that privileges generic skills and the everyday knowledge of children's experience over disciplinary knowledge. This presents something of a

'knowledge crisis' for the school geography curriculum. If the (often) challenging and abstract disciplinary knowledge of geography is perceived as irrelevant to the needs of individuals and society, teachers may sway toward the 'student experiences' and 'teacher choices' elements of their curriculum making, and away from 'geography – the subject' in their curriculum thinking (see figure 1, above).

Lambert and Young (2015) express profound worry at the neglect of subject knowledge in many schools' and teachers' curriculum thinking and they make a case for re-engagement with disciplined subject knowledge at the heart of curriculum decisions. They argue that there are three possible curriculum 'futures' (drawing from Young and Muller, 2010) which take a particular view of knowledge. These are 'future 1' – an elitist view of knowledge, with subject boundaries fixed and maintained. This is knowledge as fixed, backward looking and without consideration for the learner, or an 'under-socialised' view of knowledge. 'Future 2' is an 'over-socialised view of knowledge, whereby the learner's life, interests and instrumental purposes are over-privileged. Subject boundaries are removed and generic learning outcomes, such as skills, become the aim. Lambert and Young (2015) link a 'future 2' view of knowledge to the dominant neo-liberal discourse in society, whereby education is seen as having a narrow purpose of equipping people with 'useful' skills and abilities.

Lambert and Young (2015) call for a 'future 3' view of knowledge in curriculum making, whereby subject knowledge boundaries are maintained but also crossed for the creation and acquisition of new 'powerful' disciplinary knowledge. Subject knowledge is dynamic and forward looking in such a future. The argument for teachers applying a 'future 3' view of subject knowledge fits with Lambert and Morgan's (2010) curriculum making model of teachers balancing subject knowledge with educational purposes. But, in light of literature (such as Hartley, 1997, Apple, 2004, Kelly, 2008 and Fielding and Moss, 2011) which see teacher agency as severely limited, there is a question as to how far the pressures for

performativity prevent teachers from applying 'future 3' subject knowledge thinking to their curriculum work.

Research design and methodology – a case study approach

To summarise the discussion in this paper so far, teachers are under increasingly intense accountability and performance pressure as they make curriculum decisions. The increased pressure can be explained by three shifts in society and economy - a new individualism, a globalised, 'online' world and an uncertain role of knowledge. Each of these may restrict the teacher's agency to make the curriculum and geography teachers must navigate the pressures and shifts in their curriculum work. The research asks: What are the influences and controls over teachers' curriculum making? And, how are teachers responding to these influences and controls.

A case study approach was chosen to provide in-depth 'portraits' of teachers' curriculum making to explore these questions. Data was collected from four geography departments in London state comprehensive schools referred to as case studies A, B, C and D, teaching 'Key Stage 3' (KS3) geography (age 11-14). Data from in depth interviews, lesson observations, department meetings, observations and curriculum documents (such as KS3 'scheme of work' plans) was transcribed and then analysed in a series of steps to develop a thematic coding system. Initial codes were based on themes from the literature review, including power, control, change, conflict and scale. Codes were amended and refined following an inductive process (allowing codes to emerge from recurring themes in the data) and an iterative process – moving back and forth between the existing codes and new, emerging themes and sub-themes (or codes) in the data. Care was taken to sort and categorise emerging themes into codes without creating an over-

complex coding system. The final structure has 51 codes in three emergent themes of people (21 codes), resources & contexts (25 codes) and change (5 codes).

Each transcribed document was densely coded using the final coding system. An exhaustive content analysis was then carried out (following Cohen and Manion, 2011:563-573) to produce descriptive comments for each code, under headings for each school. The full content analysis was analysed for overlaps and repetition to reduce the data further to a series of 'analytical statements' (see Robson, 2002). These were verified for reliability by checking back against the raw data, using the notion of 'analytic generalisation' (Yin, 1994). This checking avoids undue bias and supports 'internal generalisability' (Robson, 2002).

The set of analytical statements reduced the 'thick' description of the content analysis. Case study 'portraits' and teachers' 'stories' were then produced from the data. These are inevitably partial and selective, but the analytical statements were used to guide the attention and prominence given to the themes emerging in these descriptive 'portraits' and to identify narratives running through each case as teachers talked about (and enacted) their curriculum making. These measures support a trustworthy account and a truthful representation of each case. Figure 2, below summarises the process of data collection and analysis.

Insert figure 2 here

Findings - A 'hyper-socialised' curriculum-making process

All four case studies showed that curriculum-making is an intensely 'socialised' process which threatens to undermine individual teacher agency. This statement is substantiated by an

examination of four key themes emerging through the data analysis showing that departmental curriculum making appears to be driven by: sharing and collaboration between teachers (both within the department and in wider networks); pupil skills (for life and examination success) enjoyment (of teacher and pupil) including emphasis on pupil 'voice'; and reliance on technology (speeding the transfer of information and ideas and opening a portal to current affairs and popular geography).

The case study departments' curriculum making is a collaborative process, shared between the teachers in a way which is strikingly intense. There is a carefully managed division of labour both in advance curriculum planning and at the point of classroom enactment. Each department followed the same curriculum making process of:

1. discuss and agree overall content;

2. delegate the planning of learning objectives (LOs);

3. share LOs for feedback;

4. fix LOs and assignment guidelines for each unit;

5. delegate production of lesson materials;

6. share, amend and add to lesson materials on the department's intranet;

7. use and rely on the intranet lesson plans and materials as they teach.

Teachers download or 'pull off' lesson plans from 'the system' (department shared intranet), sometimes at the point of entry to the classroom. The teachers in each department work in close cooperation, even when there are some different opinions about what and how to teach. Learning objectives and assessments are agreed and adhered to, and through 'the system' teachers rely on one another to ensure curriculum materials are there when they need them. The teachers portray this process of close cooperation as inevitable and embedded in their normal

11

working practices. I contend that the intensity of sharing and cooperation between teachers in the department is a response to the pressure which teachers are under as schooling reflects the pressures and tensions of 'the times'.

There is also an intensity in how teachers work in networks with other teachers (and people interested in the geography curriculum) beyond school. These people are 'invisible' unseen and often anonymous, appearing as contributors to sharing websites such as 'Geography Pods' or 'Geography all way', or more 'official' websites, such as the BBC, the Geographical Association and the Royal Geographical Society. The 'invisible' authors of content have developed (or re-purposed and recycled) ideas and materials, and uploaded them to websites for teachers to use. The 'social' nature of curriculum making is again striking by the level of sharing through wider communities, enabled by the internet. This appears to be the enactment of Castell's (2004) globalisation through networks. The use of internet communities can, like the collaboration within the department, be interpreted as teachers' response to the need to 'perform' effectively and use time efficiently, coupled with the need to keep the geography curriculum 'relevant' (fun and engaging) for pupils as consumers.

The concern for enjoyment (for pupils, but also for teachers) through curriculum is striking in all departments. In all data (lesson observations, schemes of work, planning meetings and teacher interviews) enjoyment is a prominent theme. A 'therapeutic' society, implied by Hartley (1997) and developed as an idea by Ecclestone and Hayes (2009) and Furedi (2009), rings true. Yet the departments are assessing and measuring their pupils with an eye on how they will perform in future public examinations in a regime of performativity and accountability. Hartley's (1997) tension of two individualisms appears to be influencing curriculum making. The teachers' emphasis on enjoyment reflects the 'narcissistic' or 'self-centred' individualism of postmodernity, and their descriptions of how they teach through

careful monitoring and measurement as well as emphasising the teaching of skills, reflects the 'performativity' of a competitive individualism.

Furthermore there is a high level of co-construction of curriculum between pupils and teacher. Group work, pupil self-management, and pupil voice (both in the lesson and in teachers' planning) show ways that pupils' own lives and experiences are a part of curriculum making. Such intense concern for pupils to be involved in curriculum making can again be seen as 'schizophrenic' (narcissistic and competitive). Pupil enjoyment and curriculum involvement appears 'therapeutic', but behind the participation, pupils are under pressure to perform in schooling which is ultimately a competitive process with a purpose of producing effective producers and willing consumers (Morgan, 2011).

The original Greek meaning of 'hyper' is 'excessive' or 'exaggerated' – qualities which describe the heightened level to which curriculum making has become 'socialised' (involving people other than the teacher herself). The 'excessive' or 'exaggerated' qualities can be explained as follows: Social and economic forces create the tension (between a therapeutic and narcissistic individualism) which plays out as pressure on teachers to produce both pupil 'happiness' and technical performance through the curriculum. Furthermore, there are endless and bewildering possibilities opened up by the internet and computers (an information 'blizzard') both for making an 'exciting' curriculum and tracking and measuring pupils' performance with ever more data. This pressure exceeds the teacher's individual curriculum making resources (time, knowledge and creativity) forcing them to use coping strategies of turning to other people and devolving curriculum making or 'reaching out', particularly by using technology, to communities that can help. The extent to which the teacher's individual curriculum making resources is exceeded is such that, alone, the teacher in the neoliberal schooling landscape, is 'out of control' (reflecting Giddens, 2000, image of the 'runaway

world'). Only by passing on (or sharing) excessive pressure, can the geography teacher manage and make sense of their curriculum making task.

Geography teachers' identities – resisting neoliberal pressures

The portrayal of curriculum making as hyper-socialised appears alienating for the teacher, who might ask 'where do I fit in?' or a step further, 'who am I in all this?' The empirical findings show that geography teachers are indeed asking these questions (albeit implicitly) and turning to their personal identities as *geography* teachers as a form of resistance to neoliberal pressures controlling their work, and the threat of losing themselves in a 'hyper-socialised' web of curriculum making. In doing so, geography teachers are asserting their personal curriculum values and beliefs. Some of the teachers interviewed identify with a radical geography called for by Huckle (1985) and Morgan (2011) to make a geography curriculum which challenges the neoliberal status quo, for example in the introduction of a new unit on 'inequalities' developed in department C. Some are aligning with an idea of 'powerful' geographical knowledge (Lambert and Young, 2015), such as the Head of Department in school D who talks of the importance of teaching the difficult (and often neglected) physical processes so that all children have a 'core' geographical knowledge. Such committed geography teachers show some teacher agency in the act of curriculum making. They have taken on a 'curriculum leadership' role. The findings show, however, that their circumstances (particularly the school context) affects their freedom to lead the curriculum with integrity.

Each department in the research portrays a subtly different narrative of curriculum making and each Head of Department (HoD) portrays a distinctive personal 'story' of curriculum leadership. In school A, enjoyment and skills are emphasised and HoD A's story is one of struggling to lead her department in isolation as her team of geographers are pulled away from

14

geography by other school responsibilities. She teaches in a school with average performance (measured in crude examination results terms) and a legacy of challenging behaviour, which she connects to the school leadership team's emphasis on skills and engagement and their relative neglect of subject needs. In school B, there is also emphasis on enjoyment and 'pupil voice' but developing pupil skills for examination success is notably strong and there is also a 'modernising geography' narrative. HoD B's story is of building a team of geography teachers who engage with the changing discipline and bring 'up to date' geography to their curriculum making.

School C has a distinct 'freedom' narrative and teachers describe autonomy and a belief that they 'teach what they want'. HoC's story accords with the freedom narrative and he appears indifferent to bureaucratic regulation over his curriculum making. HoD C's story is also one of strong engagement with the discipline through university connections and curriculum making which balances strong disciplinary knowledge with popular geographies and current affairs. However he makes curriculum decisions in the privileged setting of a high performing school. School D emphasises subject knowledge more than the other three schools and HoD D's story is one of re-engagement with the discipline and the geography education community, through studying a Master's degree and becoming an advocate for using 'powerful' subject knowledge for balanced curriculum making.

Conclusion – the significance of 'hyper-socialised' curriculum making

I have argued that geography curriculum making has become 'hyper-socialised' as a response to the intense pressure of performativity and accountability which teachers face. This pressure can be explained by three influences linked to the deepening neoliberalism of the times – a 'dual individualism', globalisation (experienced through the speed-up of communication

through technology) and an uncertainty about the role of subject knowledge. The case studies show teachers are struggling to make the curriculum with integrity in pressurised times and they are responding by turning to others and (in some cases) by re-affirming their identity as *geography teachers* to sustain their work.

This research contributes to the field of curriculum studies and specifically to the idea of 'curriculum making' by offering a social-economic explanation to the influences over teachers' curriculum work and to how they are responding to the pressures of late capitalism. The findings may be of interest to geography teachers, in particular heads of departments, as they plan, manage and make sense of their curriculum work. By offering an explanation of how intended curricula are enacted by teachers, the findings may also be significant to policy makers (for example in planning national curricula frameworks), and those involved in teacher training and continuing professional development.

References

Apple, M. (2004) *Ideology and Curriculum 3rd Edition*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Baudrillard, J. (1994) *Simulation and Simulacra.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan

Press.

Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid Modernity.* Cambridge: Polity.

Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity.* London: Sage.

Biddulph, M., Lambert, D. and Balderstone, D. (2015) *Learning to Teach Geography in the*

Secondary School: A companion to school experience. London: Routledge.

Castells, M. (2004) *The network society: A cross-cultural perspective.* London: Edward Elgar.

Cohen, L. and Manion, L. (2011) *Research Methods in Education, seventh edition.* London: Routledge.

Ecclestone, K. & Hayes, D. (2009) The *Dangerous rise of Therapeutic Education*.

Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. New York: Pantheon.

Fielding, M. and Moss, R. (2011) *Radical education and the common school: a democratic alternative.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Furedi, F. (2009) *Wasted: Why Education Isn't Educating*. London: Continuum Press.

Giddens, A. (2000) *The Third Way and its Critics*. Cambridge: Polity.

Giroux, H. A. (2005) *Border crossings: cultural workers and the politics of education.* New York: Routledge,

Goepel, J. (2013) Upholding public trust: an examination of teacher professionalism and the use of Teachers' Standards in England, *Teacher Development* (16) 4: 489-505.

Goodson, I.F. (1998) 'Becoming a school subject', in Goodson, I.F., Anstead, C.J. and Mangam, J.M. (Eds) *Subject knowledge; readings for the study of school subjects*. London: The Falmer Press.

Graves, N. (1979) *Curriculum planning in geography.* London: Heinemann Educational

Hartley, D. (1997) *Re-Schooling Society*. London: Falmer.

Huckle, J. (1985) The Future of School Geography. In R. Johnston (ed.) *The Future of Geography*. London: Methuen.

Kelly, V. (2008) *The Curriculum: Theory and Practice. 6th edition.* London: Sage.

Lambert, D. & Morgan, J. (2010) *Teaching Geography 11-18 – A Conceptual Approach*. MaidenHead: Open University Press.

Lambert, D. & Young, M. (2015) Knowledge and the Future School – Curriculum and Social Justice. London: Bloomsbury.

McCulloch, G., Helsby, G., & Knight, P. (2000) *The politics of professionalism: teachers and the curriculum.* London: Continuum.

Mitchell, D. & Lambert, D. (2015) subject knowledge and teacher preparation in English Secondary Schools: the case of geography. *Teacher Development* 19,3, pp. 365-380.

Morgan, J. (2011) What is radical school geography today? *Forum* 53, 1, pp. 116 – 128.

Morgan, J. (2012) *Teaching Secondary Geography as if the planet mattered*. London: Routledge.

Pring, R. (2013) *The Life and Death of Secondary Education for all.* Abingdon: Routledge

Rawling, E.M. (2001) *Changing the Subject: The impact of national policy on school geography 1980-2000.* Sheffield: Geographical Association.

Roberts, M. (1996) 'Interpretations of the geography national curriculum: a common

curriculum for all?', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 27,2, pp. 187-205.

Robson, C. (2002) *Real World Research. Second Edition.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Ross, A. (2000) *Curriculum: Construction and critique*. London: Falmer Press.

Stake, R. E. (1995) *The Art of Case Study Research.* Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Stenhouse, L. (1975) *An introduction to curriculum research and development.*
        London: Heinemann Educational.

Walford, R. (1981) 'Language, ideologies and geography teaching', In Walford, R. (ed.)

Signposts for Geography Teaching (pp. 215–22). London: Longman.

Yin, R.K. (1994) *Case Study Research: Design and Methods, 2nd Edition.* London: Sage.

Young, M. (2007) *Bringing Knowledge Back In: From social constructivism to social realism*

in the sociology of education. London: Routledge.

Young, M. & Muller, J. (2010) Three Educational Scenarios for the Future: lessons from the
        sociology of knowledge, *European Journal of Education*, 45, 1, pp. 11-27.

Appendix: List of final codes

i)   People

Code	Description
P.t	teacher (miscellaneous)
P.tvision	teacher's explicit reference to educational purposes and aims
P.tq	teacher's questioning
P.tcrit	teacher's critical approach to geography
P.tcreat	teacher creativity
P.troles	roles and responsibilities outside geography teaching
P.ts	other teachers (such as working as a team, using & considering other teachers)
P.tenj	teacher enjoyment & interest
P.ted	teacher's own educational background
P.tslife	teacher's previous work/ life experience &/or their family
P.h	headteacher
P.sm	senior management priorities, incl. school logistics (such as timetabling)
P.hodmnge	HoD management strategies & approaches
P.puplres	pupil as a resource, teacher making link to them and/or inter-pupil relationships such as groupwork
P.skl	development of pupil skills & abilities (both generic and geographical)
P.inc	pupil inclusion
P.expupl	ex-pupils
P.puplb	pupil behaviour
P.puplenj	pupil enjoyment
P.guru	educational or subject 'gurus' or experts
P.parent	pupils' parents

ii)   Resources & contexts

Code	Description
R.txtb	textbooks
R.map	maps and atlases
R.nc	national curriculum
R.gas	geographical educational agencies (such as GA & RGS)
R.agencs	other agencies (charities, trusts etc)
R.uni	University geography depts.
R.ac	Academic geography (incl. books, journals, online material etc)
R.gis	GIS
R.google	internet searching
R.web	known websites
R.ass	exams and assessment
R.exmbd	exam board materials used as a resource
R.lcl	local area context
R.ict	availability of ICT infrastructure
R.xcuric	other subjects' curricula (cross curricular links)
R.news	news, current affairs & the media (such as TV)
R.fwk	fieldwork
R.geog	specific geographical content or concepts
R.soc	content, skills or attitudes of importance to wider society
R.ped	pedagogy (approaches to teaching)

R.prog   progression in geography & coherence of curriculum content
R.hm   homework
R.ofstd   ofsted inspections & expectations
R.lit   literacy and attention to language
R.val   pupils exploring values, opinions or moral issues

iii)   Change

Chg.forced forced or imposed change
Chg.sought change sought or by teacher/dept.
Chg.in   inertia & inheritance
Chg.r   resistance to change
Chg.con   conflict in change

List of figure captions:

Figure 1   The resources for teachers' curriculum making in geography (Adapted from:

Lambert and Morgan 2010; www.geography.org.uk/cpdevents/curriculummaking with the

permission of The Geographical Association)

Figure 2   Steps of data collection and analysis