Recovering History Education's Forgotten Past

Diversity and Change in Professional Discourse in England, 1944-1962

Christopher Edwards

UCL Institute of Education, University of London

PhD Thesis

2016

Declaration

I, Christopher Edwards 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.

Word Count

96257 words

Abstract

This study explores diversity and change in the professional discourse of history education texts published in England between 1944 and 1962. Specifically, it examines post-war authors' views on the aims of history education and on the role that primary source materials should play in the teaching of history. This analysis reveals that this professional discourse emerged as part of a dynamic social practice in which a vibrant community of post-war authors set out their various visions for a "proposed" history education. This textual analysis draws on methods of discourse analysis, which focus on the selection and structuring of ideas.

A review of the secondary literature, which reflected back on on post-war history education revealed the existence of two contradictory positions. On the one hand, contemporary critics have heralded the period as a "Dark Age" in which rote learning, dull pedagogy and obedience to a narrow and celebratory history dominated. In contrast, on the other hand, other commentators have viewed the period as a "Golden Age" whereby history teaching was underpinned by robust civic and moral aims and in which pupils readily acquired a positive and secure national historical narrative. This study examines these two conflicting interpretations by closely analysing an array of post-war seminal historical texts published by key figures, such as, Rachel Reid, Robert Unstead, Estella Lewis and Gordon Batho and organisations, including: The Historical Association, the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters and the University of London Institute of Education.

The study concludes, that far from being singular and unchanging, post-war discourse among history educators was diverse, dynamic and thought provoking. Working within professional associations, authors discussed the purpose of history education and sought to influence history teaching in schools. What emerges is a shifting, complex discourse at odds with "Dark Age" and "Golden Age" simplicities. This study demonstrates the value of using published post-war history education texts as sources for the study of education from 1944-1962. Above all it challenges the view that there was an intellectual vacuum at the heart of history education during the two decades that followed the end of Second World War.

For
Joanna Beresford

Contents

"And the first step, as you know, is always what matters most, particularly when we are dealing with those who are young and tender. That is the time when they are easily moulded and when any impression we choose to make leaves a permanent mark."

"That is certainly true."

"Shall we therefore readily allow our children to listen to any stories made up by anyone, and to form opinions that are for the most part the opposite of those we think they should have when they grow up?"

"We certainly shall not."

"Then it seems that our first business is to supervise the production of stories, and to choose only those we think suitable, and reject the rest. We shall persuade mothers and nurses to tell our stories to their children, and by means of them to mould their minds and characters which are more important than their bodies. The greater part of the stories current today we shall have to reject."

Plato, *The Republic, Education: The First Stag*e (around 380 BC) translated by Desmond Lee, Penguin Classics, 2nd edn, 1974, p. 131.

Introduction

There are good reasons to bemoan the condition of history education in the decades following the Second World War. One reason is that at this time some leading history educators did so. John Fines, for example, writing in 1969 wrote:

> Up and down the country children are still being bored to tears by syllabuses of constitutional and political history leading to examinations seemingly based on the belief that the ability to memorise is the most important criterion in education. History teachers are regarded by their pupils and colleagues with a mixture of scorn and pity, as is evidenced by the fact that in a recent attitude-test carried out by the Schools Council history came nearly bottom of the poll.[1]

There had been at this time, Fines argued, widespread student disengagement with history education: its aims and practices no longer seen, by many, as having any real credibility. In support, he cited *The Schools Council Enquiry I*, published in 1968, which reported that only 29 per cent of 15-year-olds thought that history was a useful subject of study, and only 41 per cent of boys and 40 per cent of girls thought it held any interest for them. Further still, it reported that just 28 per cent of the boys' parents and 29 per cent of the girls' parents thought that history was a "very important" subject for their child to learn. The cause of this disengagement, Fines opined, was the style of teaching that was employed, one based, he wrote, on "the belief that the ability to memorise is the most important criterion in education".

---

[1] John Fines in the Introduction to *Blond's Teachers' Handbook*, edited by John Fines (Blond Educational, 1969).

Mary Price, a leading post-war history educator, in her landmark article, "History in Danger", published by the Historical Association in 1968, shared Fines' concerns.[2] Price wrote that at this time the majority of history lessons had consisted of taking notes and committing to memory a factual outline of British history, with teachers following the principle: "if I do not tell them, they will never know." Price was not surprised by the key findings of the 1966 survey of early school leavers conducted by the Schools Council, which was that most students thought history to be "useless and boring". In her article, she included this vignette to support her argument that in 1968 the subject had completely lost its bearings. She wrote:

> Not long ago a visitor attended a history lesson in a girls' school, which consisted of forty minutes occupied by a lecture from the teacher and copious note taking. On the classroom wall hung some first-rate brass rubbings and when the lesson was over the visitor admired them and asked one of the girls if they had learnt about the people depicted, "Oh no" came the swift reply "those are nothing to do with history, its just something a few us do on the weekends."[3]

Martin Booth, another leading post-war history educator, was also highly critical of what was then occurring in history classrooms. His study of five grammar school history departments, between 1965 and 1966, found that teaching and learning was dominated by the transmission of a received body of knowledge.[4] Booth's questionnaire and interview data indicated that history teaching consisted of listening to the class teacher and copying dictated notes, reading textbooks and learning facts. He judged the majority of lessons in the data that he had collected "seldom made demands on students". From this he concluded that post-war history departments were "wedded to techniques which tend to deaden rather than inspire".[5]

---

[2] M. Price, History in Danger, *History*, 53 (1968), 342–7.
[3] Ibid., p. 344.
[4] M. Booth, *History Betrayed?* (Longman, 1969).
[5] Ibid., p. 122.

Two decades later, John Slater echoed the views of Fines, Price and Booth when he summed up post-war history education as an "inherited consensus" in which students recalled "accepted facts about famous dead Englishmen". In 1989, he famously characterised post-war history education in the following way:

> Content was largely British, or rather Southern English; Celts looked in to starve, emigrate or rebel; the North to invent looms or work in mills; abroad was of interest once it was part of the Empire; foreigners were either, sensibly allies, or, rightly, defeated. Skills – did we even use the word? – were mainly those of recalling accepted facts about famous dead Englishmen, and communicated in a very eccentric literary form, the examination-length essay. It was an inherited consensus, based largely on hidden assumptions.[6]

In 1994, David Sylvester, the first director of the Schools Council History Project, labelled history education between 1900 and 1970 as the "Great Tradition". [7] Borrowed from Leavis, he used the term to object to what he perceived to be post-war history education's canonical approach to historical knowledge. He also took the view that pre-1970 history education had been dominated by the transmission of a received body of knowledge. He summarised this in the following way:

> The history teacher's role was didactically active; it was to give pupils the facts of historical knowledge and to ensure, through repeated short tests, that they had learned them. The pupils' role was passive; history was a "received subject". The body of knowledge to be taught was also clearly defined. It was mainly British history, with some European, from Julius Caesar to 1914.[8]

---

[6] J. Slater, *The Politics of History Teaching: A Humanity Dehumanised?* (Institute of Education, University of London, 1989), p. 1.

[7] F. R. Leavis, *The Great Tradition* (Chatto & Windus, 1948).

[8] D. Sylvester, Change and Continuity in History Teaching 1900-93. In H. Bourdillon (ed.) *Teaching History* (Routledge, 1994), p. 9.

A similar though more comical representation of post-war history education is found in *Billy Bunter's Benefit*, by Frank Richards, published in 1950. In this literary account the teaching of history is portrayed as cruel and ultimately meaningless. Here, Mr. Quelch is teaching Bunter history. The passage begins:

> Bunter! … What King succeeded Edward the Fourth on the throne of England?
>
> Bunter cudgeled his fat brains …
>
> Answer me Bunter.
>
> George the Fifth, sir, answered Bunter, taking a shot at a venture.
>
> What?
>
> I—I mean … Bunter read in his form master's expressive countenance that his shot had missed the mark, I—I mean – I didn't mean George the fifth, sir—I—I meant Charles the Third.
>
> Charles the Third! repeated Mr. Quelch, dazedly.
>
> Nunno! Again Bunter discerned that he had missed his mark. I—I meant to say Alfred, sir King Alfred, who let the cakes burn! He said Kiss me Hardy! – and – and – never smiled again.[9]

This negative view of history education's past as having been preoccupied with learning facts has been associated with Sellar and Yeatman's *1066 and All That*, first published in 1930. As suggested by its subtitle – *A Memorable History of England, comprising all the parts you can remember, including 103 Good Things, 5 Bad Kings and 2 Genuine Dates* – the book's critique, and much of its humour, derives from the absurdity of having to learn by heart facts without understanding. Sellar and Yeatman's parody has been used to encapsulate what in the past mainstream history teaching was like.[10] According to this view, in the two decades following the Second World War, students learnt by heart, without much comprehension, a simple chronological story of Britain's "glorious" past.

---

[9] F. Richards, *Billy Bunter's Benefit* (Cassell & Company Ltd, 1950), p. 128.
[10] David Sylvester suggests this to be the case in 'Change and Continuity in History Teaching 1900-93'. In H. Bourdillon (ed.) *Teaching History* (Routledge, 1994).

In a similar vein, in 1952, George Orwell recalled his experience of being taught history earlier in the century as being "crammed with learning as cynically as a goose is crammed for Christmas".[11] Drawing on his experience of boarding at St Cyprian's School, between 1911 and 1916, Orwell thought his history education to have had little to do with understanding the past. It had been for him a competition to determine which boys could best recall facts. He wrote:

> History was a series of unrelated, unintelligible but – in some way that was never explained to us – important facts with resounding phrases tied to them. Disraeli brought peace with honour. Clive was astonished at his moderation. Pitt called in the New World to redress the balance of the Old. And the dates, and the mnemonic devices. (Did you know, for example, that the initial letters of "A black Negress was my aunt: there's her house behind the barn" are also the initial letters of the battles in the Wars of the Roses?). Flip, who "took" the higher forms in history, reveled in this kind of thing. I recall positive orgies of dates, with the keener boys leaping up and down in their places in their eagerness to shout out the right answers, and at the same time not feeling the faintest interest in the meaning of the mysterious events they were naming.[12]

Beginning this study with a roll call of accusatory statements serves an important purpose. It shows that within history education studies and within the popular imagination, a very particular version of "traditional" history teaching has come to stand in for what post-war history education was like. This might be summarised in the following way: teaching aimed to conserve and reproduce established values and cultural traditions that promoted conformity, sameness and correctness. Teaching was front-of-class and textbook centred, while learning was dominated by reception, memorisation and the regurgitation of right answers.

---

[11] George Orwell, 'Such, Such Were The Joys', *Partisan Review*, September–October 1952.
[12] Ibid.

This description, this study will demonstrate, is far from complete. Whilst accepting that the evidence presented by Fines, Booth, Price, Slater and Sylvester is persuasive, it will show that their descriptions fails to capture *all* that was important about post-war history education. Post-war history education, it will be suggested, was more complex and multifaceted than has hitherto been presented or understood. This should actually come as no surprise as evidence for a more nuanced account is found in late 1960s and early 1970s writers who reported that this was indeed the case. D. G. Watts, for example, in 1972 recorded the experience of someone who was taught history in a grammar school during the early 1960s. Watts' interviewee recalled:

> Junior School history was thoroughly enjoyed by me because when we studied a certain topic we were allowed a few lessons to develop what we had been told and so by the end of it we knew and really understood what we were being taught. What a change was felt when we moved to grammar school! Here we went into a classroom at the beginning of the lesson opened notebooks and were dictated notes from then to the end, often finishing off in the middle of a sentence only to carry on from there the next lesson. We were given no opportunity to ask questions and we often did not understand what had been told us.[13]

Price and Booth qualified their judgments somewhat when conveying a sense of diversity and change within post-war history education. Price noted that, in 1968, "different and more flexible methods of teaching were being evolved by individuals in many places". Booth wrote: "Winds of change are blowing through the secondary schools, winds which are ruffling even the placid backwaters of traditional history teaching." It should be recognised that Price's 1968 article

---

[13] D. G. Watts, *The Learning of History* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972), p. 9.

"History in Danger" and Booth's 1969 study *History Betrayed* are themselves evidence of a late post-war critical perspective *within* post-war history education.

It is important to ask why it is that accounts of history education's past over-simplify in this way. This question is explored in chapter one, where a review of the secondary literature shows that many of these accounts betray authors' commitments to positions within public debates over the nature of history education in schools. Authors committed to defending enquiry-based teaching have a tendency to picture post-war history education as dull and reactionary. Whilst, it suits those authors who seek to defend the transmission of core content to imagine post-war history education as having been a golden age of knowledge transmission. At stake, here, is the importance of treating post-war history education historically with a respect for all the available evidence. This includes desisting from using it to score political points. In this study, it is argued, there is a need to rescue the historical study of post-war history education from history education polemics by opening it up to critical historical analysis.

This study offers the reader a fresh interpretation of post-war history education by examining the "proposed" curriculum, that is, the case that was made by post-war authors for how history education *ought* to be delivered. Viewing post-war history education through this lens acknowledges, for the first time, the role that history education specialists played within post-war history education. Hitherto, accounts have concentrated upon the enacted and the experienced curriculums, that is, the delivery of lessons in classrooms and their reception by students. Little attention, if any, has been paid to what post-war history education authors proposed. It is argued here that a more complete picture of post-war history education is made possible only when how it was enacted in classrooms and experienced by students is viewed alongside how it was proposed in written form.

Readers of this study are invited, then, to view post-war history education through the lens of the "proposed" curriculum. This limits its focus. Ambition in this study is confined to making inroads into understanding post-war "proposed" history

education. It is an exploratory study limited by the texts it examines and by the research questions it addresses. A fully rounded picture would have included the "enacted" curriculum, what teachers did in post-war classrooms and the "experiential" curriculum, how students received what was taught to them. These two dimensions, though touched upon, remain largely outside the scope of this study.

Admitting a place for history education writing within the landscape of post-war history education acknowledges its role and importance. When this happens, the landscape alters. It now becomes populated with writers imbued with agency bringing into view what Lawrence Stenhouse referred to as the curriculum as "praxis", that is, teachers exploring and critiquing their own practice allowing for different views and perspectives.

Available to the researcher is a body of writing that provides strong evidence of the post-war history education "proposed curriculum".[14] The range of this body of work and why the nine texts (listed below) were selected from it, and what their value as evidence was judged to be, is the subject of chapter two.

By way of an introduction to this discussion, a number of points are now made concerning the criteria that guided the selection. The nine texts listed below were chosen on the grounds that they provided strong evidence that would illuminate this study's main research concern, namely: to chart diversity and change in the post-war "proposed" history education curriculum. The main texts selected for examination in this study are as follows:

---

[14] The starting point for identifying post-war history education authors is John Fines, *A Select Bibliography of the Teaching of History in the United Kingdom* (Historical Association, 1969). In 1962, the University of London, Institute of Education published its *Handbook for History Teachers.* One hundred and ten writers contributed to it: W. H. Burston and C. W. Green (eds) *Handbook for History Teachers* (Methuen, 1962).

Board of Education (1946) *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools.*

Ministry of Education (1952) *Teaching History*, *Pamphlet No. 23.*

R. Reid and S. Toyne (1944) *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools,* Historical Association.

Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters (1950) *The Teaching of History*, Cambridge.

R. J. Unstead (1956) *Teaching History in the Junior School*, A & C Black.

C. F. Strong (1958) *History in the Secondary School*, University of London Press.

E. M. Lewis (1960) *Teaching History in Secondary Schools*, Evans Brothers.

K. Charlton, Source Material and the Teaching of History, *Educational Review*, 9(1) (1956), 57–63.

G. Batho (1962) Sources. In W. H. Burston and C. W. Green (eds) *Handbook for History Teachers*, Methuen. [15]

This sample of selected texts was based on numerous criteria. Overall, the texts were selected because they:

- Provided an opportunity to examine perspectives on post-war history education not evident in other accounts.

---

[15] The Batho article, *Sources*, included in the list, serves an important function in this study. A landmark post-war statement on source-work it is used in chapter eleven to examine diversity and change in post-war discussions on the use of primary source material in the classroom. An analysis of the *Handbook for History Teachers*, of which Batho's article is a part, was judged to be too large an undertaking for this study. It would be included, going forward, in further research on this topic.

- Evidenced post-war "proposed" history education as social practice and discourse.
- Contained individual author perspectives.
- Contained a balance of male and female authors.
- Included authors with backgrounds as teachers and teacher trainers.
- Addressed grammar, secondary modern and infant school audiences.
- Published across the period 1944-1962.
- Indicated the complexity and multifaceted nature of post-war history education writing.
- Suggested possibilities for further research.

The list included authors who were history educators or began their careers as history schoolteachers before moving into higher education. This was the case, for example, with Estella Lewis, who published her handbook, *Teaching History in Secondary Schools,* in 1960. A former schoolteacher, Lewis was, during the 1950s, a lecturer in history at Furzedown Training College. Other post-war history education writers, such as Rachel Reid, Marjorie Reeves, Gordon Batho, Charles Strong and Robert Unstead, took a similar career path. The list, therefore, enabled the study to explore, for the first time, the role that teachers and teacher trainers played in the construction of the post-war "proposed" history education curriculum.

To be considered for selection, texts would have to enable changes in the "proposed" curriculum to be charted at intervals across the post-war period. Attention was paid, therefore, to professional writing published across the late 1940s, 1950s and early 1960s. It was also considered important that texts evidenced each of the main sectors that made up the post-war state school system. This included grammar, secondary modern and infant schools. To maintain coherence, it was decided to focus on the state system alone and exclude discussion of the independent school sector from the study.

To explore the post-war history education community of practice, texts were selected that had links to two history education professional associations, namely, The Historical Association and Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters. Texts were considered for analysis when they showed signs of having had a wide readership, multiple editions or having been recommended or endorsed by other authors. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, texts were selected that were judged to offer rich qualitative evidence of the "proposed" curriculum. The authors in the list below were judged to have been the leading voices within the post-war "proposed" history education offering an abundance of evidence that would address the study's research questions.

These texts show that post-war teachers had, if they chose, unofficial curriculum frameworks to draw upon. It is, of course not possible to measure with accuracy the impact this "proposed" curriculum had upon the "enacted" curriculum. Its existence does, at the very least, call into question the view, held by Keating and Sheldon, that post-war teachers, blindly followed "government codes and circulars".[16] The IAAM, Unstead, Strong, Lewis and Burston and Green endorsed each other's writing by including them in their lists of recommended reading. The IAAM's *The Teaching of History* went through multiple editions. Given this, it can be inferred that some teachers had read and were influenced by them. These unofficial frameworks for teaching history, call into question another view implicit in accounts: that post-war teachers simply "did whatever they liked". These texts evidence a shared body of theoretical understandings about the aims, content and methods of teaching history. It is not true to suggest, this study will argue, that post-war teachers simply made it up as they went along.   Far from this, these texts suggest that they operated within a rich and diversified history education culture. The analysis of this

---

[16] J. Keating and N. Sheldon, History in Education Trends and Themes in History Teaching 1900-2010. In I. Davies (ed.) *Debates in History Teaching* (Routledge, 2011), p. 1.

"proposed" curriculum, therefore, promises a more nuanced understanding of post-war history education, one that stands in contrast to critics of the period.[17]

The texts selected for analysis confirm that the type of knowledge transmission that Fines, Price, Booth, Slater and Sylvester described was indeed evident in many (but by no means all) classrooms. Importantly, they call into question the view that this was all there was to the "enacted" post-war history curriculum. Their accounts of the "enacted" curriculum indicate that classroom practice varied and changed over time.

 It is the "proposed" curriculum (not the "enacted") that is main concern of this study. These texts are important because they show that within the "proposed" curriculum there was far more to post-war history education than the transmission of a received body of facts. They are significant because they provided an elaborate critique of knowledge transmission. These authors discussed the historical development of history education and questioned the aims, content and methods of teaching history. Establishing principles for teaching and learning they offered their readers advice on teaching methods, assessment and classroom resources. Their criticism of the work carried out by teachers working in post-war schools suggested ways of making it more effective. Post-war history education was, they thought, in a state of transition and they responded to this by defending its place in the school curriculum and by presenting a vision of what it might become.[18]

---

[17] See M. Booth, *History Betrayed?* (Longman, 1969); J. Slater, *The Politics of History Teaching: A Humanity Dehumanised?* (University of London, Institute of Education, 1989); and D. Sylvester, Change and Continuity in History Teaching 1900-93*.* In H. Bourdillon (ed.) *Teaching History* (Routledge, 1994). The representation of post-war history education is the subject of Chapter one.

[18] The exception is the work of Richard Aldrich. His work is unusual in the way it takes a more considered historical approach, treating pre-1970 history education as worthy of study in its own right. Aldrich argued (see bibliography) that it had its own developments, institutional structures, body of theoretical writing, conflicting viewpoints and significant reforms. For a full discussion of his contribution see chapter one pages 48-51.

These authors were prominent voices within post-war history education. Stanley Toyne and Rachel Reid held responsible positions within the Historical Association. Charles Strong and Robert Unstead were popular textbook writers. Estella Lewis was a highly respected teacher trainer, and Gordon Batho an influential curriculum innovator. Collectively, their work challenges the idea that there was an intellectual vacuum at the heart of post-war history education or that it can be reduced to a simple form of knowledge transmission and that nothing of significance occurred or changed.

Research Questions

This study's research concern is to examine diversity and change in the post-war "proposed" history curriculum through a study of nine texts. To manage, what is a broad concern, this focus was narrowed down to a study of diversity and change within three of its features. These were: (1) the production of the nine texts, (2) their position on the aims of history education, and (3) their position on the use of primary source material in the classroom, a thread within the aims of history education.

These three interrelated lines of enquiry dominate this study. These, then, are the three main research questions that are addressed throughout the study:

1. Who produced post-war history education writing, 1944–1962?
2. What does post-war history education writing reveal about history education aims, 1944–1962?
3. What types of source work were proposed and how does that affect understanding of post-war history education, 1944–1962?

Central to the first line of enquiry is the idea that there existed at this time what is termed here a "community of authors". Take the case of the Institute of Education's *Handbook for History Teachers,* edited by W. H. Burston and C. W. Green in 1962.

Work began on this text in May 1956, six years before it was published in 1962.[19] An analysis of the text reveals that it was headed by an editorial team of seven people and drew on a total of 110 participants, 80 men and 30 women, the completed handbook was in two parts. The first comprised fourteen separate articles written by a specialist on aspects of history education aims, content, learning theory and pedagogy. The second drew on the expertise of the majority of participants in compiling guides to school textbooks, visual resources and select bibliographies. Its production involved lecturers and teacher trainers from over 22 institutes and colleges; schoolteachers working in 15 grammar schools; academics from 24 universities; and contributions from libraries, museums, the Ministry of Works, the Air Ministry and the Commonwealth Institute. This was an impressive achievement, suggesting the existence of a "community of history educators" which enjoyed interrelationships and common concerns.

A focus on individual authors operating communally within a network of institutions is important because it goes some way to correct the impression generally found in accounts that there was an intellectual vacuum at the heart of post-war history education. The overall impression given, for example, in accounts by Price, Booth, Slater, and Sylvester, is that post-war history education was a featureless landscape devoid of activity. Slater summed this up when he wrote: "Skills – did we even use the word? – were mainly those of recalling accepted facts about famous dead Englishmen." [20]

An analysis of the Burston and Green *Handbook* (1962) provides clear evidence that this was far from the case. It included fourteen scholarly articles that addressed history education aims, syllabus construction, educational psychology, concepts, textbooks, design of a specialist history classroom, visual aids and film, the use of

---

[19] W. H. Burston and C. W. Green, *Handbook for History Teachers* (Methuen, 1962).

[20] M. Price, History in Danger, *History*, 53 (1968), 342–7. M. Booth, *History Betrayed?* (Longman, 1969) D. Sylvester, Change and Continuity in History Teaching 1900-93. In H. Bourdillon (ed.) *Teaching History* (Routledge, 1994), p. 9. J. Slater, *The Politics of History Teaching: A Humanity Dehumanised?* (Institute of Education, University of London, 1989), p. 1.

primary source material, museums, social studies, civics and public examinations. The other texts examined for this study, authored by Rachel Reid, Stanley Toyne, Charles Strong, Robert Unstead, Estella Lewis, Kenneth Charlton and Gordon Batho, clearly show that teacher practitioners reflected theoretically, in diverse ways, on the nature of history education and advocated changes to the way it was taught in schools.

This line of enquiry is important precisely because it uncovers the social context of post-war history education in which history educators worked, both collaboratively and within institutional settings. Thus, it reveals a "proposed" curriculum that was fashioned in a network of institutions that included The Ministry of Education, The Historical Association, The Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters, university teacher training colleges, cuseums and county records offices. What is meant by post-war history education, as "social practice" is further elaborated in chapter four.

For Slater and Sylvester knowledge transmission had been the dominant aim of post-war history education. Sylvester referred to it as the "Great Tradition" which, he argued, had remained virtually unaltered during the first three quarters of the twentieth century. The following passage presents a different picture to this. It is from *The Teaching of History*, a handbook for history teachers published in 1950 by the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters (IAAM), one of the key texts analysed in this study. Note how it adopts a critical stance towards knowledge transmission indicating diversity and change rather than static singularity:

> The average secondary school pupil leaves school with a confused mass of knowledge, and – even worse – with a hatred of the subject, having been forcibly fed with historical facts and theories which bear no relation to his tastes, aptitudes, or mental capacity. The root of failure is found in the lack of any discoverable purpose or coherent plan in the history course, which is said to be related to the facts of the child's experience.[21]

---

[21] IAAM, *The Teaching of History* (1950), p. 1.

There is something surprising about the way the aims of history education are handled in this passage. A salient feature of the standard view of post-war history education is that the aims of teaching history were singular and largely taken for granted. According to this view the aim was a simple matter of transmitting knowledge to inculcate a form of national identity. The authors examined for this study present a far more complex picture. They show that at this time, amongst authors at least, there was a wide range of views concerning what the transmission of knowledge meant and how it should be delivered. Far from being singular and complacent, authors' ideas were contested and changed over time suggesting concurrent trends had been in operation. What authors thought the aims of post-war history education should be, therefore, is justifiably one of this study's three main lines of enquiry.

Two factors influenced the decision to make source-work (within the "proposed" curriculum) this study's third line of enquiry. The first was a response to the view, associated with Slater and Sylvester, and recently supported by Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon, that the use of primary source material was not a feature of post-war history education. This interpretation of post-war history education, alongside other interpretations, is discussed in chapter one. The complex and diverse manner with which the texts selected for this study discussed source-work was a key point. It presented an opportunity to address, what appeared to be, a significant lacuna in how post-war history education is currently understood.

The second decisive factor was the availability of a body of theoretical literature that could be drawn upon to inform the analysis of post-war source-work. The nature of this research and how it was applied is the subject of chapter three. The key point to bear in mind here is that the work conducted by Peter Lee and Denis Shemilt provided the study with a conceptual framework that allowed the study to

make subtle distinctions between different author's approaches to source-work.[22] For a study concerned with diversity and change, the ability to make fine distinctions between approaches to source-work was vitally important. The research literature conferred upon the analysis a precision that made source-work a telling marker with which to track diversity and change.

This line of enquiry challenges the standard view, closely associated with Slater and Sylvester, according to which post-war history education pedagogic practices were restricted to teacher exposition, textbook and rote learning. The authors examined for this study indicate that on the level of the "proposed curriculum" this was not the case. This study will show authors shared a commitment to pedagogic innovation and in particular, a commitment to enriching students' experience by enhancing their engagement in the process of learning history. This concern included the use of primary source materials. Hitherto, it has generally been thought that interest in the use of source materials emerged for the first time during the 1970s. This study will demonstrate that post-war authors had a fascination with and contested source-work practices, and in some cases anticipated critical or disciplinary approaches generally associated with developments during the 1970s.

All the authors selected for this study advocated working with sources and included it within their aims for history education. The main concern in this study is with differences in approach. In 1946, the Board of Education argued that the use of source materials was "indispensable" to teaching. It held a clear view as to what the value was:

---

[20] In particular, two studies were drawn upon: Dickinson, A. K., Gard, A. and Lee, P. J. (1978) Evidence in History and the Classroom. In A. K. Dickinson and P. J. Lee (eds) *History Teaching and Historical Understanding*. London, Heinemann, pp. 1–20. And, Shemilt, D. (1987) Adolescent Ideas about Evidence and Methodology in History. In C. Portal (ed.) *The History Curriculum for Teachers.* London, Falmer Press, pp. 39–61.

> The use of illustrations – pictorial illustrations, contemporary work especially is indispensable in all stages of the teaching. Portraits of eminent persons, reproductions of old prints, documents and other famous records, such as the Bayeux Tapestry, will often form the best means of representing social life and customs, pageants and battles and the apparatus of husbandry, industry, trade and war. Some modern pictures of historic scenes may also be useful.[23]

This third line of enquiry examines the extent to which post-war writers adopted a similar position. The methodology used to address this question is explained in chapter three.

The start and end dates for this study, 1944 -1962, are publication dates of two of the texts examined for this study: as such they provide the study with a manageable time frame within which to focus the research study. They can be seen, in another sense, to mark a distinctive period in the development of history education in England. The authors of the texts studied for this study thought so, especially the earlier ones, who commented on the shift from war to peace and the 1944 Education Act as representing for them a significant turning point.

In its discussion of post-war history education, this study is not confined by these two dates; in fact, it transcends them. This was because, as well as indicating change, post-war thinking about history education contained deep lying continuities. To examine this required forays into the pre-war period and beyond. The Historical Association and the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters had a pre-war existence. Ideas concerning the aims of history education crossed over from the inter-war to the post-war period. Post-war authors referenced the Hadow report (1931); were fascinated by M. W. Keatinge's approach to source-work (1910); and were convinced by Alfred North Whitehead's, *The Aim of Education* (1929). In 1946 the Ministry of Education thought it appropriate to republish the 1937 Board of Education's handbook to guide post-war practice.

---

[23] Board of Education, *Handbook of Suggestions* (1946), p. 431.

Although the study is concerned with the years between 1944-1962, the post-war period is seen as having been a continuation of longer-term developments. This was how the writers examined for this study considered it themselves. They thought they were contributing to a "long debate" over history education that had begun much earlier.[24] For example, in their narrative of the history of history education the origins of source-work theory began with M. W. Keatinge during the first decade of the twentieth century.[25]

Methods

The methods used to analyse post-war history education writing selected for this study are explained in chapter four. They draw on approaches from discourse analysis that highlights how authors select and structure their ideas. A close reading of the texts is concerned with individual authorship, institutional context and social practice. Interest covers both form and content. Whilst, analytic foci include the foregrounding of ideas; change and continuity of ideas across texts, and the use of language, including the use of metaphor.

To track diversity and change across the period 1944-1962 texts were analysed individually, in chronological sequence, in order of publication dates. Structuring the analysis in this way allowed individual author perspectives to be examined and compared across time. The analysis followed an historical approach. This included, what Megill has termed, having a "care in evidence".[26] It also involved reading post-war authors on their own terms by acknowledging the autonomy of the past.[27]

---

[24] A founding principle of the Historical Association in 1906 was to address "the special problems of history teaching": *The Historical Association 1906-1956* (Historical Association, 1957), p. 8. Texts published during the early twentieth century that carried forward the "long debate" are found in two bibliographies: D. Dymond (ed.) *A Handbook for History Teachers* (Methuen, 1929); and A. C. Beales, *A Guide to the Teaching of History in Schools* (University of London Press, 1937).

[25] An example of this is the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools handbook, *The Teaching of History*, various editions 1950–1965 (Cambridge University Press). Gordon Batho provides a history of the "source method" in Sources. In W. H. Burston and C. W. Green (eds) *Handbook for History Teachers* (Methuen, 1962).

[26] A. Megill, *Historical Knowledge, Historical Error: A Contemporary Guide to Practice* (University of Chicago Press, 2007), pp. 1–13.

[27] Aldrich, 2003, pp. 133–43.

Addressing this study's research questions involved noting differences and shifts in what individual authors wrote about the production of texts, the aims of history education and the role that source-work should play in the teaching of history.

The analysis of who produced post-war history education writing addressed the context and production of texts. Here, analysis focused on agency, authorship, purpose and audience. This included the support of professional associations, such as, the Historical Association and the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters. This line of enquiry analysed post-war history education as "social practice" in which "real" people constructed history education within a network of institutions.

Analysis of history education aims addressed author's motives and priorities as revealed by the positioning and foregrounding of their ideas. Acknowledging the autonomy of the past, the focus was on what ideas mattered to them. The dual nature of texts as content and form was engaged with. During the analysis, the process whereby authors selected (or deselected) and structure ideas on the page was examined.[28] Analysis focussed on differences and shifts in the way authors discussed extrinsic social aims and intrinsic disciplinary aims. Following Goodson, this was treated as a discourse offering the study a nuanced way of examining the complex and multifaceted nature of post-war history education writing.[29]

The analysis of source work within the post-war "proposed" curriculum employed a conceptual framework drawn from the research literature. This was employed to track differences and shifts in discursive space, use of language, approaches, purpose, and resources used, when conducting source-work. During analysis authors' perspectives were positioned along a continuum of practices beginning with "pre-evidential" to "evidential" approaches to source-work. The analysis

---

[28] L. Prior, *Using Documents in Social Research* (Sage, 2003); J. Scott, *A Matter of Record: Documentary Sources in Social Research* (Polity Press, 1990); G. McCulloch, *Documentary Research in Education, History and the Social Sciences* (Routledge Falmer, 2004); T. May, *Social Research Issues, Methods and Process* (Open University Press, 2001).

[29] I. Goodson, *The Making of Curriculum: Collected Essays* (Falmer Press, 1988), p. 10.

treated this as a pedagogic discourse: a long debate with origins in the early twentieth century. A fuller explanation of this is found in chapter three.

Outline of the study

The structure of this study divides into: Preliminary considerations, text analysis, limitations, issues for future research, and a final conclusion.

The preliminary considerations begin in chapter one with a literature review. This examines the secondary literature to develop the point made in this introduction that the nature of post-war history education is a contested one. Preliminary considerations continue in chapter two with a survey of the sources available to the researcher of post-war history education. Here, the case is made for widening the source-base for the study of post-war history education to include post-war history education writing. The value of using post-war history education writing as a source for the study of post-war history education is evaluated, and a rationale for the selection of sources is given.

In chapter three the opportunity is taken to unpack what is meant by "source-work" the focus of the third line of enquiry: as a marker of diversity and change: in what ways did source-work feature in post-war history education writing, 1944–1962? In 1944, for example, the Board of Education advocated using sources to *illustrate* "social life and customs, pageants and battles and the apparatus of husbandry, industry, trade and war". In this study "source-work" is taken to carry a range of meanings and learning outcomes. This is expressed as a continuum of approaches that range from the illustrative to the disciplinary. This continuum is used in the main analytical section to categorise authors' approaches.

Part two of this study, chapters five to eleven, concentrates upon the analysis of authors' writing. Here, the research questions and methods outlined in this introduction and discussed in part one are applied to selected texts. In the limitations, issues for future research and final conclusion, the final part of this study, the research questions are discussed in light of the analysis carried out in

part two. It has been noted in this Introduction that the nature of post-war history education is contested. The extent of this contestation is the subject of the next chapter.

This study makes a contribution to knowledge in four ways. First, by examining in detail published post-war history education texts it demonstrates their value as sources for the study of post-war history education. Second, by discussing post-war history education as a professional discourse it presents post-war history education in a new light as having been diverse and changing. Third, viewing post-war authors as members of a professional community exerting influence over the development of history education calls into question the view that there was an intellectual vacuum at the heart of post-war history education in the three decades after the end of Second World War.[30] It is argued here that authors' proposals demonstrate the existence of a wider set of practices. Lastly, it demonstrates the value of the history of history of education research for understanding the development of history education. It is ironic that those interested in the problem of teaching history in schools have shown so little interest in its historical development.

---

[30] This approach is taken by D. Cannadine, J. Keating and N. Sheldon in *The Right Kind of History: Teaching the Past in Twentieth-Century England* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

Part one

Preliminary considerations

Chapter One

Literature Review

Representing post-war history education

Viewed as a linear progression, post-war history education has long been considered a quiet backwater that preceded the more interesting and tumultuous history education "revolution" of the 1970s. The problem with this account, it is argued in this chapter, is that its gaze is limited and its concerns too few. In this chapter, dominant historical representations of post-war history education, since the mid 1980s, are shown to have served curriculum debates over how history education should be delivered in schools rather than the historical study of the past. They describe a past suited to *parti pris* history education purposes that falls short of the standards expected of historical research.

In the introduction to this study it was noted that during the late 1960s, Mary Price and Martin Booth wrote disapprovingly of didactic teaching and the testing of factual knowledge: qualities which they took to be the defining characteristics of post-war history education.[31] The extent to which this representation of post-war history education has dominated the secondary literature is considered in this chapter. A review of the key secondary literature, from the mid-1980s to the present day identifies three competing interpretative traditions. The first follows Price and Booth in attacking post-war history education. The second counters this

---

[31] M. Price, History in Danger, *History*, 53 (1968), 342–7; M. Booth, *History Betrayed?* (Longman, 1969).

by coming to its defence. A third stakes claim to a "neutral" position that attempts to assess post-war history education on its own terms.

Three questions are addressed in the final part of this chapter. They speak to the research questions set out in the introduction. Who is said to be responsible for the production of post-war history education knowledge? How are post-war history education aims represented? As a marker of diversity and change: what role was source-work said to have had?

1. Presenting post-war history education as a "Dark Age" of teaching and learning

Within history education studies, since the mid-1980s, a negative representation of post-war history education has held sway. It is found, for example, in key works by John Slater (1989) and David Sylvester (1994)[32] and is also incorporated in the work of other leading writers in the field of history education in the period from 1989 to 2011.[33]

In this study, this interpretation is referred to as the "Dark Age" representation of post-war history education. It was chosen to draw attention to the way it sets up a binary opposition in which the qualities that are admired are only seen as having been present in post-1970 developments. In this binary opposition, pre-1970 history education is portrayed as "traditional", "old", "undeveloped", "backward" and "unenlightened". In stark contrast to this, post-1970 history education is

---

[32] J. Slater, *The Politics of History Teaching: A Humanity Dehumanised?* (University of London, Institute of Education, 1989); D. Sylvester, *Change and Continuity in History Teaching 1900-93*. In H. Bourdillon (ed.) *Teaching History* (Routledge, 1994).

[33] A. Dickinson, What Should History Be? In A. Kent (ed.) *School Subject Teaching: The History and Future of the Curriculum* (Kogan Page, 2000); R. Philip, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Education Politics* (Cassells, 1998); C. Husbands, *What is History Teaching* (OUP, 1996); C. Husbands, A. Kitson and A. Pendry, *Understanding History Teaching* (OUP, 2003); A. Kitson, C. Husbands, with S. Steward, *Teaching and Learning History 11-18: Understanding the Past* (OUP, 2011); D. Cannadine, J. Keating and N. Sheldon, *The Right Kind of History: Teaching the Past in Twentieth-Century England* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

admired for being "new", "developed", "forward", "advanced" and "enlightened". In the "Dark Age" representation pre-1970 history education is disparaged for being "dehumanising" and "mind-closing". Post-1970 history education is admired for being "humanising" and "mind-opening". Essentially, an age of darkness is juxtaposed to an age of enlightenment.

The central episode in the "Dark Age" narrative of the development of history education is a transformation that occurred during the period 1968–1976, which divided the development of history education during the twentieth century into two distinct phases. In the first phase (1900–1968), variously labelled "traditional history", "inherited consensus" or the "Great Tradition", history education is associated with civic aims, teacher telling, transmitting a received body of knowledge, and factual testing. The second phase (1968–1991), variously labelled "New History", "progressive", "alternative", "source-based teaching" and "enquiry-based teaching", is associated with independent historical enquiry, historical skills, and learning the discipline of history.[34] In this narrative, the change from one phase to the next is presented as a *"revolution"* in the theory and practice of history education.[35]

As well as Slater and Sylvester's work, the "Dark Age" narrative is found in the work of Robert Phillips, Alaric Dickinson, Chris Husbands, Alison Kitson, Anna Pendry, Ian Phillips and David Cannadine. The work of these authors, with the possible exception of David Cannadine's, are located within history education studies and not the study of the history of history education. As such, the "Dark Age" interpretation can be considered a history education construct. Certainly, this body of work has assisted in embedding the "Dark Age" representation within history

---

[34] A succinct formulation is found in Rogers: "traditional history" is knowledge of "what" and "New History" is knowledge of "what and how". P. Rogers, *The New History: Theory into Practice* (Historical Association, 1978).
[35] In the literature a third phase is identified which is associated with the era of National Curriculum, beginning in 1991 and continuing to the present day, although this is currently under review.

education discourse.[36] It is in general how the history education community has come to view its own recent past.[37]

In a celebrated passage, already referred to in the Introduction to this study, John Slater, in 1989, viewed the period 1900 to the late 1960s as a unified and unchanging phase in the development of history education in England.[38] He depicted post-war history education as coercive, xenophobic, patriarchal and canonical. Its effect upon students, he argued, had been wholly detrimental. It was "mind-closing". He used the term "inherited consensus" to convey what he took to be its uniform and unchanging character.

Slater's perspective was first delivered as a lecture in 1989 when he was visiting professor of education at the Institute of Education, University of London, a time when concerns over the politics of history education around the Education Reform Act (1988) were uppermost. His historical account of post-war history education was brief and not based on archival research. Of the sixteen pages that comprised his lecture only two discussed the history of history education. The remaining fourteen pages addressed history education issues. The idea that post-war history education was singular and unchanging provided historical backing for his defence of the "revolutionary" principles of the 1970s, which were then under attack from conservative critics. To make his case for a post-war "inherited consensus" he drew upon direct experience of being taught history during the 1930s and 1940s and

---

[36] C. Husbands, *What is History Teaching* (OUP, 1996); R. Phililps (1998) *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Education Politics* (Cassells, 1998); A. Dickinson, What Should History Be? In A. Kent (ed.) *School Subject Teaching: The History and Future of the Curriculum* (Kogan Page, 2000); C. Husbands, A. Kitson, and A. Pendry, *Understanding History Teaching* (OUP, 2003).
I. Phillips, *Teaching History Developing as a Reflective Secondary Teacher* (Sage, 2008); A. Kitson, C. Husbands, with S. Steward, *Teaching and Learning History 11-18: Understanding the Past* (OUP, 2011) D. Cannadine, J. Keating and N. Sheldon, *The Right Kind of History: Teaching the Past in Twentieth-Century England* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).
[37] Within contemporary history education professional writing, a tendency to view post-war history education in "Dark Age" terms is found, for example, in Neil Smith, *History Teachers Handbook,* (Continuum, 2010), p. 47: "Until the early 1970s, most history teaching was driven by first order concepts, i.e. what happened, when it happened, and who made it happen. History was a study of events, and the complicated, interesting stuff was left to undergraduates and professional historians."
[38] For this passage, see the Introduction, page 8.

upon the visits he had made to classrooms in his role as Staff Inspector for History when working for Her Majesty's Inspectorate between 1968-1987.

Slater acknowledged that minor variations in theory and practice had existed and conceded that a few alternative voices could be heard questioning the status quo. In a passage, little remarked upon, he noted:

> Of course it was an untidy consensus; sceptical moles were already burrowing away and some enterprising teachers looked beyond it.[39]

The presence of alternative voices in Slater's account unsettles the sense of singularity and stasis that characterises his representation. Slater, however, passed quickly over his own qualification, leaving the reader with an overall impression that post-war history education professionals rarely, if ever, discussed the fundamentals of their practice such as aims, syllabus content, learning theory or pedagogy. Such things, he wrote, were "rarely identified, let alone publicly debated".[40] In his account, with the exception of a few "sceptical moles", post-war history educators are portrayed as unthinking, compliant members of a professional community that was bound by a nineteenth-century view of school history teaching.

In Slater's narrative, a major cultural shift occurred during the 1960s that began to disrupt the long-standing consensus that had held together "traditional history" teaching and learning during the first three-quarters of the twentieth century. During the 1970s, he argued, a "new democratic outlook" undermined the non-democratic consensus that had underpinned and unified "traditional history" teaching. This shift was evident, he thought, in the way that "New History" privileged the study of the lives of the general population over the study of elites.[41]

---

[39] Slater, 1989, p. 1.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid., p. 2.

According to Slater, the cultural shift that underpinned the emergence of "New History" during the 1970s was generated by causal factors of great magnitude. This included the impact of the Second World War; loss of Empire; increased immigration to the United Kingdom and the move towards a multicultural society; the Cold War and nuclear weaponry; and improved communications. Collectively, these factors, Slater argued, challenged the:

> comfortable assumptions about the pre-eminence, superiority and centrality of Europe, and revealed the darkness that lurked at the heart of a continent hitherto known for its high culture and advanced technology.[42]

In Slater's account the transformation began to take place within the history education community with Mary Price's article, History in Danger, published by the Historical Association in its journal, *History*, in November 1968. He accorded this article landmark status for alerting the community of practice to the dangers posed by an unreformed "traditional history". Slater also cited the HMI report *Towards World History* (1969) and Coltham and Fines' *Educational Objectives for the Study of History* (1970) as important works that challenged the dominance of "traditional history". He singled out the teacher-led, state-funded, four-year history education curriculum development project, the Schools Council History 13–16 Project (1972–76), as having an impact above all other history education groups working for change. It had, he declared: "the most significant and beneficent influence on the learning of history and raising of its standard to emerge this century".[43]

He also thought the contribution of the Schools Council History 13–16 Project (SCHP) and the *History 13-16 Evaluation Study* (1980) was decisive.[44] The SCHP summed up, Slater argued, what is often called the "New History". Departing from "recalling accepted facts about famous dead Englishmen", the SCHP established a new direction that sought to define:

---

[42] Ibid.
[43] Ibid.
[44] D. Shemilt, *History 13-16 Evaluation Study* (Holmes MacDougal, 1980).

more precisely and establish a base for understanding key historical concepts: cause, change, continuity, and such skills as the evaluation of evidence and the development of an historical imagination, sometimes described as empathy.[45]

According to Slater, the aim of "traditional history" teaching and learning had been the transmission of historical facts. Formulating a new set of principles, the aim of the Schools Council History 13–16 Project (1972–76) and its subsequent development was to introduce students to the discipline of history. Students were to be taught how to conduct historical enquiry. Slater wrote that the SCHP gave:

young people not just knowledge, but the tools to reflect on, critically to evaluate, and to apply that knowledge. It proclaims the crucial distinction between knowing the past and thinking historically.[46]

In 1994, David Sylvester's survey of the history of history education in England during the twentieth century (1900-1993) was, like Slater's, brief. It shared Slater's general history education concerns. Similarly, it provided an historical introduction to a collection of essays on issues within history education by setting the debates over history in the first National Curriculum within an historical context. Sylvester's case for a "Great Tradition" argued that central government set the terms for how history should be taught during the period 1900-1968 and that teachers simply followed them. Suggesting that little had changed during the period of the "Great Tradition" served to amplify the significance of change during the history education "revolution" of the 1970s.

His account of the history of history education from 1900-1968 focused upon continuities. For this he compiled evidence from official statements published by central government at intervals from 1905, 1923, 1927, 1931, 1959, and 1967. His

---

[45] Ibid., p. 2.
[46] Slater, 1989, p. 3.

analysis of these sources provided evidence that across the period 1900-1968 the aims, content and teaching methods of teaching history set by government departments had remained stable. Sylvester's account then differed from Slater in an important regard: it was based on archival research.

His account drew upon the *official* "proposed" history curriculum, namely, "suggestions" on how history ought to be taught that were issued at intervals by the Board of Education and the Ministry of Education across the period 1904-1967. His touched upon the "enacted" curriculum by assuming that teachers in general had enacted the "Great Tradition" (government guidelines). When assessing alternative voices from the *unofficial* "proposed" curriculum, which challenged the idea of a singular, unchanging "Great Tradition", he, like Slater, asserted that their impact upon the "enacted" curriculum had been insignificant. Most teachers, he argued, had not read them.

Sylvester did acknowledge that pre-1970 published history educators such as M. W. Keatinge and F. C. Happold had proposed ideas that ran counter to the conventions of "traditional history". His writing, which aimed to demonstrate the dominance of a "Great Tradition", downplayed their significance. They could be dismissed as marginal figures.[47] Their views need not to be taken into account, he thought, because their effect upon the mainstream was negligible. He acknowledged that there had been innovations in curriculum design during the era of "traditional history", such as local history, studies in depth ("patch"), thematic studies ("lines of development") and world history. These were judged by him to be inflexions rather than fundamental shifts. They did not, he argued; alter the position that, by the 1950s, the main features of "traditional history" had remained firmly intact.

Sylvester had been the originator and first Director of the Schools Council History 13-16 Project (1972-1976). In his account of the past, he was, like Slater, committed to defending the principles of learning history through historical enquiry. He too

---

[47] M. W. Keatinge, *Studies in the Teaching of History* (London, 1910); F. C. Happold, *The Approach to History* (London, 1928).

divided the past into a backward-looking, non-changing "traditional history" (1900–1968) and a forward-looking, dynamic "New History" (1968–1991).[48]

The "Great Tradition", he suggested, had been "clear-cut in its aims and its methodology". In a key passage, he summarised its essential characteristics:

> The history teacher's role was didactically active; it was to give pupils the facts of historical knowledge and to ensure, through repeated short tests, that they had learned them. The pupils' role was passive; history was a "received subject". The body of knowledge to be taught was also clearly defined. It was mainly British history, with some European, from Julius Caesar to 1914.[49]

Sylvester, like Slater before him, contrasted the active role of the post-war teacher with the passive role of the student and again highlighted factual knowledge of a single chronological national narrative learned by rote. He was insistent that little significant curriculum development had occurred during the 70 years that spanned the period.

Sylvester's "Dark Age" representation highlighted the transmission of a received body of knowledge. Echoing Slater's "recalling accepted facts about famous dead Englishmen", Sylvester turned to Sellar and Yeatman to suggest that post-war history education had been "not what you thought. It is what you can remember."[50] For Sylvester, post-war subject aims were civic: historical passages were carefully selected to deliver moral instruction intended to foster a patriotic allegiance to a shared national identity. This was achieved, he thought, through teacher-led oral lessons and by students memorising passages of the past in preparation for factual tests.

---

[48] Sylvester, 1994.
[49] Ibid., p. 9.
[50] Ibid., p. 9. The reference to Sellar and Yeatman is *1066 And All That* (1930). Elsewhere, Raphael Samuel has used Sellar and Yeatman to suggest criticism of the "Great Tradition" from within the period; see One in the Eye: 1066 And All That, *Island Stories Unravelling Britain: Theatres of Memory*, Volume II (Verso, 1994), pp. 209–12.

Sylvester agreed with Slater that 1968 had been history education's *annus mirabilis* and also credited Mary Price's article 'History in Danger' with being the catalyst for transformation. It provided, he thought, a compelling analysis of the challenges facing school history and an agenda for change that was warmly received by the history education community. Sylvester portrayed the responses from within the history education community to the "crisis of 1968" as complex and he stressed that the transformation had been gradual.[51] He highlighted the importance of history education professionals in the setting up of local teacher associations and in disseminating to teachers the "New History" ideas and approaches published, from 1969, in the journal *Teaching History.* Like Slater, he thought the transformation was on the level of history education theory. He also singled out the Schools Council History 13–16 Project as leading the way.[52]

Sylvester was insistent that the shift from "traditional history" to "New History", which occurred between 1968 and 1976, was a watershed in the theory and practice of school history teaching. He pointed out that by 1990 nearly a third of schools followed the Schools Council History Project Course at GCSE. Furthermore, the national assessment criteria for history, implemented in 1988, meant that all students were introduced to elements of its approach. He argued that the Schools Council History 13–16 Project held a unique place in the development of history education because it formulated a new philosophy of history teaching. This new thinking, he claimed, had transformed history education from knowledge transmission to an activity of enquiry that combined substantive knowledge with disciplinary understandings. The SCHP approach to history education marked a decisive break because for the first time students were:

> to learn about the human past by looking in a chronological context at the
> sources, both primary and secondary, which historians use when they tell the

---

[51] For a discussion of the impact of the Schools Council History Project on practice, see R. Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State*, 1998, pp. 21–4.
[52] Sylvester, 1994, p. 16.

story – the history – of the past. They were to ask the same questions as professional historians: what, when and why.[53]

The SCHP, Sylvester thought, changed the content of school history by abandoning the idea that school history was exclusively about "great men and politics", affirming, instead, that it was about "all that people have done". In his view, the SCHP had recast school history from being a received body of knowledge to being a process of enquiry that could meet the needs of adolescents. He argued that it challenged the widely held assumption that most students under the age of 15 were incapable of critical historical analysis or, in Piagetian terms, of reaching a level of "formal operational thinking". It swept away "traditional history's" core belief that all that the majority of students could be expected to achieve was the memorisation of selected passages of the past.[54]

Sylvester highlighted the importance of the SCHP's reform of public examinations at 16+ as an essential element in the radical departure from "traditional history". This included for the first time enquiry-based coursework, local history fieldwork and primary source-based examinations that tested students' ability to critically evaluate and deploy primary source materials. To underline the fundamental nature of this transformation, Sylvester remarked that the "Great Tradition" was essentially the Latin *res gestae* or history as narrative deeds, while the SCHP combined *res gestae* with the Greek *historia*, thereby shifting the ground in favour of school history as a mode of historical enquiry.

In 1998, Robert Phillips used the term "inherited consensus" to convey the idea that there had been a single, unchanging professional history education discourse during

---

[53] Sylvester, 1994, p. 16.
[54] The case for the intellectual capabilities of most students under 16 being limited to memorisation of facts was made by G. R. Elton in *The Practice of History* (Fontana Books, 1967), and What Sort of History Should We Teach? In M. Ballard (ed.), *New Movements in the Study and Teaching of History* (Temple Smith, 1970).

the period 1900–1968.[55] Phillips, like Slater and Sylvester before him, acknowledged dissenting voices within "traditional history", such as Keatinge. He shared their judgement that these were marginal to the mainstream and of little consequence. Phillips characterised post-war history education as "strait-jacketed". It was, he said, anchored to a set of nineteenth-century ideologies, beliefs and values, most saliently, anti-Papist Protestantism, imperialism and social Darwinism. He explained that the dominance of this "fixed" discourse was due to the unexamined nature of its aims, content and pedagogy. In his view, the unopposed dominant discourse in history education during this period had been hegemonic, tightly regulated and closed.

Phillips also followed Slater and Sylvester in arguing that the "inherited consensus" that underpinned "traditional history" came under strain during the 1960s when its ideology, beliefs and values were challenged by large-scale political, social and cultural factors that included post-war immigration, the growth of the social sciences, Britain's relative decline as a world power, and developments in academic history. He argued that the most important factor was curriculum development within social studies and integrated approaches to the curriculum that threatened school history's status as a separate school subject. Again, Phillips singled out Mary Price's 1968 article "History in Danger" as having a decisive role in challenging the dominant pedagogic discourse and calling for root-and-branch reform.

Alaric Dickinson, in 2000, followed Slater and Sylvester in arguing that school history aims, content, learning theory and pedagogy had remained essentially unchanged until the emergence of "New History" during the late 1960s and early 1970s.[56] He repeated the view that prior to 1968, history education had been preoccupied with the memorisation of a body of historical facts. Post 1968, this shifted to developing

---

[55] For Robert Phillips' treatment of the "Great Tradition", see *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State,* Chapter 2: History, History Teaching and the Shaping of a Pedagogic Discourse (1998), pp. 12–24.

[56] For Alaric Dickinson's treatment of the "Great Tradition", see A. Dickinson, What Should History Be? In A. Kent (ed.) *School Subject Teaching the History and Future of the Curriculum* (Kogan Page, 2000), pp. 86–11.

students' understanding of the principles and procedures that historians use to research the past.

In 2003, Husbands, Kitson and Pendry divided the development of history education in England during the twentieth century into two distinct periods: the period of the "Great Tradition" (1900–1970) followed by a period they termed the "alternative tradition", which emerged during the late 1960s and 1970s. In their narrative, the late 1960s and 1970s again marked *the* major turning point in the development of school history teaching.[57] Following Slater and Sylvester, they characterised the "Great Tradition" or "traditional history" as unchanging, uniform, didactic, canonical and instrumentalist.

The work of these authors, then, constitutes the main pillars of the "Dark Age" representation. None could claim to have done large scale or systematic empirical work on the historical development of history teaching. Their "Dark Age" narrative validated their work as history educators rather than as historians of history education. Before reflecting upon this further in the final part of this chapter, a second representation of post-war history education is now examined, one that seeks to counter the "Dark Age" representation's sense of condemnation.

2. Presenting post-war history education as a "Golden Age" of teaching and learning

During the past three decades, the "Dark Age" representation has been challenged by what this study chooses to term the "Golden Age" representation of post-war history education. This representation turns the "Dark Age" representation on its head. It portrays the Schools Council History 13–16 Project and GCSE history reform not as a great advance but as "regressive", "bogus", "evil" and "corrupt". In the

---

[57] C. Husbands, A. Kitson and A. Pendry *Understanding History Teaching, Teaching and Learning about the Past in Secondary Schools* (OUP, 2003), pp. 3–20.

"Golden Age" representation, post-war history education is viewed not as a low point in the development of history education, but as its apogee.[58]

The "Golden Age" representation of post-war history education is to be found in the political right's educational reform programme that has campaigned to "restore" patriotic civic aims, teacher telling, the transmission of a received body of knowledge and factual testing.[59] During the years 1988–1994, Slater and Sylvester had locked horns with this reform agenda during the policy debates over the first History National Curriculum. During these debates it appeared in a series of pamphlets published by the right-of-centre think-tank, the Centre for Policy Studies (CPS).

In this section CPS authors Stewart Deuchar (1987), Alan Beattie (1987) and Helen Kedourie (1988) are examined to identify the characteristics of their "Golden Age" representation. This is then brought up to date by examining "Golden Age" thinking in more recent works by Chris McGovern (2007) and Derek Matthews (2009).

Founded in 1974 by Keith Joseph and Margaret Thatcher, the Centre for Policy Studies favoured a restoration of "traditional" education and called for a concentration on standards.[60] During the late 1980s, it published three pamphlets on history education authored by Stewart Deuchar, Alan Beattie and Helen Kadourie.[61] These authors portrayed post-war history education as an era when standards of history education teaching and learning were at their highest. They contrasted a confident and assured post-war era with a post-1970 history education

---

[58] Terms were used by S. Lawlor, *An Education Choice: Pamphlets from the Centre 1987-1994* (CPS, 1995); H. Kedourie, *Errors and Evils of the "New History"* (CPS, 1988); S. Deuchar, *History and GCSE History* (CPS, 1987); A. Beattie, *A History in Peril* (CPS, 1987).

[59] Quicke, J. (1989) The New Right and Education. In B. Moon, P. Murphy and J. Raynmour (eds) *Policies for the Curriculum* (Hodder & Stoughton), pp. 74–88; R. Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics* (Cassell, 1998); T. Haydn, History. In J. White (ed.) *Rethinking the Curriculum Values, Aims and Purposes* (Routledge Falmer, 2004), pp. 87–104; K. Crawford, A History of the Right: The Battle for Control of National Curriculum History 1989-1994, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 43(4) (1995), 433–56.

[60] Lawlor, 1995.

[61] Kedourie, 1988; Deuchar, 1987; Beattie, 1987.

that was in terminal decline. In their "Golden Age" representation of post-war history education, the principal purpose of school history was said to be to reproduce an esteemed body of cultural knowledge. This is seen, for example, in Deuchar's suggestion that during the post-war period, "there was a general agreement some knowledge of the history of one's country was an essential attribute for an educated person".[62]

In the CPS's "Golden Age" representation, post-war history education is a "value-free" knowledge-based curriculum, directly at odds with Slater's "value-laden" teaching facts about famous dead Englishmen. In their post-war "Golden Age", the body of received knowledge transmitted is represented as neutral and esteemed. It is seen as adapted from the research conducted by professional historians in the spirit of "history for its own sake" entirely uncontaminated by ideology. During the post-war "Golden Age", teachers passed on this "pure" historical knowledge in digested form to school students. For CPS authors, it was a "Golden Age" because teachers had successfully transmitted to the next generation *authoritative* historical knowledge. Kedourie expressed this point when she wrote: "History can provide an account of what has happened only as historians have established it."[63]

In the "Golden Age" representation, a division of labour determined the construction of curriculum knowledge. Professional historians carried out the frontline task of discovering knowledge about the past. This "authoritative" knowledge, the fruits of academic research, was then converted into textbook form and transmitted by well-read scholarly teachers. Students received the knowledge and enjoyed the benefits of being "educated".

In this representation, school history aims were restricted to the social and civic. The acquisition of historical knowledge was said to be an essential attribute of an "educated man". It enriched the life of the individual and society by fostering a

---

[62] Deuchar, 1987, p. 1.
[63] Kedourie, 1988, p. 9.

sense of identity that, in turn, strengthened the bonds of social cohesion. To be deprived of the unifying force that historical knowledge bequeathed was thought by these authors to weaken the social fabric. In this regard, Deuchar warned: "If we cut ourselves off from our own history we enormously diminish ourselves."[64]

From the point of view of CPS authors, post-war history education was unencumbered by second-order concepts such as enquiry, empathy, interpretation, cause and evidence and by historical "skills" such as source evaluation. As a consequence, it was free to successfully accomplish its central task of transmitting a body of historical knowledge that forged a sense of national identity and shared cultural inheritances. For these authors, it was a "Golden Age" because it provided educated citizens with an essential perspective on the past, one that awakened in them an appreciation of "our heritage" and "our history".

Deuchar, Beattie and Kedourie argued that post-1970 developments had placed history education "in danger". They portrayed "New History" as leading the profession away from knowledge transmission. In their view, a preoccupation with "skills" had led "New History" to renege on the true purpose of history education, which was to transmit authoritative and esteemed historical knowledge to the next generation.

Beattie wrote that "traditional history" was essentially and correctly "a detailed factual story".[65] CPS authors excluded skills and concepts from their portrayal of post-war history education. The form that the detailed factual story took was a laudatory chronological narrative of the nation. From the point of view of the CPS authors, this privileged landmark events in the history of elites. There was no place in their representation for post-war students to reflect upon the nature of history as a discipline, engage with source materials or question the claims put before them.

---

[64] Deuchar, 1987, p. 17.
[65] Beattie, 1987, p. 22.

Deuchar, Beattie and Kedourie's representation was underpinned by a learning theory that suggested that source evaluation was beyond the capabilities of most students. The historian G. R. Elton expressed this view in 1970 when he wrote:

> The well-known fact that "serious" history requires maturity weighs inescapably upon those who have to teach the altogether immature; and all that I would wish to say about those earlier years may be summed up in one phrase – concern and amusement. There are some children whose inclination is fixed upon the past: they pose no problem. The rest – the great majority – should be excited by stories and descriptions distinguished from other similar tales by being about real people; to try to give them more – to try them with the history of economics, or constitutions, or ideas – is utterly mistaken.[66]

Underpinning the "Golden Age" representation was the view that most students were only capable of learning a detailed factual story and that any attempt at critical engagement with primary sources and historical enquiry should be postponed until the later stages of child development. Elton and later CPS authors suggested that only a tiny percentage of the school population, those studying A-level history, were really capable of taking a critical approach to the study of the past.

A "positive" characteristic of the "Golden Age" representation was the idea that history education provided students to age 15 with "grounding" in historical knowledge. Providing students with grounding in knowledge, the CPS authors suggested, was the bedrock of citizenship and a necessary precondition for post-16 conceptual understanding. CPS authors stressed that post-war history education professionals had "correctly" thought it erroneous to engage students with the concept of historical evidence. Kedourie made this point, suggesting that such an

---

[66] Elton, 1970, p. 221.

engagement would violate the rules that governed the division of labour between academic, teacher and student. Kedourie wrote:

> a wealth of scholarship is required before anyone can be in a position intelligently to evaluate or interpret artefacts and illustrations of people and events.[67]

CPS authors applauded post-war history education for its "traditional" pedagogy, summarised as "chalk and talk", textbook reading and comprehension, note taking and the objective testing of factual knowledge. Post-war pedagogy did not, in their view, correctly embrace "active learning", "independent learning", problem solving, or source evaluation. For Deuchar, a key characteristic of "traditional history" was teachers telling students what had happened in the past according to academic research. Deuchar wrote: "The child embarking on the study of history needs to be told the story as it is for the time being."[68] For Kedourie it was sufficient that students were asked to "absorb the information that William the Conqueror arrived on the shores of England in 1066".[69]

Deuchar, Beattie and Kedourie portrayed post-war history education as a confident, stable and established tradition that had clear and agreed aims centred on the transmission of knowledge that fostered a patriotic civic identity. A consensus was said to have prevailed over a curriculum that elevated the teacher as the authority figure inducting students into a shared national culture.

To show that such "Golden Age" thinking endures, attention turns now to two more recent examples. Since the late 1980s, Chris McGovern has campaigned to restore "knowledge-based" history education. In 2011, he was appointed chairman of the Campaign for Real Education, a centre-right education political pressure group. In

---

[67] Kedourie, 1988, p. 13.
[68] Deuchar, 1987, p. 7.
[69] Kedourie, 1988, p. 10.

2007, Civitas published his essay, "The New History Boys".[70] Derek Matthews, a professor of accountancy at Cardiff University, published *The Strange Death of History Teaching* in January 2009.[71] Their condemnation of post-1970 history education curriculum developments and call for a return to perceived post-war approaches is strikingly similar to those of the CPS authors. Their work provides evidence that "Golden Age" thinking retains a position within public and professional discourse. As Richard Evans has noted, it is a view that continues to resonate.[72]

Employing the bellicose language of military conquest, McGovern and Matthews' account of the development of history education during the second half of the twentieth century revolves around a "battle" between two mutually exclusive systems. The key episode is the "overthrow" of "traditional history" by "New History" in a "revolution" that took place during the late 1960s and early 1970s. The outcome of this "takeover" is a rapid decline in students' knowledge of history following the "overthrow" of "traditional history".

To support his argument, Matthews used a questionnaire to demonstrate the "collapse" of historical knowledge among students attending schools and places of higher education. Over a three-year period, using a set of five closed questions, he measured the historical knowledge of 284 first-year undergraduates.[73] His results are as follows: 16.5 per cent of students were able to answer correctly the question, "Who was the general in charge of the British army at the battle of Waterloo?"; 34.5 per cent of students were able to answer correctly the question, "Who was the reigning monarch when the Spanish Armada attacked Britain?"; 40.5 per cent of students were able to answer correctly the question, "What was Isambard Kingdom Brunel's profession?"; 11.5 per cent of students were able to answer correctly the question, "Name one prime minister of Britain in the 19th century." And, finally,

---

[70] C. McGovern, The New History Boys. In R. Whelan (ed.) *The Corruption of the Curriculum* (Civitas, 2007).
[71] D. Matthews, *The Strange Death of History Teaching* (Matthews, 2009).
[72] R. J. Evans, The Wonderfulness of Us, *London Review of Books*, 33(6) (2011), 9–12.
[73] Matthews, 2009, pp. 1–3.

30.6 per cent of students were able to answer correctly the question, "In what country was the Boer War of 1899–1902 fought?"

Matthews' methods are open to criticism. His claim that historical knowledge is in decline rests on being able to show, which he does not, that in the past more students knew the answers to his questions. The representativeness of his sample of 284 students is questionable. His choice of closed questions reflects a particular cultural perspective about the nature of history that privileges certain types of knowledge. Matthew's selective and self-justifying use of evidence, a salient characteristic of the Conservative "Golden Age" tradition in general, was directed by *parti pris* history education purposes that falls short of the standards expected from academic research.

Matthews sought to show that a rapid decline in students' historical knowledge had occurred. The current generation of students, he wrote, know "almost nothing about the history of their (or anyone else's) country".[74] The failure to know the answers to these five questions, he asserted, indicated widespread ignorance of history. He wrote:

> ignorance of these facts also means a deeper lack of knowledge and understanding. Not knowing where the Boer War was fought, for example, means you know little or nothing about the history of Britain's colonial past in southern Africa, and hence the origins of apartheid or of present-day Zimbabwe. Not being able to answer question 1, and particularly the wrong answers offered, means a lack of knowledge of who Nelson was, or the significance of arguably the most famous land battle in history, or for that matter who or what was Napoleon or the French Revolution, let alone the causes or consequences of these figures and events. And, of course, a lack of knowledge of the facts axiomatically precludes any analysis of them.[75]

---

[74] Matthews, 2009, p. 1.
[75] Matthews, 2009, p. 2.

In their representation, McGovern and Matthews argued, as CPS authors had, that the "New History" "revolution" of the 1970s was responsible for a widespread decline in historical knowledge. By this, they meant that post-1970 students, unlike their post-war counterparts, no longer had a shared knowledge of a coherent national narrative. Knowing the key landmark events and personalities of the national narrative was McGovern and Matthews' measure of true historical knowledge. On this basis, they rested their case that "history" (as they understood it) was no longer being taught in schools.

To make his case for a "Great Tradition" Sylvester drew on statements issued by the Board of Education and the Ministry of Education. The case made for a post-war "Golden Age" of history education makes no reference to historical research. Its claim that post-war history education knowledge transmission was a success story, that knowledge based lessons were delivered successfully, is an assertion to be taken on trust. It is an ahistorical case that serves *parti pri* history education policy purposes. It does not pursue the goals of historical research.

McGovern and Matthews shared the same values as Deuchar, Beattie and Kedourie about how history should be taught in schools. These values dominate their construction of the past. Central to this was the idea, asserted rather than proven, that post-war history education was a "Golden Age" because students then had acquired knowledge of a coherent national narrative. McGovern went further than most by claiming, unsupported by evidence, that "traditional history" teaching had ancient cultural roots. It contained, he wrote, "the collective wisdom of hundreds, even thousands of years of history teaching".[76]

McGovern and Matthews represented "traditional history" as secure in its purpose and methods. In the following passage, McGovern again underlines the central relationship between history and collective memory:

---

[76] McGovern, 2007, p. 59.

To know the history of one's country is a birthright. It tells us who we are and how we got here. It tells us how our shared values came into being. A people that does not know its history is a people suffering from memory loss.[77]

On the important question of the place of source-work in post-war history education, McGovern and Matthews, like Deuchar, Beattie and Kedourie, thought it to have been inconsequential. McGovern and Matthews targeted "New History's" advocacy of source evaluation for their most scathing criticism, labelling it one of the key factors in the "overthrow" of "traditional history". It displaced, they argued, the coherent national narrative and undermined the authority of the teacher as the fount of authoritative knowledge. Source-work was detrimental because it challenged the division of labour, implying that all students could engage in independent enquiry and acquire the skills of the historian. McGovern and Matthews represented source evaluation as "anti-knowledge" and as the antithesis of what "traditional history" stood for. Matthews described "New History" source-work as "risible", stating that:

School children can only play at being historians and to suggest that they are being taught to use primary historical sources in a meaningful way is a ridiculous conceit.[78]

The use of primary historical sources was included in their representation of post-war history education. As Matthews suggests in the following passage, these authors thought that in post-war history education, it was an occasional and advanced practice:

This is not to say that primary sources should not be used in teaching history as stimulus material. I can remember in the 1970s going to the local County Record Office and photocopying 18th century parish registers and enclosure

---

[77] Ibid., p. 61.
[78] Matthews, 2009, p. 11.

51

maps and using them with my A-level students to very good effect to bring home to them the fundamental origin of demographic or agricultural history. This occasional exposure to primary sources fitted well into a traditional economic history course but it would have seemed an absurdity, and still does, that it should become the purpose of history teaching, as it is with the "New History".[79]

Matthews dismissed the work of early advocates of source evaluation, such as Keatinge and Happold. Their ideas, Matthews thought, had gained little ground in their time.[80] McGovern too stressed that source-work played an important, although occasional role in "traditional history". As the following passage suggests, McGovern thought that sources had a role to play supporting narrative exposition:

> The way forward for history is to separate it from "New History" altogether, in order to allow it to be taught as an unfolding narrative. This will involve lots of storytelling and story reading – something loved by both children and adults. It would not exclude looking at evidence, where this enhances the story. A visit to the Tower of London, for example, would entail many a tale of the past.[81]

The "Golden Age" representation, which during the past three decades has had a close association with the Conservative right, portrayed post-war history education as confident, stable, uniform and enduring. Its aim was said to be civic and its syllabus content an esteemed and incontestable body of received knowledge. In this representation, for the majority of students, source evaluation was precluded by an age-related learning theory that dictated that it was too difficult. Post-war history education was said to have employed sources occasionally to support teacher exposition. In the "Golden Age", source-work was at best marginal and at worst antithetical to educational concerns.

---

[79] Ibid., p. 14.
[80] Matthews, 2009, p. 10.
[81] McGovern, 2007, p. 80.

3. Presenting post-war history education as an era of diversity and change

"Dark" and "Golden Age" representations portray post-war history education as unified and unchanging, bounded by deep cultural roots. Both defended history education positions rather than pursued the goals of historical research. The differences between them have to do with values and attitudes concerning the purpose of history education as well as notions of citizenship and national identity.

Within the literature, a third representation of post-war history education places its emphasis upon diversity and change *within* "traditional history". More firmly grounded in empirical historical research, it challenges the idea that post-war history education was unified and unchanging, be it dark or golden. In this representation focus is upon change within post-war history education and upon different approaches to teaching history. It depicts post-war history education as fluid and heterogeneous.

Stepping back from defending or attacking post-war history education with *parti pri* history education purposes in mind, it takes a more neutral and nuanced position. It is less concerned with demarcating the "transformation" of the 1970s, or with the merits and demerits of "traditional history" versus "New History". Far greater significance is awarded to history education writers such as Keatinge and Happold. These "voices" are now viewed as integral to a diverse, multifaceted and changing post-war history education. A different reading of the place of source-work in post-war history education is presented, one that moves source-work from the margins of theory and practice to a place of far greater importance.

A prominent exponent of this view is Richard Aldrich, who, between 1984 and 1992, responded critically to representations that portrayed history education, as either

"Dark" or "Golden".[82] He objected to the way that the focus on transformation during the 1970s had overshadowed other changes that had occurred within history education since its inception as a subject in state schools during the first decade of the twentieth century. It is this failure to appreciate diversity and change within pre-1970 history education that lay behind his declaration that the "New History" movement of the 1970s was "the most recent in a series of new histories which in the last 100 years have enriched and enlarged the teaching and study of the subject".[83]

Aldrich's work is important in the way it takes a more considered historical approach, which treats pre-1970 history education as worthy of study in its own right. He argued that it had its own developments, institutional structures, body of theoretical writing, conflicting viewpoints and significant reforms. "Dark" and "Golden" Age representations were, he thought, remiss in their failure to capture this.

Aldrich's research presented "traditional" history as diverse, changing and contested. He acknowledged the importance of the shift from "traditional history" to "New History" during the 1970s, but argued that it should not be allowed to overshadow other developments pre 1970. The "New History" movement of the 1970s, he argued, grew out of trends already underway during the earlier period. He wrote:

> Much of what is claimed as the "New History" of today, therefore, does not appear to be new at all. Emphases upon sources, historical skills, pupil involvement, inquiry methods and learning "how", have a firm place in the

---

[82] The Aldrich position can be found in the following: R. Aldrich, New History: An Historical Perspective. In A. K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee and P. J. Rogers (eds) *Learning History* (Heinemann, 1984); R. Aldrich, The National Curriculum: An Historical Perspective. In D. Lawton and C. Chitty (eds) *The National Curriculum*. University of London, Institute of Education (Kogan Page, 1990); R. Aldrich and D. Dean, The Historical Dimension. In R. Aldrich (ed.) *History in the National Curriculum.* University of London, Institute of Education (Kogan Page, 1991); R. Aldrich, History in the National Curriculum in England: An Historical Perspective. In A. K. Dickinson (ed.) *Perspectives on Change in History Education*. University of London, Institute of Education (Chameleon Press, 1992).

[83] Aldrich, 1984, p. 222.

tradition of history teaching in this country. They need not depend essentially upon Bloom, Bruner or Piaget, nor upon highly contentious notions of structure or doubtful taxonomies for the measurement of historical and other educational objectives and skills.[84]

Aldrich's approach to research is distinguished by the equal importance he gave to *official* and *unofficial* sources from the "proposed" curriculum. Rather than dismissing them as marginal, he was the first to take history educator authors seriously. Drawing on the published works of history educators, as well as official sources issued by central government, Aldrich was able to show that school history aims during the period of the "Great Tradition" varied. "Dark" and "Golden" Age representations had reduced post-war history education aims to just two – civic and moral instruction. As result of archival research, Aldrich was able to extend the list to seven, including what he termed "subject-specific skills". His seven post-war history education aims were: (1) a vehicle of social control; (2) an introduction to heritage; (3) the promotion of moral virtue; (4) inculcation of patriotism; (5) fostering a love of peace and international understanding; (6) the development of a variety of skills both general and subject-specific; and (7) learning history for its own sake.

His challenge went further, he was able to show that aims had change during the period of the "Great Tradition". There had been, he argued, during this period a tension between the extrinsic civic aims of 1 to 5 and the intrinsic aims articulated in 6 and 7. The value accorded to each, he thought, varied in their operation at different times and across schools, with variations being most pronounced during transitions between periods of war and peace and between "academic" and "non-academic" schools.

---

[84] Aldrich, 1984, p. 212.

Furthermore, Aldrich was insistent that before the transformation of the 1970s, "sources, historical skills, pupil involvement, inquiry methods and learning 'how' had a secure place in the tradition of history teaching in this country".[85]

In support of his case that learning the discipline of history had been a secure school history aim for some, Aldrich cited the work of pre-1970 history education authors, Keatinge, Drummond, Firth, Happold and Jarvis. Their writing on history education, he contended, provided evidence that learning the discipline of history had been a feature of inter-war and post-war professional history education discourse. He judged M. W. Keatinge, writing 60 years before the advent of the Schools Council History Project, to be "New History's" founding father. Keatinge was a seminal figure for Aldrich because he had conceived school history to consist of rigorous disciplinary training. According to Aldrich, Keatinge's place in the development of history education was significant because:

> He wanted to introduce pupils to the methods of the modern scientific historian, to reduce part of the subject in schools to problem form, and to confront pupils with evidence.[86]

By contrast, Slater and Sylvester had, as already noted here, located Keatinge on the margins of "traditional history". For them, he was unorthodox and therefore to be mentioned *en passant.* Sylvester had dismissed Keatinge on the grounds that his ideas had failed to win widespread professional support. Aldrich pointed out that this had in fact not been proven. Drawing on the writings of professional history educators allowed Aldrich to critically examine the nature of mainstream history education practice during the period of the "Great Tradition".

Raphael Samuel's representation of post-war history education also highlighted diversity and change. His formulation of a "progressive tradition" within history

---

[85] Aldrich, 1984, p. 212.
[86] R. Aldrich, 1984, p. 2.

education, with beginnings during the early 1920s, included Sellar and Yeatman's *1066 And All That*, Quennell's *A History of Everyday Things in England,* Eileen Power's *Medieval People*, E. H. Spalding's *Piers Plowman* series of school history textbooks, and the *Jackdaw* series of archive packs.[87] These works provided, he argued, evidence of an alternative history education tradition that combined social history, "active learning" and engagement with primary source material. He located this not on the margins of a dominant discourse, but as an oppositional counter-discourse. In Samuel's representation, a "progressive tradition" stood in opposition to the kind of history teaching that Slater and Sylvester criticised and that the CPS lauded. In accord with Aldrich, Samuel drew a line that connected the "active learning" and the "history from below" of Quennell, Power and Spalding to the "New History" movement of the 1970s.

Peter Lee has questioned representations that treated long passages of history education development as a single unchanging tradition. He has suggested that within post-war history education there had been a concern with learning the discipline. There had been, he wrote:

> an opposition founded in the first instance on an awareness of the importance of evidence in history and on an intuitive appeal to something like "good grounds" criterion of knowledge.[88]

Similarly, Ian Steele and Brendan Elliott have questioned representing "traditional history" and "New History" as uniform periods of school history teaching. They identified underlying discursive continuities that cut across past and present practice. Steele has demonstrated that the nature and purpose of school history

---

[87] R. Samuel, *Theatres of Memory,* vol. 1: *Past and Present in Contemporary Culture* (Verso, 1994), pp. 274–87; R. Samuel, *Island Stories: Unravelling Britain, Theatres of Memory, Volume II* (ed. Alison Light) (Verso, 1998). Part Three: History, the Nation and the Schools, pp. 197–224.
[88] P. Lee, History Teaching and Philosophy of History, *History and Theory,* 22(4) (1983), 19–49.

was debated during the second half of the nineteenth century.[89] Elliott has similarly charted a continuous professional discourse over the nature and purpose of history education during the first half of the twentieth century.[90]

In a major funded research project on the history of history education in England, the first of its kind, Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon identified changes to pedagogic practice during the period 1900–1970.[91] Drawing on official guidelines, published by the Board of Education and the Ministry of Education, supported by oral testimony, students' written work, classroom resources, textbooks and examination papers they outlined an official discourse over the aims, content and pedagogy of school history teaching that showed that during the period of the "Great Tradition" history education had been contested. Their research has revealed variations in the content of syllabi. There were different combinations of local, national, world and contemporary scales and perspectives. They have shown that discussions took place over the merits of adopting outline and thematic and depth studies and that styles of teaching other than teacher telling were considered. This included teaching and learning in museums and art galleries as well as in the locality. They have also been able to point to official guidelines that recommended the use of artefacts and original historical documents in the classroom. In their representation of post-war history education, source-work was an area of central concern.

Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon took the view that during the period 1900–1970 no "dramatic" change of direction had taken place. They concurred with Slater and Sylvester that the late 1960s and the early 1970s marked *the* major turning point in

---

[89] I. Steele, A study of the formative years of the development of the history curriculum in English schools 1833-1901. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 1974; I. Steele, The Teaching of History in England: An Historical Perspective, *History Teaching Review*, 12(1) (1980).

[90] B. J. Elliott, The development of history teaching in England for pupils aged 11-18 years 1918-1939. Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Sheffield, 1975; B. J. Elliott, An Early Failure of Curriculum Reform: History Teaching in England, 1918-1940, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 12(2) (1980), 39–46; B. J. Elliott, The Impact of the Second World War upon History Teaching in Britain, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 26(2) (1994), 153–63.

[91] D. Cannadine, J. Keating and N. Sheldon, *The Right Kind of History: Teaching the Past in Twentieth-Century England* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011). A shorter version: J. Keating and N. Sheldon, History in Education: Trends and Themes in History Teaching 1900-2010. In I. Davies (ed.) *Debates in History Teaching* (2011), pp. 5–17.

the development of school history in England, the moment when history education was endangered and transformed. Mary Price's article "History in Danger" was again cited as the catalyst for transformation, along with the Schools Council History 13–16 Project as the principal agent engineering a radical new direction.

Following Aldrich, they drew a line of continuity between post-war history education and post-1970 curriculum developments. The Schools Council History 13–16 Project's rationale was said to have been a "flowering" of developments underway during the preceding three decades. In their view, the SCHP amalgamated world history, contemporary history, local history, a thematic line of development, a study in depth and source-work – all of which were in development during the post-war period. Innovation, as Aldrich had suggested, had been a feature of post-war history education.

As to the level of interest in source-work during the post-war period, Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon marginalised Keatinge arguing that there had been a gap between the theoretical literature that advocated source-work and the majority of practitioners, who were reluctant to engage with it. They noted:

> Magazines and books of guidance for teachers advocated copying original source materials and maps for the classroom; but they do not seem to have been widely used before the 1970s.[92]

They thought that the CSE Mode 3 examination, introduced in 1963, provided an impetus to working with primary source materials in secondary modern schools. Teachers of history in grammar schools, in contrast, were said to have been, on the whole, reluctant source-work practitioners, constrained by a mode of public examination that did not require it. Citing Martin Booth's 1968 study *History Betrayed?,* they thought that post-war grammar school history education had been dominated by the kinds of post-war practices that Slater and Sylvester had criticised.

---

[92] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon, 2011, p. 122.

Reflecting on the literature

There are a number of important considerations to take into account, not least of which was the way "Dark" and "Golden" representations were engaged in policy commitments. Both can be read as markers for the battle lines of public discourse during periods when the aims of school history became intensely politicised. The work of Deuchar, Beattie and Kedourie points to an interplay between the politics of history education and the development of the history curriculum, suggesting that a position outside the battle lines of policy discourse may be difficult to achieve. It is certainly the case that Deuchar, Beattie and Kedourie, during the late 1980s, and later McGovern and Matthews, wrote while being fully engaged in policy making. Their representations were shaped by a commitment to promote a version of "traditional history".

John Slater's 1988 lecture was a rebuttal of Deuchar, Beattie and Kedourie.[93] Writing at a time when the future of school history was being fiercely contested, Slater defended the principles underlying "New History" against the fierce attacks being made against it.[94] His "dark" portrayal of post-war history education also served a polemical purpose.

David Sylvester, the first director of the Schools Council History 13–16 Project and a leading figure in the emergence of "New History", concluded his history of history education with the suggestion that the battle over the nature of school history had not been completely won by "New History". He appealed to the profession to

---

[93] For the contribution made by historians to the National Curriculum debates on school history during the late 1980s, see J. Gardiner (ed.) *The History Debate: A History Today Book* (Collins and Brown, 1990). For an analysis of the debate, see Phillips (1998).
[94] J. Slater cited three "New Right" pamphlets published by the London Centre for Policy Studies: (1) A. Beattie (1987) *A History in Peril;* (2) S. Deucher (1987) *History and GCSE History;* (3) H. Kedourie (1988) *The Errors and Evils of the New History.*

defend the advancements that had been made in pedagogic knowledge at a time (1994) when the future of the History National Curriculum was uncertain.[95]

Aldrich was right to question the accuracy of "Dark Age" representations. For him, it was a case of "New History" advocates misusing the past to "sharpen a particular contemporary axe".[96] His point that representations of the "Great Tradition" as the "bad old days" (or the "good old days") slide into the "unhistorical" – a past "raided, distorted and condemned" – is an important one.[97] Aldrich was right to argue that an acceptable level of impartiality is within reach only when the experience of post-war history education is self-consciously reconstructed on its own terms in light of all the available evidence.[98]

With regards to the production of post-war history education knowledge (the first research question), whilst generally, attention has been on the contribution made by central government, a section of the literature has begun to show interest in the contribution made by history education authors. Richard Aldrich and Raphael Samuel named Keatinge, Jarvis, Firth, Happold, Spalding, Power and the Quennells as authors who, in their view, had made a significant contribution to the development of history education. Aldrich suggested that Keatinge had, in 1910, proposed that students be taught the critical methods of source evaluation. Taking writers such as these into account, Aldrich argued, made post-war history education appear innovative and reflexive.

A close reading of key authors provides compelling evidence that history education writers, their work and the community to which they belonged was very different from the singular and static picture of the production of history education knowledge associated with the "Great Tradition". So far, the list of authors

---

[95] Sylvester, 1994, p. 22.
[96] Aldrich, 1984, p. 212.
[97] Ibid., p. 210.
[98] R. Aldrich, The Three Duties of the Historian of Education, *History of Education*, 32(2) (2003), 133–43.

examined is short and refers mainly to inter-war authors. Enough is known already, however, to suggest that post-war history education authors contested the nature and purpose of school history: only the details of who they were and what they proposed remain unclear.

In the literature, the role played by post-war history education institutions, such as the Historical Association, the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters and the London Institute of Education, is beginning to be recognised. It is now recognized that there had been a post-war history education community although its contours are not clearly understood. The thinness of the available descriptions leaves unanswered questions concerning the structure of this community and its precise role in the production of history education curriculum knowledge. The literature has little to say about post-war history education authors, the scope of their ideas, and the extent to which ideas changed during the post-war period. The same is true concerning the nature of the community to which they belonged.

The idea of an "inherited consensus", first suggested by Slater, conveys the sense that post-war teachers followed unquestioningly an officially sanctioned body of history education curriculum knowledge. According to this view, the transmission of a received body of knowledge dominated the period 1900–1970 and this remained unchanged and unchallenged. It is worth repeating that Slater stated that this was an "untidy consensus" and what he termed "sceptical moles" presented alternative voices. When history education writing is foregrounded, opportunities for these alternative voices to be heard and appreciated becomes stronger.

A mixed picture of post-war history education emerges from this review of the literature. Contained within it are coercive "history masters" and "progressive" teaching.

With regards to the aims of post-war history education (the second research question), there is agreement that knowledge transmission and citizenship

education were the two principal ones. This was the view of the "Dark Age" and "Golden Age" representations. It is, however, disputed that these were the *only* aims. Richard Aldrich, Raphael Samuel, Ian Steele, Brendan Elliott, David Cannadine, Jenny Keating and Nicola Sheldon raise important questions concerning the range and stability of history education aims, suggesting that accompanying knowledge transmission and citizenship were a range of other related considerations.

Similarly, the extent to which aims changed over time is disputed. For Slater and Sylvester, and for CPS authors, they had changed little during the period 1900–1968. This is, to a large extent, a matter of perspective. These authors focused upon the "transformation" from "traditional" to "New History", which conveys the appearance of two distinct unified phases. The literature on diversity and change takes a different perspective: one that was willing to consider that the aims of history education had been subject to minor changes during the first three-quarters of the twentieth century.

With regards to the role that historical source materials played in post-war history education (the third research question), the literature is again conflicted. Two interpretations vie for attention. In the first, source-work is subsumed within a 70-year unitary phase of development between 1900 and 1970 and is seen as unchanging and marginal. In the second, source-work plays a more significant role. It was practised by *some* teachers and was a topic that attracted the attention of history education authors.

There is agreement concerning the general development of history education source-work during the first three-quarters of the twentieth century. It is agreed that a radical shift occurred at the end of the post-war period, during the years 1968–1976. This was a shift from "traditional" to "New History" source-work characterised as marking a rapid growth of interest in enquiry-based approaches to teaching school history.

In some parts of the literature, most notably Aldrich and Samuel, the theory of source-work, as a subject of history education writing is viewed as sustained, reflective and contested. Much hinges on the importance that is placed on theoretical writing in any overall assessment of post-war history education. Through the lens of post-war history education writing, source-work appears prominent, diverse and changing. This does not contradict the view that many post-war teachers neglected source-work, it simply refines it.

The picture of post-war history education, as an academic field of study, that emerges from this literature review is one that has developed recently with roots in history education polemics. Understanding post-war history education is, at present, based upon a notion of a "Great Tradition" in which the aims and practices of teaching history are considered to have been uniform and unchanging. The research that has challenges this understanding has been conducted by Aldrich, Samuel, Steele, Elliott, and more recently Cannadine et al; which has explored elements of diversity and change within post-war "proposed" history education. This study will examine these issues further by examining in more detail education author's contribution to post–war history education. It will resist marginalsising or dismissing their ideas on the grounds they ran counter to "Great Tradition" principles. It will explore, instead, the idea that there was more to post-war history education than what is contained in the idea of a "Great Tradition", as it is currently understood.

This study takes its lead from the literature on "diversity and change", which argues that post-war history education was far more complex than is generally recognised. It calls into question the view, implicit and explicit in "Dark Age" and "Golden Age" narratives, that history education professionals did little to contribute to the production of history education curriculum knowledge prior to the publication of Mary Price's article "History in Danger". It does this by exploring further the idea that not all post-war history education professionals had an unwavering and unquestioning allegiance to a single uniform, nineteenth-century tradition of history education.

Chapter Two

Sources for the study of post-war "proposed" history education

The primary sources drawn upon in this study to examine "proposed" post-war history education were located in three sites across London. Archival material relating to the IAAM's *The Teaching of History (*1950), Estella Lewis's, *Teaching History in Secondary Schools* (1960), and Burston and Green (eds.), *Handbook for History Teachers* (1962), were located in the Newsam Library and Archives, Institute of Education, 20 Bedford Way, London. Official publications, handbooks, teaching manuals, the Times Educational Supplement, textbooks, and journal articles were located in the Newsam Library and The British Library, 96 Euston Road. The Historical Association's journal "History" and the Historical Association's pamphlet series *Teaching of History* were accessed at the Historical Association, 59A Kennington Park Road London.

The best guide to the printed sources available to the researcher of "proposed" approaches to post-war history education is *A Select Bibliography of the Teaching of History in the United Kingdom* compiled by John Fines, commissioned by the Historical Association in 1969. It contains 580 titles on the teaching of history, covering the period 1900-1969. For the post-war period, (1944-1962), the time frame for this study, 150 titles were listed by Fines. Reflecting upon this body of work, Fines, in support of the general argument presented in this study, opined: "it is very salutary to learn how long ago 'modern' and 'progressive' ideas were introduced." and that people "are writing and talking about history teaching as never before".

At the planning stage a selection was made from Fines' pool of 150 that was judged would provide evidence to address the research questions, and would, therefore,

enable the research project to proceed. A justification for why these sources were considered "fit for purpose" is given in this chapter. Grounding the study on a selection makes this an exploratory study that leaves much in the field for others to research. However, whilst drawing attention to its limitations, this chapter will demonstrate that the selection was of a kind that advances understanding of "proposed" post-war history education.

This study has drawn upon range of printed sources. Five types are discussed: (1) handbooks on the teaching of history; (2) official reports; (3) journals and pamphlets; (4) *The Times Educational Supplement*; and (5) published teaching resources: textbooks, sourcebooks and archive teaching units. Research based on the oral testimony of surviving participants would compliment this study. There is urgency here, as with the passage of time the subject is fast receding from living memory.

History educators authored many of the sources used in this study and at an early stage in the research it became apparent that their writing yielded evidence of a reflective and textured kind that was at odds with representations of the "Great Tradition". It became clear that this evidenced a rich and varied post-war history education culture. The selection that was made showed that history education professionals wrote handbooks and pamphlets on the teaching of school history, short guides on aspects of classroom practice, and guides on the location of historical source materials. They compiled sourcebooks and archive packs, and they wrote textbooks and school educational guides for museums, art galleries and record offices. They also contributed to journals such as *History* and *Educational Review*, which published scholarly articles on aspects of history education.[99] It was considered important, indeed was made a requirement, that the selection reflected this reflexivity and diversity.

---

[99] For a greater sense of the range of material available, see J. Fines, *A Select Bibliography of the Teaching of History in the United Kingdom* (Historical Association, 1969).

The distinction between *official* and *unofficial* sources is an important one in the context of this study. The term "official sources" refers to those published by the Board of Education, and post 1945, by the Ministry of Education. The term "unofficial sources" refers to sources authored by history education professionals working independently of government. This is far from being a black-and-white distinction. Texts show that they were aware of each other's presence. Official sources drew upon the work of history educators and, in turn, history educators drew upon ideas contained within official sources. The distinction, in this study, is a critical one. This is because it shows that history educators contributed to the production of the post-war "proposed" history education, countering the "Great Tradition" view that it had been a monopoly of central government. It was requirement, therefore, that the sources selected provided evidence of history educators being engaged in a shared discussion about how history should be taught in schools.

It was noted in chapter one that post-war history education writing had an association with a network of institutions. These included the Ministry of Education, the Historical Association, the University of London Institute of Education, the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters, teacher training colleges, museums, art galleries, county records offices, and commercial educational publishers. The sources selected for this study were favoured because they shed light upon this community of practice.

1. Handbooks for the teaching of history

Post-war handbooks on the teaching of school history are this study's principal sources of evidence; these are listed with a rationale for their selection on pages 13-14. This section will discuss their value to the study. Their intended purpose was to provide teachers, be they specialist or non-specialists, working in junior, grammar or secondary modern schools, with general guidelines on the aims, content, learning theory and pedagogy of school history teaching. It was the comprehensive nature of their coverage, which included all of the elements of

teaching history in schools, which set them apart from other potential sources for the study of the "proposed" curriculum. It was this that makes them this field of study's source *par excellence.*

A goal of this study is to track change within author's "proposed" history education across the period 1944 to 1962. The sources selected, therefore, were required to provide evidence that addressed different types of schools within the state system and for dates of publication to range across the period at intervals. As the following discussion shows, the handbooks selected met these two requirements.

The *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools,* published in 1946, included a 33-page chapter on the teaching of school history that targeted non-specialist teachers working in primary, junior and secondary modern schools. Addressing the needs of specialist teachers, the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters (IAAM), the professional association representing post-war grammar and independent schoolteachers, published the first edition of its 210-page handbook *The Teaching of History* in 1950.[100] Writing for the history community as a whole, the Ministry of Education published its 90-page *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23* in 1952. In 1950, supporting non-specialists, the teacher trainer C. F. Strong published *History in the Primary School*, which he followed with *History in the Secondary School* in 1958. In 1956, also addressing non-specialists, the textbook author R. J. Unstead published *Teaching History in the Junior School.* In 1960, the teacher trainer E. M. Lewis published *Teaching History in Secondary Schools*, intended for non-specialists practising in secondary modern schools. In 1962, aimed at the specialist teacher of history, the London Institute of Education published a multi-authored 700-page compendium *The Handbook for History Teachers*, edited by W. H. Burston and C. W. Green.[101]

---

[100] The IAAM's fourth and final edition of *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools* was published in 1975. It contained a 30-page chapter on "Primary source material".
[101] The proposal for an IOE handbook for history teachers was first made in May 1956 when a subcommittee was set up to carry the project forward. In June 1957, objections were made in

The handbooks selected for this study were valuable in other ways. By 1945, the history education handbook was already an established genre of educational writing with origins dating back to the beginning of twentieth century.[102] During the post-war period, they provide evidence that the genre underwent significant development. In 1950, for example, the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters presented its handbook as a "reappraisal" of an earlier, much shorter version, published in 1931.[103] The best example of genre change was the University of London, Institute of Education's 700-page *The Handbook for History Teachers*, published in 1962, which broke new ground in the scale, scope and depth of its treatment.[104]

The handbooks selected make a valuable contribution to this study by providing evidence of author's subjectivities. Organising the material in similar way did not prevent the handbooks' authors from expressing a personal viewpoint, leading to striking variations in the guidance they provided to teachers. The fine textured qualitative evidence, typical of handbook sources, is seen in the following passage from E. M. Lewis's handbook, *Teaching History in Secondary Schools*, published in 1960. In this passage Lewis informs her readers that she has adapted the chapters in her book from lectures that she gave to students and teachers at Furzedown Training College, the London Institute of Education. Lewis struck a personal note when she wrote:

---

committee that a handbook would be too "authoritative" on teaching methods. Shortly after, this objection was overcome. The IOE committee thought that a new handbook was justified on the grounds that most teachers working in secondary modern schools were not members of the Historical Association and hence would not be readers of their pamphlets. (Newsome Library and Archive Special Collections, Institute of Education Library. UCL.)

[102] For a select bibliography of handbooks published in 1937, see A. C. F. Beales, *A Guide to the Teaching of History in Schools* (University of London Press, 1937). For a select bibliography of handbooks published in 1929, see D. Dymond (ed.) *A Handbook for History Teachers* (Methuen, 1929).

[103] Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools (1931) *Memorandum on the Teaching of History* (2nd edn, revised). The 1931 version ran to 75 pages compared to 175 pages in 1950.

[104] (see Introduction, page 17) For scope and depth, see W. H. Burston's treatment of the place of history in education in Burston and Green, 1962, pp. 1–15.

I have addressed this book to the non-specialists, while believing that there is something of value in it for the specialists. It follows that the children whose needs I have in mind are those in the schools not staffed entirely by honours graduates, pupils not intended for academic careers, though I think that teachers in the lower forms in grammar schools may also be helped by it. My hope is that a perusal of it may lessen the dependence of the teacher who is not primarily a historian on his class textbook. I aim to encourage him to break the habit of chapter-by-chapter teaching, in favour of a concentration on dominant trends.[105]

Here, Lewis addresses an issue that concerned her personally over the standards of non-specialist history teaching in secondary modern schools. It is heartfelt and reflective. These sources, then, access the thoughts and feelings of authors when engaged in debates over history education. The post-war authors examined for this study, as will be shown in Part Two, took up positions over a range of issues that questioned the purpose, content, methods and learning theory of school history.

There are other areas that make the selected handbooks a compelling choice for this study. They throw light on an author's historical understanding of the development of history education. They show the "proposed" curriculum set itself within an historical context.[106] They evidence authors' perceptions on the condition of the post-war "enacted" history education and its possible futures. They show, for example, that authors thought the teaching of history in schools was failing and they tell us how they thought it could be improved.

---

[105] E. M. Lewis, *Teaching History in Secondary Schools* (Evans Brothers, 1960), p. v.
[106] A post-war historical perspective on history education is seen in A. C. F. Beales, Fifty Years of Historical Teaching. In *The Historical Association 1906-1956* (Historical Association, 1957), pp. 99–112. See also Ministry of Education, *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23* (Ministry of Education, 1952), pp. 7–10. An influence on post-war history of history teaching was C. H. K. Marten, The History of History Teaching in England. In *On the Teaching of History and Other Addresses* (Basil Blackwell, 1938), pp. 1–47.

Handbook sources reveal authors' opinions on the role of the history teacher and their responsibilities. Typically, on matters of aims, content and method, they thought it was the teachers' responsibility to decide. Tolerance towards diversity is evident in these sources. They acknowledge differences between the size, location, intake, curriculum, staffing and finance of schools across the country, agreeing that no single model of teaching history would do.

Handbooks often evidence a shared theory of history education. This is evident in bibliographies and footnotes that reveal shared intellectual influences. A. N. Whitehead was one such shared reference across these texts. Their united opposition to what they saw as a nineteenth-century tradition of fact-based teaching, which they thought was prevalent in post-war schools, provides evidence of history education polemics. They advocated instead what they considered was a "new history" grounded in imaginative engagement. The handbooks used in this study show that, at this time, the use of primary source materials such as documents, pictures and artefacts was an important issue.[107] Handbooks contested the role that primary source materials should play. The IAAM limited its role to illustrating the narrative of "our national story". E. M. Lewis, in 1960, argued that students should engage with primary material as sources of information about the past. By contrast, in 1962, Gordon Batho advocated that students be taught how to question the truth claims of source material by routinely asking, how do we know this is true?[108]

Variations, like these, suggested that during the post-war period differences existed between "conservative" and "progressive" tendencies over the role that source-work should play. Both advocated the use of sources as an "aid" to narrative exposition. "Progressives" advocated using sources to arouse students' curiosity and interest. There is some evidence to show that some authors responded positively to Keatinge's thesis, made in 1910, that students should be trained to analyse primary source materials.

---

[107] Batho, 1962, pp. 95–109.
[108] Ibid.

Researchers have largely overlooked handbooks, making this the first study to subject them to detailed examination.[109] As this section has shown, the broad range of their concerns and the richness and depth of their sustained discourse on the nature of history education mark them out as being an essential source for this study.

2. Official reports

During the post-war period the Board of Education and the Ministry of Education published four official reports, each of which included subsections that addressed the teaching of school history. They are: the Norwood Report (1943), the Primary Education Report (1959), the Newsom Report (1963) and the Plowden Report (1967). Each provided teachers with guidance on the theory and practice of school history teaching.

The Board of Education's 1905 *Suggestions* started what became a steady stream of official history education statements consistently made in subsequent decades.[110] Spanning the period 1943–1967, the four main post-Second World War reports discussed the aims, content and pedagogy of school history teaching and addressed different constituencies within the post-war period. The Norwood Report (1943) spoke to a general audience. The Primary Education Report, *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned with the Work of Primary Schools* (1959), and the Plowden Report (1967) addressed history education at the primary and junior level. The Newsom Report (1963) focused on history education for "average and less-able" students attending secondary modern schools.

---

[109] Cannadine et al. (2011), with the exception of Ministry of Education *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23* (1952), pay little attention to the genre. Richard Aldrich's work examined inter-war handbooks.

[110] These were: 1905, *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools;* 1908, *Teaching of History in Secondary Schools, Circular 599*; 1918, *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools*; 1923, *Educational Pamphlets No. 37, Report on the Teaching of History*; 1926, The Hadow Report; 1927, *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools*; 1931, The Hadow Report; 1937, *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools.*

The value of official reports has long been recognised, holding, it has been argued, a privileged position within history of education studies.[111] In this study, interest lies in how these reports articulated particular views on the aims, content, learning theory and pedagogy of history education.

The Norwood Report's (1943) section on the teaching of school history ran to three pages. This was mainly taken up with a discussion on citizenship aims and syllabus content. There were, it stated, "internationalists" who advocated contemporary and world history who were opposed by "nationalists" who favoured a British syllabus. On this issue the Norwood Report sought a compromise by recommending to its readers the following middle way:

> That the history of Britain must remain the core of the History syllabus and to that core the history of other peoples must be organically related. Little good can come from imposing new subjects on the curriculum or adding new and separate blocks of history to the syllabus. But much good can come from the rewriting of old chapters, with perhaps greater attention paid to biography, with many omissions and such insertions of new matter as the wider outlook entails.[112]

In this passage Norwood can be seen safeguarding a national narrative while supporting moderate reform. It recommended that all students in the last year of school be taught modern history, asserting that it was only in "the Sixth Form that real historical study begins".[113]

Norwood's brief statement on source-work favoured "illustrative material" and advocated an improvement in the provision of classroom resources. It was not an expansive statement on source-work, as the following passage shows:

---

[111] G. McCulloch, *Documentary Research in Education, History and the Social Sciences* (Routledge Falmer, 2004), p. 80.
[112] Norwood Report, *Curriculum and Examinations in Secondary Schools: Report of the Committee of the Secondary School Examinations Council appointed by the President of the Board of Education in 1941* (HMSO, 1943), p. 99.
[113] Ibid., p. 100.

We would emphasise the value of illustrative material. Provision should be made for the acquisition of such material and for its storing in such a way that it is easily available; for this purpose the setting aside of a room as a history room is felt by some teachers to be an advantage.[114]

Two decades later, in 1967, the Plowden Report was suffused with references to source-work. It challenged the idea that "real" history began in the sixth form and it advocated teaching disciplinary understandings during the primary stage. In the view of Plowden: "Even primary school children may begin to glimpse that history is in part created by the historian."[115]

In the following passage, the Plowden Report defends the view that students of all ages and abilities were capable of developing a disciplinary understanding of history:

That this much was worthwhile was apparent from a boy, ascertained as educationally subnormal, who looking at a culvert commented, "think what things must have flowed down that drain". The same boy turned away from a model hypocaust saying that he would rather look at the real thing.[116]

Post-war official reports are sources of rich qualitative data on the aims of history education and source-work theory set within wider discussions and debates on history education content, learning theory and pedagogy. They reflect the view from the centre of government, as do the two official handbooks on the teaching of school history selected for this study: the Board of Education's 1946 *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools* and the Ministry of Education's 1952 *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23.*[117]

---

[114] Ibid., p. 101.

[115] Plowden Report, *Children and their Primary Schools: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education* (England) (HMSO, 1967), p. 227.

[116] Ibid., p. 228.

[117] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon drew upon *official* reports and handbooks on the teaching of history. In their view post-war teachers followed official guidelines. For example, in their account of

3. History education journals and pamphlets

Three post-war journals, *History* (Historical Association), *Educational Review* (University of Birmingham) and *Visual Learning*, and the post-war pamphlet series, *Teaching of History Leaflets* (Historical Association)*,* are also drawn upon in this study. In this study it was important to include theoretical or academic writing on the teaching of history in schools in order to counter "Great Tradition" and "Golden Age" accounts that portray post-war history education as an intellectual vacuum devoid of theoretical content. These sources question this view by demonstrating that, at this time, history education studies was a burgeoning field that reflected the meaning of history education. The journals and pamphlet series selected here were judged to have been the main outlet for this kind of writing. They represent, in academic terms, the cutting edge of post-war history education thinking.[118]

The work of Gordon Batho, Wyndham Burston and Kenneth Charlton, who held university lectureships in education, is important to this study because it seems to fit John Slater's description of "sceptical moles" pushing the boundaries of professional practice. Although the reception of this material by teachers within the "enacted" curriculum remains unclear, it is their contribution to the "proposed curriculum" and the manner in which it overlapped with handbooks that is of interest here.

The Historical Association's journal, *History*, for the period 1946–1968 yielded a total of 21 articles on school history teaching. They contained a range of interests

---

post-war history education, they drew upon the *official* HMI *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23* published in 1952. They read this as a description of what went on in post-war history classrooms. Viewing post-war history education through the lens of official sources such as *Pamphlet No. 23* is valuable but danger lies in conflating theoretical writing and actual classroom practice. See Cannadine et al., 2011, p. 14.

[118] G. R. Batho, Archive Teaching Units: An Experiment in History Teaching, *Visual Education*, August (1957), 2–3; G. R. Batho, Archive Teaching Units: The Progress of an Experiment in History Teaching, *Visual Education*, December (1958), 8–10; W. Burston, The Basis of the History Syllabus: Is Historical Knowledge Relative? *Educational Review*, 3(1) (1950), 22–36; K. Charlton, Source Material and the Teaching of History, *Educational Review*, 9(1) (1956), 57–63; M. Harrison, The Scope of Museums in Education, *Educational Review*, 7(1) (1954), 5–12.

that included: teaching school history in the Soviet Union, developing international understanding, teaching American history, bias in history, local history, social history and citizenship. A number specifically addressed source-work. Such was the case in 1968 when John Fines and Mary Price discussed the emergence of the archive teaching unit.[119] These articles evidence a range of key issues in post-war history education.

During the period 1956–1966, the house journal of the Historical Association, *History*, published 18 textbook review articles. These contain attitudes towards source-based textbook production. The Historical Association's pamphlet series *Teaching of History Leaflets* is drawn upon in this study when it provided evidence of post-war history education aims and source-work practices. This is the case with: *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools* by Reid and Toyne published in 1944; C. K. F. Brown's 1948 *The History Room*; Dwyer's 1964 *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools*; and M. Bryant's 1961 *The Museum and The School*.

Eleven articles that specifically focused on history education surfaced from the *Educational Review*, the journal of the School of Education, the University of Birmingham. The authors of these articles included university and college lecturers, county archivists, museum curators and history teachers. The range of issues covered by these articles was impressive. For example, Burston reflected on the nature of the history syllabus. Sargeant, Hill and Gollancz wrote on county archives. Harrison and Stevens tackled the museum and the school. Dale and Jones examined gender preferences in school history. Szreter looked at bias in historical writing. Rogers examined subject aims, Heater considered the place of contemporary history in the school curriculum and Hallam reported on logical thinking in history.

---

[119] R. R. Reid and S. M. Toyne, *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools,* Historical Association, Pamphlet, No. 128 (1944); C. K. F. Brown, *The History Room*, Historical Association, Pamphlet, No. 86 (1948); M. E. Bryant, *The Museum and the School,* Teaching of History Leaflet No. 6 (Historical Association, 1961); F. J. Dwyer, *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools,* Teaching of History Leaflet No. 11 (Historical Association, 1964); M. Price, History in Danger*, History*, 53(179) (1968), 342–7; J. Fines, Archives in School, *History*, 53(179) (1968), 348–56.

In 1956 Kenneth Charlton wrote *Source Material and the Teaching of History*. This was the standout early post-war "progressive" statement on source-work pedagogy. Gordon Batho published three articles in 1957, 1963 and 1964 on teaching with archive units for the journal *Visual Education*, which augment his 1962 Institute of Education handbook statement. These post-war history writings will be the subject of more detailed description and analysis in subsequent chapters.

4. The Times Educational Supplement (TES)

During the post-war period the *Times Education Supplement (TES)* reported intermittently on matters relating to school history teaching. Researching the *TES* series 1945-1968 on microfilm in the Newsam Library and Archives, Institute of Education, produced 101 items on the teaching of history. This consisted of 9 book reviews; 29 feature articles; 25 conference reports, 37 items of correspondence, and 1 special supplement.

This collection contained a range of viewpoints. This was most evident in the correspondence, but also in the conference reporting and on major issues differences of opinion were expressed. Under the editorship of Walter James, during the 1950s, a conservative stance was taken in feature articles on the nature and purpose of school history teaching. This favoured the view that school history should be taught differently to a small elite. School history was presented as a literary subject and its purpose was said to be the transmission of a common culture and a moral guide to action. An important part of this was to ensure that the lower classes were educated in a different way. In 1960, the *TES* expressed the view:

> Obviously it is not at all the same thing to teach history to secondary modern children as it is to teach it to gentlemen preparing to enter the university.[120]

---

[120] *TES*, February 19, 1960.

Although the *TES*'s editorial stance contributed a conservative viewpoint, its reporting of national and international history education events featured both conservative and progressive perspectives. Representations of national and international history education events focused upon a need to modernise school history. In this vein, in 1963, the historian J. H. Plumb declared:

> history is at the crossroads, it must either adapt itself to the needs of society or retreat into social triviality.[121]

Some *TES* reporting of school history reflected a reformist agenda that addressed educational aims and syllabus content. Topics covered included: international textbook reform, bias in school history and the teaching of world history; teaching international understanding; teacher training; combined history and geography courses and general studies; teaching history to the "non-academic" student; teaching modern history that fostered understanding of the contemporary world; as well as public examination reform at all levels.

The *TES* letters pages occasionally commented upon the use of primary source material in the teaching of history. One letter, in particular, catches the eye. Writing in November 1965, its author, A. M. Dyer, advocated teachers take a disciplinary approach to source-work. He wrote:

> Sir, letters have appeared in your columns during recent weeks regarding the content of the history syllabus and to a man your correspondents support the idea that what is required is a shift in content away from England, into Europe, if not the rest of the world.
>
> This is indeed depressing for it would seem to represent the only attempt at constructive thinking presently being made about a new approach to history teaching. It is of course utterly misguided.

---

[121] *TES*, October 25, 1963.

The most exhilarating development in education today is the widespread recognition of the decisive part that creative enterprise on the part of the pupil can play in his own development, linked with the realization that teachers must go to the sources and first principles of their subject, rather than content themselves with dishing out pre-digested second explanations. The only teachers to have made no headway at all in this direction are history teachers, who are still wedded to the notion there is somewhere a corpus of knowledge that every schoolboy ought to have some kind nodding acquaintance with, and that this is called history. It is a concept that results in a great deal of superficiality, and a great deal of boredom. To substitute Europe and the World for England does not radically change this situation for the better; in fact it probably makes it worse for the area of knowledge to be covered will be increased, and therefore the treatment must be that much the more superficial, and that much more pernicious.

The real challenge before the history teacher is to evolve an approach to the subject which will make creative demands of those studying it, train them in the genuine historical process of research, and bring them face to face with original source material. The great cry of the advocates of recent world history is "relevance". If history teachers can bring themselves to face the fact that the only thing that is really relevant at all levels of schooling below the sixth form is the approach to knowledge, and not in the first place knowledge itself, then, there would indeed be some hope for pupils studying school history could say goodbye to the boredom so often associated with the subject, and experience the personal satisfaction that more imaginative teachers in other fields are giving to their pupils.

A.M. Dyer, 21 Garrard Road, Banstead, Surrey, November 1965.[122]

In the context of the research concerns of this study the Dyer letter is significant. In part, this is due to its timing. Written in 1965, Dyer's argument that post-war

---

[122] *TES*, November 15, 1965.

history education was in a state of crisis and required radical reform predates Mary Price's article "History in Danger" and the "crisis of 1968" by four years. Dyer's robust advocacy of replacing knowledge transmission with a form of disciplinary history predates the Schools Council History Project's "revolution" by seven years. The Dyer letter supports Richard Aldrich's contention that prior to 1968 there had been some history educators, how many is unclear, who had been committed to taking a disciplinary approach. It suggests that John Slater was also correct in his judgement that there had been at this time "sceptical moles" challenging what he termed the "inhertited consensus".

The letter reveals something about the nature of post-war history education debates. Dyer suggests that these were largely governed by the content question, that is, the choice of what "corpus of knowledge" to transmit. The letter shows that at this time there were some, (again, how many is unclear) who were thinking about the immediate future of history education in *non-content* terms. Adopting a disciplinary position, Dyer replaced knowledge transmission with going "to the sources and first principles of the subject", insisting that all students be trained "in the genuine historical process of research".

The reporting on post-war national and regional history education conferences also indicates an active and concerned community of practice. In January 1963, the archivist A. C. Edwards spoke at a conference promoting local source material:

> Every County should have copies of its old documents made for circulation to schools and documents which are interesting to look at should be photographically reproduced, suggested Mr A.C. Edwards, a former teacher and an Essex archivist, at the London University Institute of Education on Tuesday.

> He was speaking to members of the London History Teachers Association on the use of local evidence in the teaching of history.

Local evidence was of three kinds, Mr Edwards told the Association. He showed photographic slides of Churches in Somerset and Essex to demonstrate the first category, three-dimensional evidence which stayed put. The amount of information which children could collect from a close look at tombstones, building materials and even graffiti on old church stone was surprisingly large and had endless follow up possibilities. Three dimensional evidence which had not stayed put might be investigated in local museums of which many more were needed. Documentary evidence could readily be made available to school children at county offices and Mr Edwards had brought along two medieval documents to prove his point that more was shown in them than was seen at first sight.[123]

The report indicated again that the use of source material was a matter that interested post-war teachers. It further showed that at this time teachers attended formal meetings to discuss and share practice. In this case, an institutional alliance was being forged between the Essex Record Office, the London Institute of Education and the London History Teachers Association.

The *TES* reports suggest that the influence of the London Institute of Education on source-work was growing during the late 1950s and early 1960s. For example, at a conference held at the London Institute of Education in March 1963, W. H. Burston similarly argued that historical imagination and judgement could be nurtured using "brief extracts from contemporary sources".[124] In October 1963, Miss M. E. Bryant, addressing a conference held at the Institute of Education, discussed the use of contemporary written sources.[125]

During the period 1965–1968, a number of reports promoted the use source material in the classroom. John West, in January 1965, presented a case for the use of archive teaching units likening history to science in that it consisted essentially of

---

[123] *TES*, January 25, 1963.
[124] *TES*, March 18, 1963.
[125] *TES*, October 18, 1963.

evidence rather than facts.[126] In November 1965, Martin Booth suggested that the reform of school history should begin with the analysis of the nature of the discipline.[127] In April 1968, the *TES* published a five-page "special supplement" on school history teaching.[128] One of the essays in this supplement discussed at length the place of source materials in the classroom.

5. Classroom resources: textbooks, sourcebooks and archive teaching units

Post-war handbooks suggest that across the post-war period teachers had available to them an improving supply of published primary source material. In 1962, Gordon Batho reported that post-war classroom teachers were better placed to access source material than their pre-war predecessors.[129] Guides to resources include: filmstrips, films, gramophone records, radio, television, textbooks, museum loans, postcards, sourcebooks, and archive teaching units. This study drew upon three classroom resource types: the textbook, sourcebook and the archive teaching unit.

Post-war textbooks, sourcebooks and archive teaching units were selected on the basis of their disciplinary concerns. The criterion that guided this selection was very specific. Interest was in teaching resources that used primary sources to convey the discipline of history.

The selection is guided by the lists of resources in post-war handbooks and by review articles published in the Historical Association's journal *History.* Post-war textbook authors selected include: Marjorie Reeves, *The Medieval Town*, and *The Medieval Village* from Longman's, *Then and There* series, published in 1953; R. J. Unstead's textbook, *Looking at History Britain from Caveman to the Present Day,* first published in 1955; De Beer's sourcebook, *English History in Pictures: Stuart Times,* also published in 1955; Harrison and Wells' sourcebook, *Picture Source Book*

---

[126] *TES*, January 16, 1965.
[127] *TES*, November 26, 1965.
[128] *TES*, April 20, 1968.
[129] G. Batho, Sources*.* In Burston and Green, 1962, p. 97. See also J. Fines, Archives in School*, History*, 53 (1968), 348–56.

for Social History: Early Nineteenth Century, published in 1957; I. Richards' textbook,

Britain Under the Tudors and the Stuarts, published in 1958; C. F. Strong's textbook,

Early Man and the First Nations, published in 1962; Price and Mather's textbook, *A Portrait of Britain under the Tudors and Stuarts*, published in 1966; and the archive teaching unit produced by the University of Newcastle upon Tyne under the general editorship of J. C. Tyson in 1968, *Coals from Newcastle: Archive Teaching Unit.*

Marsden has suggested that a shift in history textbook pedagogy occurred during the first three-quarters of the twentieth century. During this period, he argues, "teacher-centred", text-heavy textbooks were supplanted by "child-centred" pictured texts.[130]

It is important to recognise that the classroom resources selected for this study embody theoretical positions on source-work practice. They make choices over the type, number and size of the sources to be included and the role they perform.

The post-war classroom resources selected for analysis in this study contain written and pictorial source materials that approach source-work in different ways.[131] The analytical focus is upon the role that sources play within texts; the degree to which their provenance and context is revealed or hidden; and the extent to which the tasks and exercises that accompanied sources make demands on students' historical knowledge and understanding.

It is important to note that the sources discussed in this chapter do not cover all that was available.[132] Furthermore, there is a danger that they mislead by implying that post-war history education's only mode of expression was the printed word in published form – the handbook, newspaper article, pamphlet, journal article and

---

[130] W. E. Marsden, *The School Textbook: Geography, History and Social Studies* (Woburn Press, 2001).
[131] Pickles examines secondary school student engagement with source material. In E. Pickles, How Can Students' Use of Historical Evidence be Enhanced? *Teaching History*, 139 (2010), 41–51.
[132] R. Aldrich and D. Dean, The Historical Dimension. In R. Aldrich (ed.) *History in the National Curriculum* (Kogan Page, 1991); I. Goodson, *The Making of Curriculum Collected Essays* (Falmer Press, 1988); R. Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Education Politics* (Cassell, 1998).

school textbook. Throughout the post-war period the *Times Educational Supplement* reported on national and regional history teacher conferences where professional discussion found expression in the spoken word. The *TES* summarised a number of conference findings and it can be assumed that minutes were kept of meetings. However, the full import of these conferences was unrecorded and in most cases lost.[133]

The sources drawn upon in this study do not represent everyone who contributed to the development of post-war "proposed" history education. There was not enough time to include, for example, the field of post-war history education audiovisual resourcing, including radio, music, filmstrip, film and television.[134] This is an area of major importance that warrants a separate study. Similarly, it was beyond the scope of this study to research the archives of public examination boards.[135] Intriguingly, handbooks provide evidence that examination boards during the post-war period discussed source-based coursework and source-based examination papers.[136]

It was also not within the scope of this study to fully examine the contribution that post-war teacher training courses made towards shaping the discourse on what school history source-work teaching ought to be.[137] The minutes of the London Institute of Education Standing Sub-Committee on History show that during the post-war period regular meetings were held to discuss the content of history education teacher training courses and this included the use of source materials.[138] These omissions serve to underscore the complexity of post-war history education and its layered output, be it printed or otherwise.

---

[133] Meetings notes for the Standing Committee History IOE, IOE Library Historical Collections.
[134] Burston and Green, 1962, pp. 68–74; D. Crook, School Broadcasting in the United Kingdom: An Exploratory History, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 39(3) (2007), 217–26.
[135] See School Examinations IOE online catalogue: www.oie.ac.uk/services/45252.
[136] IAAM, *The Teaching of History in Secondary School*s (Cambridge University Press, 1965), pp. 103–18.
[137] IOE archive, University of London, Institute of Education Handbooks ULIE1/; IOE archive, Regulations and Syllabuses for the Teachers Certificate ULIE 2/.
[138] Papers of the Standing Sub-Committee on History 1949–1959. IOE Archive. These are briefly discussed in Chapter ten.

Handbooks, official reports, journal articles, pamphlets, the *TES* and classroom resources are used in chapters five to eleven of this study to examine diversity and change in post-war history education aims. The sources selected for this study, it will be shown, challenge the view that post-war history education was uniform and unchanging. They provide this study with a body of qualitative source material that reflect the multiple and changing viewpoints of a group of post-war history education professionals. They point to a level of activity that bridged government policy at the centre to classroom practice at the local level. In chapters five to eleven, it is argued, this middle tier of activity provides a fresh perspective on the nature of post-war history education.

Chapter Three

Approaches to Source-work A Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

This purpose of this theoretical chapter is to unpack the concept "source-work": a necessary preliminary task for a study such as this, which is concerned with different post-war approaches towards the use of primary source materials in the "proposed" curriculum. It acknowledges that a range of approaches to source-work existed at this time and goes on to construct a conceptual framework that enables the study to discuss differences between them. This chapter examines, then, the different meanings that leading history education writers, in the past and the present, have attached to source-work.

In the first part of the chapter, three post-war writers illustrate variations in practice, they are: Marjorie Reeves' (1953) *The Medieval Village*; Molly Harrison's (1954) *Learning Out of School*; and R. J. Unstead's (1956) *Teaching History in the Junior School*.

Differences in approach are further explored in the second part, which examines how contemporary history educators viewed source-work. This demonstrates how source-work, within contemporary history education, is a highly contentious issue.

In the third part, attention turns to the research literature on students' understanding of historical evidence to assemble a continuum of source-work practices. Peter Lee and Denis Shemilt's sensitivity to shifts between different

approaches provides this study with a conceptual language with which to discuss diversity and change in post-war writing on source-work in Part Two of the study.[139]

The chapter begins by examining what nineteenth-century writers referred to as the "catechistic" approach to teaching history. In this question and response approach to teaching, students memorised "important" facts about the past. This is viewed from the point of view of post-war history education writers who strongly opposed it. It was their attitude towards catechistic teaching that, in part, explains their fascination with source-work.

The post-war history of history education

Opposition to rote learning was a recurring theme in post-war history education writing. The post-war writers examined for this study associated it with outdated nineteenth-century practices that were the antitheses of good teaching and they admonished teachers who practised it. The post-war narrative of the development of history education from the nineteenth century to 1960 pitted an older tradition grounded in memorising facts against a newer tradition that advocated a personal, imaginative engagement with stories. The post-war writers selected for this study saw themselves as "progressive" and found space in their texts to poke fun at nineteenth-century writers, such as Richmal Mangnall.[140] They saw themselves following in the steps of a "modernising" tradition that from the late nineteenth century had gradually reformed the teaching of school history and kept pace with the needs of a changing society.

---

[139] A. K. Dickinson, A. Gard and P. J. Lee, Evidence in History and the Classroom. In A. K. Dickinson and P. J. Lee (eds) *History Teaching and Historical Understanding* (Heinemann, 1978); D. Shemilt, Adolescent Ideas about Evidence and Methodology in History. In C. Portal (ed.) *The History Curriculum for Teachers* (Falmer Press, 1987); P. J. Lee and D. Shemilt, A Scaffold not a Cage: Progression and Progression Models in History, *Teaching History*, 113 (2003), 13–23.
[140] R. Mangnall, *Historical and Miscellaneous Questions* (4th edn) (D Appeton & Co., 1856). For post-war criticism of Mangnall, see the Ministry of Education, *Teaching History Pamphlet No. 23* (HMSO, 1952), p. 7; Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools, *The Teaching of History* (3rd edn) (Cambridge, 1965), p. 2.

The post-war narrative of the development of history education foregrounded the part played by key individual history educators. It began with the "pioneering" work of Thomas Arnold at Rugby School, during the first half of the nineteenth century, and moved forward with contributions from Joshua Fitch, James Bryce, M. W. Keatinge, F. C. Happold and M. V. C. Jeffreys.[141] These writers were said to be innovative, experimental and offered an alternative to rote learning. Sir Henry Marten, history master at Eton College and leading inter-war historian of history education and the source of much post-war thinking about the development of history education, struck a positive note when he suggested:

> We have seen, then, that in the last hundred years since the time of Dr Arnold, and even during my own life time of sixty years, there have been changes in the position of history both in universities and schools which amount to a Revolution.[142]

Marten's narrative concentrated on Eton, Harrow and Rugby, where he traced the emergence of history education as a separate school subject during the nineteenth and early twentieth century. This was his "revolution". In an essay published in 1957, commemorating the bicentenary of the Historical Association, A. C. F. Beales, the post-war history educator, concurred with Marten that, during the first half of the twentieth century, history education had during the first half of the twentieth century undergone considerable development. Importantly, Beale's narrative discussed developments in the state sector; he wrote:

---

[141] The post-war narrative of history education is found in C. H. K. Marten, *On the Teaching of History and other Addresses* (Basil Blackwell, 1938). Marten's influence is seen in the Ministry of Education's *Teaching History Pamphlet No. 23* (HMSO, 1952); A. C. F. Beales, Fifty Years of Historical Teaching. In *The Historical Association 1906–1956* (Historical Association, Wyman and Sons, 1957); IAAM, *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools* (Cambridge University Press, 1965).
[142] C. H. K. Marten, *On the Teaching of History and other Addresses* (Basil Blackwell, 1938), p. 47. Marten's book includes: a 49-page essay on the history of history education, as well as essays on the teaching of history; fairness in textbooks; the content of history in schools; what may a boy learn from the study of history? and some practical hints for the youthful historian. The Ministry of Education drew on Marten's historical narrative of history education in its 1952 pamphlet *Teaching History* (see p. 8).

Nothing is more striking in any study of this half-century, than the contrast between the stereotyped attitude to content and method then, and the almost infinite flexibility in both today. It is a major revolution; and it has gone on, manifestly, from the time when history at last came into its own, in the Fisher era of multiplied secondary schools and the Advanced Courses after 1918.[143]

For a number of post-war authors, the development of history education during the first half of the twentieth century involved two traditions: "traditional" rote learning and "progressive" creative engagement. Many post-war writers liked to contrast the "dullness" of rote learning with the "vividness" of approaches that engaged students imaginatively around storytelling.

In 1950, eighteen years before the publication of Mary Price's article "History in Danger", the IAAM argued that the future of history education in state schools was endangered. The IAAM thought that they were living in an age in which older traditional certainties were passing away. For them, recent events had cast a long questioning shadow over the purpose of history education. In 1950, the IAAM reflected:

The course of modern history, from the great depression of the early 1930s to the catastrophe of the 1940s has created a world utterly different from that of 1925, and has radically affected the outlook of most thinking people. Those of us whose work is to teach history in the schools are in some ways peculiarly aware of this change. We have felt acutely the need for a reinterpretation of our own approach to the past; we have watched history being made at a bewildering pace at Coventry, in Stalingrad and above all in Hiroshima.[144]

Post-war writers thought that significant developments in history education were underway during the post-war period itself. The Ministry of Education's handbook

---

[143] Beales, 1957, p. 101. A. C. F. Beales was a lecturer in the History of Education at King's College London and executive editor of the *British Journal of Educational Studies*.
[144] IAAM, 1950, preface, p. xiii.

Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23, first published in 1952, represented post-war history education as unstable and changing. It reported that alongside the traditional "outline" approach, still widely practised, were alternative approaches, recently developed, such as studies in development and studies in depth, which invited a personal and imaginative engagement with history.[145]

The post-war writers, with whom this study is concerned, were united in their opposition to the rote learning of facts and dates, as a stand-alone approach to teaching history. They thought it failed to capture the interests and fire the imagination of students, which they thought was a prerequisite for learning. What they meant by the "dullness" of rote learning is illustrated in the following passage from the work of the nineteenth-century author Richmal Mangnall, a writer selected for ridicule by the IAAM:

> Name the principal events in the time of William the Conqueror? The battle of Hastings, fought between William and Harold when the latter was killed; Doomsday Book compiled, the curfew bell established, sheriffs appointed, the New Forest in Hampshire laid out … and the feudal law introduced. What was Doomsday Book? An account of the value of every man's estate, the number of servants and cattle upon it. What was the Curfew bell? A bell ordered to be rung every night at eight o'clock, when the English were to put out their fire and candle. What was meant by the Feudal Laws? Estates held by this law were occupied by men who were obliged to assist the master of the estates, engage in his quarrels, and do him other actual services; these men paid no rent: in process of time, this law was so much abused, that when a gentleman sold his estate, the farmer who lived upon it, his children and stocks of cattle, were also sold. When was the custom of beheading introduced? By William the Conqueror: musical notes were also invented in this reign by a

---

[145] Ministry of Education, *Teaching History* (1952), pp. 5–19.

Frenchman: the English were in general at this time illiterate, rude, and barbarous.[146]

Mangnall claimed that her catechistic method of closed question and response would awaken a reader's curiosity about the past.[147] It is difficult to gauge the effect a passage such as this had on young nineteenth-century learners. It is safe to conclude that for Mangnall engagement with sources was not an aim.[148] Beyond such brief mentions, her work contains no visual or written sources or any references to the nature of historical enquiry. It is dominated by "remarkable events" and "important historical personalities". For Mangnall, history was a received body of knowledge to be recited and recalled, quite literally a catechism.

A very different approach to that of Mangnall is seen in the work of the post-war history educator Marjorie Reeves. In her school history reader, *The Medieval Village,* first published in 1953, she took a position that avowedly opposed rote learning. Significantly, she made the use of primary source materials integral to her aims.[149] She sought to develop students' understanding of the past through a narrative approach that referenced primary source materials in pictures and short extracts. One of her principal aims was to develop in students an appreciation that valid knowledge of the past was grounded in primary source research. On the first page, she invited her readers to reflect upon history as a discipline. She wrote:

Every fact in this book comes from some record written at the time the book is describing; nothing has been invented in these pages, which seek to be a

---

[146] R. Mangnall, *Historical and Miscellaneous Questions* (4th edn) (D Appeton & Co., 1856), p. 98.

[147] Ibid.,, preface.

[148] For the aims of Victorian history education, see V. Chancellor, *History for their Masters* (Adams and Dart, 1970), pp. 139–42.

[149] *The Medieval Village* (1953) was the first title in the Then and There series of history books for schoolchildren. Between 1953 and 1980, *The Medieval Village* went through seventeen impressions. From 1931 to 1938, Marjorie Reeves was lecturer in history at a Camberwell teacher training college, before taking up a post as tutor in history at St Anne's College, Oxford. From 1953, she was managing editor for Longman's Then and There series. See Ruth Deech, *The Guardian*, 13 December 2003, at: www.guardian.co.uk/news/2003/dec/13/guardianobituaries.highereducation. In 1955, Reeves published a defence of the critical pursuit of academic knowledge in *Three Questions in Higher Education* (Hazen Foundation, 1955). For a later statement on her position, which strongly opposes the rote learning of history, see M. Reeves, *Why History?* (Longman, 1980).

true record of the life and thought of people who themselves lived in medieval villages. What they wrote are original sources to which historians have to go back for their information. If you want to write a historical play or novel, see if you can take your detail exactly and accurately from original sources.

In the same way every picture in this book is based on a drawing made by someone who lived then and there. You will find out more about these original sources and pictures by reading pages 83 and 84.

By studying what people said in word and picture about themselves, you will come to feel at home in one "patch" of the history of the past and really live with the group of people as they thought and worked. And gradually you will be able to fill in more patches of history.[150]

Reeves thought it important that students appreciate that historical knowledge was only valid when grounded in source materials. This involved becoming acquainted with the disciplinary question, how is the past known? Reeves went further, students should, she thought, work with primary historical materials to form their own independent judgements. Addressing a young readership, perhaps 11–12 years of age, she challenged the view that teaching the discipline be postponed until age 16. She thought it essential that *all* students had an appreciation of "how do we know?" and learned to distinguish between historical accounts grounded in primary source research and literary accounts that were not.

Visual and written primary sources saturated the main body of her text and in an appendix, she provided introductions to psalters, court rolls, account rolls, costumals and wills. In the section Things To Do, she invited students to actively engage with sources in groups and as individuals. In the following passage, her enthusiasm for investigation is clearly conveyed:

---

[150] Reeves, *The Medieval Village,* 1953, p. vi.

Go and explore your parish church. Find out when it was built. Is it older or newer that the parish church at Westwood? Find out if it has any of these in it: a nave, a chancel, a belfry, a north aisle, a south aisle, transepts, wall paintings, stained glass windows, ancient tombs.[151]

Reeves provided her readers with twenty-eight tasks. Some called for the extraction of simple factual information; others employed sources as a stimulus for picture and model making, and some were creative writing activities set around an imaginary conversation, story or song. Group tasks included making a loom, organising a May Day Festival and mounting a historical exhibition. Reeves' approach to source-work displayed considerable diversity, a theme that is followed up in Part Two of this study.

A strong opposition to rote learning combined with advocacy of source-work is also found in the work of Molly Harrison.[152] Her museum education guide, *Learning Out of School*, published in 1954, presented the case for an affective response to primary source materials. Harrison's aim differed from the "how do we know?" question that had fascinated Reeves. Harrison, instead, was concerned with sensitivities, the imagination and feelings. She asserted that source-work had:

---

[151] Reeves, 1953, p. 87.

[152] M. Harrison, *Learning Out of School* (ESA, 1954). Following her training at Avery Hill teacher training college, Molly Harrison taught in schools in and around London, including one in Shoreditch in the late 1950s. She worked alongside Marjorie Quennell, as curator of the Geffrye Museum, East London, from 1946 to 1969. Gene Adams, who worked with Harrison, recalled: "When I first arrived at the Geffrye in 1959, I was shocked by the poverty of the children who flocked in on Saturdays and during school holidays. As it had remained open all through the war, Harrison must have been only too aware of the suffering and privation undergone by local people. But under her influence, the museum soon became their children's much loved club and playground, and gave them much practical assistance. A typical Saturday would find children of all ages spreadeagled on the floors, eagerly hunting for clues, fitting together jigsaw puzzles, educational toys and guessing games - while the museum hummed like a beehive all round them. Everything was made to teach, but disguised as fun. Painting and modelling were done in the art room, and there was a wonderful little pottery." See Gene Adams, *The Guardian*, 23 August 2002,
at: www.guardian.co.uk/news/2002/aug/23/guardianobituaries.obituaries1?

a social as well as an aesthetic value, and as a means towards greater understanding, wider sympathies and increased visual delight, in fact towards the creation of better and more sensitive people.[153]

Harrison argued that museum sources should be used to develop "the whole personality" of the child through the refinement of the senses. Her source-work goals were tied to social and personal development rather than with disciplinary understandings. Historical sources were, she thought, a means to cultivate in students a sense of wonder and delight in being in the world. She did not discount disciplinary concerns altogether as they might arise as a consequence of her main goal, the refinement of "sensitivity, of awareness, of imaginative identification".[154] In this she sought to counteract what she saw as the desensitising effects of modern urban living. Post-war urban children had, she thought, lost their sense of wonder, their belief, as she put it, "in fairies at the bottom of the garden".[155]

Central to her approach was the proposition that the aesthetic properties of sources awaken in students a sense of wonder and delight. It was an approach that sought to engage with feelings "far removed from words or conscious thought". Source-work was for her a deeply personal encounter far removed from fact-based approaches. She wrote:

> There is a fundamental principle involved here. What do we expect a boy or girl to GET from a museum visit? Facts? Figures? Lumps of information? .... Surely not. Rather, do we hope to sow a tiny seed of interest, to give them the idea that museums are places where beautiful and interesting things are to be seen and to which they will want to return on their own? We hope to introduce them to magic of one kind or another, and we know that, though

---

[153] Harrison, 1954, p. 44.
[154] Ibid., p. 8.
[155] Ibid.

94

indeed words have their magic, it is a rare child who senses it as readily as he reacts to the visual magic of the real thing seen, or the picture made.[156]

It was essential, Harrison thought, that the experience of engaging with source-work was pleasurable. Her starting point was with the five senses and the imagination. Sources were aesthetic objects that contained what she termed the "gosh" factor. At their most effective they engendered wonder. Sources, therefore, were valued for their intrinsic aesthetic properties rather than as sources of historical evidence. It was, she thought, their beauty that thrilled and inspired.

Harrison, like Reeves, practised an active source-work pedagogy that favoured creative, expressive tasks and activities. She was, of course, in a position to exploit the museum space in ways not open to Reeves. This approach placed a greater weight of importance on visual learning and direct contact with sources. She summarised this as seeing, handling and responding. Harrison's source-work pedagogy began with looking and drawing. She argued that the act of drawing the source enhanced looking and thereby deepened appreciation. Refined looking deepened the encounter, making it a contemplative experience "far removed from words or conscious thought".

Harrison's source-work was a physical encounter. On this she wrote:

They will be thrilled if they can try on a hat or a jacket, carry a sword, work a spinning wheel, strike a note on some strange musical instrument from a far-away land.[157]

Her tasks elicited an imaginative response. In one challenging, open-ended exercise she invited students to:

---

[156] Harrison, 1954, p. 34.
[157] Ibid., p. 28.

Imagine yourself a boy or girl of the early 17th century visiting this room for the first time. You would see many things, which would surprise you. Make a list of them. Why would they seem strange?[158]

Reeves and Harrison shared an enthusiasm for creative source-work activities. Both advocated writing and picture making that called for an imaginative response. How they defined their aims and framed their conceptions of source materials was, however, very different. Reeves promoted elements of disciplinary source-work that posed the question "how do we know?" Students were made aware that historical knowledge was grounded in primary source research. Harrison's interest was with the aesthetic properties of source materials and their power to provoke a personal response.

The third and final post-war writer to be examined in this section on variations in post-war source-work is Robert J. Unstead. The intended audience for his handbook *Teaching History in the Junior School* was non-specialists working with younger children aged 7–12 years.[159] Published in 1956, Unstead's text included a statement on the aims of school history, a four-year syllabus, and suggestions on teaching methods. He referenced Reeves and Harrison and, in general terms, approved of their approaches to source-work. Yet, in some ways, his approach to source-work differed from theirs. It was his use of sources to support narrative exposition which he tied to moral education that set him apart.

Unstead was critical of what he termed the "legacy of dullness", which he associated with "traditional history" and by which he meant the rote learning of dates, kings, battles and causes. He shared with Reeves and Harrison an enthusiasm for "active" approaches to source-work including dramatisation, picture making and

---

[158] Harrison, 1954, p. 57.
[159] R. J. Unstead, *Teaching History in the Junior School* (A & C Black, 1956). Robert John Unstead was a teacher (1936–1940) and then headmaster (1947–1957) at the Grange Primary School, Letchworth Garden City, Hertfordshire. He authored the school textbook series *Cavemen to Vikings* (1953), *The Middle Ages* (1953), *Tudors and Stuarts* (1954), *Queen Anne to Elizabeth II* (1955). These were combined into one volume, *Looking at History* (1955), followed by *People in History* (1957) and *A History of Houses* (1958).

model making. He thought, like them, that it was important to appeal to the interests of students. His approach to these shared goals was different in the way it combined biography with narrative outline to serve moral education.

Unstead thought that the principal aim of school history was to set before students a moral standard to which they might aspire. Studying biographies of "great" men and women in history would, he thought, make an important contribution to the civic wellbeing of the nation by helping to create virtuous citizens. On this point he wrote:

> Our children are more likely to grow into citizens of the kind of race that, in our better moment, we know ourselves to be, if they have been made aware of the qualities of men and women whom successive generations have admired.[160]

The virtues that he thought citizens should possess were honesty, courage, mercy and loyalty. He argued that school history would most effectively deliver them through historical biography. Figures such as Scott, Drake, Bruce and Churchill, he suggested, exemplified tenacity, while Barnado, Fry and Shaftesbury personified compassion. Bunyan and the Pilgrim Fathers, he thought, modelled persistence of faith. He insisted that Alfred, King of Wessex "must be presented to children as the hero-king of all time".[161] He underlined the importance of studying heroic individuals in *People in History*, published in 1957. In the following passage, he made it central to a child's personal development as well as to their history education. He wrote:

> Every age has its heroes who stir the imagination and shape the lives of ordinary people. For a child in particular, tales of heroism and adventure, of

---

[160] Unstead, 1956, p. 3.
[161] Ibid., p. 25.

high courage and achievement, are an important and essential part of his development, as well as his first introduction to history.[162]

Unstead's syllabus was an outline narrative of the nation's history. It was, he thought, a narrative structure that matched closely what students were interested in and were capable of understanding. History was, he asserted, "the story of people through the ages".[163] British history should be favoured, he reasoned, because it was the history of "our own people".[164] Although history was mainly about the stories of particular men and women, he insisted that it was important to place them within a social context. His syllabus placed inspirational figures centre stage but also included how ordinary people lived, worked and travelled.

Unstead thought that the key to a revival of school history lay in narration. He maintained that there was "no better way of learning than to listen to their teacher tell a good story".[165] Storytelling as moral instruction was, he thought, an approach that would engage students and thereby reinvigorate history teaching. In the following passage, he made the case for school history as a dramatic narrative peopled by a cast of heroes. This is what his version of a reinvigorated post-war history education would have looked like. Unstead wrote:

> If any understanding of the Middle Ages in Britain is to be achieved, we cannot leave out the stories of William I, Becket, and Richard Coeur de Lion, for they personify kingship, the Church and the Crusader, all dominant ideas in men's minds. The great patriots who resisted Edward I, Llewellyn, Wallace and Bruce must also have a place. There is compassion in the story of Queen Philippa at Calais, mediaeval warfare at Agincourt, the anger of the peasant in

---

[162] R. J. Unstead, *People in History: From Caractacus to Alexander Fleming* (A & C Black, 1957).
[163] Unstead, 1956, p. 11.
[164] Ibid., p. 10.
[165] Ibid., p. 27.

Wat Tyler's story and the growth of learning and literature in the lives of Chaucer and Caxton; moreover, all are dramatic, thrilling stories.[166]

Unstead employed the dramatic narrative as a pedagogic device. He insisted that a story "well told" should be "authentic". This was for him a matter of story selection and presentation. In a key passage on source-work, he stated:

> The non-specialist teacher may wish, from time to time, to find out, or to help his children to discover, exactly what people said or did at some particular moment of the of the past …

> From sources such as these, children can hear exactly what happened when Cook's ship went aground on the Great Barrier Reef, or the very words which the prentice used to cajole customers.[167]

Source-work played an important role in Unstead's approach. He recommended that it be used to capture and stimulate students' interest at the start of a lesson or when introducing a new topic.

He suggested that teachers begin their lessons by showing the class a picture or reading aloud a source extract. This would, he thought, arouse interest and illustrate narrative. He suggested that teachers deploy artefacts, visual sources or eyewitness accounts to create the illusion of gaining direct access to the past. He drew from a narrow range of sources. Source extracts were at their most effective, he thought, when they were thrilling and dramatic. Used to illustrate an outline narrative, a well-chosen source would lend authenticity, add colour, aid memory and arouse interest.

Diversity in approach and a striving for change, in the work of Reeves, Harrison and Unstead, supports the findings of the recently conducted History in Education

---

[166] Unstead, 1956, p. 31.
[167] Ibid., p. 9.

Project, namely, that history teaching in England during the first three-quarters of the twentieth century underwent development.[168]

The work of Reeves, Harrison and Unstead's work suggests there may have been variations in teacher expertise, most particularly (although this has yet to be clearly demonstrated) between a minority of graduate specialists working in grammar schools and a majority of non-specialists working in primary and secondary modern schools – a question that is further explored in Part Two of the study. Reeves, Harrison and Unstead lend support to the History in Education Project's contention (yet to be clearly demonstrated) that a shift in curriculum content as well as pedagogic styles had occurred during the period 1900–1970 and that a tension had existed between "traditional" (teacher-centred) and "progressive" (child-centred) history teaching styles.

The view that Reeves, Harrison and Unstead contested history education is in accord with how they perceived themselves. They were drawn to source-work because they sought an alternative to the "dullness" of rote learning and because they shared a commitment to addressing the interests of students in ways that provided an imaginative and creative experience. However, it is noteworthy that in seeking to reform post-war history education, they had different understandings of what sources were and what could be gained by using them in the classroom.

Contemporary source-work debates

Recent versions of the History National Curriculum for England have promoted an enquiry approach to conducting source-work. In 2007, this was designated as "using evidence" coupled with "historical enquiry" to constitute the "processes" of "doing" history. Whilst in 2013, it was stated that students should be taught to "understand the methods of historical enquiry, including how evidence is used rigorously to make historical claims". The 2007 History National Curriculum is cited here because

---

[168] Cannadine, Keating and Sheldon, 2011, p. 7. See the website: www.history.ac.uk/history-in-education.

of the nature its explanation, which degined its terms and included a progression model of students' historical thinking. The 2013 verison retained the aim of disciplinary source-work but omitted to explain what this meant.

According to this framework, students are said to acquire knowledge and understanding while learning to conduct historical enquiry.[169] Taking this position, students are said to learn how history operates as an approach to knowledge (how do we know?) and are provided with opportunities to reflect epistemologically upon the nature of historical knowledge. This point is made clear in the following passage taken from the 2007 version:

> As they develop their understanding of the nature of historical study, pupils ask and answer important questions, evaluate evidence, identify and analyse different interpretations of the past, and learn to substantiate any arguments and judgements they make. They appreciate why they are learning what they are learning and can debate its significance.[170]

This is not the same as Reeves, Harrison, and Unstead had thought source-work to be. One difference is the level of critical demand. The National Curriculum in 2007 stated that young learners aged 5–7 were to find out:

> about the past from a range of sources of information (for example, stories, eye-witness accounts, pictures and photographs, artefacts, historic buildings and visits to museums, galleries and sites, to ask and answer questions about the past.[171]

Conducting source-work was defined as "using evidence", which was taken to mean:

---

[169] History: Programme of study for key stage 3 and attainment target, *The National Curriculum 2007*.
[170] Ibid., p. 111.
[171] History National Curriculum Key Stage 1 can be accessed online at: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100202100434/http://curriculum.qcda.gov.uk/key-stages-1-and-2/subjects/history.

Knowledge of the past is based on evidence derived from sources and depends on the questions asked and the sources available rather than making prior assumptions about the validity and reliability of the historical sources used. This includes evaluating the value and reliability of evidence by studying the provenance, purposes and language of sources.[172]

The 2007 National Curriculum measured different "levels" of understandings of "using evidence" on an eight-point scale. This, it was claimed, provided teachers with a means to measure the "progress" or "development" of students' understanding of "using evidence". According to National Curriculum guidelines for history, at level 4, information taken from sources is used as evidence to test a hypothesis. At level 5, sources are evaluated to establish evidence for a particular enquiry. At level 6, sources are evaluated to establish relevant evidence for a particular enquiry. Working with sources at level 7 required students to establish the evidence for a particular enquiry and consider issues surrounding the origin, nature and purpose of a source.[173]

The National Curriculum's approach to source-work went further than Marjorie Reeves, asking: "How do we know about the past?" and making students appreciate that knowledge of the past was based on primary sources. The National Curriculum required students, as they advance in their learning, to *use* sources as "evidence" when conducting their own historical enquiries. Compared to the three post-war writers, the 2007 version of conducting source-work was, in disciplinary terms, far more ambitious.

The disciplinary approach to source-work enshrined in the 2007 National Curriculum is an area of contention within contemporary history education.[174]

---

[172] *The National Curriculum 2007*, p. 114.

[173] Ibid., p. 102.

[174] For concerns that teaching source-work in preparation for public examinations at GCSE and A-level has become formulaic and that poorly conceived source-work assessment models have lowered standards of classroom practice, see G. Howells, Life by Sources A–F: Really Using Sources to Teach AS History, *Teaching History*, *Beyond the Exam* edition*, 128 (2007), 33–6; C. Culpin, Why We Must Change GCSE, *Teaching History*, 109 (2002), 6–10.

Rosalyn Ashby, for example, has argued that it failed to meet the standards of a disciplinary approach set down by an earlier generation of history educators. This failure, she suggested, lay in its use of the term "skills" to describe source-work learning. For Ashby, the theoretical work begun by the Schools Council History 13–16 Project during the 1970s, and subsequently developed by Rogers, Shemilt and Lee, constituted the benchmark of an authentic disciplinary source-work practice.[175] The hallmark of this approach was, she argues, its foregrounding of "evidence" as a concept, and the principal aim of source-work, she contended, was to develop students' understanding of it. Working with sources is not, in her view, a skill to be mastered in isolation but a form of conceptual understanding developed through practice.

Ashby argued that teaching "skills" rather than a concept of evidence downgrades standards of source-work practice. It marked a move away from subject-specific understandings centred on "evidence" and a move towards teaching non-subject-specific generic skills such as analysis, inference, judgement and synthesis. Generic skills, as such, were not to be discounted. They should not, she argued, be confused with or replace developing an understanding of history's second-order concepts.[176]

As well as "skills" versus "evidence" there are other points of contention surrounding contemporary source-work practice. Chris Culpin has argued that the pressures of public examinations exert an adverse effect on classroom source-work practice by introducing formulaic approaches designed to meet examination requirements. [177] Long-standing "traditionalist" demands that source-work be confined to an occasional and illustrative role have been reprised.[178] Striking a balance between source-work and storytelling, between "skills and knowledge", is

[175] R. Ashby, *Understanding Historical Evidence: Teaching and Learning Challenges*. In I. Davies (ed.) *Debates in History Teaching* (Routledge, 2011) pp 137-47.
[176] Ibid., p. 137.
[177] Culpin, 2002, pp. 6–9.
[178] For a recent call for a return to "traditional source-work", see D. Matthews, *The Strange Death of History Teaching* (2009).

an ongoing debate that lies at the heart of contemporary history education discourse.[179]

Underpinning contemporary debates are competing visions of what history education should be. Recent school history policy making has stressed the importance of core knowledge acquisition challenging approaches associated with SCHP and the 2007 History National Curriculum.[180] Contemporary debates highlight the contested role of contemporary source-work that raises fundamental questions concerning the nature and purpose of history education. Two striking features of these debates are, first, source-work is viewed as a range of activities and, second, learning source-work is viewed developmentally as a range of understandings.

The relevance of these contemporary debates to this study is that the conceptual tension between content coverage (body of knowledge) and historical processes and skills (form of knowledge), so strong within contemporary debates, are similar those that underlay post-war debates. The point has been well made by Richard Aldrich, that debates over the nature and purpose of history education have been continuous since the beginning of the twentieth century.[181]

A continuum of source-work practices

In this chapter, so far, the concept of "source-work has begun to be unpacked by examing a range of approaches taken, firstly, from the post-war period and secondly from contemporary debates. In these case's variations of approach were found. Unpacking the concept continues in this section by arranging the variety of approaches along as a continuum of practices. This continuum will form for this

---

[179] Haydn, 2004, p. 95.

[180] At time of writing the Department for Education is planning to replace the 2007 National Curriculum framework in 2014. In February 2013 it published a draft National Curriculum that rehearsed arguments over source-work associated with the Centre for Policy Studies during the late 1980s. Characteristically, it privileges substantive knowledge over concepts and skills and dramatically downplays disciplinary source-work. The draft document can be accessed online at: http://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/n/national%20curriculum%20consultation%20-%20framework%20document.pdf. The final draft was published on 11 September, 2013.

[181] Aldrich, 2003, pp. 133–43.

study a conceptual framework that can be applied in Part Two of the study to categorise post-war approaches to source-work. This theoretical framework draws on a number of leading theorists on history education source-work: M. W. Keatinge (1910); The Schools Council History 13–16 Project (1972–76); and Peter Lee (1978) and Denis Shemilt (1987).[182] These differing perspectives are discussed now.

1. M. W. Keatinge: "a training school of the mind"

The impact of M. W. Keatinge upon the development of history education was touched on in chapter one, where within the secondary literature conflicting interpretations of his significance were noted. Slater and Sylvester judged his impact upon classroom practice during the period 1910–1970 to have been limited and on this basis dismissed him as a marginal figure. In contrast, Aldrich, focusing upon Keatinge as theorist, represented him as a founding father of a disciplinary tradition and a writer of great importance.[183] In chapter two, it was noted that Keatinge was a key authority for post-war handbook authors. The authors examined for this study, as will be shown in Part Two, displayed varying degrees of sympathy for his ideas.[184] Keatinge's impact on post-war history education is discussed fully in chapter eleven. This section is concerned with his approach to source-work and how it can be used to inform a continuum of source-work practices.

---

[182] The main texts consulted were: M. W. Keatinge, *Studies in the Teaching of History* (London, A & C Black, 1910); Schools Council History 13–16 Project, *What is History? Teachers' Guide* (Holmes McDougall, 1976); Schools Council History 13–16 Project, *A New Look at History* (Holmes McDougall, 1976); A. K. Dickinson, A. Gard and P. J. Lee, Evidence in History and the Classroom. In A. K. Dickinson and P. J. Lee (eds) *History Teaching and Historical Understanding* (Heinemann, 1978); D. Shemilt, Adolescent Ideas about Evidence and Methodology in History. In C. Portal (ed.) *The History Curriculum for Teachers* (Falmer Press, 1987); P. J. Lee and D. Shemilt, A Scaffold not a Cage: Progression and Progression Models in History, *Teaching History*, 113 (2003), 13–23.

[183] Aldrich (1984, p. 211) wrote of Keatinge: "He wanted to introduce pupils to the methods of the modern scientific historian, to reduce part of the subject in schools to problem form, and to confront pupils with evidence."

[184] The three post-war texts that referenced Keatinge were: Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools, *The Teaching of History* (Cambridge University Press, 1950); K. Charlton, Source Material and the Teaching of History, *Educational Review*, 9(1) (1956), 57–63; G. R. Batho, Sources. In W. H. Burston and C. W. Green (eds) *Handbook for History Teachers* (University of London, Institute of Education, 1962), pp. 95–109.

Slater, Sylvester and Aldrich were in agreement that Keatinge's 1910 *Studies in the Teaching of History* was a seminal statement on history education source-work. Peter Lee acknowledged this when he wrote:

> The perennial debate on the appropriate role of primary source material in school history, initiated by M. W. Keatinge in 1910, has been vigorously reawakened by the protagonists of the "new" history.[185]

The case for crediting Keatinge with shaping the debate over source-work is strong. The questions that he raised in 1910 were the ones that attracted attention during the post-war period, and continue to attract attention today. He asked: Should history education be more than the transmission of facts? How can students be more actively involved in learning? What form of intellectual training can school history deliver? What role should source-work play in the development of historical thinking? What is the scope of students' historical thinking? Is the development of historical thinking age related? At what point in a student's education can they begin to engage with historical sources critically and analytically?

Keatinge presented source-work as a range of activities. He advocated an illustrative use of sources to convey "atmosphere to stimulate the imagination".[186] This contained within it a wide range of possibilities for different kinds of creative learning. Keatinge also advocated taking an intellectual approach, which he expressed in the question: *"How can history be made into a real training school of the mind?"*[187] This extended the range of possible activities yet further. As the following passage shows, his critical and analytical source-work tasks contained levels of challenge and sophistication. He wrote:

---

[185] Dickinson, Gard and Lee, 1978, p. 1.

[186] Keatinge, 1910, Chapter 4, Contemporary Documents as Atmosphere: "they have also their value as giving atmosphere and stimulating the imagination, and it is frequently legitimate to employ them mainly for this purpose and to make the reasoning that can be done in connection with them a secondary matter. When used thus the documents need not always be placed in the pupil's hands, though they are more effective when this can be done" (p. 96).

[187] Keatinge, 1910, p. 38.

These exercises may involve little more than an almost mechanical process, or they may be devised so as to make demands upon the boy's whole ingenuity. Of whatever degree they may be, they necessitate classroom apparatus widely different from the conventional textbook.[188]

Keatinge's range of activities began with sources as information to evoke an emotional or imaginative response and moved towards more and more sophisticated fields of intellectual engagement.

In *Studies in the Teaching of History* and in the textbook that Keatinge co-wrote with N. L. Frazer, *A History of England for Schools*, Keatinge provided examples of his "source method". These show that he was mindful of the need to differentiate across ages and abilities and to provide different levels of challenge and difficulty.

For the highest level of difficulty he set exercises that, in his words, made "demands upon the boy's whole ingenuity". He demanded close, multiple readings of short and long primary source extracts taken from a wide range of authors and periods. In some instances students were asked to compare two, three or four extracts. The following three examples serve to illustrate the nature and degree of challenge that Keatinge and Frazer posed. They are drawn from the section on the Norman Conquest in their textbook A *History of England for Schools.* The first example invited students to read a short extract from "Chronicles of the Conquest" and then to complete the following empathetic exercise:

Write a conversation between Duke William, a superstitious Breton lord, a greedy Angevin and a religious and scrupulous noble from Boulogne, who are considering whether they will join him or not in his expedition against England.[189]

---

[188] Ibid., p. 39.
[189] M. W. Keatinge and N. Frazer, *A History of England for Schools, with Documents, Problems and Exercises* (A & C Black, 1911), p. 378.

The next example asked students to read and compare three long extracts: from Bede's *Ecclesiastical History;* from the tenth-century *Old Irish Life of St Columba*, and from the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* by William Malmesbury. Using these sources, students were instructed to:

> Compare the lives of the clergy and monks in England at the coming of the Normans with the life led by St Columba.[190]

The third example asked students to study a long extract from a Saxon Chronicle and to use its internal evidence to gauge:

> How far do you consider that the writer of this portion of the Saxon Chronicle is fair in his statement?[191]

It has been shown that Harrison and Unstead employed sources to evoke an emotional and imaginative response in support of narrative exposition and that Reeves adopted a rudimentary disciplinary approach. Keatinge considered the imaginative and the intellectual as complementary approaches. There was, nonetheless, in his approach a sense of progression, particularly in the field of intellectual engagement, that went far beyond that suggested by Reeve.

 2. SCHP: "an activity of enquiry"

In the secondary literature, there is general agreement that the Schools Council History 13–16 Project (1972–76) epitomises a disciplinary approach to source-work.[192] In the debates over post-war history education, during the late 1980s,

---

[190] Ibid.

[191] Ibid.

[192] See for example: J. Slater, *The Politics of History Teaching: A Humanity Dehumanised?* (University of London, Institute of Education, 1989); D. Sylvester, *Change and Continuity in History Teaching 1900-93*. In H. Bourdillon (ed.) *Teaching History* (Routledge, 1994) A. Dickinson, What Should History Be? In A. Kent (ed.) *School Subject Teaching: The History and Future of the Curriculum* (Kogan Page, 2000); R. Philip, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Education Politics* (Cassells, 1998); C. Husbands, *What is History Teaching* (OUP, 1996); C. Husbands, A. Kitson and A. Pendry, *Understanding History Teaching* (OUP, 2003); A. Kitson, C. Husbands, with S. Steward, *Teaching and Learning History 11-18: Understanding the Past* (OUP, 2011); D. Cannadine, J. Keating and N.

Slater and Sylvester made the SCHP the centrepiece of their transformation narrative and Aldrich conceded that the SCHP's approach was of major significance. It was, of course, equally the decisive regressive development in the Centre for Policy Studies' narrative of decline, a back-handed compliment. The SCHP's rationale for source-work embodied what is currently understood to be the disciplinary approach to source-work.[193] It is taken here to represent what is termed a "strong" form of disciplinary source-work on the continuum of approaches to source-work.[194]

The Schools Council History 13–16 Project's 1976 *What is History? Teachers' Guide* contained an aims statement that summarised the SCHP's distinctive disciplinary approach.[195] On the continuum it represents what is termed a "strong" disciplinary position. The Schools Council History 13–16 Project's expressed its aims in the following way:

> WHAT IS HISTORY? The Aim
>
> The aim is to introduce pupils to the following ideas about history as a discipline:
>
> (i) That history is a subject about people and whatever they have said and done in the past.

Sheldon, *The Right Kind of History: Teaching the Past in Twentieth-Century England* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011).

[193] See, for example: D. Shemilt, Adolescent Ideas about Evidence and Methodology in History. In C. Portal (ed.) *The History Curriculum for Teachers* (Falmer Press, 1987), p. 40; P. Lee, Putting Principles into Practice: Understanding History. In M. S. Donovan and J. D. Bransford, *How Students Learn History in the Classroom* (National Academies National Research Council, 2001), p. 40; S. Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past* (Temple University Press, 2001), pp. 40–4; T. Haydn, J. Arthur and M. Hunt, *Learning to Teach History in the Secondary School: A Companion to School Experience* (Routledge Falmer, 2001), p. 21; K. C. Barton and L. S. Levstik, *Teaching History for the Common Good* (Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001), p. 82; A. Kitson and C. Husbands with S. Steward, *Teaching and Learning History 11-18: Understanding the Past* (OUP, 2011), p. 32.

[194] Two Schools Council History 13–16 Project publications informed the formulation of the model: *A New Look at History* (Holmes McDougall, 1976) and *What is History? Teachers' Guide* (Holmes McDougall, 1976).

[195] SCHP, *What is History? Teachers' Guide*, 1976.

(ii) That the study of history involves detective work and a search for evidence and clues about these people in the past.

(iii) That there are many different types of historical evidence (both primary and secondary sources) and this evidence has grown and changed through the ages.

(iv) That there are many problems connected with historical evidence – for it can be biased, open to differing interpretations or insufficient.

(v) That a study of people in the past involves asking questions about their actions, their motives and the consequence of their deeds.[196]

A central feature of its approach was to present school history as an "activity of enquiry".[197] This included: addressing open-ended source-based enquiry questions, receiving training in source-work methodology and reflecting upon the nature of history as a discipline. The idea of source-work as an "activity of enquiry" marking the end point of a continuum is important for this study. The SCHP claimed that it was this that set it apart from what had gone before.

The SCHP's "detective work" introduced students to the role that sources play in the construction of historical knowledge leading to an understanding that knowledge about the past is dependent upon sources and that the knowledge gained from them was not self-evident. Students learnt that there were reasons why sources should be critically evaluated and that historical knowledge was interpretative and provisional.

The content of lessons with a "strong" disciplinary approach is dependent upon the enquiry question being pursued. The SCHP's handbook, *A New Look at History,* which addressed the question of content, underlined that it was not a received body of knowledge. "Content was", the handbook stated:

---

[196] SCHP, *What is History? Teachers' Guide*, 1976, p. 4.
[197] The phrase "activity of enquiry" recurs in the SCHP's statement on aims and principles, SCHP, *A New Look at History*, 1976.

about the human past and all that men have said or undergone, so far as it can be known from the evidence which has survived.[198]

Historical content was made contingent upon the totality of sources that had survived. Through sources, the "raw material" of history, the historical past was reconstructed. Content in a "strong" disciplinary approach emphasised the variety and range of source materials available. A feature of this approach was the importance placed upon the full range and types of sources:

> Sources of history varied in kind; that they are not, as is so often assumed, only literary but that pictures, artefacts, buildings, and the very ground upon which we walk is evidence from the past.[199]

In this approach, substantive knowledge ("knowing what") was pursued and valued but was always in relation to the disciplinary approach ("knowing how"). Rejecting the view that school history was simply a coherent body of knowledge, it suggested that it would be:

> more meaningful to see history as a heap of materials which survive from the past and which historians can use as evidence about the past.[200]

If school history was an activity of enquiry, then content was something to be discovered or constructed through source-based problem solving. Content contained that which was known and that which was unknown. The past was viewed as a "foreign country" that was personal, unfamiliar and strange. It was, therefore, a place for exploration and discovery.

A characteristic of a "strong" disciplinary approach to source-work was the view that age and ability were not in themselves barriers to learning the discipline. The SCHP argued this should begin at an early stage and be accessible to all. In 1976, the

---

[198] SCHP, *A New Look at History*, 1976, p. 17.
[199] Ibid., p. 36.
[200] Ibid., p. 36.

SCHP cited Jerome Bruner in support of this point: "any subject can be taught effectively in some intellectually honest form to any child at any age of development".[201]

The governing metaphor in a "strong" disciplinary source-work pedagogy is "the historian was like a detective". This provided a distinctive source-work vocabulary that included "investigation", "reconstruction", "discovery", "clues", "findings", "reports", "evidence", "mysteries" and "explorations". The emphasis in the classroom was upon students experiencing source-work as "problem solving". This valued making personal judgements, formulating questions and drawing conclusions independently. Focus was upon developing students' historical thinking and teacher expertise lay in exercising a pedagogy that supported its development. Stress was placed upon learning collaboratively through dialogue and discussion. "Doing history" was approached as a cognitive journey.

3. Lee and Shemilt: pre-evidential and evidential source-work

Starting in the late 1970s, Peter Lee and Denis Shemilt's work has led the research on students' understanding of primary source materials. As Table 1 below shows, the distinctions that they have made provide a language with which to discuss key shifts across an illustrative to disciplinary source-work continuum. For the purposes of this study this is described as moving along a continuum from illustrative to "weak disciplinary" to "strong disciplinary" source-work.[202] As Table 1 indicates it is also referred to as moving from pre-evidential source-work thinking to evidential source-work thinking. So far in this study, it has been noted that Reeves, Harrison and Unstead operated between the illustrative to the "how do we know?' Lee describes this range on the continuum as moving towards the "weak" disciplinary and falling short of the strong disciplinary.

---

[201] SCHP, *A New Look at History*, 1976, p. 33: J. S. Bruner, *The Process of Education* (Harvard University Press, 1960).
[202] The distinction between weak and strong approaches is discussed by Dickinson, Gard and Lee, 1978.

For Lee and Shemilt the range between the illustrative and the disciplinary marked the territory of the pre-evidential to evidential source-work thinking. Understanding begins with "pre-evidential" thinking, in which, Lee explains, sources are viewed as "windows" or "pictures" which appear to afford direct access to the past.[203] In Shemilt's words, in the "pre-evidential" stage, "knowledge of the past is taken-for-granted".[204] He explains that at this point the disciplinary question, "how do we know?" simply does not arise because primary sources appear to provide authoritative textbook-like information and not potential evidence about a past that is open to being discovered. In this phase, sources appear to be fragments of information.

Lee and Shemilt state that whenever sources are employed, there is the potential for students to begin to see or appreciate them as evidence. When this occurs, this marks the critical shift from pre-evidential to evidential source-work thinking or from illustrative to "weak" disciplinary source-work. A student encountering an eyewitness testimony may, with or without the prompting of a teacher, begin to "see" or appreciate it as providing evidence about the past and that this is "how we know?" This appreciation is, Lee and Shemilt suggested, a minimal understanding that sources provide evidence for the past. Lee described this breakthrough in the following way:

> What we have here is a continuum stretching from the relatively simple and passive seeing as evidence to the complex interpretative activity of the professional historian.[205]

Beginning to see sources as evidence was, in Shemilt's words, a "dawning apprehension of what evidence is". Shemilt has written that this involves viewing eyewitness testimony as "privileged information about the past", posing the disciplinary question "how do we know?" In this understanding the past is known

---

[203] Dickinson, Gard and Lee, 1978, p. 15.
[204] Shemilt, 1987, p. 42.
[205] Dickinson, Gard and Lee, 1978, p. 15.

Table 1: A Continuum of Sourcework Practices. *This table shows markers used in this study to discuss post-war approaches to source-work.*

Illustrative (Pre-evidential)	Weak disciplinary (Moving towards evidential)	Strong disciplinary (Evidential)
The terms "past" and "history" are conflated and knowledge about the past is taken for granted.	Knowledge about the past is taken for granted but the question how the past is known begins to be discussed.	History is viewed as an activity of enquiry in which knowledge about the past is constructed. The question "how do we know?" is now central.
Viewed as conveying reliable information, primary sources are treated as "windows" that afford direct access to the past.	Knowledge about the past is known because primary sources provide reliable information about the past. Students begin to see that sources provide evidence about the past.	Students understand that knowledge about the past is dependent upon applying a methodology.
Sources are employed to support and affirm narrative story telling and are appreciated imaginatively and emotionally.	Sources are used in creative activities and to support discussion and project work.	Students learn how to use sources critically to address open-ended enquiry questions.

because eyewitnesses recorded what happened. The past still appears to speak for itself but knowledge about it is not entirely taken for granted, it is grounded in eyewitness testimony. The past is known because the people who were there can tell us about it.

From seeing sources as evidence to using sources as evidence as part of an enquiry involves learning a "method to guide the use of source materials".[206] In a "strong" disciplinary approach (such as the Schools Council History Project), "inference from evidence becomes self conscious".[207] To summarise, the hallmark of pre-evidential thinking is an inability to understand that sources provide evidence about the past. Pre-evidential thinking is an understanding that sources provide evidence about the past. The ability to draw inferences from sources is a characteristic of strong disciplinary thinking.

Lee and Shemilt reveal students' conceptual understanding of primary source materials to be fluid and developmental. They move from the pre-evidential to the evidential and from a past that is "given" to a past that is constructed. Students' understandings move in the direction of the disciplinary when the question "how do we know?" is implicit or explicit. Eyewitness testimony ceases to be a "window" when it is appreciated as the point of view of someone.

Accordingly, source-work, in this study, is viewed as a continuum of practices from "illustrative" to "weak" to "strong" source-work approaches, sketched out in the table above.[208] This is intended to signal subtle nuance and range. The literature suggests that disciplinary source-work aims are being "worked towards".[209] As Lee and Shemilt state, viewing an historical source as an "illustration" can, in cognitive

---

[206] Shemilt, 1987, p. 52.
[207] Ibid.
[208] The distinction between weak and strong approaches is discussed by Dickinson, Gard and Lee,1978.
[209] See: The Schools Council History 13–16 Project, *A New Look at History* (Holmes McDougall, 1976); Dickinson, Gard and Lee, 1978; P. Rogers, *The New History* (Historical Association, 1978); Shemilt, 1987; D. Shemilt, *History 13-16 Evaluation Study* (Holmes MacDougal, 1980); Wineburg, 2001.

terms, be an early stage in the development of a disciplinary understanding.[210] Using "disciplinary source-work" as a continuum provides this study with a helpful methodologoical and conceptual framework. It is applied throughout chapters five to eleven to discuss diversity and change in the work of post-war history education authors.

---

[210] Lee and Shemilt, 2003.

Chapter Four

Perspective and Methods

History education as a "social practice"

In this study post-war "proposed" history education is viewed from a "social practice" perspective.[211] From this perspective the focus is upon post-war writers who discussed, collaborated, interacted and published, with the intention of making sense of history education. Viewed as a "social practice" focus is upon the agency of individuals and the interaction of their ideas whilst working within institutions. The value to this study of taking this perspective is that it looks beyond generalities to particularities placing a new emphasis upon diversity and change.

A "social practice" perspective brings into view the institutional and collaborative nature of post-war history education writing. This is seen, for example, in the production of *The Teaching of History*, a handbook for teachers, first published in 1950 by the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters (IAAM), a professional association that represented the interests of teachers working in independent and grammar schools.[212] A committee of history education professionals produced this 200-page text. The text stated who the members of this committee were. The chairman was J. Gould, who taught at West Leeds High School, the vice-chairman was J. C. James from Rendcomb College, an independent school, and the secretary was C. P. Hill, who taught history at Bristol Grammar School. Nine other history teachers working in independent or grammar schools were committee members:

---

[211] Taking a "social practice" perspective was influenced by Stuart Hall's *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices* (OU, Sage, 1997).
[212] IAAM, *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools* (Cambridge University Press, 1950).

they were: C. Colegrave Scott, L. T. Daw, J. W. Hunt, A. l. Kneen, R. C. O. Leonard, E. K. Milliken, T. Molloy and R. R. Sellman.

This collaboration extended beyond the IAAM's history committee. The committee invited history teachers to write and share their views on history education. Extracts from this correspondence were included in the main body of the text. Twenty-nine correspondents were thanked by name by the committee, many of whom were leaders in the field of post-war history education.[213] In the case of the IAAM's *The Teaching of History,* over forty history educators were involved in its production.

Looked at from this perspective, the landscape of post-war history education becomes populated by named history education professionals, supported by a network of institutions who are seen, as was the case with the IAAM history committee and its wider membership, acting collaboratively (or socially) to influence the development of post-war history education. This counters the impression that is found in the secondary literature, and discussed in chapter one, that post-war teachers were "acted upon" and lacked agency.

Collaboration, interaction and an intention to develop history education can be seen in the post-war work carried out by the Historical Association, the leading professional association representing the interests of teachers of history. During the post-war period its headquarters in London was linked to a network of regional branch associations. By 1955, its membership had grown to 8,000.[214] In 1944, it published *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools*.[215] This 27-page pamphlet was the Historical Association's most comprehensive wartime statement on history education aims, content, learning theory and pedagogy. Its production was headed

---

[213] Those named were: Miss M. Reeves, Messrs A. Birtles, E. F. Bowman, J. Vincent Chapman, C. A. Coomber, R. R. Dale, R. A. Dalton, T. B. Davis, H. Greenleaves, S. E. Gunn, G. H. Hainton, F. C. Happold, W. T. Harris, L. C. Hayward, H. Lever, F. H. Mackay, F. S. Marston, S. Middlebrook, C. J. S. Mollard, C. H. C. Osborne, A. F. W Pratt, F. W. G. Ridewell, F. W. Scott, J. Scupham, W. R. Speight, C. A. Scott, F. L. Tomlinson, F. E. Watson, and P. D. Whitting.
[214] G. Stretton, A Record of the First Fifty Years. In *The Historical Association 1906–1956* (Historical Association, 1957), pp. 5–65.
[215] R. R. Reid and S. M. Toyne, *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools,* Historical Association Pamphlet, no. 128 (Historical Association, 1944).

by a committee of nine and drew on contributions from thirteen of its regional branch associations.

The teaching experience of the membership of the IAAM and the Historical Association committees had largely been confined to the independent and grammar school sectors.[216] In the case of the Historical Association's committee of nine, five had worked in grammar or independent schools and the remaining four in university departments or teacher training colleges. Four members of the committee were described as "history masters", while the others had been lecturers, teacher trainers, principals or headmasters. The social, political and cultural background of post-war history education writers is extremely pertinent to a "social practice" perspective. Who is saying what about history education, why are they saying it, and to whom are they speaking are matters that are touched upon in this study.

In another significant development from the era, work began on the University of London, Institute of Education's *Handbook for History Teachers* in May 1956; six years before it was published in 1962. [217] This, the largest single post-war collaboration, was headed by an editorial team of seven and drew on a total of 110 participants, 80 men and 30 women. The completed handbook was in two parts. The first comprised fourteen separate articles written by a specialist on aspects of history education aims, content, learning theory and pedagogy. The second drew on the expertise of the majority of participants in compiling guides to school textbooks, visual resources and select bibliographies. Its production involved lecturers and teacher trainers from over 22 institutes and colleges; schoolteachers working in 15 grammar schools; academics from 24 universities, and contributions from libraries, museums, the Ministry of Works, the Air Ministry and the Commonwealth Institute. The scale of this collaboration demonstrates a post-war history education

---

[216] Although these two texts indicate that the gender of post-war history education authors was preponderantly male, it should be noted that this was a community that provided opportunities for women to contribute. Notable examples of female post-war authors being Marjorie Reeves, Molly Harrison, Margaret Bryant, Estella Lewis and Mary Price.

[217] W. H. Burston and C. W. Green, *Handbook for History Teachers* (Methuen, 1962).

community with links connecting schools, training colleges, universities, museums and record offices.

The value of viewing post-war history education as a "social practice" is its focus upon history education as a social activity. This is seen in the production of the IAAM's *The Teaching of History*, the Historical Association's *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools*, and the Institute of Education's *Handbook for History Teachers.* This is important because there has been a tendency for the human collaborative side of post-war history education to be overlooked in representations that focus upon general features. Moving from the general to the particular, the spotlight shifts to individual history educators working collectively within institutional settings. From this perspective, history educators are placed centre stage and post-war history education takes on the appearance of having been a dynamic and actively engaged "living" tradition.

From this perspective, writers such as the IAAM's committee chairman J. Gould, its vice-chairman J. C. James and its secretary C. P. Hill bring to their writing particular experiences of the world informed by their social class, family, education, gender and ethnicity. Writers such as these are seen operating within what Peter Burke has called "communities of belief".[218] Focus is upon collective "ways of thinking", which draws attention to multiple viewpoints and subtle shades of opinion within post-war history education writing. From this perspective post-war history education writing is viewed as a social activity that continuously made and remade history education. Texts like the IAAM's *The Teaching of History* are seen, therefore, as inexorably socially constructed.

Subtle shades of opinion can be seen in the following passages from the IAAM's handbook, *The Teaching of History*, published in 1950.[219] Here, the IAAM presents a defence of source-work. It had, it argued, a vital role to play in the teaching of history:

---

[218] P. Burke, *History and Social Theory* (2nd edn) (Polity, 2005), pp. 95–6.
[219] IAAM, *The Teaching of History,* pp. 78–9.

120

Source material has a definite value in the classroom and is perhaps too often neglected. The amount of such material that can conveniently be introduced into a text-book is small, and the teacher will find it useful to have at hand some collections of source material, or still better, a growing collection of his own choice. Discrimination is essential, and the original material should be quoted only with some specific end in view.

Two main purposes are served by the use of original material. The first is the imparting of a sense of vividness and reality, as when an eyewitness of a dramatic episode is quoted, or a descriptive passage suggests a background or lends colour to a person or period. Many such excerpts will gain by being read aloud by the teacher. The use of firsthand accounts and descriptions, provided that the language is not too difficult, helps a young child to realise that history is about real people, and is not a matter of names in a book.

The second aim to which sources may contribute is the arousing of interest in the question "How do we know?" Even young children in school should be made curious about the origin of the history put before them in text-book form, and a few practical illustrations from sources are the best way of achieving this. One or two lessons devoted to this topic may be well worthwhile.

One way of employing source material may suggest itself, which is as a rule too ambitious for any but sixth-form pupils. This is the use of originals for research, comparison, or criticism. To attempt to develop critical powers by a "source method" is generally speaking, to ask the pupil to run before he can walk.[220]

In this passage the IAAM is seen contesting the nature of source-work. There were, it argued, appropriate and inappropriate ways of conducting source-work. It was suggested that for the majority of students, source-work should be used to

---

[220] Ibid., pp. 78–9.

stimulate students' interest. It ruled out as inappropriate the use of sources to teach the methods of critical source evaluation and historical enquiry. This was, however, qualified. All students, it stated, should be introduced in a limited way to the disciplinary question "How do we know?"

The IAAM, in this passage, was not proposing rote learning. This was not the "Great Tradition" or "traditional" history teaching, as is commonly understood. The IAAM made a case for using sources that engaged students' imagination and which enriched and deepened their experience of learning school history. The authority of eyewitness testimony can, it suggested, help "a young child to realise that history is about real people, and is not a matter of names in a book".

The IAAM presented a complex set of proposals that contested the nature of source-work practice. It considered both uncritical and critical approaches, discussed the availability of sources and commented upon their use in classroom and textbook. Further, it discussed the qualities that comprised an effective source and highlighted how language was a barrier to practice.

The IAAM's cautious perspective on an analytical approach to source-work sprang, in part, from a learning theory that set low expectations on what students were capable of achieving. It was this that underlay its recommendation that sources should be read to students to capture their interest. This was challenged by the proposal that students should be introduced to the question "How do we know?" This diversity is reflected in its use of disciplinary and narrative source-work vocabularies. Disciplinary terms such as "source-material", "sources", "original material", "firsthand accounts" and "eyewitness account" vie with narrative or literary terms, such as "descriptive passage", "descriptions", "excerpts" and "illustrations".

Viewing post-war history education as a "social practice" provides a way to understand the subtle connections that cut across the ideas contained within post-

war history education writing.[221] The term "traditional" history education signifies a single fixed set of ideas on the aims, content, learning theory and pedagogy. This study, taking a different perspective, focuses on diversity and change.

The post-war authors examined for this study are not considered to be representative of the post-war teaching profession as a whole. What can be said with certainty, however, is that they represent post-war history education's most articulate voices.

Methods

This study's three main research questions – Who produced post-war history education writing? What does post-war history education writing reveal about history education aims? How did authors' address the question of source-work in post-war history education? – are addressed by examining a set of post-war history education texts, discussed in chapter two. To address this study's research questions through an examination of texts, it was important to consider their authorship, purpose and audience, to establish who was saying what to whom.[222] The texts examined for this study provide a mediated view of post-war history education. [223] This means recognising that post-war authors represented and addressed different sectors of the post-war history education community.

Careful analysis of history professionals written work fulfils an aim of this study, which was to view post-war history education as a "social practice" constructed by "real" people. This will examine authors' motives, concerns and priorities to reveal the issues within post-war history education that mattered to them. An attempt is made to respect the "autonomy of the past" and to judge post-war authors on their own terms.[224] Authors' ideas were targeted, but were not judged as "correct" or

---

[221] J. Tosh, *The Pursuit of History* (Longman, 2000), p. 177.
[222] A. Marwick, *The Nature of History* (Macmillan Education, 1989); J. Tosh, *The Pursuit of History* (Longman, 2000); R. Aldrich, The Three Duties of the Historian of Education, *History of Education*, 32(2) (2003), 133–43.
[223] Tosh, 2000, p. 183.
[224] Aldrich, 2003, pp. 133–43.

"wrong". For Tosh, the "historical method" draws on a "sceptical intelligence" that respects the autonomy of the past. Accuracy is achieved, he suggested, when the researcher consciously sheds present-day assumptions and seeks to understand the past on its own terms.[225] For Evans, the "historical method" provides rules of verification that demand the researcher has "to get it right".[226] For Megill, the hallmark of a historical approach is a "care in evidence".[227] Examining audience shines a light on the reorganisation of schools following the 1944 Education Act, a key context to authors' work. This will expose differences between junior, grammar and secondary modern school audiences.

The eleven members of the committee responsible for the IAAM's handbook *The Teaching of History,* published in 1950, had worked in the grammar or independent school sector, which represented approximately 20 per cent of the school population. The IAAM claimed that its handbook addressed the needs of teachers working in secondary modern and technical schools, which were responsible for 80 per cent of the school population.

It is unlikely that those responsible for the IAAM's handbook had first-hand experience of teaching history in secondary modern schools. The IAAM's *de facto* target audience were younger teachers and new entrants to the profession working in the grammar and independent school sectors.[228] The texts examined for this study suggest that it was the grammar and independent school sector that dominated pedagogic discourse throughout the period. The articulate voice of post-war history education came from it. Educators from this sector had the outlets to allow their ideas to be known via publications, while the 80 per cent undoubtedly had views and perceptions but these were typically left unrecorded.

---

[225] Tosh, 2000, p. 57.
[226] J. E. Evans, *In Defence of History* (Granta Books, 1997), p. 104.
[227] A. Megill, *Historical Knowledge, Historical Error: A Contemporary Guide to Practice* (University of Chicago Press, 2007), pp. 1–13.
[228] IAAM, 1950, p. xiv.

To borrow a phrase from Lindsay Prior, texts such as the IAAM's handbook *The Teaching of History* are "containers of content", they carry content in a particular form.[229] Recognising the dual nature of texts as *content* in a particular *form* highlights the process whereby authors select and structure content on the page, a process of selection and deselection.[230] Targeting the way authors navigate the process of structuring what is, and what is not, important shines a light on interests and priorities.

Robert Phillips used the term "pedagogic discourse" to capture the ideas, beliefs and values shared within what he termed the history education community of practice.[231] His concern was with the making of the first History National Curriculum during late 1980s, which, he argued, was a culture war over competing versions of English national identity. He stated that a pedagogic discourse referred to a "regulatory system, that creates, maintains, and legitimates certain pedagogical practices and forms".[232] He applied this idea to link curriculum knowledge to power relations in support of his thesis that the making of the National Curriculum had been ideologically driven.

Phillips' interest in post-war history education was marginal and his brief comments on it were ambivalent. On the one hand, he aligned himself with Slater and Sylvester, taking the view that post-war history education had been a "Dark Age". On the other hand, he noted the importance that rapid political, social and cultural change had for post-war history education, arguing:

---

[229] L. Prior, *Using Documents in Social Research* (Sage, 2003), p. 3.

[230] L. Prior, *Using Documents in Social Research* (Sage, 2003); J. Scott, *A Matter of Record: Documentary Sources in Social Research* (Polity Press, 1990); G. McCulloch, *Documentary Research in Education, History and the Social Sciences* (Routledge Falmer, 2004); T. May, *Social Research Issues, Methods and Process* (Open University Press, 2001).

[231] R. Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State* (Cassell, 1998).

[232] For this definition of pedagogic discourse, Phillips drew on B. Bernstein, On Pedagogic Discourse. In J. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (Greenwood, 1986).

Any notion of "consensus" – real or imaginary – which had developed over history teaching by the 1950s, began to disintegrate from the 1960s onwards.[233]

Phillips introduced the idea of a "demise of consensus" during the mid to later part of the post-war period, which suggested change rather than stasis or inertia. However, he did not develop this point and left unexamined what the nature of pedagogic discourse prior to 1970 had been.

The idea that there had been a post-war pedagogic discourse is intriguing.[234] The texts analysed for this study, as will be shown in chapter five, the opener to Part Two, provide evidence for its existence. Goodson has argued that pedagogic discourse offers a nuanced way of viewing the development of school subjects. It marks, he argues, the boundary, at any one time, between what can and what cannot be said about teaching a subject.[235]

Such a boundary is seen in the IAAM passage, in which the "source method" was invalidated. Texts like these, Bernstein has suggested, selectively create what education is thought to be.[236] Paltridge, echoing Prior, has suggested that pedagogic discourse can be understood to be a process of selecting, structuring, ordering and arranging aspects of curriculum knowledge in particular ways.[237] In this study, pedagogic discourse informs the analysis of post-war history education writing by focusing on the ways post-war authors selected and ordered their ideas.[238]

---

[233] Phillips, 1998, p. 14.

[234] The following texts influenced the developing of this perspective: B. Bernstein, On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge. In M. Young (ed.) *Knowledge and Control* (Collier-Macmillan, 1971); B. Bernstein, On Pedagogic Discourse. In J. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (Greenwood, 1986); B. Bernstein, *The Structuring of Pedagogic Knowledge* (Routledge, 1990).

[235] I. Goodson, *The Making of Curriculum: Collected Essays* (Falmer Press, 1988), p. 10.

[236] B. Bernstein, 1986, pp. 209–10.

[237] B. Paltridge, *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction* (2nd edn) (Bloomsbury, 2012), p. 24.

[238] P. Atkinson, *Language, Structure and Reproduction: An Introduction to the Sociology of Basil Bernstein* (Methuen, 1985), p. 147.

In chapter three a continuum model of source-work practices ranging from "pre-evidential through to "evidential" approaches was introduced. According to this, the IAAM text, discussed in this chapter, favoured "pre-evidential" thinking. It also contained "weak disciplinary" features associated with the beginning stage of the continuum. In 1950, the IAAM thought learning the discipline was "too difficult" for most students and instead valued history as a "storehouse" of knowledge, although, it is important to note, the question "how do we know?" had an occasional presence.

On the whole, source-work content was linked to a master narrative. "Doing" source-work was tied to teacher telling and student engagement was restricted. Source extracts were presented, to use Lee's phrase, as "windows open unto the past". This was, of course, the view of just one text. In the next seven chapters, this study will consider the extent to which other post-war texts took a similar view.

Part Two: Text Analysis

Chapter Five

The Board of Education's *Handbook of Suggestions*

This is the first of seven chapters that examines post-war history education texts to address this study's three main research questions: Who produced post-war history education writing? What does post-war history education writing reveal about history education aims? How did authors address the question of source-work in post-war history education? One text is examined in this chapter: The Board of Education's *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools*, published in 1946.

In chapter one it was noted that within the secondary literature the aims of post-war history education are contested. John Slater and David Sylvester portrayed them as instrumental and unchanging.[239] They suggested that the purpose was to train students to become "responsible" citizens. Richard Aldrich called for a more nuanced approach, one that acknowledged the changing and diverse character of post-war history education aims. His list of aims included: history for its own sake, social control, heritage education, moral virtue, patriotism, pacifism, international understanding, as well as generic and history-specific skills.[240] Aldrich reasoned that, during the period 1900–1970, aims had served a variety of purposes; Slater and Sylvester had, he argued, oversimplified the matter.

---

[239] J. Slater, *The Politics of History Teaching: A Humanity Dehumanised?* (University of London, Institute of Education, 1989); D. Sylvester, Change and Continuity in History Teaching 1900-93. In H. Bourdillon (ed.) *Teaching History* (Routledge, 1994).

[240] R. Aldrich and D. Dean, The Historical Dimension. In R. Aldrich (ed.) *History in the National Curriculum* (Kogan Page, 1991), p. 101.

Speaking to this debate, this chapter examines the aims of the *Handbook of Suggestions'* for history education, including the role that primary source materials should play in the teaching of history.

The *Handbook of Suggestions* reflected the views within governmental circles about what history education in elementary schools, during the mid- to late 1940s should be. It is important to note that many of its ideas had their origins in an earlier period. The 1946 edition was a reprint of the 1937 edition. The decision to republish may have been out of necessity as this was the only text available. It would be another six years before the Ministry of Education published what superseded it, *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23.* The decision to republish in 1946 indicates that those within official circles with an interest in history education continued to have confidence in pre-war ideas.[241]

The audience for the *Handbook of Suggestions* was teachers working in state elementary schools, which, following the 1944 Education Act, were in the process of becoming primary, junior and secondary modern schools. It is estimated that more than two-thirds of teachers delivering history in elementary schools had received no subject-specific training, while the history education training received by the minority of teachers who had received training is said to have been woefully inadequate.[242] It is estimated that 88 per cent of students in state schools attended public elementary schools, the vast majority of whom completed their history education without qualifications at 14 years of age.[243] Under the 1944 Education Act, the 88 per cent of students who would have attended elementary schools before the war switched during the immediate post-war period to attending primary schools, and at age 11, to Grammar, Technical or Secondary Modern

---

[241] In a prefatory note to the 1946 *Handbook of Suggestion,* dated June 1944, M. G. Holmes, Secretary to the Board of Education, states: "It has been necessary to reprint this volume while an Education Bill is before Parliament and important developments including the abolition of the term 'Public Elementary School' are in view. Many of the principles which form the basis of the Handbook may be expected to acquire increased significance in the conditions to be created under the Bill and the Board are confident that teachers generally will continue to find this book a useful guide" (p. 3).
[242] See B. J. Elliot, An Early Failure of Curriculum Reform: History Teaching in England, 1918-1940, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 12(2) (1980), 44.
[243] B. Simon, *Education and the Social Order 1940-1990* (St Martin's Press, 1991), p. 26.

schools. It is estimated, that in 1951, secondary modern schools catered for 65 per cent of the secondary school pupils whilst grammar schools catered for 29 per cent and technical schools 4 per cent of secondary school pupils.[244] The *Handbook of Suggestions* was published to provide guidance for the teachers of these students. In this sense, it represents what those in "official" circles thought the great majority of the school population should know about the past.[245]

The *Handbook of Suggestions'* statement on aims centred on ideas prevalent during the first decade of the twentieth century. It drew heavily upon the Board of Education's 1904 "Code of Regulation" written by Sir Robert Morant.[246] The "Code of Regulation" was judged by the 1946 *Handbook of Suggestions* to represent "a great deal of what is best and most inspiring in our modern outlook".[247] Morant's 1904 aims for state elementary education, quoted at length in the 1946 edition, privileged character training and citizenship education. Morant argued that only when students' character had been formed would they then be able to go on and become "upright and useful members of the country in which they live and worthy sons and daughters of the country to which they belong".[248] Morant reasoned that a history education would most effectively serve this when it aroused in students "a living interest in the ideals and achievements of mankind".[249]

Morant's emphasis on extrinsic outcomes that history can contingently contribute to privileged a particular set of virtues, habits and dispositions. His young citizens

---

[244] D. Cannadine, J. Keating and N. Sheldon, *The Right Kind of History: Teaching the Past in Twentieth-Century England* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), p. 107.

[245] Of course, the impact that this text had upon teachers' classroom practice during the 1940s is difficult to measure, and is a matter beyond the scope of this study.

[246] Board of Education, *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools* (HMSO, 1927). The 1937 aims statement is broadly similar to, although not exactly the same, as the 1927 edition. In 1927, emphasis is upon teaching a continuous narrative and the rights and duties of a citizen. The 1927 edition states that for children the teaching of history is "pre-eminently an instrument of moral training" (p. 139). School history is said to deal with "true stories of real men and women, of actual communities and nations; it is a record writ large of their influence for good and evil" (p. 139).

[247] Board of Education, *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools* (HMSO, 1946), p. 9. Sir Robert Morant was the first Permanent Secretary to the Board of Education between 1902 and 1911.

[248] Ibid., p. 11.

[249] Ibid., p. 9.

should exhibit industriousness, self-control, perseverance, respectfulness, loyalty, dutifulness and courtesy. History education should foster these traits, he declared, by teaching students to reverence what is noble, to be ready for self-sacrifice, and to strive the utmost after purity and truth.[250]

Drawing on Morant, the *Handbook of Suggestions* argued that elementary education should aim to transmit what it termed the best in "national cultural traditions". Morant thought that it was self-evident that the "standards of conduct on which our civilisation depends" inhere within and are dependent upon "our national cultural traditions".[251]

The *Handbook of Suggestions* viewed history education as a vehicle for transmitting "national cultural traditions", seen as a body of knowledge that students required to become "good" citizens. Thus, the *Handbook of Suggestions* provides strong evidence that within "official" circles, at least, there was during the mid-1940s an adherence to what at the time were considered to be "traditional" educational aims and that within this framework history education's role was to promote them.

These strong ties to earlier ideas did not mean, however, that during the immediate post-war period the aims of elementary education were beyond re-examination. An openness to change is also seen in the *Handbook of Suggestions'* assertion that it was vital that "modern education must adapt itself to modern needs".[252] This did not alter the *Handbook of Suggestions'* position that the prime purpose of state elementary education was to mould character and produce "responsible" citizens. What was open to change was the meaning of "responsible" citizens. By mid-century, Morant's formulation of citizenship was being contested. According to the Board of Education, in 1946, it no longer met the needs of post-war English society. The *Handbook of Suggestions* made the case for change by suggesting that post-war citizens required a new set of virtues, habits and dispositions; ones that included:

---

[250] Ibid., p. 10.
[251] Ibid., p. 37.
[252] Ibid., p. 11.

having common sense, holding a breadth of view, being adaptable employees, and being able to utilise effectively an increase in their leisure time.

In this way, the *Handbook of Suggestions* contested the type of citizenship education to be fostered. In this "modern" interpretation, the purpose of education, according to the *Handbook of Suggestions,* was to prepare students to take their place in society by providing them with the knowledge, skills and values that would enable them to contribute to the common good of a rapidly changing democratic state.[253] History education justified its place on the curriculum, the Board of Education argued, when it supported this endeavour.

The *Handbook of Suggestions* chapter on teaching history ran to 33 pages. It covered the aims of history education, syllabus content, learning theory and methods of instruction.[254] Like the other post-war handbooks examined for this study, it began with a statement on aims. The *Handbook of Suggestions*' aims statement was brief. It is as follows:

> **The main aims of the teaching**. History is the story of the doings of human beings and the society in which they lived and this story has to be told to children mostly under the age of 15. First-hand experience is obviously impossible for the child, who must depend upon his teacher or on books for his knowledge of facts and events and of the relations between them, which form the subject matter of History. Many of the connecting links between past events are beyond the comprehension of any but the brighter children, and the notion, in particular, of communities or states acting as wholes is

---

[253] Ibid., p. 11.

[254] The purpose of publishing the *Handbook of Suggestions* remained consistent throughout the first half of the twentieth century. In 1912, the Board of Education reported that the intention that lay behind the publication of the first *Handbook of Suggestions* in 1905 was "to determine the subjects which could usually be taught and to arrange them in a consistent plan, a more important task remained. This was to spread as widely as possible a knowledge of the best that was being thought and done in the whole sphere of elementary education throughout the country so that every teacher might be able to draw on in some measure the accumulated experience of all the others." Board of Education, *Report of the Board of Education for the year 1910-1911* (HMSO, 1912), p. 21.

difficult for a child whose experience is limited to the comparatively narrow environment of his home and his school.

The story of things that have happened to human beings in the past is, however, of natural interest for children, if it is presented in a lively, vivid way with due regard to its proper setting in time and place. We can, at least, ensure that they have in their minds a body of stories of notable events and people pictured against a background which though it may be incomplete, is yet clear and true as far as it goes. None the less, if History is to be to the child anything more than a succession of interesting stories, the teacher will have to present them in such a way as to help him to realise that the world is always changing – and not in a fortuitous way. He can show how a particular event may influence many subsequent events, and he can let his pupil feel that some events are vastly more important than others. It is from his History lessons that the child will come to learn that the present grows out of the past and conditions the future, and that what happens in one community may affect other communities. Thus, he will see that the story of England is not an isolated story, but is linked up with that of other parts of the world. In this way, the teacher may arouse in his pupils, through a sense of significance, a lasting interest in the past and a desire to extend their knowledge of History after they have left school, and he may hope that his teaching at school will lead them later to look on current events in their broader aspects and as affecting the lives and interests of others as well as their own.[255]

Although short, this is, nonetheless, a complex statement. Six of its most salient ideas warrant further consideration. The first is that a primary purpose of history education was to transmit a body of knowledge. This dominated the *Handbook of Suggestions*' aims statement as a whole: it is its overriding concern. The knowledge that was to be transmitted was narrative "stories" composed of facts and events. An important learning objective was that students:

---

[255] Board of Education, 1946, pp. 401–2.

have in their minds a body of stories of notable events and people pictured against a background which though it may be incomplete, is yet clear and true as far as it goes.

A second idea was that only an educated adult mind could fully grasp "true" historical knowledge, the results of historical scholarship. On this basis, they reasoned that in schools only a few very able students were capable of understanding "true" historical knowledge. Most students, they judged, were capable of only understanding history as a "body of stories of notable events". The *Handbook of Suggestions* employed a model of cognitive development that imposed severe constraints on the elementary school or secondary modern school learner. This constraint made the learner dependent upon the teacher and textbook for their knowledge, making knowledge transmission inevitable.

A third leading idea was that knowledge transmission would only be successful if students' capabilities and interests were taken into account. This confers upon the *Handbook of Suggestions*' aims a "student-centredness". The *Handbook of Suggestions* took the view that students had a "natural" interest in stories and therefore teachers of history should make this their starting point. This was used to justify taking a narrative approach and governed the selection of content, an issue that dominated its statement.

A fourth idea was that knowledge transmission would only be successful if students were engaged in the learning process. The transmission of knowledge was of great importance in the *Handbook of Suggestions*. Teaching strategies that presented knowledge in a lively and vivid way were seen as a key to engaging students. It is important to note that the *Handbook of Suggestions* actively sought approaches that aroused interest in history. This extended to wanting students to carry forward their interest in history into adulthood.

A fifth idea was that history education should develop students' *understanding* of history. This qualifies the view that the *Handbook of Suggestions only* aim was the

transmission of a "body of stories of notable events and people". It thought it important that students should understand that events had causes, that some events were more significant than others, and that historical change was not always for the better. It also thought it important that students should be able to place the national narrative within a wider international context.

The sixth and final leading idea was that students should appreciate that the past explained the present, or in the words of the *Handbook of Suggestions*, the "present grows out of the past and conditions the future". This *presentist* orientation underlay its citizenship aims. The value of learning history, in its view, lay not in understanding the past *per se* but in moulding character and shaping students' understanding of the world in which they lived. Understanding the present rather than the past gave the study of history its *raison d'être.* This emphasis upon understanding the present day determined the types of historical knowledge students were exposed to.

In the Handbook's aims statement, there is little to suggest that during the mid-1940s, within official circles, history education aims were being discussed in disciplinary terms. That is, in the sense that the SCHP had defined it as an "activity of enquiry" centred on the critical evaluation of source material. It was instead dominated by substantive knowledge transmission leading to citizenship education.

Nonetheless, a close reading reveals that it had concerns over a number of issues that were seen as difficult and not clear-cut. These included moral and citizenship education, content choice, student interests, student engagement, the presentation of knowledge, historical understandings, and the utility of history education.

The transmission of knowledge was a means to achieving identity and character formation. Historical knowledge had value when it promoted a collective national identity, cultural roots and shared inheritances, and when knowledge instilled values and attitudes that, in its terms, prepared students to take their place as functioning citizens. In the *Handbook for Suggestions*, historical knowledge was

framed as a single uncontested chronological national narrative: a "body of stories" of landmark events and important people, which students learned to remember largely through teacher exposition.

Although knowledge transmission was its primary aim, it recognised that to achieve it depended upon having effective teaching methods. The *Handbook of Suggestions* grappled with the pedagogic challenge of making history education engaging and accessible to all students. One of its solutions was to select a "body of stories" that matched the interests and capabilities of students. If history education was to successfully achieve its aim of nurturing "modern" citizens, it argued, then it was paramount that teaching methods stimulated students' imagination and aroused their curiosity about the past. A *sine qua non* of history education, it asserted, was that history should be presented to students in an interesting and accessible way.

The *Handbook of Suggestions* made a clear distinction between an "intellectual" and an "emotional" approach to history education. An "intellectual" approach to learning history was judged to be appropriate for older "able" students, an elite precocious group who were able to comprehend on the level of educated adults. The intellectual demands of understanding "adult" historical texts was said to be beyond the majority of students. As the following passage shows, the *Handbook of Suggestions*' aims were framed by a view of students' historical thinking that underlined their limitations, and learning history for the majority of students attending elementary schools could only ever be an imaginative and emotional encounter. According to the *Handbook of Suggestions*:

> From its study the mature reader may gain a wider intellectual outlook and a saner judgement, and these benefits in their degree may also accrue to older children. For all children, however, history is pre-eminently of value as a stimulus to their imagination and as an appeal to the enthusiasms.[256]

---

[256] Board of Education, 1946, p. 402.

The authors of the Handbook argued that history should be presented to students as a "record writ large of the influence for good or evil".[257] In this sense, Slater and Sylvester were right in pointing out that history education in 1946, at least within official circles, was considered an instrument of moral training, the purpose of which was to instill civic pride and virtue that served to maintain the social order. The *Handbook of Suggestions* proposed that students learned to embrace "the splendour of heroism, the worth of unselfishness and loyalty, and the meanness of cruelty and cowardice".[258]

The aims of the *Handbook of Suggestions* were dominated by character education and initiation into membership of the national community. Its authors thought that history education should cultivate a shared vision of the nation's past and the central issue, they believed, was how to most effectively deliver this vision. The following passage encapsulated the socially oriented goals that it thought school history should serve:

> The ultimate test must be whether it assists in the development of citizens who desire the common good and are prepared to make sacrifices to secure and maintain it; men and women, that is who care for all that is lovely and of good report. For the fully educated person, we should do well to remember, is one who is enlightened in his interests, impersonal in his judgements, ready in his sympathy for whatever is just and right, effective in the work he sets himself to do, and willing to lend a hand to anyone who is in need of it.[259]

The teaching of history in the *Handbook of Suggestions* functioned as an instrument of socialisation, in which knowledge transmission served to inculcate prescribed cultural norms and values. The teaching of history in elementary schools was justified on the grounds that it contributed towards a whole school policy to foster "citizens of good character".

---

[257] Board of Education, 1946, p. 403; Board of Education, 1927, p. 139.
[258] Ibid., p. 403.
[259] Ibid., p. 15.

There is little in the *Handbook of Suggestions* to suggest that it thought working with historical sources had a *major* role to play in achieving its aims. It assigned importance to the transmission of a fixed body of knowledge and in addition adopted a theory of learning that excluded the possibility that students could engage with source materials as sources of evidence about the past.

The *Handbook of Suggestions* did, however, discuss source-work, although only briefly. The authors thought that the value of employing primary sources in the classroom was to enhance knowledge transmission and aid its socialising goals. Source-work had value, it argued, when it engaged students' interest and this was achieved when it authenticated and illustrated narrative exposition. The space allotted in the *Handbook of Suggestions* to a discussion of the use of source materials was not extensive. The following short passage was the closest it came to a sustained analysis of the aims of source-work:

> The use of illustrations – pictorial illustrations, contemporary work especially is indispensable in all stages of the teaching. Portraits of eminent persons, reproductions of old prints, documents and other famous records, such as the Bayeux Tapestry, will often form the best means of representing social life and customs, pageants and battles and the apparatus of husbandry, industry, trade and war. Some modern pictures of historic scenes may also be useful.[260]

In this passage, it is important to note that source-work was said to be an *indispensible* part of elementary school history education, recommending that all students encounter sources as part of their learning. Furthermore, teachers were encouraged to employ sources as the "best means of representing" historical knowledge. The passage emphasised the value of employing visual primary sources, such as "pictorial illustrations", "portraits" and "old prints".

The *Handbook of Suggestions*' general history education aims suggest that such "illustrations" were to be employed to "aid" teaching a body of stories of notable

---

[260] Board of Education, 1946, p. 431.

events. Their value lay in their appeal to students' imagination and for their ability to stimulate students' interest. In the passage, emphasis was upon "representing" and "illustrating" and this suggests that they were valued, using Peter Lee's phrase, as "windows open unto the past". The *Handbook of Suggestions*, in 1946, did not consider it appropriate to discuss source-work in terms of "training of the mind" or as a means to discuss "how" the past was known. The passage suggests that a source, such as the Bayeux Tapestry, should be used to illustrate a narrative of the Norman Conquest in terms of "this is what it looked like". In addition, in a weak disciplinary sense, the Bayeux Tapestry validated the narrative by offering students proof that the narrative was true. Thus, the Bayeux Tapestry was used not to reflect on different interpretations of events, but simply to illustrate how the Norman Conquest was "known".

As well as employing portraits of eminent persons, reproductions of old prints, documents and other "famous records", the *Handbook of Suggestions* recommended that teachers support their narrative exposition with reference to local sites of historical interest. This included street names, architecture, recorded sayings, coins and pottery. Sources, such as these, it argued, have a "natural appeal" that renders learning "picturesque". By appealing to the imagination of students, historical sources were said to "give life and reality to persons and events".[261] Thus, historical sources had an important "indispensible" role to play within the *Handbook of Suggestions*' framework of aims: they rendered the stories about the past that teachers told more vivid and more credible. They bestowed authenticity upon narrative exposition. In the words of the *Handbook of Suggestions*: "Whatever helps them to believe in the story and to see the actors in it as real men and women is of value."[262]

The *Handbook of Suggestions* makes clear that source-work had an important but *minor* role to play in *assisting* the delivery of its goals. It was considered to be an aid to a pedagogy that stressed the importance of an affective and imaginative

---

[261] Ibid., p. 414.
[262] Ibid.

encounter with narrative storytelling. The Handbook provides evidence that, from the perspective of its authors, history education aims should be dominated by moral and civic education. It has been noted that alongside these dominant aims other related matters were also considered. This included fostering an interest in history that they would carry forward into adult life and making history education an engaging and enjoyable encounter. Student engagement was considered by the *Handbook of Suggestions* to be at the heart of best practice and in this, its authors believed, source-work had a vital role to play.[263]

By privileging knowledge transmission and civic education, the *Handbook of Suggestions* supports Slater and Sylvester's contention that before the emergence of "New History" during the 1970s, history education aims were rooted in a long-standing tradition. That appears to have been the official position regarding the education of the majority of students attending state schools during the mid- to late 1940s.

However, there is also some support for Aldrich's view that the aims of history education during this period were reflected upon and underwent change. Although the changes evident here do not represent a dramatic shift towards the disciplinary, as Aldrich had suggested, there was nonetheless an agenda for reforming knowledge transmission.

While self-consciously rooted in a Morantian tradition of moral and civic education that looked back to 1904, the 1946 *Handbook of Suggestions* also looked forward to revising post-war history education. The main concern of this revision was with content. It was important, its authors thought, to review content, to make it more relevant and to tailor it to match the interests of students. This also involved adopting methods that engaged students in content transmission in ways that appealed to their imaginations. The use of sources was seen as indispensable because it was thought they would arouse interest in narrative storytelling by making it more authentic and more vivid.

---

[263] Ibid., p. 403.

In terms of the continuum of approaches to source-work discussed in chapter three, its approach was "pre-evidential". This was, incidentely, also the view of G. M. Trevelyan, a leading post-war public historian, who was president of the Historical Association, 1946–1949, when remarking that "the history of events is ephemeral, and for the scholar; the poetry of events is eternal, and for the multitude".[264] Using sources uncritically to illustrate storytelling *might* invite students to conclude that this was how we know about the past, but this was not the intention of the *Handbook of Suggestions*'. It appears that within official circles during the mid-1940s, learning "real" history should be restricted to a privileged few. In chapter six the idea that such views were fixed and unchanging is tested when the views of the 1946 *Handbook of Suggestions* is compared with a Ministry of Education statement published in 1952.

---

[264] Cited in D. Cannadine, *G. M. Trevelyan: A Life in History* (HarperCollins, 1992).

Chapter Six

Ministry of Education, *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23*

In this chapter a second post-war official text is examined, *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23*, published by the Ministry of Education in 1952.[265] It is used as a point of comparison with the 1946 *Handbook of Suggestions*, providing an opportunity to explore the range of "official" ideas on the aims of history education and to consider the extent to which official ideas changed during the early post-war period, that is, from 1946 to 1952.

There are formal differences between *Pamphlet No. 23* (1952) and the *Handbook of Suggestions* (1946). *Pamphlet No. 23* ran to 89 pages, making its discussion on history education approximately three times longer than the *Handbook of Suggestions*.[266] *Pamphlet No. 23* addressed a wider rage of concerns and discussed them in greater detail. Its broad range of focus included: history education aims, primary, secondary and sixth form syllabus content and classroom approaches across all types of post-war schools, teacher training and adult education. *Pamphlet No. 23's* account of the state of post-war history education eclipsed that offered by the *Handbook of Suggestions.* No other post-war official text on history education comes close to matching its level of detail.[267] It stands unchallenged as the major

---

[265] Ministry of Education, *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23* (HMSO, 1952). An indication of its importance can be measured by the fact that in 1962 HMSO published a fifth impression of *Pamphlet No. 23.* As its title suggests, it was one in a series of 23 pamphlets on education topics published by the Ministry of Education during the years 1945–1952. Topics covered in the series included the teaching of subjects such as: metalwork, art, local studies, camping, citizenship, reading, and building crafts. Others in the series respond directly to the 1944 Education Act: *The New Secondary Education* (1947); *A Guide to the Educational System of England and Wales* (1945). For the sake of brevity, it is hereafter referred to as *Pamphlet No. 23.*

[266] *Handbook of Suggestions* only ran to 11,000 words compared to *Pamphlet No. 23's* 36,000 words.

[267] A measure of its importance is that between 1952 and 1962, *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23* was reprinted five times. For two other post-war official statements on history education, see: Ministry of Education, *Primary Education: Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned with the Work of Primary Schools* (HMSO, 1959); The Newsom Report, *Half Our Future* (HMSO, 1963).

"official" post-war statement on history education.[268] It indicated that, in 1952, within official circles, history education was seen as an important school subject.

Pamphlet No. 23 is a report on the state of history education in England during the early 1950s as seen from the viewpoint of His Majesty's Inspectorate. It was an anonymous text, the names of its authors were not declared. The picture it presented is more analytical than *Handbook of Suggestions*' "how-to" guidance on classroom practice. This quality is displayed in the following passage. Here, it was argued that teaching about the past is a characteristic of all systems of education. The form that it takes, it was suggested, is always negotiated and hence subject to change over time:

> Teaching about the past is one of the constant elements found in the education of all societies. In East and West, in ancient or in modern times, in religious or in secular societies, the principles in which it has been proposed to educate youth have always been checked, reinforced and exemplified by reference to the past, Gods, heroes revelations, tables of laws, revolutionaries, natural law, Declarations of Rights or materialistic dialectics have been invoked in the different civilisations and revered as guides in the education of youth. The Laws of Moses, Solomon, Charlemagne, Alfred (themselves the great educators of their period) remained for centuries the ultimate court of appeal to the peoples to whom they were given. Education in them was education *par excellence*. And if in recent times the "Rights of Man" or the historical analyses of Marx have become, for some, the ultimate arbiter, education in these teachings is still education through history.[269]

The intended audience for *Pamphlet No. 23* was the wider post-war history education community, which included teacher trainers and history teachers

---

[268] For a comparable statement, see Department of Education and Science, *History in the Primary and Secondary Years: An HMI View* (HMSO, 1985). There are strong similarities between *Pamphlet No. 23* and the Board of Education's *Report on the Teaching of History Pamphlet No. 37*, published in 1923. Whereas the 1923 Report openly declares its authorship to be a committee composed of HMI and historical advisers to the Foreign Office, the authorship of *Pamphlet No. 23* is left anonymous.
[269] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 5.

working across all types of post-war schools. It can be assumed that it would also have attracted the attention of non-professionals with a specific interest in the teaching of history. It presented a defence of history education at a time when the purpose of teaching history was being questioned, though the text does not state by whom and why. Like the *Handbook of Suggestions*, it did this on the grounds of social utility, arguing that the teaching of history delivered important social benefits. It framed its statement on aims within a narrative of the development of history education that acknowledged links to the past but which also recognised new thinking during the post-war period. This showed that within the Ministry of Education there was, during the immediate post-war period, a commitment to defending, promoting and reforming history education.

In *Pamphlet No. 23* the aims of history education were discussed in an opening, 13-page chapter titled: "Why have we been Teaching History?" As this title suggests, the approach taken was not an unexamined recital but a considered examination of what the aims of history education had been in the past and should be in the future. In this examination, there was a constructive dialogue between history education's past and present. The authors of the report took the view that post-war history education should adapt itself to meet the new circumstances within which it found itself. Its idea of a history education tradition was different from Slater and Sylvester's "inherited consensus" and "Great Tradition". Where Slater and Sylvester emphasised singularity and non-change, *Pamphlet No. 23* highlighted diversity and change, taking the view that "tradition" was alive and active.

Pamphlet No. 23 did not represent post-war history education, as Slater and Sylvester had done, as a profession unthinkingly following *en masse* an "inherited consensus". Instead, it represented history education as a living phenomenon that during the post-war period engaged in what it termed "present day controversies

about the purpose of history teaching".[270] As far as it was concerned, post-war history education aims were undergoing a comprehensive re-evaluation.

Pamphlet No. 23 began its examination by setting post-war history education aims within a narrative of the historical development of history education. It began by suggesting that two dominant history education aims were present when and wherever teaching about the past was conducted, and it described them as "traditional purposes". The first was moral instruction and the second the transmission of knowledge. In this, there was a measure of agreement with the *Handbook of Suggestions.*

The transmission of knowledge was defined by *Pamphlet No. 23* as handing on to the next generation cultural traditions or heritage. Within this process there was the possibility of change. As with the *Handbook of Suggestions*, the knowledge considered valuable enough to hand on was negotiable. In the view of *Pamphlet No. 23*, each new generation was faced with deciding which cultural traditions it wished to transmit. This dialogue between the past and the present arose, it argued, because what had been considered significant knowledge in the past was affected by changes in the present. This social construction of history education knowledge is evident in the following passage. Here, the point is made that the content of a history syllabus is a negotiation that takes place within social settings:

> The point which we need to note here is that the motive of history teaching as the conveying of tradition had not radically changed; what had changed, and must always change in every age was the notion about what the tradition was and what was important to us within it. That is something which every age decides in accordance with its information and with its outlook.[271]

Pamphlet No. 23, like the *Handbook of Suggestions* before it, represented post-war history education linked to "traditional" ideas. There was agreement between the

---

[270] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 6.
[271] Ibid., p. 13.

two texts that knowledge transmission and moral education have been, and would continue to be, the core aims of history education: this appeared to be non-negotiable. It was clear to the authors of both documents that the content of what is taught and how it was presented to students would undergo adaptation in response to wider societal change.

Pamphlet No. 23 observed that moral education dominated history education during the early post-war period. This was discussed, as the following passage shows, in terms similar to the ones found in the *Handbook of Suggestions*:

> One is the moral motive, the view that it is good for boys' and girls' character that they should hear or read about great men and women of the past and so learn gradually to discriminate between disinterested and selfish purposes, or between heroism and cowardice.[272]

According to this, history education was justified when moral lessons were drawn from the lives of "great" men and women in history. This theme was developed in the next passage. The study of history in schools, it suggested, can be said to have value when it is used to mould character. According to the Ministry of Education:

> The pupils should leave school having made the acquaintance of people in history whose lives and achievements it is enlarging to the personality to have known, having studied movements whose rise and fall are not only thrilling to study but worthy in their own right to be known.[273]

Pamphlet No. 23 reported that during the immediate post-war period, history education served character training and citizenship education, the purpose of which was to prepare students to take their place in society. In the following passage, it was reported that exemplary stories from the national narrative were used to instill

---

[272] Ibid., p. 11.
[273] Ibid., p. 18.

loyalty to the state. The clear lesson in this passage was that citizens had a moral duty to uphold the rule of law and to defend the state against foreign aggression:

> If the soldiers and sailors who followed Marlborough and Wellington, Drake and Nelson, had defended the independence of this country from foreign danger they in their turn might be called upon to do likewise. If the yeoman who supported Pym and Hampden had won parliamentary liberties, they might be called upon to defend and also to exercise those liberties. If Galileo and Newton, Pasteur and Lister and all their less famous collaborators had extended human knowledge then there might be a tradition, which might be followed. If the group who supported Wilberforce or Lord Shaftesbury had reformed the conditions of the poor and the oppressed, they might do so, or lend intelligent support to others who were doing so.[274]

Pamphlet No. 23's narrative of the development of history education located the origins of the moral aim within Victorian public schools during the nineteenth century. It was a tradition subject to shifts in content and teaching style. It reported that during the immediate post-war period, the overtly sermonising style of moral instruction favoured by Thomas Arnold at Rugby School during the first half of the nineteenth century was being challenged and had become less evident. In the following passage, it is apparent that the need for moral instruction was alive and well in post-war history education; however, it differed from the form of which Victorian history educators would have recognised and approved:

> Today we are more shy – some will say more decently modest – about bestowing our admiration and our scorn, our praise and our blame, but we still make much use of the heroic in history, especially with younger children: the stories of Thomas More, Latimer and Ridley or Charles I at their executions; of Elizabeth Fry in the prisons, or of Florence Nightingale at the Crimea; of Abraham Lincoln or Madam Curie, are not neglected. There has certainly been a change in our approach to the element of personal greatness

---

[274] Ibid., p. 11.

in history, but it would be very far from true to say that we have abandoned the view that the example of famous men and our fathers that begat us is one of history teaching's fundamental values.[275]

Pamphlet No. 23 made much of the fact that major changes had taken place in the design of the history syllabus over the period 1850–1950. It noted a transformation from the simple factual outlines of "good" and "bad" monarchs, typical of mid-nineteenth-century syllabi, to the immediate post-war syllabus, which was being conceived of in ways that included: constitutional, political, economic and social perspectives; local, national and international scales; trends, movements, developments, periods, outline, and as prehistory and history. Over the period 1850–1950, it reported, historical knowledge had deepened and widened to include a range of perspectives and timescales.

The following passage suggested that during the immediate post-war period teaching a body of knowledge continued to be a dominant aim. Here, "heritage" was used to denote the body of knowledge to be transmitted. It was emphasised that this was to be shared collectively:

> But it should be noted that the fundamental idea of history as an evolution, as bestowing a heritage, survives and is, generally, at least implicit in the syllabus. And with it there survives the idea that this heritage is something it is right and valuable to study.[276]

Like the *Handbook of Suggestions*, *Pamphlet No. 23* judged content selection to be one of the central challenges facing post-war history education. This was so because it was thought circumstances had changed. The content selection "problem" was wrestled with in the following passage. The authors of *Pamphlet No. 23* argued that if history education was to serve citizenship education, then it should first state what kind of knowledge and what kind of citizenship is desired:

---

[275] Ibid., p. 12.
[276] Ibid., p. 9.

A far cry, indeed, from the straight line of the rise of national greatness and parliamentary democracy, which was the normal fare around the turn of the century. But then, if the boy was seen to be the heir to all the ages, the iron age and the stone age as well as the ancient civilizations, and if he was growing into a world society rather than a national society, was not history as heritage bound to mean something quite different?[277]

What it saw as the expansion of historical knowledge, the result of historical scholarship, led *Pamphlet No. 23* to question the content of lessons. The following passage warned of the danger of overloading content and Sellar and Yeatman's parody of Victorian rote learning was referenced. Addressing this as a problem, the passage invited teachers to reflect critically upon the nature of their practice:

The heritage of the past is a long story, with many sidelines, and with new ones always being added. And it has been found that it is an ambitious purpose to try and convey that story. Even if he sticks to British history, how easily, in the pupil's mind, it has turned into "1066 and All That". Probably we ought, as a sort of meditation at the beginning of each autumn term, to re-read that remarkable classic to help us to keep our sense of proportion.[278]

Knowledge transmission, according to the authors of *Pamphlet No. 23*, had value when it promoted a sense of national identity that helped to assimilate the individual within the national community. As the next passage explained, historical knowledge was seen as valuable when students' identity came to be associated with the nation to which they belonged:

---

[277] Ibid., p. 13.

[278] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 13. *1066 and All That: A Memorable History of England, comprising all the parts you can remember, including 103 Good Things, 5 Bad Kings and 2 Genuine Dates.* Written by W. C. Sellar and R. J. Yeatman and illustrated by John Reynolds, it was published in book form in 1930. Raphael Samuel made the point that Sellar and Yeatman's text provides evidence of a critical anti-rote history education tradition. See R. Samuel, *Island Stories: Unravelling Britain, Theatres of Memory, Volume II* (Verso, 1998), pp. 209–12.

To have been introduced to the sweep of history, even if it is almost all forgotten, even if it is has been grasped in the most confused way, has this value, that it puts our life in some sort of perspective in time just as geography, however ill understood or digested, puts our notion about the village, our country, or our occupation into some sort of perspective in space.[279]

At first glance, there appeared to be broad areas of agreement between the Board of Education in 1946 and the Ministry of Education in 1952. Essentially, the Ministry of Education's approach was instrumentalist, as the Board of Education had been before it. This suggests that within official circles across the period 1946–1952, history education's primary purpose continued to be the inculcation of values that served the "common good". In the next passage, *Pamphlet No. 23* explained that its three main aims, knowledge transmission, moral education and citizenship education, were interrelated:

the motive that they should be introduced to their heritage, introduced, that is to the way things have come about, and so to their own environment, in which they will have to live and to act. This motive, like the other, is largely moral, because it is a matter of introducing them to their responsibilities.[280]

It is important to note that *Pamphlet No. 23*'s statement on aims of history education contained dominant and subdominant aims. Its dominant aims were the transmission of knowledge that supported moral and citizenship goals, viewed as evolving and adapting to new post-war circumstances. Supporting these was a set of subdominant (pedagogic) aims whose function was to assist in the delivery of knowledge. *Pamphlet No. 23* reported that during the early post-war period, new ideas were circulating concerning content selection and teaching methods. This new thinking, it suggested, generated novel solutions. It wrote:

---

[279] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 14.
[280] Ibid., p. 13.

There is, however, an understandable dissatisfaction with outline history which is supposed to convey the evolution of a heritage but which is likely to end up as "1066 and All That". New approaches of history teaching have been attempted in an endeavour to deal more effectively with its unwieldy subject matter, and some of them have the appearance at least of starting from different assumptions about the value of history teaching.[281]

While it can be argued that *Pamphlet No. 23* supported the Slater and Sylvester position that post-war history education aims were indeed dominated by knowledge transmission, moral education and citizenship education, this passage shows that beneath the surface resided pressing questions concerning content choice and teaching methods. These pedagogic sub-aims, which addressed how the main aims could be best achieved in the classroom, drew attention to how post-war educators responded to wider societal change. The authors of *Pamphlet No. 23*'s socially constructed view of the development of history education suggested that each generation redefined history education in light of its own values and priorities.

Significantly, *Pamphlet No. 23*'s analysis of the aims of history education challenges the Slater/Sylvester view that post-war history education was unreflective. In its discussion, as will be shown, was an expectation that history education aims would continue to change, and in ways that were unpredictable.

Open to discussion in 1952 was the idea that history should only be taught as a chronological outline narrative. *Pamphlet No. 23*'s advocacy of "patch" studies, the study of short periods in depth, was seen by its authors as a departure from the traditional outline narrative. Teaching short periods selected for intensive study was thought by *Pamphlet No. 23* to have been a significant post-war innovation that extended the boundaries of what history education was for. It was different because it was less concerned with using the past to explain the present, studying the past in depth could, its authors argued, be for its own sake.

---

[281] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 14.

According to the authors of *Pamphlet No. 23*, an outline history syllabus and a syllabus that included period studies in depth or "patch" had quite different aims. The aim of traditional outline history, it was suggested, was to explain how the present had emerged out of the past, while the aim of "patch" studies, such as "The Elizabethan Age", was to understand the past on its own terms. *Pamphlet No. 23* indicated that some post-war professionals were thinking about teaching history in this way.[282] In the "patch" approach, it was said the aim was to provide an "imaginative immersive experience". This was said to allow students to "enter into" the past. As the following passage shows, *Pamphlet No. 23* thought this signified an emerging trend, and one that marked a major development in the aims of history education:

> There are those who go further than this by claiming that the value of historical study in schools lies precisely in the process of getting "under the skin" of a particular age in the thorough cultivation of a particular "patch" as it is sometimes called. And this claim is made on the grounds that the imaginative experience of really entering into another time, with its different habits and different scales of value, is enlarging to the imagination and to the understanding, while if a real grasp of the "feel" of one particular age is acquired, a key is given to the understanding of other ages.[283]

Supporting the main aims of history education was a set of subdominant pedagogic aims whose function was to assist in the transmission of knowledge. In the following passage, *Pamphlet No. 23* discussed the subdominant aims it thought were prevalent in post-war history education. The first to be discussed were "imaginative experience" and "self expression", which it described as being important "occasional" aims of post-war history education:

---

[282] For an early example of this approach in published form, see M. Reeves, *The Medieval Village* (Longman, 1954).
[283] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 15.

The teacher may – very occasionally he does – say to himself that history, as an adolescent study, is simply an imaginative experience analogous to self expression as in an art, and that we have no right to talk about external objective truths or facts to be discovered, still less to be learnt.[284]

This discussion continued by turning to disciplinary understandings as a subdominant aim. In the following passage, teaching history is referred to as a "scientific intellectual discipline" and as a "matter of detecting and weighing evidence". Interest is shown in historical methodology, that is, with how history works as a discipline and with how knowledge about the past is gained. This again was described as an occasional aim:

Or he may – and occasionally does – say that history is simply a scientific intellectual discipline, analogous to that derived from learning to multiply or to prove geometrical theorems, a matter of detecting and weighing evidence, analysing motives, estimating results, irrespective of place or period.

The extent to which imaginative experience and disciplinary history were considered subordinate to the dominant aims is made clearer in the next passage in which they are referred to as representing "extreme views". Although "occasional", their inclusion is nonetheless significant. It provides evidence that, for some post-war teachers, students' subjective experience and learning the discipline of history were considered to be legitimate aims:

But these are extreme views. They call attention to subjective values that are highly important, but few will agree that they represent the only or final values. History – school history – is more than an adventure of the imagination. It is also more than a labyrinth to be explored for the sake of learning the technique of exploring.[285]

---

[284] Ibid., p. 18.
[285] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 18.

According to *Pamphlet No. 23*, moral education, knowledge transmission, imaginative experience, personal expression and understanding history as an approach to knowledge could be combined in different ways and applied with varying degrees of emphasis. In the following passage, *Pamphlet No.* 23 thought it necessary to point out that although there was a diversity of aims to choose from, teachers should be reminded that, in its view, knowledge transmission was the most important. *Pamphlet No. 23* wrote:

> The final goal is to understand something, to appreciate something, just as the final goal of studying Greek is to appreciate Homer and Aeschylus. Not merely the mental discipline involved.[286]

Pamphlet No. 23 reported that public pressure to reform history education had created uncertainty among some post-war history educators concerning the purpose of history education, though did not go on to explain the nature of this pressure or why it became manifest. This uncertainty had widened the discussion to include what it termed "extreme" views concerning the aims of history education.

There is no evidence to suggest that *Pamphlet No. 23* proposed that students should be taught to critically evaluate and use sources while conducting small-scale open-ended historical enquiries, as the SCHP was to envisage it in 1972–1976. It indicated that some post-war professionals were referring to history education as a "scientific intellectual discipline" and as being a matter of "detecting and weighing evidence". This was mentioned briefly and described by it as representing an "extreme" view. It is nonetheless still important as it indicates that some post-war practitioners were engaged in pursuing a disciplinary approach of some kind. Putting this to one side, *Pamphlet No. 23* had a view on what the role of source-work should be, and this is now turned to.

The use of source materials appears midway in the text on page 51. It was not treated as a separate topic but as part of a chapter entitled "Eleven to Fifteen:

---

[286] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 18.

Some Wider Considerations".[287] In this discussion it was suggested that source-work could fulfil a number of purposes. As with the *Handbook of Suggestions* in 1946, source-work was valued as a strategy to engage students more fully in teacher narrative exposition.

Like the *Handbook of Suggestions*, *Pamphlet No. 23* began its discussion by establishing the limits to what history education could accomplish. Guiding the discussion was the idea that students' understanding of history was limited by their "natural sensitivities and passions". Within these limitations there was, it thought, much that could be accomplished when working with sources. All students were said to be capable of responding to sources *emotionally* and some were capable of responding *intellectually* and this included understanding the role that sources play in the construction of accounts.

Pamphlet No. 23's learning theory, like the *Handbook of Suggestions*, was based upon students having a passion for storytelling. The "mental make up" of students, it argued, determined that the most appropriate stories for students were those where the actions of great individuals are rendered dramatic, romantic and heroic. As the following passage shows, it coupled storytelling to its two dominant aims of moral instruction and the transmission of knowledge:

> Strongest, surely, is their delight in a strong human story, and this universal interest makes it possible for us to take them straight to some of the things which make history best worth studying, the aspirations and efforts of individuals within the pattern of the movement of their times.[288]

This passage asserts that as well as possessing a passion for storytelling, students also embraced a passion for hero worship. In the next passage, the past was presented as a place of enchantment and the emphasis was on an emotional

---

[287] *Pamphlet No. 23*, Chapter V, "Eleven to Fifteen: Some Wider Considerations". The use of historical sources is discussed on pp. 51–7.

[288] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 50.

response. It is argued that the purpose of history education was to satisfy an innate human need for wonder and awe. Narrating heroic stories was said to be the means by which this can be best achieved:

> The most widespread passion of all is that of awe. Not for nothing is every child a hero-worshiper … To every child and adolescent alike every person is larger than life or else just not alive at all … They seek these larger than life figures in the past. Properly taught, history is the most awe-inspiring and awe-satisfying subject of all.[289]

A passion for dramatic stories that evoke a sense of wonderment was considered by *Pamphlet No. 23* to be the first stage in students' learning development. As they matured, students were thought to be capable of responding in other ways. They were said to be capable of a "joy of discovery"; of having a natural curiosity about the "cause and effect" of events; and of having a "passion for the particular".

The first mention of historical sources as having a role to play in history learning appeared in a discussion of students' "passion for the particular". Students were said to possess a "hunger for the actual" and the "authentic relic". As the following passage shows, this was seen as offering students an emotional experience. Relics were valued for their ability to "thrill". The power to thrill was deployed as a strategy to enhance the telling of a story:

> And associated with the hunger for the actual is the age-old fascination of the authentic relic. To see, even though one may not touch, the thirteenth century parchment on which the Magna Charta is inscribed can be a very thrilling experience for a child, always provided that he knows first how it was

---

[289] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 50, quoting from J. Hampden Jackson, What is History? (Bureau of Current Affairs), p. 38.

won and how greatly Englishmen have prized the liberties they derive from it.[290]

A disciplinary interest in the use of sources was expressed in the next passage, showing that *Pamphlet No. 23*'s interest in source-work was not just confined to the *affective*. The "detective" metaphor is used and it is suggested that students have a natural "detective interest". This carries disciplinary overtones; however, it should be noted that it stopped well short of suggesting that students conduct small-scale primary source enquiries. The use of the detective metaphor did, nonetheless, indicate an intellectual engagement with the nature of historical evidence and "the process by which we gain knowledge of the past". As early as 1952, *Pamphlet No. 23* reported:

> Still another form of sensitivity to the past felt by boys and girls is the detective interest. More than half the undoubted fascination of pre-history our knowledge lies in the process by which we gain knowledge of it. The fragility and the durability of crockery which makes of a refuse heap a mine of information, or the discoloration of the soil which reveals a hearth thousands of years old – these have an irresistible appeal to the boys, or the man, who enjoys Sherlock Holmes and his successors. We often make use of this interest to give boys some idea of what archaeological evidence is.[291]

This strong focus on "the process by which we gain knowledge" was not evident in the *Handbook of Suggestions*; neither was giving students "some idea of what archaeological evidence is". This suggests that during the early 1950s, within official circles, there was interest in what was termed in chapter three a "weak" disciplinary approach to source-work, that is, in the "how do we know?" question where sources are beginning to be appreciated as providing evidence about the past.

---

[290] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 51.
[291] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 53.

In the *Handbook of Suggestions* sources were, in Lee and Shemilt's terms, treated "pre-evidentially" as "windows" that appeared to afford direct access to the past and which conveyed authoritative knowledge. In the passage above, the disciplinary question "how do we know?" was introduced. Sources are still treated as "windows" but students were now to *see* them as providing evidence. The disciplinary idea conveyed here was that archaeologists know about the past by investigating source materials, making history an activity as well as a body of knowledge. This important passage showed that during the early 1950s a weak disciplinary approach to source-work was a feature of history education discourse, although this was not the critical "strong" disciplinary source-work that Aldrich had hinted at.

In the following passage, the authors also considered the use of written primary sources. The detective metaphor was again employed. In this discussion source-work was viewed as an evolving practice, with written sources an important area for development. Frustration and an expectation of change are expressed. The authors of *Pamphlet No. 23* suggested:

> It is a pity that it is so much harder to tackle the equally important problem of literary evidence; but could not the same detective interest be invoked?[292]

As with the *Handbook of Suggestions*, illustrative historical sources were highly valued. Picture sources were said to have value when they stirred the imagination by providing narrative with a visual representation. In the words of *Pamphlet No. 23*:

> It is the particular and the concrete which secures the response and which sets the pupils' minds and imagination to work, then the wise teacher will consider how he can make the classroom work vivid by illustration.[293]

---

[292] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 53.
[293] Ibid.,, p. 54.

Pamphlet No. 23's discussion of the use of sources included aspects of local history. This was also considered to be an important area undergoing development that had the potential to "stimulate their detective curiosity" and "understand" history in a different way. In this passage, a study of the local environment was seen as an important after-school activity:

> But the life of the boys and girls outside the classroom and out of school hours will also be important to him because he will want to help them to look at their surroundings with a new understanding.[294]

Pamphlet No. 23 suggested "investigating" the past by visiting parish churches. In the following passage, disciplinary and narrative lexicons are employed. When studying a parish church students were said to "reconstruct" the past by making "deductions". At the same time, parish churches were "sources of historical information" that "illustrated" a single fixed narrative:

> But probably the richest source material for reconstructing, by observation and deduction, a wide field of social and cultural life is to be found in the older parish churches. The brasses, stained glass, heraldic arms and epitaphs are obvious sources of historical information. It is not quite so often appreciated how the older parish church reflects the successive centuries, and it can be a fascinating thing for the boy or girl to follow English history, from the Norman Conquest to the Tudors, reflected around him in stone and glass.[295]

The sense of an evolving post-war history education discourse is captured in *Pamphlet No. 23*'s discussion on museums and records offices. Both were seen as in a process of forging closer partnerships with schools by making available source material and contributing to developing approaches to source-work. In the

---

[294] Ibid.
[295] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 55.

following passage, it is reported that the museums' service supporting schools had undergone a transformation:

> An increasing number of children now live within reach of one of the great museums. In the past the museum has often enough seemed a forbidding place where stuffed animals and inanimate objects enjoyed as their principal attribute a singular quality of deadness. This is no longer true; a movement of "bringing the museum to life" has changed the whole principle of presentation in a large number of the museums and has made them places of great fascination both for boys and for girls.[296]

The use of "original documents" was said by *Pamphlet No. 23* to be an emerging practice, supported by records offices, and of interest to a minority within the profession. *Pamphlet No. 23's* discussion on the use of sources ends with an examination of the difficulties of using "original documents". As the following passage shows, this was an area of source-work development that held a great deal of interest. *Pamphlet No. 23* stated:

> Few more interesting developments have taken place in school history in recent years than the attempt to examine with children, original documents.[297]

In this passage, working with "original documents" was seen as an important area of experimental curriculum development. The discussion continued by identifying two barriers that it considered were holding it back. The first was said to be logistical. *Pamphlet No. 23* noted: "The problem here is the problem of bringing pupil and record into fruitful contact." *Pamphlet No. 23* was optimistic that with the support of records offices and with teacher planning this barrier could be overcome. In the following passage, *Pamphlet No 23* explains why "original documents" should be used. It should be noted that these were pre-evidential.

---

[296]Ibid
[297] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 58

Even "the challenge to children to find things out for themselves" did not appear to raise the question "how do we know?", although it can be seen as moving in that direction. The passage begins by stating, that "original documents" were being used in classrooms:

> There is already sufficient evidence to suggest that this is an approach which can bring an added interest to the work, which can stimulate imagination, and which can offer a challenge to children to find things out for themselves. [298]

Pamphlet No. 23 was alive to the difficulties in obtaining copies of original documents and to the limited financial resources available to support history education during the immediate post-war period. In the next passage, teachers are directed to locate sources in the locality such as private collections of family archives, the local parish register, enclosure award maps and to seek the support of museums and records offices.[299] It is a passage that provided telling insight into the technical and financial realities facing post-war history education:

> such services need money and staff, and in these difficult days developments are inevitably slow. There will, however, normally be documents of local interest either in private hands, in the records office, or in the church. Sometimes these can be photographed by private arrangements: often transcripts may be made, for there is nearly always someone who is willing to help in reading or handwriting. None of this work is easy, and it entails much time and hard work, but it has been done and it can be justified by the results in the classroom.[300]

For *Pamphlet No. 23*, the main issue concerning the use of original documents was not criticality, inference, or viewing them as evidence; rather it was their language.

---

[298] Ibid.

[299] In a period that predates the World Wide Web and the photocopying machine, making reproductions of sources was a great deal more difficult. During the post-war period, the work of records offices, such as Essex, Lancashire and Gloucestershire, in making original source materials more widely available is significant.

[300] *Pamphlet No. 23*, p. 57.

Original written sources had a value when they could be comprehended to arouse interest and stimulate the imagination. This was sufficient for *Pamphlet No. 23*.

In this chapter, early post-war "official" history education has been examined through a comparison of two texts. The focus has been on the range of ideas and the extent to which they changed.

Taking the aims of history education first, the reading undertaken here has noted broad similarities between the *Handbook of Suggestions* (1946) and *Pamphlet No. 23* (1952), suggesting continuity rather than change. The six leading ideas underlying the *Handbook of Suggestions*' aims statement were also prominent in *Pamphlet No. 23*.

In these two texts there was a consensus that the purpose of history education was to transmit a body of knowledge, viewed as "our heritage"; and that this should be tailored to match the capabilities and interests of students; and further, it was considered important that students were emotionally and intellectually engaged in the process. The overriding aim, agreed by both texts, was to nurture "good" citizens through moral and civic lessons that fostered a distinctive collective memory and national identity.

These texts privileged selected narrative passages that promoted collective cultural traditions and values. Underlying this was the idea that for the majority of students history education should be an emotional experience and that a small minority of students were capable of taking an intellectual approach.

Alongside broad areas of agreement were elements of diversity and change. This centred on the content of the knowledge to be transmitted and the methods used to transmit it. In these texts the selection of content to be taught was under review. Both texts were reformist in the sense that they sought a history education that aspired to be more than rote learning names and dates and they thought that it should adapt to meet the needs of a changing society. They understood that to

achieve this required a greater range of teaching methods. This was because, as well as retaining knowledge, they wanted to engage students emotionally, imaginatively and intellectually. This would result, they thought, in making the process of knowledge transmission more effective.

According to these official authors, history education was changing. Their reading of its historical development appeared to confirm this. From the point of view of *Pamphlet No. 23*, the way history was being taught appeared to be changing during the early post-war period, perhaps most notably in the emergence of teaching selected periods of time in depth, suggesting that the past could be studied for its own sake.

In the authors' view the content of lessons was subject to revision. Each generation, they thought, should revise the syllabus in light of new knowledge and changed circumstances. Therefore change was inevitable, if history education was to meet the needs of a rapidly changing society.

Diversity and change are seen in their discussions on source-work. Change in the sense that these texts advocated that teachers take up the practice as part of an alternative to rote learning facts and because source-work was seen as an important area for curriculum development. Within official circles, this appears to have been more strongly voiced in 1952 than in 1946. In their writing, using sources to engage students opened up a diversity of approaches. In these two texts, they ranged from the pre-evidential to the weak disciplinary. Sources were used to illustrate a narrative, generate awe and wonder, convey a moral message, inspire, entertain, picture social conditions, as well as enable students to see sources as evidence and address the disciplinary question "how do we know?"

In these texts, there was a sense of inventiveness about selecting content and its presentation. Knowledge transmission should, they thought, aspire to be interesting, accessible and enjoyable. The use of primary source materials had an important place in these discussions. In these texts, sources enabled the past to be

experienced imaginatively in a way that satisfied a "natural" love of story. The language that was used to express this was emotionally charged and transformative. The use of sources was said to kindle "a lifelong flame of historical imagination"; to "fire the imagination", and awaken interest in the "delights of history" by make history live.

Pamphlet No. 23 thought that encountering sources enhanced narrative exposition by rendering it more vivid and real. An encounter with an original document, such as Magna Carta, had the potential to arouse feelings of wonder that reinforced bonds of collective identity in "our" past. According to this view, students should encounter "original documents" because they aided the core aims of knowledge acquisition, moral instruction and civic responsibility. In these discussions the use of sources augmented the dominant aims of history education by engaging students' interest, stirring their imaginations and providing them with opportunities to conduct independent fact-based investigations.

Pamphlet No. 23's discussion represented a shift in the direction of disciplinary source-work. Detective source-work, it wrote, was in its "experimental phase". It took the view that it was only a matter of time before it would enhance and deepen the practice of history education.

Pamphlet No. 23's discussion on source-work fell short of the criteria associated with the Schools Council History 13–16 History Project. It did, however, meet the criteria for a "weak disciplinary" approach to source-work set out in chapter three. The authors believed that source-work had an important role to play in the reform of post-war history education. It would, they argued; potentially play an important role in revitalising a post-war history education that would otherwise be dull and ineffective. In chapter seven, writing by Rachel Reid and Stanley Toyne is examined. Leading lights within the Historical Association during the early post-war years, they too sought to change the practice of history education in schools.

Chapter Seven

Rachel Reid, Stanley Toyne and the Historical Association

Unlike the official texts discussed in chapters five and six, the authors examined in this chapter can be named. They were Rachel Reid and Stanley Toyne and during the early 1940s they co-wrote the pamphlet *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools*, published by the Historical Association in 1944.[301]

In the context of this study, Reid and Toyne represent a shift in viewpoint. In their writing, post-war history education is seen through the eyes of two experienced history educators and the Historical Association, the professional association of which they were members. To draw attention to their link to central government, the texts in chapters five and six were referred to as "official" sources. Not having a direct link to central government, Reid and Toyne's text is referred to in this study as an "unofficial" source. This is not intended to be a clear-cut distinction.[302] It serves to point to the diversity of early post-war history education writing.

This chapter builds upon the argument begun in chapters five and six. So far, this has challenged the idea that post-war history education was uniform and unchanging, a view commonly associated with the writing of John Slater and David Sylvester.[303] In chapters five and six, it was noted that "official" texts across the period 1946–1952 supported Slater and Sylvester's contention that post-war history education justified its place on the curriculum on instrumentalist grounds. However,

---

[301] *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools* is available to download at: www.history.org.uk/file_download.php?ts=1291892835&id=7212.

[302] For example, Reid and Toyne's *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools*, published by the Historical Association in 1944, drew on the following publications from the Board of Education: The Hadow Report, *The Education of the Adolescent* (HMSO, 1926); *Report on the Teaching of History* (HMSO, 1927); The Hadow Report, *The Primary School* (HMSO, 1931); The Hadow Report, *Infant and Nursery Schools* (HMSO, 1933); The Spens Report, *Secondary Education with Special Reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools* (HMSO, 1938). These references provide strong evidence of an interchange of ideas taking place between "official" and "unofficial" publications.

[303] For a fuller account of this, see Chapter one.

it was argued that supporting their instrumentalism was a set of pedagogic aims that addressed questions concerning student engagement, content and teaching methods and that these represented elements of diversity and change. In other words, the views expressed within official circles in 1952 were not the same as those expressed in 1946. This chapter explores these issues in more detail by examining an "unofficial" early post-war history education text.

As in the preceding two chapters, focus is upon post-war history education writing as a "social practice". This means, in the case of Reid and Toyne, considering how their text was produced. It will be argued that these authors worked collaboratively within an institutional setting that sought to change the course of post-war history education in ways that can be considered significant. Their text, it will be argued, represented a profoundly reflective social practice.

To make this argument, attention is focused upon what Reid and Toyne, in 1944, considered to be the aims of history education and the role that source-work should play in the development of students' knowledge and understanding of the past. Comparing Reid and Toyne's position on aims and source-work with that of the Board of Education's *Handbook of Suggestions*, published in 1946 (the subject of chapter five), calls into the question the simplistic notion of a period of uniformity'

It was argued in chapter six that in 1952 *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23* had considered "weak" disciplinary approaches to source-work, in that it advocated approaches that promoted the idea that source material provided evidence about the past. This chapter considers the extent to which Reid and Toyne, eight years earlier, in 1944, were also open to this educational stance.

Carried forward into this chapter is the argument that post-war history education was a living, evolving tradition. It is an argument that calls into question representations such as "inherited consensus" and "Great Tradition" that stressed the unchanging nature of post-war history education. To support this argument, it

was noted that "official" texts took the view that history education had continuously accommodated new subject knowledge emerging from historical scholarship and had modified its instrumentalist aims to meet the changing needs of society; the important point being that the general aims and syllabus content found in the early twentieth century were not exactly the same as those espoused during the early post-war period. With this in mind, this chapter examines how Reid and Toyne represented the development of history education and their place within it.

One of the main values of post-war history education texts is their ability to demonstrate in a very direct way that "real" people contributed to the making of post-war history education; a vital point generally overlooked in notions of "inherited consensus" and "Great Tradition". This chapter takes seriously the relevance of authorship. Pausing to consider the identity of early post-war history education authors such as Rachel Reid and Stanley Toyne shines a light on the agency of early post-war history educators. Exploring authorship demonstrates that active on the ground were teachers who, in their own terms, made sense of history education. It is with the question of authorship and the idea of a living and evolving tradition that discussion in this chapter begins.

The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools, published by the Historical Association in 1944, was a collaboration involving some of the leading figures in pre- and early post-war history education. Rachel Reid, one of its co-authors, had helped found the Historical Association in 1906 and by 1944 had supported its work for 38 years. During this time, she had been chair of the Historical Association's Illustrations Committee between 1922 and 1928, and had played a leading role in the Historical Association's campaign to reform the School Certificate Examination during the 1930s.[304] In addition, she had been an inspector of schools (evidence of

---

[304] To mark its jubilee in 1957, the Historical Association published a volume of papers: *The Historical Association 1906–1956* (1957). Miss Grace Stretton's contribution to this, A Record of the First Fifty Years. In *The Historical Association 1906–1956* (Historical Association, 1957), pp. 5–55, is the source for the historical details in this section.

overlap between the "official" and "unofficial") and a lecturer in History at Girton College, Cambridge and at University College, London.

Stanley Toyne, Reid's co-author, had served as chair of the Historical Association's Examinations Committee between 1938 and 1943, was chair of the Historical Association's Teaching of History Committee between 1943 and 1945, and had been Chairman of the Council of the Historical Association between 1946 and 1949. In addition, he had taught history in the independent school sector at Bedford School and Haileybury College and had served as headmaster at St Peter's School, an independent school in York.[305]

During the period of its production between 1940 and 1944, Reid and Toyne received support from an advisory committee of the Historical Association, some of whom had published on history education.[306] Their experience of teaching history sprang from the independent and grammar school sector. The group included G. G. Armstrong, a history master at the County Secondary School, Stockton-on-Tees; A. C. F. Beales, a lecturer in education at King's College, London; Mr. S. R. Brett, a history master at Nuneaton Grammar School; E. H. Dance, a history master at Wolverhampton Grammar School; Miss D. Dymond, the Principal of Portsmouth Training College; Miss H. M. Madley, the Assistant Director of Education for Warwickshire, formerly a lecturer in History at Bingley Training College; and C. H. K. Marten, the Vice-Provost and former History Master at Eton College.

Work began on *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools* in 1940. During its production Reid and Toyne consulted members of thirteen branches of the

---

[305] In 1945, Toyne published A History Syllabus: Thoughts on What to Learn and How to Learn It, *History*, 30 (1945), 159–72.

[306] A list of their works include: A. C. F. Beales, *A Guide to the Teaching of History in Schools* (London, 1957); E. H. Dance, *History the Betrayer: A Study of Bias* (London, 1960); For Harry, England and St George!, *Journal of Education*, 90(1062) (1958), 10–12; D. Dymond (ed.) *Handbook for History Teachers* (London, 1929); H. M. Madley, *History as a School of Citizenship* (Oxford, 1920) and *Time Charts* (Historical Association, 1954); C. H. K. Marten, *On the Teaching of History and other Addresses* (Oxford, 1938) and The First School Examination and the Teaching of History, *History*, 13 (1928), 17–29. The source for these references is J. Fines, *The Teaching of History in the United Kingdom: A Select Bibliography* (Historical Association, 1969).

Historical Association.[307] They also drew upon pamphlets published previously by the Historical Association and reports published by the Board of Education.[308]

Reid and Toyne's collaboration was ambitious in its scope. Its 27 pages covered what it termed the "why, the what, the when and the how" of teaching history in schools.[309] This included the nature of history, the aims of history education, teacher training, curriculum time, resources, syllabus design and content, learning theory, historical thinking, and the relationship between history and civics. Written at a critical time and receiving the approval of the Historical Association, *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools* represented a major statement on history education, one that encapsulated the views of an influential group of early post-war history educators.

Underlying their statement was a profound dissatisfaction with the general state of classroom practice. *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools* responded to this by presenting teachers with a revised framework within which to plan and teach. Reid and Toyne's text, therefore, provides strong evidence of early post-war teacher collaboration linked to reforming syllabus content and teaching methods.

Evidence to show that teacher collaboration in history education was not a new phenomenon is seen in the Historical Association's campaign to reform public examinations, a campaign in which Reid and Toyne played a part. In 1957, in her account of the history of the Historical Association, Grace Stretton wrote that public examination reform had preoccupied and divided the Historical Association

---

[307] The branches of the Historical Association that were consulted were: Bangor, Bournemouth, Bristol, Exeter, Leeds, Central and North Lancashire, Central London, Manchester, Norfolk, Oxford, Sheffield and Worthing (see Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 1).

[308] Reid and Toyne begin their text: "During the thirty-seven years of its existence the Historical Association has issued many leaflets in which a number of distinguished and experienced writers and teachers of history have set forth their views on the purpose and educational value of the study of history as well as on the most effective methods of teaching it. These leaflets have been a source of inspiration and guidance to hundreds of teachers in planning their syllabuses and determining their methods" (Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 1).

[309] Reid and Toyne, *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools* (Historical Association, 1944), p. 1.

throughout the 1920s and 1930s.[310]

The Historical Association's support for the reform of public examinations had begun in 1925, when a subcommittee of the Historical Association was set up to review the School Certificate.[311] This was later discussed at annual general meetings of the Historical Association in 1927 and 1928 and at a conference held in 1928; in 1930, the Historical Association canvassed teachers' opinions and published articles in its journal *History.*

These teacher discussions, as reported in the journal *History*, suggested that a range of positions were taken on the question of reform. Historical Association members who opposed reform, these articles suggested, favoured a style of public examination that tested the recall of factual knowledge on political topics drawn from a study of a single textbook. The Historical Association's Examination Committee unequivocally favoured reform, recommending in 1933 that teachers working with examination boards conduct experimentation.[312]

Reformers within the Historical Association disapproved of the School Certificate's emphasis on memorisation of factual knowledge and the privileging of political topics. They accused it of encouraging teaching to the test and killing students' interest and enjoyment in learning about the past. Suggestions for a new kind of examination included widening the range of topic areas to include social, economic and local history. They called for setting questions that matched students' ability, which were accessible and which tested what students had studied during their examination courses. A move away from just recalling factual knowledge could be made, it was suggested, if students were allowed to refer to timelines of events and

---

[310] Stretton, 1957, pp.36–7. The School Certificate was a public examination for schools first established in 1918 and was usually taken at age 16. In order to gain the certificate a student would have to pass Mathematics, English and three other subjects, similar to the BTEC Extended Diploma of today. Students who stayed on at school received the opportunity to take the Higher School Certificate at age 18. In 1951, the General Certificate of Education (GCE) O-levels and A-levels replaced the School Certificate and the Higher School Certificate.

[311] Ibid.

[312] Report of the Historical Association Examinations Committee Recommendation, *History*, July (1933), 139–45.

textbooks during the examination. These arguments appealed to a sense of fairness and a need to engage students in the study of history. Underlying these concerns was the desire to make history education more appealing and relevant to students. They also show that teachers at this time had taken various positions on a key aspect of history education.

By far the most progressive voice in favour of reform was F. C. Happold, a teacher working at the Perse School, Cambridge (1922–1928) and then the Bishop Wordsworth School, Salisbury (1928–1960). His proposals for a source-based examination shifted the emphasis away from testing recall of factual knowledge towards testing students' ability to process factual knowledge while working with primary and secondary source material. In 1931, Happold argued:

> My own particular objection to the present examination tests is that they are too little tests of intelligence, too much tests of memory; tests which the normal boy can tackle moderately well, but the preparation for which tends to prevent one from giving that real historical training which might be so valuable in what is for many the last year at school.[313]

Happold argued that public examinations should aspire to do more than prepare students to recall factual knowledge for a test. He argued that they should train students to intelligently engage with source material. In his examination paper, students were presented with eight short extracts taken from secondary and primary sources. His questions invited students to examine this material in a manner that anticipated aspects of the New History movement of the 1970s.[314]

---

[313] F. C. Happold, The Case for Experimentation in Examinations: A Reply, *History*, April (1931), 37.
[314] To illustrate this point, consider Happold's three source-based questions: "(1) Summarise very briefly what light each passage throws on the character, aims or career of Napoleon. You are not required to make a précis, but to show in two or three sentences what are the chief points brought out in each passage. (2) Can you detect in these passages any fundamental differences of opinion about Napoleon? Which supplement and which appear to contradict each other. (3) Using these passages as material, together with any other information you possess, write a character sketch of Napoleon Bonaparte. When you have finished underline those parts of your character sketch which

According to Stretton, support for examination reform among members of the Historical Association was divided, with a large section strongly opposing it. This opposition to reform did not, however, prevent work beginning on *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools* in 1940, when Rachel Reid called for a new "authoritative guide" on the framing of the syllabus.[315]

The production of Reid and Toyne's text provides strong evidence of "social practice", as it clearly shows shows how post-war educators worked collaboratively within an institutional setting to influence the development of history education. In this case, it demonstrates that during the 1940s, the Historical Association pursued long-standing reform issues, while it also responded to more immediate concerns. Reid and Toyne stated that their proposals for a new framework were a response to the 1944 Education Reform Act, which encouraged widening access to state secondary education to all students under the age of 15. What is significant about this is that it suggests that they looked forward optimistically to a post-war history education that would change and evolve.[316]

Reid and Toyne's statement was remarkably self-assured. This reflected these authors status as leaders in the field of history education within the Historical Association, the institution they represented and of which they were members. This was to be expected, given how the Historical Association saw its role at this time. The HA claimed that it was:

> The indispensable forum for the discussion of the nature of history and the educational importance of its various parts.[317]

The Historical Association was established in 1906 to represent the teaching of history in schools with a brief to defend the interests of teachers in policy decision-

---

are based on these sources." See F. C. Happold, A New Type of Question in History Papers, *History*, 13 (1928), 126–30.

[315] Stretton, 1957, p. 46.

[316] The 1944 Education Act proposed that all children should receive a secondary education to age 15 years.

[317] Stretton, 1957, p. 39.

making.[318] Following disruption during the Second World War, the early post-war period was a time of recovery and growth for the Historical Association. Its membership in 1947 numbered 6,503, and by 1950 this had grown to 8,000.[319] This large and influential group, a vibrant history education community of practice, was Reid and Toyne's intended audience.

Evidence of "social practice" is seen in the following passage. Here, Reid and Toyne argue that the Historical Association was uniquely placed to determine what the aims, structure and content of the school syllabus should be. It was predisposed to lead on these matters, they argued, because it alone possessed the historical and pedagogic knowledge required to deliver history education to students. Reid and Toyne contended that:

> To make such a pronouncement is the peculiar right and duty of the Historical Association as including both teachers engaged in advanced historical study and teaching at the Universities, who can give authoritative guidance as to the relative importance of movements and facts for understanding the past which has made the present, and teachers engaged in teaching history to boys and girls, who can judge how much their pupils can assimilate, and when and how that amount can best be taught.[320]

Here, it can be seen that Reid and Toyne thought that the Historical Association possessed a natural authority to govern the development of post-war history education. It was, they argued, uniquely placed to determine what the aims of history education should be; to guide teachers on the methods they should employ in classrooms; and to select what knowledge was to be transmitted. It was incumbent upon the Historical Association, they thought, to authorise what the future of history education would look like.

---

[318] Ibid., p. 10.
[319] Ibid., p. 49. (Which is about the same size as its membership today.)
[320] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 1.

Reid and Toyne made two statements on the aims of history education. The first was located in the main body of *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools* (pages 3–4) and a second, a summary statement, was included near the end (page 23). Both are considered here. Their main statement is as follows:

AIMS AND PROBLEMS OF TEACHING HISTORY

There are those who say it is not possible to teach history thus understood to children at all. In a sense this is true: there are even many adults to whom real history cannot be taught. It is true also of literature, which was not written for children but for grown men and women, and those highly educated; but this has never been regarded as a reason for not including literature in the school curriculum, only for careful selection and treatment. Greek and Latin prose literature, apart from works on philosophy, actually consists almost wholly of history and political speeches; but this has never been a bar to its study by schoolboys. It is the same with history. We may not be able to teach children as much history as they ought to know, because it deals with the doings of grown men and women, and therefore with many experiences beyond the range of boys and girls; but we can at least teach them something of what history is about; we can give them a sense of time, of the reality of the past, and of its close connection with the present; and we can try to make them understand that the world in which we live is not a normal world, because the world is always changing, and so free them both from fear of change and from desire for change for its own sake. In so doing, we can also give them some of the knowledge of man's progress in civilisation and of his relations with his fellowmen which we must have if we are to understand our environment and how best to adapt it to our ever-changing needs, together with some of the kind of knowledge essential to general culture and to the enjoyment of art and literature. At the same time we can by showing how each of the other subjects in the curriculum has contributed to the making of our present environment, give them all a value and meaning that none can have in and by itself. Moreover, in studying history, however simply, the pupil has to use his

memory, his imagination, his reasoning power, and his judgment in collecting, examining, and correlating facts, in drawing conclusions from men's actions, weighing evidence, and in forming general opinions which he must learn to regard as provisional only and as more or less probable rather than as true or untrue. In short, the study of history can and should give boys and girls some of the kind of knowledge indispensable both as a foundation for any real understanding of the world of to-day and as a basis for culture of any kind, some training in the quasi-inductive processes of thought most common in adult life, and some power of considering current events in the light of past experience. But if these ends are to be attained the syllabus must be framed in accordance with definite principles, the content must be carefully selected, and it must be taught in such a way as to make the reason for its study intelligible to the pupils.[321]

A comparison of Reid and Toyne's aims statement with the one made by the Board of Education reveal striking similarities. They shared a commitment to a version of knowledge transmission that involved more than "recalling accepted facts about famous dead Englishmen", as Slater had suggested. Both fiercely opposed a history education that privileged learning historical facts by rote. The leading ideas in Reid and Toyne's statement corresponded closely to the ones found in the Board of Education's *Handbook of Suggestions*, indeed both texts suggested that on the question of what history education was for there were broad areas of agreement between them.

Both statements began from a position that knowledge transmission could not transmit "real history", which was defined as the results of historical scholarship. Gaining knowledge of "real history", they took for granted, was the exclusive preserve a highly educated elite. Both thought that the most pressing challenge facing history education was making "real" historical knowledge accessible to students and this involved developing effective methods of presenting it to them.

---

[321] Reid and Toyne (1944) pp 3-4

They took it for granted that the purpose of history education was to serve as a conduit through which the results of historical scholarship (the historical record) were passed on in a highly modified form to students. It appeared to them that the solution to the adult nature of "real history" lay with careful selection. Their different versions of knowledge transmission aspired to be accessible and engaging, while delivering very specific citizenship goals. Both thought that this involved taking into account students' interests and abilities. Their formula was to tailor knowledge to match students' prior understandings. The reward, prized by both, was the production of "good" citizens, considered essential for post-war society

Both were wedded to a set of interlocking core aims that privileged versions of knowledge transmission that fostered citizenship education. The purpose of this, they agreed, was to furnish students with essential knowledge about the society to which they belonged and their place within it. These core aims appeared to these authors as "natural" and were therefore left unexamined. The selection of knowledge and developing methods of presenting it was their central problem and this allowed room for a diversity of approaches. What knowledge was to be transmitted and how it was to be presented, they reasoned, very much depended upon the interests and abilities of different students. It was indeed possible, they asserted, to teach students "something of what history is about". Taking a knowledge-based approach, their texts outlined what this "something" might be.

A vital area of concern in both texts was that the knowledge selected for transmission should be historically "accurate" or as true to the "historical record" as was possible. It was important to them that what was transmitted was "authentic" historical knowledge. It appeared to them that what this selected authentic knowledge should be was becoming more diverse; whereas the Board of Education favoured simple "stories" drawn from our national heritage, Reid and Toyne placed "cultural" knowledge of the world today centre stage.

A notable feature of both texts is the range of benefits that history education was said to bestow. In their lists of benefits both included "historical thinking". In this,

they included developing the faculties of memory, imagination and reason. They took the view that the memorisation of historical facts had a place but of equal importance was imaginative engagement. Further, a history education had value when it developed students' sense of chronological time. They thought it important that students were aware that events in the past had actually occurred and were not just made up implying some disciplinary understanding of how historical statements are made. The "good" post-war citizen, they thought, should possess knowledge of cultural progress and should have an appreciation that historical change was inevitable.

A history education was important, they argued, because it enabled students to make sense of who they were and helped them understand the world they belonged to. This made being able to distinguish between literature and historical knowledge important. For students were required to take on trust the veracity of the knowledge being transmitted to them. They had to believe that what was being transmitted to them was "true" historical knowledge.

Their aims statements included working with factual knowledge in diverse ways. "Doing history" meant, for these authors, learning to independently collect, examine and correlate facts. "Thinking historically" involved "weighing evidence", "forming judgments" and "drawing conclusions". Reid and Toyne went so far as to suggest that "doing" history was an inductive discipline that constructed provisional knowledge.

As with the Board of Education in 1946, the principal purpose of a history education was for Reid and Toyne, in 1944, to enable students to take their place in society and this largely meant transmitting knowledge of a shared national culture. This aspect is clearly expressed in the following key passage, found in Part II, Summary of *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools* (page 23). Here, Reid and Toyne declared:

> The purpose of teaching history is two-fold:

1. Educational:

(i) To train the pupils to think accurately about human affairs, first overcoming the inertia bred of familiarity, and then the influence of habit, prejudice, and passion.

(ii) To develop in the pupils as future citizens some sense of the relativity of truth, some insight into the springs of human action, some notion of the responsibility and the duty laid on men and women as members of a society.

(iii) To aid in individual character-training by teaching the great moral truths of life, not directly, but through examples of conduct, especially those which have from age to age inspired men with courage and devotion, with indignation against wrong and enthusiasm for right, with sympathy and tolerance, sometimes with reverence and humility.

The attainment of these aims depends largely on the manner of presentation, but they cannot be ignored in planning the syllabus itself.

2. Instructional:

(i) To give the pupils, not merely useful or interesting information about the past, but also some knowledge of the happenings which have most influenced man's progress in civilisation and his relations with his fellow-men, no less attention being given to changes in conditions – including the progress of invention and the advance of knowledge – than to political history in the narrow sense, together with some knowledge of the present state both of their own country and of the world.

(ii) To give them the training necessary to enable them to acquire for themselves new knowledge about the past, to correlate it with what they already know, and to interpret it carefully and without bias.[322]

These civic aims are similar to the ones found in the Board of Education's *Handbook of Suggestions*. This statement shows that Reid and Toyne took for granted that history education's principal purpose was to deliver a celebratory historical narrative of "the progress of civilisation" that would help prepare students for adult life in civic society. Reid and Toyne's history education "training", like the Board of Education's, sought to form students' character and furnish them with the knowledge they thought was required to fulfil civic duties and responsibilities.

Reid and Toyne presented their version of history education as a training that would transform and redeem by exposing students to the "great moral truths of life". Selecting content that would provide moral instruction would, they argued, enable students to overcome their innate "prejudices and passions" and would mould them into virtuous, dutiful and responsible citizens.

For Reid and Toyne, history education's higher function was, as it was for the Board of Education, to serve citizenship education by delivering selected historical knowledge deemed suitable for becoming a "good" citizen. This interweaving of history education, moral education and citizenship education is seen in the following passage. Here, Reid and Toyne suggest that history education has a distinctive role to play in delivering the socialising goals desired by post-war society. To create social cohesion, they argued, it was necessary that students identify themselves with the history of the national community by taking ownership of it. Reid and Toyne wrote:

Civics in the sense of citizenship, *morale sociale*, cannot be taught in set lessons any more than any other part of morality. The spirit of citizenship, the sense of membership of a society and of the responsibility entailed by such

---

[322] Reid and Tpyne (1944) p 23

membership, should grow out of the whole history course. It is from the study of history that children – like men – can most easily gain a knowledge of true moral values, and of the meaning of right, duty and justice, as well as an understanding both of the value of freedom and of the responsibility that goes with it. If these do not grow out of the whole history course, then that course, however carefully it may have been planned, must be regarded as an educational failure.[323]

Reid and Toyne cautioned teachers not to teach history as an end in itself. To do so, they argued, would risk undermining its true civic function. In the following passage, Reid and Toyne underlined that history education was a form of citizenship training in which the purpose of knowledge about the past was to explain present-day concerns. Reid and Toyne wrote:

Difficult as it may sometimes be for the specialist interested in the study of history for its own sake, the teacher of boys and girls should always keep in mind that for them the study of history is part of their non-technical training as future citizens, and should therefore always seek to give them, along with some idea of the course of man's social and political development, some appreciation of the influence of the leading events in history, however remote in time or place, not only on the past but on the present, and through it, on the future.[324]

As with the Board of Education, it did not occur to Reid and Toyne to question the assumption that citizenship education should dominate early post-war history education aims.[325] They took it for granted that the study of the past was a guide to living in the present. That matters could be otherwise was left unexamined.

---

[323] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 21.
[324] Ibid., p. 25.
[325] Reid and Toyne's instrumentalism draws on classical Greek historiography. They write: "Then the chronicle was transformed by the genius of Herodotus and Thucydides into genuine history, a record, based on enquiry, of events recounted not for their own sake only but as a part of human experience" (1944, p. 3).

It is appropriate, at this point, to consider what type of citizenship Reid and Toyne and the Board of Education were promoting. Joel Westheimer and Joseph Kahne's citizenship typology, published in 2004, is useful here when suggesting that citizenship education is never in theory restricted to a single outcome and that "taking one's place in society" always has a range of possible meanings. Arguably, Westheimer and Kahne's *personally responsible* citizenship type approximate what Reid and Toyne and the Board of Education had in mind, when they suggested that "good" citizens should be of good character, honest, responsible and law-abiding. It did not occur to these authors that history education might foster taking on leadership roles, questioning truth claims or seeking systemic social and political change – attributes found in Westheimer and Kahne's other two citizenship types.[326]

For the Board of Education and for Reid and Toyne, becoming a "good" citizen meant becoming a "responsible" member of society, fully aware of their rights and responsibilities. It would be reasonable to suggest that these two versions of history education served as an instrument of social discipline, their purpose being to legitimise existing power relations by fostering willingness to serve the interests of the state.

 Like the Board of Education, Reid and Toyne prized history education's capacity to mould character by correcting "bad" habits and instilling "positive" values. For them, it followed, that students should study stories from history that exemplified what was, in their view, ideal citizenship behaviour. To them, this could best be achieved by exposing students to exemplary narratives that illustrated what being a dutiful and responsible member of society entailed.

In their evolving view of the development of history education during the nineteenth and twentieth century, Reid and Toyne recognised that the nature of

---

[326] J. Westheimer and J. Kahne, What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy, *American Educational Research Journal*, 41(2) (2004), 237–69. Their three conceptions of the "good" citizen were: personally responsible, participatory, and justice oriented. Also available at: www.democraticdialogue.com/DDpdfs/WhatKindOfCitizenAERJF.pdf.

character training had not been entirely static but had undergone change. In the following passage, they observed that during the nineteenth century, history education had focused on the ruling elite, the "men of affairs". They thought that at the beginning of the post-war era history education faced a different set of civic needs. What had changed was the new requirement that history education would socialise the wider population. On this change, Reid and Toyne reflected:

> As such, history deals with the problems which have tested the skill and wisdom of all the statesmen who have ever lived, with the kind of probability on which the conduct of life depends, and with that incalculable factor in human happenings – the will of man directed by his prejudices and swayed by his passions and desires. Long regarded as indispensable for men of affairs, the study of history is no less necessary now for a democracy, which claims freedom and power but has yet to learn that both impose responsibility.[327]

Reid and Toyne, like the Board of Education, took the view that during the first half of the twentieth century, history education in England had evolved to keep pace with wider social change. Change was also prompted by the need to accommodate a continually expanding historical record, the fruits of historical scholarship. In the following passage, the authors explained how the content of history education necessarily underwent generational shifts in response to social change and historical research. Reid and Toyne wrote:

> Each generation has to re-write history in the light of new knowledge and experience, and every passing year, while adding to the sum of facts to be known, raises new questions to be asked of the past for the guidance of an ever-changing present. Clearly there cannot be a final history syllabus even for a single school. Every history syllabus ought to be revised at least every five years.[328]

---

[327] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 2.
[328] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 6.

It is significant, in light of the view that history education was at this time unified and unchanging, that Reid and Toyne took the development of history education very seriously. They reported that it was under considerable pressure, faced difficult challenges and appeared to have an uncertain future. A central theme was the changing content of knowledge transmission.[329] Historical knowledge, they wrote, was constantly advancing.

Reid and Toyne's framework for a revised post-war history education was content based and took a narrative form. They considered it to be groundbreaking in the way it reflected the changed democratic values of post-war society. A post-war history education that emphasised knowledge transmission, they thought, could no longer be just concerned with an elite but had to have a regard for the general population. Their shared, collective narrative of the past was designed to tell the story of "ordinary" members of society, one that the whole school population could identify with.

As with the Board of Education, Reid and Toyne likened learning the narrative of "our past" to accumulating a "store of knowledge".[330] This involved learning the story in terms of its key factual information. This was how they framed their learning objectives and outcomes. They wrote that as well as developing a real interest in history, students under the age of 11 could be expected to acquire:

> a good store of information about some of the great men and chief events of
> the past and about the beginnings of civilisation, together with some sense of
> the relation of these to one another and to their own lives, and at the same

[329] Ibid., p. 2.
[330] The Hadow Report (1931) on *The Primary School*, which Reid and Toyne cite as a source, stated: "The later stage of the pupil's work in history, the building up of a simple constructive view of the development of his own community in particular and of civilisation in general, would then offer a field of intelligent thought and interest which should not fail to attract and this in turn should lead to the conception that our civilisation is the fruit of the activities of many peoples, and is rapidly becoming the common possession of mankind" (p. 171).

time are able to read a simple history-book for themselves, and to answer from it and from their own little store of knowledge a few simple questions.[331]

Acquiring a "little store of knowledge" was evident too in what average students attending secondary school were thought to be capable of achieving. They wrote:

All boys and girls of average intelligence in all types of schools should by the age of 15 have acquired a useful modicum of knowledge about their common past...[332]

In the following passage, what can be achieved given the right circumstances is again framed in terms of knowledge acquisition:

Given … a well-qualified teacher, a reasonable amount of time, and adequate equipment, experience shows that it is not really difficult to give pupils of average intelligence a fair knowledge of the past out of which the present has come.[333]

Acquiring a "storehouse of knowledge" dominated Reid and Toyne's discussion. They discussed this in terms of "covering the ground", and by "fixing" in the student's mind. The Board of Education had described history education as learning a "stirring story". The following passage shows Reid and Toyne employed a similar vocabulary. They described the syllabus as being:

A great story and a stirring one, with many links with other subjects in the curriculum, especially with Scripture, literature and geography. A long story too; and to some it may seem impossible to cover so much ground with children. It is certainly not easy, often it may be difficult, even very difficult, but it is not impossible. Even in four years, from 11 to 15, the ground can be,

---

[331] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 14.
[332] Ibid., p. 7.
[333] Ibid., p. 3.

has been, covered, not in detail of course but in outline, which is all that is suggested here.[334]

For Reid and Toyne, building a "storehouse of knowledge" began in the early years with laying the "foundations" of knowledge and later by putting in place the narrative "structures" of knowledge. The narrative structure was seen as a continuous chain of events from "long ago" to the present that focused upon the origins of present-day political, economic and cultural institutions and which traced the roots of English national identity. Its underlying principle (shifting from an architectural to a horticultural metaphor) was that seeds of the present were planted in the past, asserting that "our" national culture was "deeply rooted" in "our" collective past. Reid and Toyne's syllabus was designed to make students feel that the roots of the society to which they belonged were sunk deep. They wrote:

> From the Ancient World we have derived not only the beginnings of our material civilisation but most of our ideas in art and literature, mathematics and science, philosophy and religion, as well as our conceptions of good government, law, order, and justice. It is also the world of the Bible and of the Classics, and knowledge of its history is essential for understanding both.[335]

Reid and Toyne were fully aware that in order to achieve their aims, students had to identify with the narratives they were being taught. This was a celebratory or appreciative engagement with knowledge and not a critical or interpretative one. Reid and Toyne, in the following passage, discussed history education as being an initiation into a common culture of shared cultural inheritances that defined the national community and the behaviour of its members. They wrote:

> The story of our own past, the past of each one of us, which has made us what we are, and from which we can never escape, though we may from the

---

[334] Ibid., p. 10.
[335] Ibid.

study of that same past receive inspiration to the prudence, courage, and wisdom needed to enable us sometimes to rise above it.[336]

Although Reid and Toyne were committed to a version of knowledge transmission that promoted civic aims, it would not be fair to portray them as fact-grinding history educators. They, like the Board of Education, explored aspects of teaching and learning that lay outside the scope of Victorian history education. It is these aspects that characterised their approach as one that respected diversity and change. This is seen, for example, in their insistence that teaching and learning should begin with the interests, age and capabilities of students; in the importance placed upon independent study and rational thinking; and in how they defined history as a discipline.

The most imporant element in their approach that made their version of history education open to change and diversity was their focus on teaching and learning. Asking *what* knowledge was to be transmitted and *how* can it be transmitted effectively to students meant that they were not simply reproducing a traditional history education but sought, in their own terms, to revise and move it forward. They clearly envisaged the process of teaching and learning to be transmitting a "storehouse of knowledge", but they refined the process by insisting that it had to be tailored to match the ability and interests of students. As the following passage shows, they were aware of the consequences if the process of refinement was ignored. They wrote:

> the selection of events and the manner of their presentation must be determined first by the age and capacity of the pupils, as it is waste of time to attempt to teach a child what is wholly beyond his mental range.[337]

Reid and Toyne made tailoring the transmission of knowledge to match students' interests, age and capabilities a key principle of syllabus planning, teaching and

---

[336] Ibid., p. 3.
[337] Ibid., p. 23.

learning. It was a vital consideration, they thought, because for learning to take place students' "insatiable curiosity" about the past had to be stimulated and engaged. It was a concern with student engagement that attempted to relate knowledge transmission to the experience of students that elevated their approach to a position beyond transmission by rote. They wrote:

> The first condition is that the teachers know enough history to be able to select the content in accordance with the principles here laid down and to present it to their pupils in such a way as to arouse their active interest in it, using the well-nigh insatiable curiosity of the young about their own environment as a means to this end.[338]

A feature of early post-war writing on history education that has so far received little scholarly attention is its theoretical or research-based dimension. Notions of "inherited consensus" and "Great Tradition" too easily dismiss this era as being unthinking or nontheoretical. Reid and Toyne's writing suggested that this was far from being the case.

Reid and Toyne's writing had a theoretical dimension that drew upon research findings in the field of child development that had been published by the Board of Education between 1926 and 1938.[339] This body of research suggested that students brought to learning individual interests, natural curiosity, and powers of attention, imagination and reason, all of which developed as they matured in age. As the following passage shows, it was vital for Reid and Toyne that teachers worked with and not against students' naturally developing inclinations and capacities. On this they wrote:

---

[338] Ibid., p. 4.

[339] Reid and Toyne drew on Board of Education reports: the Hadow Report, *The Education of the Adolescent* (HMSO, 1926); the Hadow Report, *The Primary School* (HMSO, 1931); the Hadow Report, *Infant and Nursery Schools* (HMSO, 1933); the Spens Report, *Secondary Education with Special Reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools* (HMSO, 1938); the Board of Education (1927).

Fourteen is as critical an age for most children as 7 or 11; and the interests and outlook of boys and girls of 14 differ markedly from what they were at 11 or 12, affecting profoundly their attitude towards so essentially human a subject as history as well as the capacity they bring to its study. The growth of "Intelligence" is then slowing down as it approaches its maximum, reached in most cases before the end of the sixteenth year; but capacity for concentration and intelligent recollection is increasing, individual differences are developing, and the pupil is beginning to look at his work in school in relation to life as he expects to live it after he has left. It is now that pupils are apt to lose interest in history.[340]

Drawing on the research, they designated teaching students aged 7–11 as "preparatory" and judged it to be enough for students to study disconnected episodes that appealed to their innate romantic and heroic interests. The research model of child development informed what was to be taught at the different stages of development. As the following passage shows, Reid and Toyne followed this very closely:

For the youngest pupils, stories of great men and women of the past, and stirring episodes are clearly the most suitable material for history lessons. Their dramatic qualities and picturesque details help to fix in a child's mind the great figures and important events of the past, and every history syllabus should contain a good selection of them.[341]

Aged 11 years, students were said to possess sufficient "sustained interest and attention" for them to begin the process of gradually accumulating, from lesson to lesson, knowledge of a chronological narrative, what Reid and Toyne termed a "consecutive course" in history.

Working with this model of child development and applying the principle of working

---

[340] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 11.

[341] Ibid., p. 12.

with (and not against) students' interests, age and capabilities had a major bearing on their decision-making. It influenced what content should be taught; at what age it should be taught; and how it should be taught and it prioritised the need to engage students in the process of learning. As the following passage shows, it placed them in a different history education camp than the one characterised by drill or catechism. They wrote:

> As far as the order and manner of presenting the selected material are concerned, consideration must be given first to the age, the capacity and the environment of the pupils for whom the course is intended, as it is simply a waste of time to try to teach a child what is wholly outside his mental range; though it may, more often than is sometimes believed, be that when a child is unresponsive, it is the choice, not of material, but of the method of approach, that is at fault.[342]

"Fixing" in the mind a narrative of events through knowledge transmission was for Reid and Toyne a complex, interactive process requiring knowledge of the expanding historical record, the psychology of the child, and teaching methods.

Complexity is seen in the following passage where Reid and Toyne's learning outcomes for older students included procedural and epistemological understandings. Here, the expectation is that students will learn to find new knowledge by themselves and appreciate that it is provisional. Reid and Toyne wrote that stuidents should acquire:

> some skill in gaining new knowledge when required, and some appreciation of how little they really know.[343]

In current history education, professional discourse terms such as "historical method" and "historical thinking" have distinctive disciplinary connotations.[344]

---

[342] Ibid., p. 7.
[343] Ibid.

During the past four decades, following the work of the Schools Council History Project (1972-76), it has come to be associated with an activity-based approach in which students are introduced to the methods and concepts that historians employ. Students are taught to conduct small-scale, open-ended, source-based investigations that develop a style of thinking that approximates that used by historians working in the field. Typically, this involves students critically evaluating source materials and presenting their own evidence-based conclusions.

It is significant that Reid and Toyne included "historical method and thinking" in their scheme for post-war history education. It shows willingness on their part to consider active approaches to learning history. However, their use of these terms did not signify that they were promoting teaching history as an activity of enquiry as the Schools Council History Project had formulated it during the 1970s, or as has been the mainstay of professional discourse ever since. For Reid and Toyne, these terms meant "the art of gaining information for themselves". They saw this as an essential skill required for building "a storehouse of knowledge".[345] It was valued because it engaged students in learning and because it was a vital skill required by all post-war citizens living in a modern democratic society.

The modes of "historical thinking", "method" and "independent learning" that Reid and Toyne proposed served their vision of citizenship. Their proposals echoed the view of the Spens Report (1938), which encouraged schools to teach students how to make independent judgements. The Spens Report thought it vital that on reaching adulthood students were able to cope in a world of "mass suggestion". It was a sentiment that Reid and Toyne agreed with. The Spens Report outlined its concerns in the following way:

---

[344] See, for example: Schools Council History 13–16 Project, *A New Look at History* (Holmes McDougall, 1976); P. Lee, Putting Principles into Practice: Understanding History. In M. S. Donovan and J. D. Bransford, *How Students Learn History in the Classroom* (National Academies National Research Council, 2001); D. Shemilt, Adolescent Ideas about Evidence and Methodology in History. In C. Portal (ed.) *The History Curriculum for Teachers* (Falmer Press, 1987); A. Megill, *Historical Knowledge, Historical Error: A Contemporary Guide to Practice* (University of Chicago Press, 2007); S. Wineburg, *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past.* (Temple University Press, 2001)
[345] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 19.

We urge that children should, so far as possible, be trained at school to think and reason for themselves in order that they may be in a position as adults to examine carefully and appraise in a judicial spirit the many forms of mass suggestion which will inevitably meet them in later life. While we fully recognise that it is desirable that children should be encouraged to reflect about political, social and economic problems, we think on the whole that their capacity to deal effectively with these problems in later life can best be trained on the one hand by encouraging them to think objectively about problems which arise in the ordinary life and work of the school and on the other hand by inculcating the need for a similar attitude in later life. The habit of independent judgment may be fostered by providing them at school with suitable opportunities of thinking and reasoning for themselves.[346]

The "historical thinking" Reid and Toyne had in mind was more than the simple retrieval of historical knowledge at a rudimentary level. It involved locating and adding new information to the students' own storehouse of knowledge, a process that included teachers reading *to* students a narrative story, teachers reading *with* students, and students finding out information about the story by themselves. It also implied that, if the dangers of mass suggestion were to be avoided, students learned to distinguish between facts that were accurate and inaccurate and between information that was true and false.

In the following passage, the authors argued that even younger students can be trained to answer questions from a book and share their discoveries with the class. According to Reid and Toyne:

History lessons even at this stage will therefore not consist only of stories told by the teacher and "told back" by the children. There will be independent work by the children in reading their history books in order to answer

---

[346] Board of Education, the Spens Report (1938), p. 129. A similar civic view was expressed 19 years later in the Newsom Report (1963): "A man who is ignorant of the society in which he lives, who knows nothing of its place in the world and who has not thought about his place in it, is not a free man even though he has a vote. He is easy game for 'the hidden persuaders'" (p. 163).

questions, some of which will call for knowledge already gained, in writing some of the answers, and in discussing others in class. Children of 9 or 10 can do these things quite well.[347]

Reid and Toyne's aims included a form of "independent" study that allowed students to take an active role in their own learning. Their version of "active" history was confined to "discovering, correlating, arranging, and interpreting new facts".[348] Although it implied an element of judgement and evaluation, a sense of what was historically true, their independent study was not an invitation to conduct an open-ended historical enquiry.

In their framework, Reid and Toyne proposed that students should study a period or a topic in depth alongside the main outline study. In chapter six of this study, it was noted in that the Ministry of Education's *Pamphlet No. 23*, published six years later in 1952, made a similar proposal. This showed that the value of studies in depth was being discussed at this time. The Ministry of Education in 1952 argued that it offered a different "experience" of studying history, one that allowed the past to be studied for its own sake and one that would enrich and revitalise post-war history education. Reid and Toyne argued that studies in depth complemented studies in outline because it gave a better understanding of the interaction of events, ideas and personalities. Returning to the theme of independent study, they wrote that it allowed students to develop "some skill in collecting, arranging, and interpreting historical evidence for themselves".[349]

They also thought that studying a period or topic in depth presented students with a different kind of experience, one that invited reflection upon the evidence-based nature of historical knowledge. It gave students an opportunity to conduct "project

---

[347] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 14.
[348] Ibid., p. 19.
[349] Ibid., p. 24.

work" and would, they wrote, lead students to appreciate the "unwisdom of passing judgment without careful consideration of all the available evidence".[350]

Like the Ministry of Education in 1952, Reid and Toyne argued that studying history in depth (as opposed to outline) fostered different skills, knowledge and understandings. They proposed that all students be given this experience and from it they hoped that they would:

> gain some knowledge of the kind of material on which history is based, and of the way in which it has to be handled.[351]

From this it can be seen that Reid and Toyne included in their proposals elements of independent learning, studying the past for its own sake, and the sense that historical knowledge is evidentially based. This provides evidence that there was, at this time, a degree of complexity of thinking around approaches to history education; at least, it is fair to say, more than has generally been credited.

In a section titled "The Nature of History", Reid and Toyne addressed the question, what is history? Unlike the Schools Council History Project, they chose not to consider the disciplinary nature of history as a form or an approach to knowledge. Instead, they chose to highlight how the function of history education had changed. From once being training for a ruling elite it was becoming training for the population as a whole.

First and foremost, history was for Reid and Toyne an authoritative body of knowledge. Not a fixed body of knowledge but an ever-expanding "record of the past", the painstaking results of university-based historical scholarship. They were aware that this was "based on the investigation of evidence" but chose to downplay its disciplinary basis.[352] To them, what mattered was not introducing students to

---

[350] Ibid.
[351] Ibid.
[352] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 22.

disciplinary history but making the body of knowledge transmitted to them accessible without in the process losing historical accuracy.

Reid and Toyne's version of knowledge transmission contained some disciplinary considerations. They thought, for example, that it would be an advantage if students were able appreciate that history was a search for truth, that literary and historical accounts of the past were different, and that historical knowledge was provisional. In the following passage, these authors made clear their own understanding of the interpretative nature of history. They wrote:

> the record must be as true, both in fact and in interpretation, as is possible, bearing in mind that our knowledge of historical facts can never be complete, and that our interpretation of them can never be as objective as of scientific facts. [353]

A clear line was drawn between their understandings that history is interpretative and evidentially based and their framework that presented history as an authoritative body of knowledge. It was not their intention to teach students that historical accounts were interpretations that required critical appraisal but rather to accept that what they were told mirrored the "historical record" and that it could be accepted because it was "true in fact and in interpretation".

Reid and Toyne organised their syllabus around five enquiry questions. These were: (1) How did civilisation arise and develop? (2) How was the political map of the world made? (3) How did the political and social institutions and the economic organisation of peoples grow up? (4) How did religion and philosophy, mathematics and science, art and literature grow up? (5) How and why did men's relations with one another at home and abroad change and so bring about the events recorded in history?[354] At first sight, organising the syllabus in this manner conveys the sense that history was as an "activity of enquiry". This was not the case. Reid and Toyne

---

[353] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p 22
[354] Ibid.

did not propose teaching students how to conduct these enquiry questions. These were not open questions. At hand were ready-made answers drawn from the record of the past.

The battle lines for Reid and Toyne in 1944 were not between transmission and enquiry, as they were to become during the 1970s, but between truth and falsehood. Their priority lay in demarcating the subject boundaries of history and literature. Literature, they pointed out, was imaginary, while history was a search for factual truth. Being able to tell the difference, they proposed, should begin with the very young. In the following passage, the case is made for a clearer demarcation. For Reid and Toyne:

> A child of 8 or 9 can appreciate the difference between truth and fiction; and if children are to apprehend the study of history as a search after truth, we cannot begin too soon or be too careful to make and keep that difference quite clear even in the stories used in history lessons for the youngest pupils. The place for imaginative writing about the past is the English lesson, and stories of King Arthur and his knights, and of Robin Hood, which belong to our literary heritage, not to our historical, might with advantage to the teaching of English no less than of history be transferred to lessons labelled "Literature." So, too, with trivial stories such as those of Canute and the Waves, the Loss of the White Ship, and Raleigh and his Cloak. Stories of Charlemagne, Roland, and the Cid are at once more interesting and more important.[355]

In Reid and Toyne's version of post-war history education, considerably more so than the one presented by the Board of Education, there was no place for "our literary heritage" or "trivial stories", such as those of Canute and the Waves, in their syllabus. Their stance defended historical accuracy and they looked forward to a reformed post-war history education that was more fully grounded in historical scholarship.

---

[355] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 12.

Reid and Toyne reminded teachers that it was their responsibility to keep abreast of new findings of historical scholarship and to modify their syllabus content accordingly. Their discussion on the role of source-work was brief. One of their 26 pages was allotted to it. Nonetheless, the importance they assigned to it is striking. Like the "official" texts examined in the previous two chapters, they considered it a necessary classroom practice and marked it out for further development during the post-war period. The type of source-work they proposed and the extent to which it was disciplinary will now be considered.

The use of primary historical sources was not one of Reid and Toyne's dominant aims. It fell short of making critical engagement the cornerstone of an enquiry-based approach in the way that the Schools Council History 13–16 Project had during the 1970s.

They assigned source-work a subordinate role supporting their version of knowledge transmission coupled to moral and citizenship education. Their approach was pre-evidential; its role was to engage interest, illustrating a narrative and exemplifying moral conduct or ideal citizenship. There is little to suggest that interest was shown in employing sources as evidence as part of a historical enquiry. Evaluative concerns such as context, authorship, purpose, production, audience, interpretation, reliability and value, as evidence did not concern them.

In their discussion, Reid and Toyne mainly focused on source materials' non-disciplinary qualities. Like the Board of Education, they valued its ability to arouse wonderment, interest and curiosity. They also propagated the idea that source material conveyed the past as dramatic, vivid and real. There appears to have been, at this time, an agreement among writers that the main role of using source material in the classroom was to augment the transmission of knowledge and to cultivate a set of attitudes, beliefs and behaviours. Reid and Toyne assigned source-work a subdominant role supporting their version of knowledge transmission coupled to moral and citizenship education.

With reference to the continuum of source-work practices that was outlined in chapter three of this study, Reid and Toyne's source-work was pre-evidential, its role was to engage students' interest, illustrate a narrative, and exemplify moral conduct and ideal citizenship. There is little evidence in their writing to suggest that they were interested in presenting sources as evidence about the past or in using sources as part of an open historical enquiry. They valued source-work when it helped to "fix in a child's mind" the knowledge being transmitted. In practice, this worked when sources were treated uncritically or pre-evidentially as reliable accounts of great landmark events.

Yet, their writing was not entirely devoid of disciplinary concerns. Such a perspective is seen in the following passage where a case is made for extending the range of sources conventionally used. Here, teachers are invited to reflect on their practice. Note the use of the disciplinary term "raw material". Reid and Toyne wrote:

> These considerations mean that we must find a place in our syllabus for material of a kind very different from that which has hitherto been the staple of most syllabuses – anecdotes for younger pupils, biographies and chronicles for older. These are not history as we think of it to-day, but part of its raw material.[356]

The next passage returns to one of their central themes: the importance of presenting historically accurate knowledge that conveys moral and civic guidance. Here, source-work is seen as playing an important role in developing civic awareness. Reid and Toyne's argument is that eyewitness testimony referred to as "anecdotes" can model ideal civic behaviour. In Reid and Toyne's words:

> Anecdotes, provided they are true, besides adding to our knowledge of how men and women can act, the heights to which quite ordinary folk can rise when inspired by a great ideal and the depths to which even the great can

---

[356] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 8.

sink when moved by self-interest alone, supply the picturesque or exciting details which fix in a child's mind the great figures and important episodes of history.[357]

This passage contains another of Reid and Toyne's main arguments: that well-chosen source extracts containing "exciting details" can aid knowledge retention. Treated as "windows", it shows Reid and Toyne advocating a pre-evidential approach to source-work. They took for granted that "anecdotes" conveyed *reliable* and *accurate* knowledge. For them, character training took priority over critical engagement. A focus on the importance of character training was evident in the next passage, which began with Reid and Toyne instructing teachers to refrain from interpreting or speculating:

> Biographies, provided that we do not in modern fashion offer our own surmising as, or even in place of, ascertained fact, give valuable insight into the motives which have urged men to action, the kinds of difficulties they have had to overcome, and the means by which they overcame them: there can be no better approach to understanding politics as distinct from political history than to read a biographies of politicians.[358]

In this passage, Reid and Toyne returned to another of their central arguments: that school history was a guide to action, what the Board of Education's *Handbook of Suggestions* referred to as a "record writ large of the influence for good or evil".[359] What interested them and what they underlined was that biographies should only transmit "ascertained facts" that illustrated the moral lesson that citizens should always aspire to overcome adversity.

This pre-evidential approach conveyed the idea that sources mirror a past that was out there waiting to be known. In the next passage, which discussed chronicles,

---

[357] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 8.
[358] Ibid.
[359] Board of Education, *Handbook of Suggestions* (1946), p. 403; *Handbook of Suggestions* (1927), p. 139.

teachers were instructed to treat sources as information, and not as evidence. Chronicles had value, only in so far as they provided factual information that illuminated the present and the future. In their words:

> Chronicles provide the essential groundwork of historical knowledge by setting forth events as they happened at a given time and place; but they contain much that is of little value if we are studying the past, not for its own sake, but as an explanation of the present and a guide for the future. So there must be selection in order that more time and attention may be given to bringing out the permanent as well as the contemporary importance of such historical events as the battle of Salamis, the Crusades, and Crecy, too often left as nothing more than interesting episodes.[360]

The following passage revealed a different, more disciplinary side to their thinking. This returns to their interest in studying the past in depth as a means to offer a different kind of experience from simply looking at the past in outline. Like the Ministry of Education in 1952, they entertained the idea that the past can be studied for its own sake in a way that illuminated how people in the past once lived. Reid and Toyne suggested that it was time for teachers to extend their source-work repertoire to include archaeology and travel writing. They noted for example:

> History, however, if it is to answer all four of our questions, has to deal with other material than anecdotes, biographies and chronicles. It has to take note of what archaeology has to tell of man's life in past ages, of what travellers have to tell us of the ways of men still living in different parts of the world as men once lived wherever man could live at all.[361]

In the next passage, it was argued that archaeology and travel writing could be used to understand "men's thoughts and beliefs" in the past. This was said to yield useful knowledge rather than evidence. Nonetheless, they appeared to be suggesting that

---

[360] Reid and Toyne, 1944, pp. 8–9.
[361] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 9.

history could explore the otherness of the past as well as explaining the present:

> It has also to take account of men's thoughts and beliefs as revealed in their writings, their laws, their monuments, their folk-lore, even in their fairy tales. As we shall see, it is because much of this kind of material can be used by quite young children that history lessons for them need no longer be restricted to anecdotes and legends, but can be used to give them a store of information of the greatest value for later use.[362]

This passage opened up the range of source materials, *showing* that sources such as these are the means by which the past is known. This indicated the faint beginnings, and no more than that, of a weak disciplinary approach. There is here, perhaps, a slight movement from sources as unexamined information to the possibility that this is how the past is known.

Alongside the "official" texts examined in chapters five and six, Reid and Toyne strongly encouraged teachers to make greater use of local sources in their practice. The value of this was again pre-evidential, it was to illustrate a national and international narrative. They wrote:

> In this connection more frequent use than is always customary might be made of Local History to supply both approaches to, and illustrations of, national and even general history, as well as of the way in which local circumstances can affect general history, and those in turn can be affected by events in far-distant lands. The approach to the rise of sea power will not be – or at least ought not to be – the same at Bideford as at Birmingham.[363]

The range of Reid and Toyne's approach to source-work seen in the next passage was broadly in line with the Board of Education's 1946 pre-evidential account of the use of illustrations. The use of visual primary source materials, what Reid and Toyne

---

[362] Ibid.
[363] Ibid., p. 19.

refer to as "authentic pictures", and what the Board of Education termed "illustrations", had multiple functions. They served as stimulus, conveyed the reality of the past, contained reliable knowledge, and could be used to develop the skill of retrieving information. Reid and Toyne put it this way:

> supplemented by the liberal use of carefully chosen authentic pictures, the aim being first to rouse interest in the past for its own sake and then to make the children appreciate the fact that the past is still part of their own present. If to arouse interest should be the first aim, and to give a store of information of value for future use, the second, the third, and by no means the least important even for young children, should be to train them in the art of gaining information for themselves.[364]

These authors valued source-work as an essential pedagogic device that would help revitalise knowledge transmission during the early post-war period. It was valuable to them because it engaged students' interest and authenticated a selected narrative history by rendering it interesting and "true".

Reid and Toyne's approach was illustrative. Knowledge about the past was taken for granted and accordingly sources were handled pre-evidentially as "windows" that afforded direct access to it. Practice focused on acquiring information and not the testing of truth claims. For Reid and Toyne, the main purpose of history education was to prepare students to take their place in society as responsible and dutiful citizens. This was to be achieved through the transmission of a narrative that conveyed a shared past and a collective identity.

Their text was primarily concerned with the selection of historical content and the methods of presenting it to students. This was then linked to three further considerations: students' interests and capabilities, developments in historical scholarship, and shifts in society's citizenship needs.

---

[364] Ibid., p. 14.

Although Reid and Toyne's shared many of their leading ideas with the "official" texts examined in chapters five and six, they pursued interests that marked their writing out as having a distinctive identity of its own. The first was their concern with broadening the range of sources used in classrooms. This was linked closely to their interest in syllabus reform and in opening the study to a thematic and topic approach that included studying the past for its own sake. This was related to their interest in exploring teaching methods other than teacher exposition. In particular, Reid and Toyne had an interest in the study in depth that complemented their main outline study. This was a way, they thought, of developing transferable study skills. As with the official texts, there was in their writing a trace of the disciplinary. Reid and Toyne wrote that students should "gain some knowledge of the kind of material on which history is based, and of the way in which it has to be handled".[365] In their work, this was, however, not to the fore or systematically pursued.

This chapter develops the argument that was begun in chapters five and six. In chapters five and six, a key proposition was that important early post-war "official" texts challenged the Slater and Sylvester position that post-war history education was uniform and unchanging.[366] This chapter further develops and supports this argument. For, as this chapter has shown, Reid and Toyne's text provides evidence that early post-war history education writing contained elements of both diversity and change.

Revealing the social practices that lay behind the production of Reid and Toyne's text has strengthened the case for a new interpretation of the period which respects diversity and change. It has demonstrated the extent to which educational authors worked collaboratively within an institutional setting to change the course of post-war history education in ways that can be considered significant. Reid and Toyne's text provides evidence that early post-war history educators were engaged in a reflective, intellectual social practice

---

[365] Reid and Toyne, 1944, p. 25.
[366] For a fuller account of this, see Chapter one.

In this chapter, it has also been argued that Reid and Toyne's dissatisfaction with rote learning implied competing versions of knowledge transmission. This lends support to the argument begun in chapters five and six that early post-war history education was far from being a single set of approaches. Reid and Toyne's text implies that early post-war history education was, for some history educators, a field of study open to debate. This counters the view that history education was at this time unexamined.

Further, this chapter provides evidence that teachers sought, in their own terms, to remake history education. For example, many addressed what they considered to be the "problems" that teaching history faced in early post-war schools. Their writing proposed solutions to "problems" and these proposals included not one but a variety of viewpoints.

Evidence of diversity can be seen in Reid and Toyne's concern with the "problem" of historical knowledge. Theirs was a level of concern that was far more intense than that expressed by the Board of Education. Reid and Toyne were preoccupied by the inherent difficulty of the "record of the past". They saw a need for teachers to continuously accommodate new knowledge emerging from historical scholarship. They saw that this was a process of adaption that threatened the accuracy of knowledge. Reid and Toyne's history education tradition was therefore not fixed but alive. They saw it as their responsibility, not simply to preserve tradition, but to revitalise it and move it forward.

In chapters five and six it was noted that "official" texts across the period 1946–1952 supported Slater and Sylvester's argument that the aims of post-war history education had been instrumentalist. Reid and Toyne's aims statement supports this view. Their framework for a new syllabus was also a celebratory narrative that served particular civic goals. Emerging from this chapter is a picture that is more complex. The range of pedagogic sub-aims that underpinned Reid and Toyne's dominant civic aims supports Richard Aldrich's argument that the aims of post-war history education were diverse and subject to change.

This chapter has shown that Reid and Toyne's delivery of citizenship through history education bestowed a range of skills, different kinds of understandings about the past, and transmitted various types of historical knowledge including local, depth and outline.

A key finding in this chapter is that the approaches taken by the Board of Education and Reid and Toyne were broadly similar. This finding suggests that a broad consensus was in place during the early post-war period. It also suggests that this was a different kind of consensus than the one presented by Slater, which focused upon the transmission of a fixed body of knowledge. The consensus these texts shared was more layered and nuanced. It included matching knowledge to students' age, ability and interests in ways that engaged and aroused curiosity. It prioritised serving the needs of a rapidly changing society. It sought effective ways to deliver history education to a body of students, all of whom, for the first time, were to attend secondary school.

This chapter has found support for the finding in chapters five and six that the use of primary source materials was seen as an important pedagogic device that should be used to illustrate and validate narrative exposition. Reid and Toyne's discussion on source-work, similar to that found in the "official" texts, was emphatically pre-evidential.

It was noted in chapter six that in 1952, *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23* had discussed "weak" disciplinary approaches to source-work and had raised the disciplinary question: how is the past known? This included discussing how primary source materials provided evidence about the past. Reid and Toyne shared this interest. They also valued eyewitness testimony's ability to validate the veracity of narrative exposition. They also raised the disciplinary question: how is the past known? This was clearly not history education as an "activity of enquiry", as defined by the Schools Council History Project. Their work, nonetheless, does suggest that some history educators at this time were discussing a "weak" disciplinary approach to source-work.

In the next chapter these points are taken up again. There, the focus of attention shifts to another early post-war history education text, *The Teaching of History*, published in 1950 by the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters, a professional association that represented the interests of teachers working in the grammar and independent schools sector.

Chapter Eight

The Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools

To further build the argument set out in the previous three chapters, attention now turns to the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters' handbook, *The Teaching of History*, published in 1950. The Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters (IAAM) was a professional association that represented the interests of teachers working in the grammar and independent school sectors.[367] This chapter examines diversity and change in post-war history education through the lens of the IAAM's text by addressing this study's three main research questions. At this stage in the development of the argument, this research focus can be expressed in the following way. First, does the production of the IAAM's text suggest a dynamic social practice amongst history educators? Second, does their text reveal a diversity of history education aims? Finally, does this text provide evidence that the IAAM advocated a weak disciplinary approach to source-work? Discussion now begins by considering the first of these three research interests, the production of the IAAM's text.

Throughout the post-war period, the IAAM sought to influence the teaching of subjects in secondary education and this included the teaching of history.[368] Its status as a professional association and hence its ability to influnece can be, to some extent, measured by the size of its membership, which in 1945 numbered 11,594, increasing in 1958 to 16,679.[369] Concerned with defending its members' conditions of service, the IAAM's activities included publications on curricular

---

[367] The IAAM was founded in 1891 by a small group of London schoolmasters. It was then known as the Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools. Its main objects were the promotion of professional status and standards for secondary school masters, including conditions of service, security of tenure, salaries and pensions. It also took an interest in wider educational policy including the school curriculum and examinations. In 1978, it merged with the Association of Assistant Mistresses to form the Assistant Masters and Mistresses Association.

[368] This study is concerned with the aims of history education in early post-war state schools. A separate study is called for of the aims of history education in early post-war independent schools.

[369] IAAM membership numbers can be found in the Institute of Education Library (University of London) Historical Archives reference (AMA/A/10).

matters and, in 1950, it published *The Teaching of History,* a handbook on history education.[370]

Like the Historical Association, the IAAM had a long-standing interest in publishing on history education. The IAAM's interest began in 1925 with the publication of the *Memorandum on the Teaching of History.* It considered *The Teaching of History* (1950) to be a revision of the earlier text.[371] The IAAM's *The Teaching of History* had a constant presence throughout the post-war period. Reprinted in 1952, a second edition appeared in 1956; it was reprinted in 1958 and 1961, with a third edition appearing in 1965; and a fourth and final edition published in 1975. In terms of publishing on history education, the IAAM had been active for 50 years, from 1925 to 1975.

With a committee of history educators taking responsibility for its composition, once again, teacher collaboration was very evident in the production of this text.[372] It reflected the views of this committee and of a section of its membership who were consulted during production. Its intended audience was, although not exclusively, teachers practising within the grammar and independent school sector. The IAAM stated that it was written "in the first place for the teacher in the academic type of secondary school".[373] *The Teaching of History* provided its readers with a general framework on the theory and practice of history education. From it, early post-war teachers of history would have gained guidance on all aspects of their work. It saw itself giving direction to post-war history education. It stated that it would have:

---

[370] During this period, the IAAM published subject handbooks for Science, Modern Languages, Geography, Mathematics, Classics and English. See the Foreword to *The Teaching of History* (1950).

[371] *Memorandum on the Teaching of History,* Issued by the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools (Cambridge at the University Press, 1925).

[372] Post-war history education authors wrote for a highly differentiated secondary school system. Depending upon their performance in an examination at the age of 11, students were allocated a place in one of three types of school. On this basis, about 25 per cent of the school population was selected to take a place in grammar schools. These taught an academic curriculum, characterised at the time as teaching students how to deal with abstract concepts. The remaining 75 per cent of students either attended a technical school where mechanical and scientific subjects were taught or a secondary modern school, which taught practical skills aimed at equipping boys for unskilled jobs and girls for home management.

[373] IAAM, 1950, Preface, p. xiv.

... an important influence on the theory and practice of the teaching of History in secondary schools of all types.[374]

The IAAM's *The Teaching of History* was authored by a committee of eleven history educators drawn from the ranks of its membership. The chairman was J. Gould, a teacher working in West Leeds High School. The vice chairman was J. C. James, from Redcomb College, and the secretary was C. P. Hill who taught at the Bristol Grammar School. The other eight members of the committee were C. Colegrave Scott, L. T. Daw, J. W. Hunt, A. L. Kneen, R. C. O. Leanard, E. K. Milliken, T. Molloy and R. R. Sellman. A tally of the committee members and their schools showed that six had taught in independent schools and five in grammar schools. Going by Reid and Toyne's 1944 collaboration and the IAAM's 1950 collaboration, it appears that those writing about history education during this time shared similar social backgrounds and experience.

The writing process adopted by the IAAM during the late 1940s was similar to the one taken by the IAAM in 1925. In both cases, a committee was set up to steer the production and members were invited to send in their views by post. The IAAM committee during the late 1940s received correspondence from 29 individuals, including leading figures in early post-war history education, such as M. Reeves, F. C. Happold, A. L. Keen (committee member) and T. B. Davis. F. C. Happold held the distinction of having contributed in 1950 to *The Teaching of History* and to the 1925 *Memorandum*.[375] In 1950, the Preface credited the vice chairman J. C. James and the secretary C. P. Hill with carrying out the bulk of the work of editing and drafting the final version.

Some aspects of the production of *The Teaching of History* and the thinking that lay behind it were recorded in the IAAM's committee meeting minutes, now housed in

---

[374] IAAM, 1950, Preface, p. ix.
[375] In 1925, the IAAM drew on a larger pool of correspondence. The IAAM's *Memorandum on the Teaching of History* was compiled by a Central Committee of 12 members who drew on the correspondence of 62 members.

the Institute of Education library.[376] The minutes recorded that on 19 October 1946, under the auspices of the IAAM, the History Memorandum Committee held its first meeting. Over a three-year period, it met ten times in London, at 29 Gordon Square. They met on Saturdays and each meeting lasted approximately two hours. It was agreed that each member of the committee would take responsibility for drafting a section of the text.

The minutes noted that certain topics aroused discussion. In an early meeting, the aims of history education were said to have been the subject of "wide discussion" and to have been the "most difficult and important single problem confronting the committee".[377]

Other topics generating discussion in the early meetings included the need for specialised history classrooms and the use of visual aids and of radio, television and film in schools. In later meetings discussion turned to teaching style, the committee agreeing that a well-told story was a vital part of history teaching and that mere lecturing by the teacher was wholly undesirable. In a later meeting there was disagreement over where in the text to place sections on blackboard technique and the design of a history classroom.[378] These minutes provide clear evidence of educators working collaboratively to address what in their view were key issues within history education.

Something of the IAAM's attitude towards the 1944 Education Act was captured in a speech delivered by G. Worsley, the chairman of the IAAM, when speaking to the IAAM's annual conference in Blackpool, in January 1947.[379] In this speech, Worsley defended selective education, arguing that selecting students for grammar school

---

[376] The minutes for the meetings held by the committee of teachers responsible for the publication of *The Teaching of History* have been deposited in the IOE University of London Library and Archive; a guide to the Assistant Masters Association archive can be seen online at http://archive.ioe.ac.uk/DServe/dserve.exe.
[377] Institute of Education, University of London Library (October 1946) (AMA/F 4).
[378] The pressing issues in 1925, according to the *Memorandum on the Teaching of History*, were insufficient curriculum time, inadequate classroom accommodation and resources, and a need for specialised history teachers.
[379] Institute of Education, University of London Library (January 1947) (AMA/B/9).

places offered "equality of educational opportunity". However, the underlying tone of his speech was apprehensive. In his view, early post-war education was in a state of transition and faced a future that was uncertain. He foresaw dangers ahead. In light of this, he thought it necessary to reiterate what he took to be the purpose of education. He stated:

> The social aim of education will not be easy to realise, but, if democracy is to survive, we must aim at the cultivation of civic virtues based on understanding. We must remember that much unrest and much mal-adjustment springs from the fact that the individual does not adequately realise his place in the complex economic and social activities of the modern state.

A mood of apprehension about the current and immediate future of history education was evident too in the Preface to the IAAM's 1950 text. It noted that an "ocean of time and spirit" divided the publication of the IAAM's first *Memorandum* in 1925 and its new publication in 1950.[380] In the following passage, taken from the Preface, is the idea, evident in other early post-war texts, that history education must adapt to wider social and political change if it is to fulfil its aims and survive as school subject. In this passage, the IAAM argued that events from the 1930s and the Second World War, still fresh in the memory, make a re-evaluation of history education unavoidable:

> The course of modern history, from the great depression of the early 1930s to the catastrophe of the 1940s, has created a world utterly different from that of 1925, and has radically affected the outlook of most thinking people. Those of us whose work it is to teach history in the schools are in some ways peculiarly aware of this change. We have felt acutely the need for a reinterpretation of our own approach to the past; we have watched history being made at a bewildering pace in Coventry, in Stalingrad, above all in Hiroshima. We have seen accepted traditions and institutions subjected to

---

[380] IAAM, 1950, Preface, p. xiii.

fierce strain and criticism; we have noted and welcomed a vast widening of the field of interest in the past, to include, for example the history of the United States and of Soviet Russia, and in a very different way, of the British Empire. Current events have set the history teacher a new set of problems – or a least have reset him old problems in new and alarming forms.[381]

As well as re-evaluating itself in light of social and political change was the idea that history education must accommodate the new knowledge emerging from the field of historical research. The sense of early post-war history education being unstable was added to by challenges from within education and from the wider society at large. The IAAM authors took the view that early post-war history education was beset with difficulties, "old problems" that had taken on "new and alarming forms".[382]

As far as IAAM authors were concerned, national and international events and the emergence of new historical knowledge were important factors forcing change within history education. A host of other factors were identified, which included: the 1944 Education Act, the abolition of the School Certificate and the introduction of GCE O-level examinations in 1951; developments in educational psychology; the use of radio, television and film in schools; the popularity of social history; and a growth in the number of specialist trained teachers of history. They thought that younger teachers, in particular, were having an effect upon early post-war approaches to history education. The early post-war generation of history teachers, they thought, offered something different. The IAAM wrote:

> Their approach to their subject is more philosophical, and they ask their pupils more often for reflection upon what they learn, rather than for knowledge alone.[383]

---

[381] IAAM, 1950, Preface, p. xiii.
[382] Ibid.
[383] Ibid., p. xiv.

The IAAM, in 1950, acknowledged their debt to the authors of the 1925 *Memorandum*. They did not think they were simply reproducing their ideas. They thought early post-war history education faced a stark choice: adapt to meet the new demands of post-war society or risk losing credibility as a school subject. In response to this, the IAAM declared that their text was a "detailed reconsideration of the problems of teaching history" and asserted that what was now needed was a new approach.[384]

This description of the production of the IAAM's text supports the findings of chapter seven, that an elaborate social practice underpinned the publication of some early post-war history education texts. The production of Reid and Toyne's Historical Association pamphlet and the IAAM's handbook included teacher collaborations supported by professional teacher associations that were connected to large teacher memberships. This presents a different picture of early post-war history education from the featureless landscape seen in representations of this period. The picture that emerges from these texts portrays groups of teachers collaborating to exert influence over the development of early post-war history education. This chapter lends support to the argument, first suggested by Reid and Toyne's text, that this dynamic social practice was essentially a grammar and independent school movement. Chapter ten will examine how this social practice invisaged the teaching of history in post-war secondary modern schools.

This chapter and chapter seven have shown that history educators pursued reforms. This calls into question the argument that early post-war history education was *entirely* fixed and unchanging. Reid and Toyne and the IAAM authors saw themselves as contributing to a living, evolving tradition of history education practices. It is striking that they pursued similar reforms and for similar reasons. Both saw a need to regenerate post-war history education. The IAAM's position on regenerating post-war history education was, however, different in two notable respects. It was the first to suggest that a new generation of graduate teachers

---

[384] IAAM, 1950, Preface, p. xiv.

were entering the profession after the Second World War and that they were more open to reform. Second, the IAAM's text marked a dramatic shift in outlook. It was more apprehensive about the future of history education, arguing that reform was necessary if the subject was to survive as a subject on the school curriculum. Here, the IAAM appears to be anticipating the case that history education was "in danger", a position generally associated with Mary Price and the late 1960s.

The IAAM's framework for history education was not a simple reproduction of tradition but was, like Reid and Toyne's (1944) and the Ministry of Education's (1952), a detailed, reflective examination. The pattern used by the IAAM to structure their text was similar to other authors. The IAAM's *The Teaching of History*, in common with other early post-war texts, opened with a reflective statement on the aims of history education. Like the other texts so far examined, this framed what followed in the rest of the text. In this sense, early post-war history education writing can be said to have been aims driven.

Like the other texts so far examined, the "ideal" teacher of history was, according to the IAAM, a scholar steeped in knowledge.[385] This common feature gave early post-war history education writing a pronounced teacher-centredness dominated by the transmission of knowledge.

A preoccupation with knowledge transmission is seen in the coverage that was allotted to it. About a quarter of the IAAM's text, that is, 50 pages, discussed the content question "what history shall we teach?" In this discussion, the IAAM formulated principles for designing programmes of study. Like the other early post-war texts, this was primarily concerned with matching content to students' needs and reviewing content in light of new scholarship and wider societal change.

Sharing other authors' concern with the pedagogy of knowledge transmission, almost half of the IAAM's text, that is, 95 pages, discussed teaching methods. The IAAM's discussion began with a review of conventional practices, that is, teacher

---

[385] IAAM, 1950, p. 9.

exposition, blackboard technique, the use of textbooks, note taking, essay writing, the testing of knowledge and preparation for external examinations.

In addition to this, and providing evidence of extending teachers' pedagogic repertoire, the IAAM went on discuss teaching methods that promoted "active" learning. These included the use of sources, project work and "research methods", debates, drama, model making and the use of historical novels, indicating a concern to engage students actively in the process of knowledge transmission.

The IAAM's interest in "active" learning is reflected in its proposals for a specialist history classroom; a topic that it discussed in great detail and which it considered was a key issue in post-war history education. The IAAM proposed that post-war history classrooms housed a film projector, filmstrip projector and an epidiascope. [386] On its walls hung time charts and illustrations. Purpose-built cabinets displayed models. Maps and charts were neatly stored in cupboards. It contained a small library of history books and a museum of artefacts. It proposed that the post-war history classroom should be a multipurpose space that could accommodate drama, craftwork, project work as well as conventional teacher exposition.

The idea that history education required a room of its own, on a par with geography and science, suggested that some post-war writers were reflecting upon the specialist nature of history education. The IAAM's concern with clarifying history education's subject identity by focusing upon its distinctive approach to teaching and learning echoed Reid and Toyne's concern with making knowledge transmission mirror the historical nature of the "record of the past". Teaching history in post-war classrooms, the IAAM suggested, required specialist knowledge but it also required specialist space, equipment and resources. [387] The IAAM's proposed classroom

---

[386] An epidiascope is an optical device for projecting a magnified image onto a screen.

[387] The case for history having its own specialised facilities was made in the IAAM's 1925 *Memorandum* (p. 3). In 1948, the Historical Association published a pamphlet on the subject by C. K. F. Brown, *The History Room*, Pamphlet No. 86. This would indicate that it was an issue that was gathering momentum during the early post-war period.

design reflected an ambition to provide students with an active, imaginative engagement with learning.[388]

In the four texts so far examined, there was general consensus what the key issues were within early post-war history education. This included a preoccupation with clarifying the aims of history education; with establishing principles for constructing an effective syllabus; with refining and developing teaching methods that engaged the learner; and with defending history as a subject within the curriculum. These key issues indicated that there was, within these four texts at least, a vibrant professional discussion around what early post-war history education ought to be. This supports the argument that, for these authors, history education was a field of study open to debate. Like Reid and Toyne, the IAAM proposed solutions to the "problems" facing early post-war history education. It is significant that the IAAM's solutions were not entirely the same as those proposed by Reid and Toyne.

A pronounced feature of the IAAM's statement on the aims of teaching history was the extent of its uncertainty. Like the Ministry of Education's *Pamphlet No. 23* (1952), the IAAM took the view that the task of formulating aims for history education was no longer as straightforward as it had once appeared to be. This diffidence in the face of formulating aims distances the IAAM from the Historical Association's pamphlet *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools* (1944) and the Board of Education's *Handbook of Suggestions* (1946), which approached aims with a far greater degree of certainty. The two later texts by the IAAM (1950) and the Ministry of Education (1952) suggest that, by the early 1950s, the aims of history education were coming under greater critical scrutiny.

The IAAM's uncertainty sprang, in part, from their perception that they were living through what they termed "catastrophic" times. It appeared to them that the course of history was running at a "bewildering pace" and this was creating a post-war society that was "utterly different" from what had come before. The IAAM described the early post-war period as an "age of uncertainty and rapid change", in

---

[388] IAAM, 1950, pp. 160–7.

which circumstances were no longer what they had once been.[389] They looked back to what they considered to have been a more stable period during the mid-1920s when the IAAM's *Memorandum on the Teaching of History* had been published. The IAAM noted that, in 1925, history education's civic purpose had been largely taken for granted. In 1925, the IAAM noted, the aim of history education had been:

> to equip the citizens of the future with a full knowledge of the circumstances in which society had evolved, so that they might go forward to better things.[390]

Adding to the IAAM's anxiety was the perception that the teaching of history in schools was failing to fulfil its civic purpose. In 1950, the idea that history education had a civic function was never in doubt. However, in question was the effectiveness of the teaching methods employed to deliver it. The IAAM reported that many students had become disengaged, making reform necessary because:

> The average secondary school pupil leaves school with a confused mass of knowledge, and – even worse – with a hatred of the subject, having been forcibly fed with historical facts and theories which bear no relation to his tastes, aptitudes, or mental capacity. The root of failure is found in the lack of any discoverable purpose or coherent plan in the history course, which is said to be related to the facts of the child's experience.[391]

Drawing on the work of A. N. Whitehead, the IAAM thought that the root cause of this situation was the failure to engage students in the process of learning. As with other early post-war texts, the IAAM took the view that for knowledge transmission to be effective, the knowledge being transmitted had to match students' age, capabilities and interests.[392] As the above passage shows, the IAAM were concerned

---

[389] IAAM, 1950, p. 2.
[390] Ibid., p. 1.
[391] Ibid.
[392] A. N. Whitehead's theory of "inert ideas" had a strong influence on early post-war writers. In his *The Aims of Education and Other Essays* (Macmillan Company, 1929), he wrote: "In training a child to activity of thought, above all things we must beware of what I will call 'inert ideas' – that is to say,

with improving the quality of history education teaching and learning by placing a greater emphasis upon the learning needs of students.

When calling for greater student engagement in learning, the IAAM were aware that they were challenging a version of knowledge transmission that emphasised rote learning, or what the IAAM termed, the "force-feeding" of historical facts. In their view, they were reappraising the aims of history education in light of a particular theory of child development. The aims of history education, they were persuaded, should be formulated with reference to the capabilities of students.

The IAAM's text, alongside the Ministry of Education's *Pamphlet No. 23* (1952), suggested that formulating aims had, by the early 1950s, become far more problematic. The IAAM thought this was so because there was no longer, as there once had been, general agreement about what the national philosophy of life was. The IAAM's solution to the "aims problem" was to draw on what they considered to be the "new" theory of learning that stressed the importance of matching knowledge transmission to the needs of students. This, they thought, put strict limitations on what knowledge could be transmitted and hence what history education could achieve. This appeared to them to be a more realistic course to take.

The IAAM made a virtue of restricting their aims to what they thought students were capable of learning. In the words of the IAAM, the aims of history education must be "limited by the capabilities of our pupils".[393] It is important to note that this was not an abandonment of knowledge-based transmission. It was an attempt to produce a more effective model, one that would achieve history education's enduring civic purpose.

---

ideas that are merely received into the mind without being utilised, or tested, or thrown into fresh combinations … The child should make them his own, and should understand their application here and now in the circumstances of his actual life. From the very beginning of his education, the child should experience the joy of discovery" (pp. 1–2).
[393] IAAM, 1950, p. 2.

The IAAM, in common with the other early post-war writers, made a clear distinction between academic and school-based historical knowledge. The central problem for them was again that "real history" or "academic history" was too difficult for students to understand. The IAAM's engagement with this "problem" is seen in the following passage. Note that history is used to denote a body of knowledge and a set of disciplinary understandings. Importantly, both are said by the IAAM to be beyond the grasp of most grammar school students. In the words of the IAAM:

> It is an inescapable difficulty of the historian in school that history, being the stuff of life itself, is a subject for the mature mind. The history we teach our pupils cannot be the history we ourselves know, nor can we realise for them more than a glimmering of the value the subject may hold for us. The specialist student may prize a faculty of judgment, a gift of detachment, and other intellectual qualities which the study of history can bestow, but such values must elude the grasp of all but our most advanced pupils.[394]

The IAAM's discussion on the aims of history education ran to just over 2,000 words. Its reappraisal of "tradition" centred on identifying the syllabus content and teaching methods that they thought would effectively deliver the knowledge and understanding that would enable students to take their place in post-war civic society.

In 1925, the IAAM's *Memorandum* had argued that the purpose of teaching history in schools was to equip the citizens of the future with a "full knowledge of the circumstances in which society had evolved, so they might go forward to better things".[395] In 1950, the IAAM was employing a different language. Delivering "full knowledge" and learning how to move "forward to better things" were less prominent. Greater emphasis was now upon developing and enriching the minds of future citizens. In the words of the IAAM, the role of post-war history education was

---

[394] Ibid.
[395] IAAM, 1925, p. 1.

to produce "citizens who are alert and devoted people whose minds are developed and enriched".[396]

Like other texts examined here, the IAAM was captivated by the idea that students' age, interests and capabilities should inform the knowledge and skills that teachers transmitted. For them, it was a condition of teaching and learning that teachers worked with students' "natural" propensities. The entry point, they thought, was to harness students' "innate" curiosity about the world and their "innate" love of story. This idea, which they shared with other authors, was the key to reinvigorating and making more effective post-war history education.

The IAAM's learning outcomes assumed that most students attending grammar schools up to the age of 16 were capable of acquiring a liking for history, learning a body of knowledge, a set of study skills, and developing a style of thinking. These outcomes were similar to the ones Reid and Toyne had set. In practice, they meant finding pleasure in narrative storytelling, remembering historical facts, acquiring the skill of independently finding out new facts, and deploying facts to form judgements. However, their expectation of what a grammar school student aged 16 would gain from a history education was quite modest. To achieve the main objective of the ordinary school course, the IAAM wrote, it would need to "implant a liking for history and have taught some rudimentary skill in understanding and handling historical facts".[397]

The criticism that too many students disliked school history because they had been forced to learn what they could not understand underpinned the IAAM's approach. Like the other post-war writers so far examined for this study, they made accessibility and engagement the lynchpin of their pedagogy. This still involved knowledge transmission as acquiring a body of facts but its aim was not simple memorisation. Students should be able, the IAAM thought, to respond to facts emotionally and imaginatively. As the following passage shows, they thought that

---

[396] IAAM, 1950, p. 6.
[397] Ibid.

an *affective* approach should dominate the main stages of learning up to age 15. The IAAM stated that, in their view, it would be:

> sound practice to emphasise the emotional features of the subject up to the age of fifteen; the teacher should consciously attempt to fire the imagination of his pupils, and even to exploit the romance of history. At a later age the intellectual values can predominate and a critical faculty be developed.[398]

In specifying their preferred approach to history education, the IAAM employed a horticultural metaphor. This was at variance with Reid and Toyne's metaphor of building a "storehouse of knowledge". For the IAAM, teaching history was implanting knowledge, sowing seeds and ripening a crop and students were to be nurtured and cultivated and their minds enriched. In their view, the teacher of history was a cultivator of knowledge and not a force-feeder of facts. This implied a different kind of teacher–student relationship. The teacher "awakened" their students' interest in the past, and having done so, led them to knowledge. In the following passage, the IAAM introduced the idea that the teacher was an "interpreter" of knowledge:

> The teachers' role is that of interpreter between the complex material of history and the immature minds of his pupils.[399]

For the IAAM the higher purpose of interpreting the complex material of history was to serve citizenship. It was this that gave history status as a school subject and justified its place in the curriculum. For the IAAM, the principal purpose was to "produce citizens who are alert and devoted people whose minds are developed and enriched".[400] The future of history education, therefore, lay with developing approaches to teaching that would realise this civic project. Making history education effective was a central concern and in the IAAM's writing there was the sense that early post-war history education must adapt to engage students in

---

[398] IAAM, 1950, p. 3.
[399] Ibid., p. 6.
[400] IAAM, 1950, p. 6.

learning or run the risk of appearing to be irrelevant. This "crisis" bestowed urgency and an openness to think afresh the direction post-war history education should take.

For the IAAM, the means to producing "devoted people" was through a shared historical narrative that fostered an identity with the national community. Inculcating a patriotic national identity was central to their project. Included within this was what they termed "intellectual values" and "modes of thought". The IAAM's position on "historical thinking" was similar to the one taken by the Historical Association in 1944. The IAAM also argued that history education should produce responsible, dutiful citizens who would play their part in civic life by employing independent judgement when casting their vote during election time.

The IAAM made developing students' "thinking" a central feature of their framework. It would be wrong to equate the IAAM's use of the term "historical thinking" with the Schools Council History Project's use of the term. As the following passage makes clear, the IAAM thought it out of the question that history education could promote a form of "historical thinking" that was grounded in disciplinary understandings. The IAAM wrote:

> In the training of the intellect, it would be rash to claim for history results which no other subject could produce.[401]

There can be little doubt that the IAAM's "skills of mind" referred to citizenship training and not the craft of the historian. As with the Historical Association in 1944, the IAAM argued that post-war history education should teach students how to make reasoned judgements by viewing arguments from more than one point of view. This was seen as a skill every citizen should possess in the changed circumstances of the post-war world. The IAAM spoke about developing students' ability to weigh evidence, detect bias and recognise the difference between truth

---

[401] Ibid., p. 3.

and falsehood. This had little to do with developing critical historians. Rather, it was geared towards making "responsible" citizens.

Although not explicitly stated, the IAAM's writing hints at Cold War dangers. A sense of imminent threat lent urgency to their claim that history education be grounded in political realities. In the next passage, the IAAM informs their readers that "our present way of life" is being threatened and for this to be averted a new more "active" citizenship was required. Somewhat revealingly, the IAAM stated that:

> The foundations of democracy will be undermined by a negative and passive conception of citizenship which is one of the most insidious dangers to our present way of life.[402]

History education was viewed by the IAAM as a safeguard against a politically uncertain future and its role was to provide citizens with grounding in civic awareness, parliamentary democracy and current affairs. In what seemed to them to be a turbulent period, the IAAM considered it to be vitally important that citizens play an active role in defending "our present way of life". As the following passage showed, those selected to attend grammar schools were seen as having a particularly important civic role to play:

> Never has it been more important than today that there should be a large number of instructed persons who can grasp the problems of organised societies.[403]

Like other early post-war writers examined for this study, the IAAM thought that the value of studying the past lay in understanding the present, although this did not entirely exclude the past being studied for its own sake. As the following

---

[402] IAAM, 1950, p. 4.
[403] Ibid.

passage showed, history education had value when it explained how the present had come to be. The study of the past, the IAAM, claimed:

> can provide standards of reference by which to criticise our own age; it can shed light from other days by which to see the mechanical triumphs of the twentieth century for what they are.[404]

Citizenship training dominated the IAAM's aims statement. Contained within it was the idea that it should deliver a form of cultural education. The IAAM regarded this as educating the "whole man" and "enriching the minds" of citizens.[405] The IAAM left it to teachers to ultimately decide which particular aspects of culture their students were exposed to. The IAAM recommended bringing students into contact with architecture and archaeology in a form of visual learning. As the following passage showed, to be made "whole" through a cultural education should be an enjoyable experience. The IAAM argued:

> It is in pursuing this kind of "visual" history, as well as the reading of plain narrative, that many pupils will find enjoyment, while they remain blind to the attractions of *haute politique* and unmoved by the play of ideas. This need not disappoint the teacher, for in the boy who enjoys his work one of the aims of history teaching – and a very important one – has been fulfilled.[406]

Using the visual study of archaeology and architecture to "enrich" the mind enabled them to argue that the study of the past could be pursued for its own sake. There is no indication that they intended such an encounter to be disciplinary. They promoted instead the idea that the study of heritage for pleasure was an important end in itself.

The IAAM took seriously the idea that students should draw moral lessons from exemplary historical narratives. All the texts so far examined for this study took this

---

[404] IAAM, 1950, p. 4.
[405] Ibid., p. 5.
[406] Ibid.

view. For the IAAM drawing moral lessons was problematic. As the following passage shows, they questioned the direct homiletic approach, typical of Victorian history education:

> But whether historical personages or incidents should be presented as models for our pupils' imitation is a contentious question. Some would have us deliberately set forth the lives of great men or the stories of great deeds for the inspiration of young minds as a method of character training.[407]

The IAAM questioned the effectiveness of drawing moral lessons through didactic instruction. They pointed to the way it falsified the historical record and led to student disengagement. In their view, it was wrong for a teacher to simply impose values on students. The teacher should instead lead a discussion about moral questions.

They contested the values that should be promoted: downplaying heroic and cowardly conduct and foregrounding tolerance and civic responsibility. The teacher's role as the "interpreter" of knowledge was, they argued, to lead their students sensitively towards these values and to help them become "citizens who are alert and devoted, people whose minds are developed and enriched".[408]

So far, the argument in this study concerning the aims of post-war history education has suggested there was a degree of diversity and change. Post-war rationales, according to these texts, were more complex than is generally recognised. This argument acknowledges that Slater and Sylvester were right to suggest that character training, moral education and citizenship education dominated post-war history education aims but were wrong to leave their readers with the impression that the aims of history education were not discussed in any depth. In this chapter it has been seen that the IAAM's text confirms the earlier finding that early post-war

---

[407] IAAM, 1950, p. 5.
[408] Ibid., p. 6.

writers discussed the aims of history education in considerable depth and in a manner that reflected diversity and change.

The IAAM's statement of aims contained all the elements so far seen in the other three texts analysed. Like them, the IAAM took it for granted that history education should serve a specific civic purpose. Again, the IAAM focused mainly on the "problem" of knowledge transmission and sought a reformed model that was both accessible and engaging. It also drew on a learning theory that matched knowledge transmission to students' age, ability and interests and it too sought a history education that developed not just memory but imagination and reason. This chapter strongly suggests that for these four texts the search for a more effective model of knowledge transmission was the defining characteristic of this period.

The IAAM's text also makes significant additions to the argument presented here. The first is the IAAM's claim that a grammar school history education delivered a "special" form civic of training. A key passage on this is the IAAM's assertion that: "it was important that there was a large number of instructed persons who can grasp the problems of organised society". This aim to train students who were "alert and devoted people whose minds are developed and enriched" is reflected in the IAAM's metaphorical language that favoured "cultivation" rather than building a storehouse of knowledge. Differences across the grammar and secondary modern school divide are taken up in chapter ten, when history education in post-war secondary modern schools is examined.

This chapter has uncovered important evidence that the IAAM thought they were breaking away from tradition. This was seen in the other texts, though not in such a pronounced way. The IAAM's perception was that they were living in an "age of uncertainty and rapid change", which necessitated a reappraisal of traditional aims. This sense of urgency can be seen to have propelled them to reflect and innovate.

A point that has not been recognised is the extent to which the IAAM was open to curriculum development. They considered it a truism "that there is at least as many

methods of teaching history as there are teachers of history". They declared: "we would not stifle that briskly experimental approach to the teaching of history without which our craft would ossify".[409] This openness extended to discussing contrary positions. Open discussion is seen in their statement on the use of source material, this study's third research interest, where the line between what was and what was not appropriate was contested.

The IAAM's statement on the role that source-work should play in post-war history education began by striking a positive note. It stated that the use of sources had a "definite value" and encouraged teachers to incorporate sources into their classroom practice. The IAAM can be seen to be pushing for change, when they argued that: "Source material has a definite value in the classroom and is perhaps too often neglected."[410]

The IAAM encouraged teachers to work with published anthologies of historical sources, such as *Sources of English History* by L. F. Salzman and *Materials of English History* by F. J. Weaver. They advised teachers to compile their own collections of source extracts. They ruled that there were conditions on the kinds of sources and their uses. The IAAM stated: "Discrimination is essential and original material should be quoted only with some specific end in view."[411]

The IAAM statement on the use of sources was located within a much broader discussion on teaching methods that associated it with oral narrative instruction, blackboard technique, textbook instruction, note taking and essay writing. This presented it as a "teaching aid" that served knowledge transmission.

The IAAM's enthusiasm for pedagogic experimentation was linked to reinvigorating knowledge transmission. IAAM authors opposed teaching by "drill" or, what they termed, the "deep dull groove of stale repetition".[412] Taking this stance, they

---

[409] IAAM, 1950, p. 60.
[410] Ibid., p. 78.
[411] Ibid.
[412] IAAM, 1950, p. 67.

sought a new balance between teacher instruction and student activity. The use of sources was seen by the IAAM as a means of achieving this aim.

The IAAM stated that "original material" served two main functions. The first tied it to narrative exposition. The use of sources had a value, the IAAM wrote, when imparting:

> a sense of vividness and reality, as when an eyewitness account of a dramatic episode is quoted, or a descriptive passage suggests a background or lends colour to a person or period.[413]

The IAAM's, *Memorandum on the Teaching of History,* published in 1925, shows that this was not a new position. The IAAM, in 1925, had argued that sources should be used to add "atmosphere" to narrative exposition.[414] In 1950, the IAAM recommended that teachers use dramatic or descriptive sources to bring a factual chronology to life. Eyewitness testimony was valuable, the IAAM thought in 1950, because it gave narrative a sense of reality.

It mattered to them that post-war history education appealed to students' imagination and held some interest for them. The inclusion of source material in the classroom held the promise of transforming students' experience of studying the past by giving them a direct experience of "being there".

In the IAAM's approach to source-work, teachers selected the sources and read them to students as "windows" on the past. It was enough simply to engage students' interest. It was an approach that suited the IAAM's favoured pedagogy of direct teacher instruction. The IAAM recommended that such "excerpts" would be more efective when they were read aloud by the teacher.[415]

---

[413] Ibid., p. 79.
[414] IAAM, 1925, p. 38.
[415] IAAM, 1950, p. 79.

Like other early post-war writers examined for this study, the IAAM wanted students to appreciate the difference between historical and literary accounts. It was important to them that students understood that the accounts put before them were not simply made up. Teachers reading "first-hand accounts" to students went some way, they thought, in demonstrating the historical reality of the stories they told students. The IAAM noted that:

> The use of first-hand accounts and descriptions, provided that the language is not too difficult, helps a young child to realise that history is about real people, and is not a matter of names in a book.[416]

The IAAM's second aim was more disciplinary in the way it drew students' attention to the question, "how do we know" about the past? As the following passage showed, this extended to them appreciating that textbook accounts had an evidential basis. According to the IAAM:

> Even young children in school should be made curious about the origin of the history put before them in textbook form, and a few practical illustrations from sources are the best way of achieving this. One or two lessons devoted to this topic may well be well worthwhile.[417]

In 1950, the IAAM posed the question: what were students capable of learning from sources? This had been central to the IAAM in 1925, suggesting that source-work had been a topic for discussion for the IAAM throughout the inter-war period. In 1925, the IAAM had argued that older grammar school students should be taught how to critically evaluate source material. As the following passage showed, this meant going further than treating sources as reliable testimony. In 1925, it was suggested that older students, working independently, should question the reliability of sources, compare sources, make inferences and draw their own conclusions. In 1925, the IAAM had argued:

---

[416] Ibid.
[417] Ibid.

The use of sources is valuable in revealing the processes by which the historian works to his end, or the difficulties of conflicting evidence, of bias or of misinformation that he meets, and it teaches boys to be healthily critical of the printed word. Exercises on documents encourages close reading, selection of essentials, judging for oneself, inferring motives and characteristics, all of them things one has to do in ordinary life.[418]

It is important to note that the 1925 *Memorandum* stated that there was a "great diversity of opinion" concerning the capabilities of students to think in a disciplinary way.[419] The 1925 statement warned teachers of the dangers of taking this approach with younger students, describing those who did so as "enthusiasts of scientific methods" and dismissed them as being too "extreme". As the following passage shows, the IAAM in 1925 thought it impracticable. In their opinion:

It has not been found that the extreme course adopted by enthusiasts of scientific methods of learning History are at all practicable.[420]

In 1925, the IAAM objected to disciplinary source-work for younger students on the grounds that it was too time-consuming. It would, they thought, detract from the central task of knowledge transmission. A second objection centred on students' cognitive abilities. They doubted that most students were capable of learning a "scientific methods" approach to source-work. It seemed to them that most students were incapable of "mastering the intricacies of original historical research".[421] Unable to recommend to teachers a "scientific methods" approach, they nonetheless thought that most students attending grammar schools should be introduced, at least in a limited way, to the nature of history as discipline. They suggested that studies in local history could arouse in students what they termed the "spirit of research". In 1925, the IAAM took it for granted that knowledge would be transmitted to students by teachers and by reading textbooks. In addition to

---

[418] IAAM, 1925, p. 37.
[419] Ibid. p. 38.
[420] Ibid.
[421] Ibid., p. 39.

this, they suggested, "some knowledge of the primary sources can be given throughout the curriculum".[422]

In 1950, the IAAM's case was broadly the same. In 1925 and in 1950, history education source-work was seen as having been a contest between "enthusiasts" and "opponents" of "scientific methods".

The first time the reader of the 1950 text encountered the role of sources is in a discussion on the role that illustrations played in school textbooks. There were three positions on this question. The first took the view that illustrations in textbooks were an unwanted distraction and should be dispensed with. A second favoured including them but was divided on the question of their authenticity. A third position discussed whether it was preferable to present students with modern renderings of medieval drawings on the grounds that the originals were too obscure. The IAAM sided with the view that textbook illustrations should be "clear, plentiful, relevant, and well documented, or should be dispensed with altogether".[423]

In 1950, the IAAM repeated its 1925 warning to teachers concerning the deployment of a "scientific methods" approach. As the following passage showed, the IAAM thought older grammar school students studying A-level history were capable of conducting disciplinary source-work but younger students were not. The IAAM expressed this position in the following way:

> One way of employing source material may suggest itself which is as a rule too ambitious for any but sixth-form pupils. This is the idea of originals for research, comparison, or criticism. To attempt to develop critical powers by a

---

[422] IAAM, 1925, p. 39.
[423] IAAM, 1950, p. 75.

"source method" is, generally speaking, to ask the pupil to run before he can walk.[424]

To support their case, the IAAM included an extract from a member's correspondence. Its message was that the "scientific methods" approach was a step too far. The correspondent rejected the idea that primary source exercises were integral to history education and that younger students should routinely work independently with source material. They warned:

> Superficially, the idea of using sources in schoolwork is very attractive: it makes the teacher believe he is really doing his job as an historian by leading his pupils to the fountainhead. In fact this is nonsense.[425]

The correspondent judged critical and analytical procedures to be unrealistic in a school setting. Intriguingly, there is a suggestion in the passage that some early post-war history teachers were finding the approach "attractive".

They also rejected the idea that there was a workable middle ground between narrative exposition and academic history. They held fast to the idea that they were separate spheres. The relationship between narrative school history and academic disciplinary history was either/or. They continued:

> The time allotted to history in schools is far too short, and sources are far too long except where a single direct and dramatic document, like Charles I's Five Members' speech or Lincoln's Gettysburg address, is available – and this is comparatively rarely. Research on all but the simplest documentary evidence of the past is far too difficult an intellectual exercise for boys, for it demands a well-trained adult mind.[426]

---

[424] IAAM, 1950, p. 79.
[425] Ibid.
[426] Ibid.

The correspondent rejected the idea that curriculum time could be managed in ways that permitted extended source-work. This marginalised source-work and privileged narrative exposition, dismissing the idea of employing sources that were challenging in their complexity, language and length and which demanded critical analysis.

This contributor to the IAAM's professional discourse only favoured source materials that were short in length, employed simple language, and were dramatic in their content. Decisively, they rejected the idea that most students in the 12–16 age range were capable of following a course of training in critical analysis. Critical analysis should be postponed, the correspondent asserted, because it required an adult mind. The tone of the correspondent towards disciplinary source-work was cautious and disdainful. They continued:

> It can be done in some small degree by a group of boys working, for example, on some very generalised topic of local history under adult guidance in their spare time; but there is no adequate time for it in class. The real value of sources is to the teacher, who does not read half enough of them: and of course as illustrative extracts which the teachers may use to illumine his arguments.[427]

In this passage, a critical approach can be seen as an extracurricular activity practised in "some small degree" by small groups under the guidance of a teacher. If it did not stray from what students were capable of knowing and if it did not take valuable curriculum time away from the central task of knowledge transmission, then the IAAM thought there was a place for a source-work that addressed the disciplinary question, "how is the past known?"

Having cautioned teachers against teaching a critical approach to the majority of students under the age of 16, the IAAM returned to what they thought was acceptable source-work practice. Although the IAAM held serious reservations

---

[427] IAAM, 1950, p. 79.

about source-work, they nevertheless reassured teachers that the difficulties encountered when working with sources could be managed. The IAAM wrote: "It is possible, however, to exaggerate the difficulty of source material, even for younger pupils." [428]

The main challenge of working with sources, the IAAM thought, concerned their length and language. In the following passage, the IAAM state that these difficulties can be overcome by careful selection and editing. Making sources accessible was a key principle of the IAAM's source-work. In the words of the IAAM:

> Constitutional documents are better in modern, simple and abbreviated form, but there are many other types of documents that will provide easily digested and illuminating passages. Boys can find interest in the descriptions by Julius Caesar and Tacitus of the early German tribes. Chroniclers' accounts of the characters or personages like Charlemagne or Henry II make good reading. Episodes from the travels of Marco Polo, Columbus, or Livingston have a direct appeal. The most elementary study of the monks would be enriched by quoting from the rule of St Benedict, or from the friars by citing the precepts of St Francis. Even legal records of a simple kind, such as cases tried by manorial or Pie Powder Courts may easily convey a human interest and an insight into social conditions. Local examples of course have special attraction. John Wesley's Journal and Cobbett's Rural Rides contain excellent material, and it is often worthwhile to read a first-hand account of a dramatic episode like Macaulay's description of the passing of the first Reform Bill.

This is a list of sources that was not without challenge. It confirms that their appeal had been that they were "easily digested", "descriptive", had a "direct appeal", had "human interest", were "dramatic" and gave "insight into social conditions". These qualities were tied to the IAAM's aims. These centred on stimulating students' interest in narrative history by rendering it "vivid and real". This could be achieved,

---

[428] Ibid.

they thought, when students encountered sources that had a "direct appeal" to their imagination.

Sources such as these delivered an aesthetic pleasure, aroused curiosity and brought the past back to life. The IAAM went further still by suggesting that there were some extracts which can be properly used only by being "put in the hands of the pupils, when that may be employed along with the textbook, as a basis for discussion and written work".[429]

The four texts that have so far been examined for this study, which cover the period 1944–1952, have shown that authors at this time discussed and valued source-work. An important finding has been that the use of primary sources was considered at this time to be an essential component in the transmission of knowledge. The Ministry of Education and the IAAM went further by viewing it as an important pedagogic strategy that would help regenerate post-war history education.

These four texts clearly show that for these authors, at least, it was pre-evidential approaches to source-work that were prized the most. They looked to primary sources to augment narrative exposition and to help address what they considered to be the "problems" of knowledge transmission. This approach to source-work exploited the factual knowledge that sources conveyed and the illusion that they offered direct access to the past. These intrinsic qualities would, they thought, help overcome the difficulties of traditional knowledge transmission by engaging students *affectively* in the reception of factual knowledge.

Thus, the continuum of source-work practices discussed in chapter three indicates that the IAAM's approach was predominately pre-evidential. It also took the view that sources were to be appreciated emotionally, imaginatively and aesthetically as "windows" through which the past could directly be seen, their reliability and accuracy being left unquestioned.

---

[429] IAAM, 1950, p. 80.

A key finding has been that the Ministry of Education (1952) and the IAAM (1925 and 1950) also discussed weak disciplinary approaches, although not always approvingly. Revealing the evidential basis of knowledge transmission, the "how do we know?" question, was considered by them to have little relevance for the majority of students. They thought it only appropriate for post-16 students studying A-level history.

The IAAM made the appropriateness of disciplinary source-work a central feature of their discussion. It is significant that as early as 1950 the IAAM's text suggests that approaches to source-work had become an issue containing competing viewpoints.

An important finding in this section of the study is that the Ministry of Education's *Pamphlet No. 23* (1952) and the IAAM's handbook (1950) make it clear that some teachers at this time were practising a critical approach to source-work. An interesting question that this raises is why were these texts were so opposed to this practice?

The explanation for this is found in their attachment to the transmission of knowledge as the means to delivering their civic aims. Using source-work to promote their versions of collective identity and a shared national past did not require critical thinking. As the IAAM pointed out in their discussion, they thought it would undermine it. Another key finding in this part of the study has been the impact of learning theory upon authors' expectations of what students were capable of achieving. These authors operated with a theory that endorsed student engagement but precluded critical thinking.

These four texts contained a range of viewpoints. Although wedded to knowledge transmission they displayed a commitment to reform that questioned what the aims, content and methods of teaching history should be. This is a different position from Slater and Sylvester's characterisation of the period as uniform and unchanging. In the next chapter these ideas are further examined in texts written

by Charles F. Strong and Robert J. Unstead, two teacher authors working in the primary school sector during the early 1950s.

Chapter Nine

Charles F. Strong and Robert J. Unstead

Further evidence that post-war writers contested history education is found in the following two post-war handbooks on the teaching of history: *History in the Primary School*, by C. F. Strong, published in 1950, *Teaching History in the Junior School,* by R. J. Unstead, published in 1956. When addressing post-war history education, they both asked probing questions concerning its aims and teaching methods, including the role that primary source material should play. They sought to influence the development of history education. In so doing, their writing provides evidence of post-war history education as a "social practice". A comparison of these two texts reveals similarities and differences that expose a richly textured post-war history education discourse.

Strong and Unstead's texts drew upon history education writing published during the first half of the twentieth century.[430] Strong took many of his ideas from the Board of Education's 1931 Hadow Report, *The Primary School*, and its 1937 handbook, *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools*. His recommended readings for teachers listed leading pre-war history educators, who included Dymond, Clarke, Findley, Firth, Worts and Walker.[431]

Unstead's references were mainly post-war. He drew upon the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters, *The Teaching of History*, published in 1950, and the Ministry of Education's, *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23*, published in 1952.

---

[430] For a list of published post-war history education writing, see J. Fines, *A Select Bibliography of the Teaching of History in the United Kingdom* (Historical Association, 1969). For pre-war writing, see D. Dymond (ed.) *A Handbook for History Teachers* (Methuen, 1929) and A. C. F. Beales, *A Guide to the Teaching of History in Schools* (University of London Press, 1937).

[431] D. Dymond, *A Handbook for History Teachers* (Methuen, 1929); F. Clarke, *Foundations of History Teaching* (Oxford University Press, 1929); J. J. Findley, *History and its Place in Education* (University of London Press, 1923); C. B. Firth, *The Learning of History in Elementary Schools* (Routledge, 1932); F. R. Worts, *The Teaching of History in Schools*: *A New Approach* (Kegan Paul, 1929); E. C. Walker, *History Teaching for Today* (Nisbet, 1935).

He also cited pre-war history educators, such as Catherine Firth, and Molly Harrison, a leading post-war museum educator, and he recommended the pre-war work of Marjorie and C. H. B. Quennell.[432]

These references to other texts point to strong links between pre- and post-war ideas, and to an exchange of ideas that took place within a "long debate" over the nature of history education.

Both authors had taught history in junior schools. Strong had taught at the Sloane Junior School in Chelsea, while Unstead had taught in Letchworth at the Norton Road Primary School (1946–1951) and then at the Grange Primary School (1951–1957).[433] This showed that there were some opportunities for post-war teachers to contribute to the production of history education knowledge as textbook and handbook writers.[434]

The layout of these texts followed a pattern common to post-war handbooks; beginning with aims, moving on to syllabus content and teaching methods and finishing with classroom resources. Their intended audience was non-specialist teachers working in junior schools, a key issue for both writers.

One of Unstead's main arguments was that training colleges were failing to prepare non-specialists to teach history in junior schools.[435] This was for him a major factor holding back the development of post-war history education. Both authors thought they were addressing this problem by offering non-specialists teachers the expert guidance that would improve their practice.

---

[432] M. Harrison, *Learning Out of School* (1954); Marjorie and C. H. B. Quennell, *A History of Everyday Things in England* (B. T. Batsford Ltd, 1918–1934); Marjorie and C. H. B. Quennell, *A History of Everyday Life in …* (B. T. Batsford Ltd, 1921–1926).
[433] For details of Unstead's biography, see *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* edited by H. C. G. Matthew and B. Harrison (Oxford University Press, 2004), vol. 55, pp. 903–4.
[434] There is less material available on Charles Strong's background.
[435] Unstead trained at Goldsmith's College, London from 1933 to 1936. He was 21 years of age when he took his first teaching post in 1936.

Strong and Unstead published textbooks that embodied the principles espoused in their handbooks.[436] Thus, they offered a four-year course that included course materials as well as guidance on teaching methods. In this commercial enterprise, they competed for the junior school history education publishing market. That they published to influence the development of post-war history education is seen in the way they critically examined post-war history education.[437] They underlined its failings and put forward proposals that would, in their view, result in its improvement. In their own terms, they wanted to remake post-war history education.

Both authors saw the 1944 Education Act's reorganisation of state education as an opportunity to review the nature of junior school history education, arguing that it should be a self-contained stage in students' history education with its own distinctive aims, syllabus content, teaching methods and resources.[438] When making this argument, they posed probing questions that included: What is the purpose of teaching history to junior school students? Can they be actively engaged in its study? What methods of teaching suit them? What are the teaching and learning principles underlying this approach?

In posing these questions, they were responding to critics who questioned whether or not it was possible to teach history to junior school students, aged 7–11 years. In the face of this criticism, both Strong and Unstead were concerned that post-war school history was in danger of losing its curriculum place. Coming to its defence, Strong stated that he wanted to "vitalise" it and Unstead, as will be shown, wanted

---

[436] R. J. Unstead's four-volume *Looking at History* (A & C Black, 1953): *From Cavemen to Vikings*; *The Middle Ages; Tudors and Stuarts; Queen Anne to Queen Elizabeth II*; C. F. Strong, *The New Primary Histories: A Progressive Series of Class Books for Junior Pupils* (1950): Book One: *Heroes of Olden Days*; Book Two: *Brave Men and Women*; Book Three: *The Country and the Town*; Book Four: *Homeland and Empire*.

[437] Unstead's set of four class textbooks *Looking at History* sold over 8 million copies. See *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* edited by H. C. G. Matthew and B. Harrison (Oxford University Press, 2004), vol. 55, pp. 903–4.

[438] The 1944 Act brought to an end the elementary school (5–13 years) by introducing primary schools (5–11 years) and secondary schools (11–15). Primary schooling was split into infants (5–7 years) and junior school (7–11 years). Strong and Unstead addressed history education for the junior school student.

to "bring it back to life".[439]

Strong and Unstead were fully aware that their proposals for post-war history education ran counter to what they took to be "traditional" history education theory and practice. It seemed to them that post-war history education was a contest over content, pedagogy and learning theory. They represented this by contrasting the "dullness" of rote learning, which they opposed, against the "vividness" of active engagement, which they championed. Unstead characterised "traditional" history education as a "legacy of dullness".[440] He included in this teacher lecturing, reading aloud from a textbook, cramming, and regurgitating facts. He thought it lifeless. He blamed grammar schools for they way they prepared students for public examinations for its widespread practice.

Strong and Unstead both portrayed "traditional" history education as "dull" and disengaging and argued that students found no pleasure in its learning. They based their proposals for a revitalised post-war history education on two principles, common across post-war handbooks. First, it was essential that students found learning interesting and pleasurable and, second, what they were learning about connected with their experience.

Strong argued that "traditional" history education, learning historical facts by rote, was based upon the erroneous learning theory that the junior stage (7–11 years) was the optimum time for memory learning. He described this as a "fatal fallacy" holding back the development of post-war history education.[441] Contesting this, Strong argued:

---

[439] Strong may have borrowed "vitalise" from page 170 of the Hadow Report; See Board of Education, *Report of the Consultative Committee on the Primary School* (HMSO, 1931). Available online at: www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/hadow1931/hadow1931.html. Unstead took his guiding principle to keep school history "alive and vivid" from the Ministry of Education's, *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23* (1952). See Unstead, 1956, p. 79.

[440] Unstead, 1956, p. 2.

[441] Sellar and Yeatman's *1066 and All That* (1930) was a key text for Strong and Unstead. Strong (1950) commented that it was the "funniest book in the English language" (p. 16). Unstead (1956) wrote that it was a "masterpiece", commenting that: "The dates, battles, kings and causes that were to have been committed to memory by a couple of generations went into the making of the glorious muddle and the cascade of howlers that fill that celebrated book" (p. 4).

It is bad enough that we should victimise children by filling their minds with what can so easily be proved to be mental lumber: it is a more heinous sin that we should erect this fallacy into a virtue in teaching by allowing ourselves to believe that at this age children are specifically apt to learn by rote.[442]

Strong and Unstead's critique of "tradition" challenged the view that juniors should simply learn by heart the landmark events of a political and constitutional national narrative. It was mistaken, they argued, because it paid no regard to students' age, interests and capabilities. Like other post-war writers, they both made this one of their key principles for teaching and learning. It was a mistake, they argued, to focus on wars and political developments because they were concepts that lay outside students' experience and therefore held no meaning for them. From a student's point of view, they argued, this was "mental lumber" and a waste of time.

They rested their case on the argument that the pedagogy that had the greatest natural appeal to younger students was not fact based but story based. Unstead argued that students would engage with history when it was presented as stories about "people and how they lived".[443] Thrilling and exciting stories of adventure, heroism and romance had the strongest appeal because they made the greatest impression on students' emotions and imagination by making the past appear vivid and real. According to both Strong and Unstead, a revitalised post-war history education rested upon selecting the right stories and finding the means to present them to students in an attractive way. The way forward, they thought, was to pay less attention to the memorisation of facts and focus instead on engaging students creatively and imaginatively in storytelling. Thus, both lent support to the view, shared by other post-war writers examined for this study, that post-war school history should aspire to be a "a very good story; what it needs most is a good telling".[444]

---

[442] Strong, 1950, p. 23.
[443] Unstead, 1956, p. 11.
[444] Unstead, 1956, p. 79. Here, Unstead is quoting from the Ministry of Education's *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23.*

There were differences between Strong and Unstead on the issue of story selection and the matter of their historical accuracy. On the question of historical accuracy, Unstead was the greater purist, insisting that teachers should only select stories that can be proven to have a historical foundation and to reject those that cannot. This appeal was similar to the one made by Reid and Toyne in 1944. In 1956, Unstead argued:

> teachers should make every effort to present them unadorned with sickly romanticising or legendary half-truths. There is an abundance of good material without having to perpetuate such apocryphal tales as Raleigh's cloak, Alfred's cakes, the game of bowls, Bruce's spider, Watt and his kettle or even the murder of the Princes in the Tower.[445]

Unstead made historical accuracy a feature of his approach. For him, it was important that the stories that were told were "true stories" and that the subject boundary that defined history as discipline was recognisable. Strong took a different view. He was content to relax subject boundaries. If they were "good" stories, it mattered less that they were historical or literary. He wrote:

> we are not greatly concerned, in the first two years of the junior stage at least, with fine distinctions between literature, history and geography. What we have to remember is that the human and romantic aspects have the greatest appeal at this stage, and it matters little under what specific heading they are placed.[446]

While Strong recommended selecting stories from the "storehouse of world literature", Unstead championed the accuracy of teaching the historical record.[447]

---

[445] Unstead, 1956, p. 29.

[446] Strong, 1950, p. 27.

[447] Making this argument, Strong followed the Hadow Report (Board of Education, 1931), which stated: "We would, however, point out here that in the primary school much of what is commonly taught as history may better be read as literature. We have in view partly stories, such as the legends of King Arthur and Robin Hood, which are priceless national treasures but not serious history, and partly other stories of genuine historical texture that make a strong appeal to children but cannot, in

Unstead was interested in developing students' sense of period, wanting them to imaginatively "enter into the past". As the following passage shows, he made the imaginative encounter with stories a key part of his rationale for school history. Unstead wrote:

> A second prime reason for teaching history to juniors lies in its power to enrich their imaginations. Junior children are interested in people – in how they live, work and amuse themselves whether they are Eskimos, Arabs, or medieval villeins. A child's lack of experience and of preconceived ideas is an asset, for he can enter into the life of the Lake Village, or Manor with the same ease and gusto that permits him, in his unsophisticated games, to transform a collection of old tins and planks into an Indian encampment or a space rocket.[448]

Unstead thought it important that students understood that people in the past thought and acted in ways that were different from people living in the present. The past was different from the present, he argued, and should be judged on its own terms. It was important to him not to present people in the past as being "just like us". He wanted to avoid the past becoming an object of condescension. He wrote that it was:

> equally important to preserve children from the view that our ancestors were undersized, rather stupid and superstitious folk who had not yet received the benefits of modern progress.[449]

Strong took a different view. He insisted that the purpose of studying stories was to illuminate the present. The selection of his stories was less concerned with

the simple form in which they must be presented, be used to build up the notion of historical continuity. A child may gain useful historical materials from such stories, but he should read them, as he may later read a historical novel, mainly for the interest of their contents. In the same way a child may well read in these years a simple connected history of his own or another country, not for the purpose of learning the story in detail, but in order to obtain a general outline of it which he can fill in at a later stage" (pp. 99–100).

[448] Unstead, 1956, p. 4.
[449] Unstead, 1956, p. 12.

historical accuracy and more to do with their "civic significance". As the following passage shows, for Strong, history was a vehicle for understanding the present:

> Clearly, then, if the purpose of history learning and teaching, is, as we have said, ultimately social, it follows that the bringing of the past into relation with the present is not merely desirable, but a positively essential aspect of it. Consequently the matter must be selected with a view to showing the continuity of history by relating it to the present, which in turn, cannot be understood except in its historical setting.[450]

Strong and Unstead differed over content selection and syllabus design. Unstead's four-year course favoured a purely British story from prehistory to the present day, while Strong's course included stories of the ancient world and from European and world history. Unstead viewed history more as an autonomous subject, while Strong thought it more a vehicle for delivering civics. These differences in orientation, Unstead's historicism and Strong's presentism, displayed a tension in their writing.

Like other post-war writers examined for this study, both Strong and Unstead addressed the "problem" of historical knowledge. They too recognised its vast scope and its conceptual challenge for students and they also adopted the principle that content selection should be directed by students' age, interests and capabilities. Like other authors, they considered what they thought the interests and capabilities of students were.

Addressing this question, Strong and Unstead worked with a model of children's mental development. For this they drew on the *Memorandum on the Mental Characteristics of Children Between the ages of Seven and Eleven*, written by Cyril Burt (an appendix to the Hadow Report, published in 1931).[451] This model underpinned their critique of "traditional" learning by rote, was used to justify

---

[450] Strong, 1950, p. 32.
[451] In his suggestions on books for the teacher's use, Strong recommended the section on mental development from the 1931 Hadow Report. See Strong, 1950, p. 134.

shifting the narrative focus to stories about "people and how they lived", and justified the move to involve students "actively" in the learning process.

The other key theoretical text was, *Aims of Education* by A. N. Whitehead, which was published in 1929. This contained the doctrine of "inert ideas", which provided history education authors with a theory for how students learned. For post-war writers it suggested that students were not empty vessels but agents in the learning process. Strong took "inert ideas" to mean that it was a "fatal fallacy" to transmit historical knowledge that lay outside students' everyday experience. Drawing on the *Hadow Report* and Whitehead, Strong offered the following summary of what he considered were the interests and capacities of junior school students. He wrote:

> It is broadly true that the infant child creates without appreciation and that juniors develop a more critical attitude to what they create. But this does not mean that juniors have any capacity for interpretation or logical criticism. Nor must their power of attention be exaggerated. Junior children's attention is sensuous rather than intellectual, and is directed to objects rather than to ideas and beliefs. Hence we shall gain their attention only if we present them with material concrete enough for them to perceive. Again, their attention easily flags. If therefore, we are to encourage them to finish a task we must see that the period devoted to it is not overlong. They delight in movement and like to carry out small tasks that they can perform with skill.[452]

As this passage showed, Strong worked with the idea that for younger students learning history was a "sensuous" experience. In common with other post-war writers, he downplayed younger students' ability to exercise critical reasoning and instead placed centre stage their ability to engage emotionally and imaginatively with historical materials. The theory of child development that Strong worked with dictated that history education for most students was an emotional rather than an intellectual endeavour. Furthermore, Strong was convinced that tasks and activities set before younger students should be simple, short and concrete. The influence of

---

[452] Strong, 1956, p. 13.

Whitehead is evident in Strong's suggestion that learning should be tailored to match what students were capable of knowing and understanding.[453]

Strong and Unstead both thought it self-evident that history education's principal purpose was to meet social ends. As with other post-war writers examined in this study, their discussions centred on how knowledge transmission could serve citizenship education, moral education (character training) and an appreciation of heritage. It was how these three ideas combined that gave their history education aims their distinctive character. In their view, history was studied in schools primarily because it prepared students to take their place in civic society. For them, this carried specific meanings.

Strong and Unstead valued history education because they considered it to be "civilising". In Strong's words, it could "turn wayward children into citizens".[454] Unstead valued its power to bring about moral improvement. Both thought its role was to assimilate students into a dominant culture. History education strengthened the bonds of social cohesion by teaching students to identify with a shared narrative of the nation's past. Knowledge transmission was to be a source of reverence and inspiration that would transform the uncultured child into the cultured citizen. Strong wrote that teaching history played a role in training students "to become adult members of a cultured society exercising taste and discrimination".[455]

Character training dominated Strong's and Unstead's aims statements. Entering civil society, they argued, carried with it civic responsibilities. For both this was best achieved by telling stories that conveyed moral lessons. Unstead's ideal society was

---

[453] Whitehead's most complete work on education is the 1929 book, *The Aims of Education and Other Essays*, which collected numerous essays and addresses by Whitehead on the subject published between 1912 and 1927. The essay from which *Aims of Education* derived its name was delivered as an address in 1916 when Whitehead was president of the London branch of the Mathematical Association. In it, he cautioned against the teaching of what he called "inert ideas" – ideas that are disconnected scraps of information, with no application to real life or culture. He opined that "education with inert ideas is not only useless: it is, above all things, harmful".
[454] Strong, 1950, p. 21.
[455] Strong, 1950, p. 79.

a place where honesty, courage, mercy and loyalty prevailed. The likelihood of this being realised, he argued, was greater when the teaching of history focused on the lives of "great" historical figures. Unstead expressed his idea of an exemplary history education in the following terms:

> Our children are more likely to grow into citizens of the kind of race that in our moments, we know ourselves to be, if they have been made aware of the qualities of men and women whom successive generations have admired.[456]

Becoming a responsible citizen, for Strong and Unstead, involved being taught a specific moral outlook learnt through emulating the behaviour of figures that were said to have displayed ideal civic behaviour. In the following passage, Unstead provides examples of what he had in mind. The historical figures that he thought students should model their behaviour on included:

> The courage of Scott and Drake, the tenacity of Bruce and Churchill, the compassion of Barnado, Elizabeth Fry and Shaftesbury, the persistence and faith of Bunyan and the Pilgrim Fathers are moral qualities which we put before children in the belief that they will impress themselves upon these undeveloped personalities as the standards of conduct to which people may at least aspire.[457]

The other post-war writers examined for this study had also promoted the idea that history was a guide to moral action. They located the origins of this idea either in the *Board of Education's Code* of 1904 or earlier in the public schools during the first half of the nineteenth century.[458] It was an idea that was central to Charles Strong. Strong asserted that the ultimate purpose of teaching and learning history was "and can only be, a civic one" and that history was "the most obviously civic

---

[456] Unstead, 1956, p. 3.
[457] Unstead, 1956, p. 3.
[458] Board of Education, *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools* (HMSO, 1946).

subject of all".[459] For him, becoming "civic" meant becoming less "wayward" and in turn this meant becoming an "adult member of a cultured society exercising taste and discrimination".[460] For Strong, the purpose of teaching history was to instill the values that, for him, constituted "good" character. In this he included the values of standing true to one's principles, behaving without fuss when difficulties arose, and living a devoted family life.[461] He argued, that teaching history through stories of heroic self-sacrifice, such as the legend of "Horatius at the Bridge", students would identify with these values. He explained that the:

> human element in such stories may not be entirely beyond the children's experience, and if they can be consciously related to that experience then not only will the stories be enjoyed but the episodes of which they tell will be brought home to the children as examples of the display of man's fortitude and the growth of human endeavour. Looked at in this way, Horatius will first be thought of as one of the brave men on whose lives we have depended for many of the things we now have and enjoy.[462]

There was a hint of moral panic in his suggestion that history education had a vital role to play in combating what appeared to him to be a decline in standards of public taste caused by newer forms of mass entertainment. He argued that history education had a vital role to play in shaping how the masses chose to use their leisure time. Strong reasoned:

> If, then, we hope to improve the conditions of life and public taste in this respect, the place to start is in the school, and there to develop such a sense of values as shall outlast the period of schooling, and to furnish the means of retaining and improving that sense throughout adolescence and adult life.[463]

---

[459] Strong, 1950, p. 21.
[460] Ibid., p. 79.
[461] Ibid., p. 30.
[462] Strong, 1950, p. 30.
[463] Ibid., p. 78.

Strong turned to the *Hadow Report*, published in 1931, for what junior school history education should look like. He thought that by the end of the course, aged 11, students should be able to read and understand a simple history book and have a familiarity with aspects of an outline narrative. Moreover, they should begin to have "a lively sense of the bearing of history upon his everyday life".[464] In the end, the fulfilment of history education was measured by the success of its civilising mission. The past, students were to learn, was something with which they should identify and take pride in. According to Strong, the most important lesson that history could teach was that:

> our civilisation is the fruit of the activities of many people, and is rapidly becoming the common possession of mankind.[465]

Both writers contested the pedagogy of moral education, taking the view that an overtly didactic or sermonising style of teaching, which they associated with "traditional" history education, would be less effective than leading students to draw their own moral lessons from the knowledge transmitted to them in story form. In fact, stories from history were, they argued, capable of speaking directly to students. Unstead, citing the Ministry of Education's *Pamphlet No. 23*, asserted:

> It is best to let history tell its own story; to tell its story even when we cannot point directly to a purpose or a moral. It's a very good story; what it needs most is a good telling.[466]

For Strong and Unstead, new "debunking" trends in historical scholarship had made moral education more difficult. Unstead thought it necessary to respond to revisionist historians who had reinterpreted the "heroic" lives of "great" historical figures in unflattering terms.[467] He was prepared to accept that the "debunkers" of

---

[464] Ibid., p. 132.
[465] Ibid., p. 133.
[466] Unstead, 1956, p. 79.
[467] An early "debunker" was Lytton Strachey's *Eminent Victorians* (1918), which challenged the reputations of Cardinal Manning, Thomas Arnold, Florence Nightingale and General Gordon.

Richard the Lionheart, Robert the Bruce, Marlborough and T. E. Lawrence had produced valid interpretations but thought it would be a step too far to allow their "moral relativism" a place in the classroom.

It was on this point that the limits of Unstead's insistence on historical accuracy ended. For him, the value of moral instruction outweighed that of historical interpretation. It was more important to him that students gained moral guidance than that they understood that there were conflicting accounts of "famous" historical figures. He was insistent, for example, that Alfred the Great should be presented to children "as the hero-king of all time".[468] He dismissed the work of the "debunkers" as a "sterile occupation". [469]

Unstead acknowledged the importance of social history, or what he termed, "the ordinary man's struggle for food and shelter".[470] In his view, he was proposing a revised version of hero worship. He saw his course for junior school as a synthesis of old with new thinking that set "great men and women" within a social context.

Strong and Unstead took it for granted that the purpose of history education was to prepare students to take their place in post-war society. This did not mean that they saw themselves tied to an unchanging tradition or that history education was *just* the transmission of a received body of knowledge. In Strong's words, the aim of history education involved discrimination and judgement making. It was:

> to assist in equipping the learner with a point of view and in furnishing him with the means of checking that point of view.[471]

It appeared to them that post-war history education was in state of flux. Strong's interest was with the "new" audiovisual technologies of film, television and filmstrip, wireless and gramophone. He thought that these were about to transform

---

[468] Unstead, 1956, p. 25.
[469] Ibid., p 3.
[470] Ibid., p. 4.
[471] Strong, 1950, p. 21.

post-war history education. He noted: "We are at the dawn of a day of great advancement and rapid progress in educational technique and provision."[472] Strong embraced the new technology with its prospect for a more visual history education. For him, a key problem holding back post-war history education was its supply. There were not enough machines to go round. He explained:

> In an age of rapid advancement in educational methods and techniques it is very difficult for the provision of material things to keep pace with the quickly moving tide of theory and practice.[473]

Strong and Unstead's contribution to post-war writing on the aims of history education did not depart from knowledge transmission. Their aim "to turn wayward children into citizens" involved adopting methods that made knowledge transmission more effective. Making knowledge transmission more engaging and pleasurable also made it more memorable. Their projects centred on designing a new and more effective mode of knowledge transmission.

Strong and Unstead embraced the social utility of history education; for them, it delivered on two fronts. First, the goal of ensuring students learnt to identify with "our history" assured a sense of collective identity, a personal sense of belonging to the body politic. Second, it also educated students to behave in a responsible way. In pursuing these aims, there was no great disagreement with the other post-war writers examined in this study. The message was clear: history education had an essential role to play in maintaining standards of public decency and in upholding the rule of law.

There was a sense of urgency in the manner in which they restated these aims. Unstead asked: why teach history in the junior school at all? For him, the aim of history education was not a matter that could be taken for granted, it had to be demonstrated and justified. Both of these writers sought to win an audience over to their way of thinking, implying that there were readers who needed persuading.

---

[472] Ibid., p. 81.
[473] Ibid., p. 80.

The use of sources to enliven the past was integral to Strong and Unstead's proposals for post-war history education. There were similarities in their approach but there were striking differences as well. The use of primary source materials served their dominant aims. In the case of Strong, his source-work trained students to act in a socially responsible manner by developing character. Exposing students to stories of heroic self-sacrifice selected from the "storehouse of world literature" would, he thought, awaken in them the "basic interests of civilised existence".

He recommended the story of *Horatius at the Bridge,* which recounted how three Roman soldiers had been prepared to sacrifice their own lives for the defence of their country.[474] He also chose the narrative poem, *The Burial of Sir John Moore after Corunna* by Charles Wolfe, a tale of heroic self-sacrifice, which recounts how, in 1808, Sir John Moore, the leader of the British Army, died heroically fighting the French in battle.[475]

The theme of heroic self-sacrifice ran through his suggested literary sources taken from classical as well as modern world literature. Strong made no distinction between literature and history or between history as a discipline and the past as a set of events. Sources such as *Horatius at the Bridge* were presented as "windows" through which the past can be directly accessed. He deliberately downplayed the fact that literary sources were authored and conveyed a particular perspective.

Strong advocated the use of source materials to enliven storytelling. He thought they brought to it interest and excitement and provided an alternative to learning by rote, an approach he described as like "pouring water into a kettle with the lid on".[476] He associated student disengagement with dull storytelling, which could be

---

[474] His source was the narrative poem *Horatius at the Bridge*, written by Thomas Babington Macaulay and published in *Lays of Ancient Rome* by Longman in 1842. Macaulay's poem contains the following appeal to self-sacrifice: "And how can man die better / Than facing fearful odds / For the ashes of his fathers / And the temples of his Gods" (verse 28). Strong also suggested the use of Macaulay's poem "The Armada".
[475] Charles Wolfe wrote this poem in 1814 and it was first published in a provincial Irish newspaper in 1817.
[476] Strong, 1950, p. 42.

overcome when, for example, at the start of the lesson a source would "secure the attention and concentration of pupils".[477]

Underlying Strong's source-work pedagogy were two ideas that he drew from the *Hadow Report* (1931). The first, that students' learning under the age of 11 was predominantly "sensuous" and not "intellectual", framed his use of sources. The second, that teaching and learning should be active, dictated that his use of sources should involve students in learning.

Strong recommended a wide range of teaching strategies. Like other writers examined for this study, he saw himself as fashioning a new knowledge transmission; one that was not, in Strong's words, confined "to mere exposition by the teacher and the reading of a book".[478]

Strong suggested beginning a unit of study with teacher exposition and then moving to other types of activity. He described a unit of study as like "a stream in motion".[479] In this, he thought there was a place for collaborative groupwork, independent study, project work, writing poetry, storytelling, painting and drawing, dramatisation and pageants, visiting museums, rambling, visiting sites of historical interest in the locality, making models and puppetry. The classroom should be, he insisted, a place designed to accommodate craftwork, drama and a library. He thought that primary source materials had a role to play supporting all these activities.

Strong had a preference for visual sources. He argued that picture sources in class textbooks should be historically accurate and based on "contemporary illustrations".[480] He recommended picture collecting as a whole class activity, arguing that it fostered students' sense of belonging to the group by enabling the individual to contribute to the collective. Students should collect postcards and

---

[477] Ibid., p. 78.
[478] Strong, 1950, p. 98.
[479] Ibid., p. 14; an idea drawn from the Hadow Report.
[480] Ibid., p. 62.

cuttings from magazines and newspapers and catalogue them under themes and arrange them chronologically according to time periods. He argued that pictures of Stonehenge, Cleopatra's Needle and the Bayeux Tapestry could be used to arouse students' interest in history and at the same time help train their "powers of observation".[481]

There were, for him, limits to what could be achieved. Strong drew the line at what he termed "the ability to test the value of a true record".[482] A "sensuous" engagement with visual sources was a powerful experience when they were presented as "windows" on the past. Looked at in this way, they made the past appear vivid and real. As the following key passage shows, Strong's approach to the use of sources was, in Lee's terms, "pre-evidential".[483] He wrote:

> But such illustrations should be left simply as interesting pictures of the records of a race or nation, and the question of their authenticity or veracity may safely be left for a later stage of life.[484]

Although postponing criticality to a later stage, Strong's approach placed upon the use of sources a weight of importance. He made the use of sources intrinsic to a pedagogy that challenged "tradition". They made his classroom activities "joyful and productive".[485] A joy in learning was seen in his enthusiasm for students' studying history outside the classroom. On this he asserted:

> Some local history should be included in every history syllabus in the latter half of the primary school course, and no such syllabus can be regarded as

---

[481] Ibid., p. 66.
[482] Ibid., p. 35.
[483] P. Lee, Evidence in History and the Classroom. In A. K. Dickinson and P. J. Lee (eds) *History Teaching and Historical Understanding* (1978), p. 15.
[484] Strong, 1950, p. 36.
[485] Ibid., p. 72.

satisfactorily carried out if it does not allow for visits to places and objects of historical interest in the neighbourhood of the school.[486]

For Strong, the purpose of learning outside the classroom was to help tell the national narrative. Therefore, his use of sources was always a means to better storytelling of a single-track progressive narrative. The story that he thought was important to tell was "the endeavour of mankind in the upward movement towards a finer and finer civilisation".[487]

Strong's approach was predominately illustrative and pre-evidential. His suggestion that students should be taught that sources such as Stonehenge were a "record of the race or nation" was his only step in the direction of a very "weak" disciplinary approach. For him, sources were objects of a shared heritage, elements within a collective memory. It did not occur to him to use sources to interpret the contested narratives of the nation.

Unstead's proposals for the use of sources were similar to those Strong had proposed. He also advocated that teachers reject "traditional" teaching methods that centred on memorising factual historical information and instead recommended an approach to source-work that engaged students in active, imaginative storytelling. Unstead wanted students, far more than Strong did, to "enter into" the story. His alternative to "tradition" focused on imaginative experience, which he made central to his approach.

Unstead also selected dramatic storylines that centred on the lives of famous people and how they lived.[488] He presented this as a continuous narrative and, like

---

[486] Ibid., p. 73.
[487] Ibid., p. 22.
[488] An Unstead syllabus was a list of "famous" individuals set within a social context; for example: Thomas More, Tudor homes, Princess Elizabeth, Drake and Tudor seamen, Tudor amusements, Guy Fawkes, Rupert and Cromwell, Samuel Pepys, Stuart homes, travel in town and country, Marlborough, Prince Charles Edward, Captain Cook, ships and sailors, Georgian homes, James Watt, Stephenson, Lord Nelson, steamships, Shaftesbury and poor children, Florence Nightingale, Victorian life, Captain Scott, story of aeroplanes, Alexander Fleming. See Unstead, 1956, p. 97.

Strong, suggested a variety of teaching strategies that would support its telling. The use of primary source materials was one of these strategies.

Unstead thought that storytelling was the "root of an interest in history" and it was the inspiration drawn from this that sent "the archaeologist to his dig, the historian to his research".[489] It was, he continued, the "magic of a well told story" that stimulated "the child's imagination and extended his experience".[490] Having made storytelling the cornerstone of his proposals, he demanded that students play an active role in learning them. Unstead argued that "all real learning has to be active".[491] He characterised this as "listening, reading and doing".[492] He encouraged teachers to utilise sources to engage students' interest and to render their listening more active.

Unstead entered the debate over "originals" versus modern renditions in textbooks, taking the view that "originals" should not be used too generously without explanation, and that they were better redrawn by a good artist.[493] Like other post-war writers, he encouraged teachers to collect museum postcards, which he thought were "most valuable as a source of reference, especially for children's drawings and models".[494] He had an interest in how students perceived visual sources and thought it was a valuable skill they should develop.[495] He wrote that

[489] Unstead, 1956, p. 27.
[490] Ibid., p. 26.
[491] Ibid., p. 28.
[492] Ibid., p. 53.
[493] Unstead, 1956, p. 72.
[494] Unstead, 1956, p. 72.
[495] In *Looking at History*, Unstead employed four types of images: (1) the full-page artistic representation in colour, (2) the black-and-white artistic representation in line drawing, (3) the black-and-white line drawing rendering primary source material, and (4) the photographic black-and-white reproduction of primary source material. Two-thirds of *Looking at History's* illustrative content comprised line drawings and coloured plates that vary in their degree of historical accuracy. The full-page colour plates confirm Unstead's own estimation that the use of colour in textbook illustrations tends towards the production of images of garish sentimentality. A large number of Unstead's black-and-white line drawings are imaginative reconstructions that manage to avoid crude anachronism. If the historical accuracy of many of Unstead's illustrations is open to question, there can be no gainsaying that the quantity of illustrations he deployed was unquestionably groundbreaking. His text/illustration ratio was, for a class textbook of its type, an unprecedented four pictures to one page. There is also no gainsaying the tally of black-and-white photographs amounting to 360, constituting one-third of the book's illustrative content that we could with confidence classify as

teachers should encourage students to "look closely and with discrimination" and to explain what they can see.[496]

"History exists", Unstead wrote, "on every side, in the rounded window of the church, in the road outside the school, in the level-crossing and the inn-sign."[497] He treated local history as an issue within post-war history education writing. "A good deal has been written and said", he wrote, "about the value of teaching local history."[498] He thought that throughout a four-year junior school course, every opportunity should be taken to explore sites of historical interest in the immediate locality. "There is no doubt", he wrote, a "teacher who ignores the district about the school is neglecting what may be a rich source of historical interest."[499] For him, learning outside the classroom developed observational skills and provided stimulating starting points for narrative work on the national story.

The following passage showed Unstead's view of how local history could be used to develop students' conception of history, in what was termed in chapter three a "weak" disciplinary approach. In this passage, students had the opportunity to make a connection between source material situated in their locality and the narrative taught to them in class. There was, in this activity, the potential to see local sources as providing evidence about the past, thus raising the question "how do we know?" The concrete nature of local sources, Unstead suggested, confirmed the truthfulness of the classroom narrative by grounding it in proof. Although pre-evidential, this passage sees Unstead moving, perhaps more so than Strong was prepared to, in the direction of the weak disciplinary. He argued:

---

primary source material. *Looking at History's* manifold illustrations were selected to match closely the subject matter within the text but are left open to his own criticism that class textbook illustrations be accompanied by explanatory notes. Unstead used the device of closely integrating descriptive text and illustration.

[496] Ibid., p. 72.
[497] Ibid., p. 46.
[498] Unstead, 1956, p. 45. Unstead cites Molly Harrison, *Learning Out of School*, published in 1954, as evidence that he was engaging with post-war history education writing.
[499] Unstead, 1956, p. 46.

Their eyes can be opened, and they will be made much more keenly aware of their locality, if the teacher illustrates his lessons with a piece of Roman pottery that has been unearthed on the new housing estate, or the fossil that someone has found down the quarry, and if he encourages them to go see the mound some way off that was once a hill fort, as well as the church with its remaining Norman arch and the list of vicars stretching back to the Armada. Thus he will be teaching them to look about and to see the familiar with fresh eyes.[500]

Engaging with this very "weak" disciplinary perspective, he recommended that teachers obtain museum loans and ask students to bring in from home artefacts to set up a classroom "museum" on a table or in a cabinet. He suggested that they exhibit Victorian pennies and stamps, antimacassars and early photographs, collections of flints, fossils and Roman tiles, an arrowhead, candlesnuffer, a blunderbuss and piece of flail.[501]

He recommended using sources to capture students' interest at the start of a lesson. He wrote: "When starting a new topic on a fresh period, it is always well to consider its introduction; how to command the children's interest from the outset."[502] Capturing the interest of students from the very beginning was what he thought pictures, artefacts and visits could do effectively, and especially, as the following passage showed, if presented in a surprising or dramatic way. Unstead explianed:

Sometimes it is effective to produce from one's pocket a piece of flint, a scrap of Roman tile, an old coin, a book such as Pilgrim's Progress or Pepys's Diary, and to make that the starting point of a lesson or topic. In these simple ways, children are not only encouraged to bring along their own treasures and to

---

[500] Ibid., p. 46.
[501] Unstead, 1956, p. 46.
[502] Ibid., p. 50.

keep their eyes open, but they more readily appreciate that history is alive and is within reach.[503]

Unstead and Strong differed in the importance they placed upon written primary sources and historical accuracy. Unstead thought it important that students should appreciate that the narrative put before them was "a true story" because "It has no meaning otherwise".[504] He insisted that even non-specialist teachers working in junior schools should address with students the questions: "Is it true?" and "How do we know?"[505] It was in the telling of a "true" story that source materials had their greatest appeal.

Unstead devoted a whole page to discussing written sources at the beginning of his text on page eight, at the end of the Introduction. To signal its importance, he wrote under the subheading "Source Material". Strong was less forthcoming on the subject. His discussion on source-work began mid-text and focused mainly on visual sources; he hardly mentioned the written word.

Unstead's early discussion focused on the importance of private reading to secure teachers' subject knowledge. He listed the history books he thought teachers should have read in preparation for knowledge transmission.[506] He included within this primary source readings, which he suggested they read to their students. The non-specialist teacher, Unstead wrote, may wish:

---

[503] Ibid., p. 50.
[504] Ibid., p. 29.
[505] Ibid., p. 7.
[506] His list included: Quennell, *Everyday Life* series *and History of Everyday Things* (4 volumes); Collingwood, *Roman Britain*; Trevelyan, *English Social History*; Power, *Medieval England*; Salzman, *English Life in the Middle Ages, England in Tudor Times*. First on his list was Marjorie and Charles Quennells' four-volume *History of Everyday Things in England,* published between 1918 and 1934. Unstead's admiration for the Quennells' work is reflected in the numerous references he makes to it throughout his own text. The Quennells' focus on "how people lived", their use of illustration within the text, was possibly an important influence on Unstead's own writing. Another possible influence was Marjorie Reeves' Then and There series, The Medieval Town (1954) and *The Medieval Village* (1954), which Unstead also recommended (see p. 93).

from time to time, to find out, or to help his children to discover, exactly what people said or did at some particular moment of the past.[507]

He listed titles where teachers could locate "extracts interesting to juniors".[508] These included Harrison and Bryant's then recently published *Picture Source Book for Social History: Sixteenth Century*, published in 1951, and Harrison and Wells' *Picture Source Book for Social History: Seventeenth Century*, published in 1953, and *Picture Source Book for Social History: Eighteenth Century*, published in 1955. He recommended John Dover Wilson's source anthology *Life in Shakespeare's England*, published by Penguin in 1949. He described this as "a mine of fascinating information from contemporary writing, some of which will appeal to students".[509]

He suggested that teachers obtain "contemporary quotations" from Dent's Everyman Library: such as Sir John Froissart's *The Chronicles of England, France, Spain*; *Captain Cook's Voyages of Discovery*; Richard Hakluyt's *Hakluyt's Voyages*; the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*; and *Pepys Diary.* Unstead underlined that visual and written primary sources were readily available and, further, that knowledge of them was a necessary requirement for the teaching of history. In his view, they were part and parcel of a teacher's basic subject knowledge.

Unstead proposed that occasionally "interesting" passages selected from "source-books" be deployed to enliven history teaching and learning. In a pre-evidential way, he stated that a student listening to an "extract" was hearing "exactly what happened" in the past. Unstead argued that sources derived their "interest", in part, from appearing to be a "window" opening onto the past. The student was, according to Unstead, captivated by the thought that they were experiencing the past directly. Its period detail and language created an illusion of actuality that had an immediate appeal to feelings and the imagination.

---

[507] Unstead, 1956, p. 8.
[508] Ibid., pp. 8–9.
[509] Ibid., p. 36.

To create a similar effect, Unstead suggested that teachers use the French Ambassador's description of Queen Elizabeth, in 1597, and Pepys diary account of bloodletting. They were effective because their intrinsic literary qualities had a direct appeal for students. In a sense, the source extract enabled them to vicariously "enter into" the past. They also evoked the "strangeness" of the past, sometimes in a humourous way, and underlined that the past was different from the present. Some of these qualities were seen in the following description of a seventeenth-century schoolmaster, another "interesting extract" he recommended that teachers use:

> must be a man of sound religion, neither Papist nor Puritan, of a grave behaviour, and sober and honest conversation, no tippler or a haunter of ale-houses, and no puffer of tobacco.[510]

For Unstead, written source extracts served to enliven storytelling but they were more than mere embellishments. Reading a well-chosen extract would, he thought, heighten student engagement, making listening more "active", which would enable students to *experience* the "magic of a well told story". Unstead wrote: "Words uttered at the time had the authentic flavour of actuality"; they encapsulated events in sound bite form.[511] Unstead suggested that an example of the "authentic flavour of actuality" was Becket's reply to the four knights entering the Cathedral: "Lo, I am here, no traitor, but a priest of God."[512]

Facilitating listening, as an "intensely active mental process" required a specific type of extract.[513] Unstead thought that the following part-description of the funeral of Florence Nightingale, from the *Manchester Guardian*, 1910, was one of those examples. It is by no means a straightforward text for a ten-year-old student to encounter if approached critically as evidence of the past. But approached uncritically as a "window opening unto the past", it delivered, Unstead argued, a

---

[510] Unstead, 1956, p. 9.
[511] Ibid.
[512] Ibid., p. 27.
[513] Ibid., p. 27.

"good" story centred on human experience set against rich period detail. These were the narrative qualities that Unstead admired in narrative exposition, in general. The description of the funeral of Florence Nightingale began:

> As the body was borne into the church there was sitting in the porch a little old man in decent black, wearing pinned on his waistcoat the Crimean medal with the Sebastopol clasp. Once he was Private Kneller of the 23rd Foot, now old Mr. Kneller, the Crimean veteran of Romsey. If you talked to this cheerful veteran he would readily tell you how in the trenches before Sebastopol he was shot in the eye and was taken to hospital at Scutari – how as he lay in the ward by night he would see a tall lady going along past the beds carrying a lamp. He does not remember at all whether she ever spoke to him, nor whether he spoke to her but he remembers like a spark in the embers of his dwindling mind the apparition of the lady who came softly along the beds at night carrying in her hand a lantern – "one of them old fashioned lanterns".[514]

In fact, this extract delivered a particular interpretation of an event, one that supported Unstead's preferred narrative of the national story.

Unstead's classroom activities fell short of what David Sylvester termed teaching history as an "activity of enquiry".[515] An "enquiry" approach, from Sylvester's perspective, involved learning a method that enabled students to use sources as evidence to address open-ended historical questions. Sylvester argued that history education was interpretative. Unstead's approach was rooted in narrative storytelling.

Unstead's chapter on teaching methods, "History in the Classroom", addressed twelve areas. The first was subtitled "Information", which affirmed the importance of teacher-led knowledge transmission. He asserted:

---

[514] Unstead, 1956, p. 27.

[515] Schools Council History 13–16 Project, *A New Look at History*, 1976: "First, it [history] is an activity of enquiry into the past and its raw material is the evidence which has survived from the past" (p. 14).

A great part of the teaching of history consists of imparting information and facts to children, and the best source of information is still the teacher.[516]

He extolled the virtues of students finding out information from textbooks, taking notes, writing creatively, learning dates, learning history through drama, making models, drawing and painting, listening to wireless broadcasts, using reference books and reading historical fiction. Making, writing, drawing and acting were all activities that could be informed by source material. He did not discuss source-work *per se*; it was subsumed within these activities. It made a valuable contribution but was not a method in its own right. Pictures, he suggested, should be used as sources of information for model making. His 13-page discussion on model making was as important, if not more important, than his discussion on using primary source materials.[517]

Unstead's activities were concerned with consolidating knowledge about a past that was known and taken for granted. His project was to make this more imaginative. His use of drama invited students to "identify themselves with characters and scenes of the past".[518] The examples he gave were short and dramatic: paying homage to the overlord; collecting Doomesday Book entries; punishing a fraudulent baker with his short-weight loaf about his neck; ordeal by combat; the capture of Guy Fawkes; and the activities of the Press Gang.[519]

Unstead made 82 suggestions for written work, none of which engaged directly with primary source materials.[520] In these tasks, sources were used as initial stimulus and as information; they were not themselves the object of writing. His writing tasks were not explicitly concerned with the disciplinary questions "How do we know?" and "Is it true?" They were information-based and not "source-based" activities.

---

[516] Unstead, 1956, p. 50.
[517] All 11 black-and-white illustrations in Unstead's *Teaching History in the Junior School* (1956) illustrate model making.
[518] Unstead, 1956, p. 59.
[519] Ibid.
[520] Ibid., Appendix 1, pp. 81–5.

Unstead treated the past as a received body of knowledge. This is seen in his writing tasks that posed "closed" questions that required "correct" answers and which aimed to consolidate information deemed important. He advocated varying the written tasks for pupils. . Some tasks required single-sentence answers or the creation of a list of facts. Others were more creative. They asked students to give an empathetic response or write a story, letter, poem or dramatic piece.

A suggested year-one activity was to require youngsters to draw how "early man made his home in a cave". By year four, students were asked to answer more challenging questions: "Suppose you were on the Victory, describe the appearance of Lord Nelson. Say why you think he is remembered as our greatest sailor?" Or "Make a list of modern heroes and write about one."[521] In all these activities, sources were treated pre-evidentially and used only to support knowledge acquisition.

Working with sources was important to Unstead and Strong. They both thought that it had an important contribution to make to post-war history education in the junior school. However, there were clear limits to what they thought it could do. This was set, in part, by their view of what they thought students were capable of achieving. It was also influenced by their search for an alternative to the "dull legacy" of traditional teacher exposition. Above all, Strong and Unstead wanted students to enjoy and take pleasure in learning about the past.

With reference to the continuum of source-work approaches discussed in chapter three, these two authors treated sources, on the whole, as "windows opening onto the past". A great deal of their writing took for granted the accuracy of historical knowledge. Asking students to reflect upon the disciplinary question "how do we know?" was not, for them, a dominant aim. These authors sought a "sensuous" or imaginative experience that used sources to engage students in the process of knowledge transmission. Yet, the way eyewitness accounts, artefacts and local

---

[521] Unstead, 1956, p. 85.

source materials were deployed created opportunities for students to begin to see sources as potential evidence about the past.

In this chapter, Strong and Unstead are seen to present a critique of post-war history that drew attention to the "failure" of knowledge transmission. This was similar to the critique found in Reid and Toyne (1944), the IAAM (1950) and the Ministry of Education (1952). This indicated that, for these authors at least, knowledge transmission was seen as a key issue within post-war history education. For them, the critical question was: What would a "new" model of knowledge transmission look like?

The post-war critique of knowledge transmission found in the texts selected for this study counters the view that history educators, in Slater's words, "rarely identified, let alone publicly debated" history education.[522] In fact, text analysis suggests that quite the opposite was found. An anxiety that post-war history education was at a crossroads and in "danger" permeated these texts. It was a central feature of the IAAM's text (1950). Unstead's anxiety concerned standards of teacher training and the demands of public examinations, which he thought were factors holding back the development of post-war history education. Strong's anxiety was directed towards "civilising" young minds and maintaining standards of public decency. Once again, there is little in Strong and Unstead's texts to suggest that all was well with post-war history education. They do not lend support to the argument that this was a "Golden Age" in the development of history education.

The "social practice" that produced Strong and Unstead's texts can be described as a "pedagogic discourse", a term Robert Phillips employed to describe the debates over history education during the 1980s and early 1990s.[523] The complexity of these authors' discussions, and the extent to which ideas, beliefs and values were shared

---

[522] J. Slater, *The Politics of History Teaching: A Humanity Dehumanised?* (University of London, Institute of Education, 1989).
[523] R. Phillips, *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State* (Cassell, 1998).

across all the texts examined for this study, makes it possible to discuss post-war history education in terms of discourses.

The discourse articulated in these six texts had common features. There was, for example, an insistence that post-war history education should aspire to be more than mechanical rote learning. This was a discourse of reform that directly challenged memorising selected facts from an outline narrative of political events. Central to its reform programme was the idea that students should be actively engaged in the process of knowledge transmission. This was tied to a learning theory that matched the process of engagement to the "natural" stages of students' psychological development. It was seen as vital that student engagement was through storytelling and that this was to be pleasurable. An emphasis was placed upon "entering into the past" imaginatively and emotionally in social history topics. This was a key feature of Unstead's approach but it is also a feature of other texts which indicated a growing interest in period studies or studying the past in depth. Viewed in this context, the pedagogic approaches of authors such as Unstead appear "progressive".

Strong and Unstead's texts support the earlier finding that the "new" knowledge transmission served civic purposes. They, like the other authors examined here, thought it self-evident that the purpose of history education was, in Strong's words, to "turn wayward children into citizens" through moral education and character training. They privileged a celebratory narrative that fostered a patriotic national identity, viewed by these authors as essential to the maintenance of post-war society.

This chapter has revealed differences between authors. Strong's aims were overtly civic, while Unstead's main concern was with moral education. Where Strong narrated a world history, Unstead favoured a national story. There were differences as well in emphasis over the subject boundary between history and literature and between studying the past to explain the present and studying the past for its own sake.

In this chapter, the two authors have been seen to advocate learning activities that "actively" engaged students in the "new" knowledge transmission. This was seen, for example, in designs for specialised teaching classrooms that facilitated creative writing, painting and drawing, dramatisation and model making. In their view, the history classroom should be transformed into a specialised environment that would enable students to engage creatively in the process of knowledge transmission.

According to the authors featured in this chapter, working with sources pre-evidentially had a vital role to play in delivering the "new" transmission of knowledge. These authors' enthusiasm for source-work encouraged all teachers to use written and visual sources, artefacts, museum visits and local historical sites. Above all, Strong and Unstead valued the intrinsic properties of sources to arouse interest in learning a narrative. This included the disciplinary question, "how is the past known?", which drew attention to the evidential basis of the narrative being told. The presence of this question, although peripheral to their main concerns, marks a move in the direction towards taking a "weak" disciplinary approach to source-work. There is no evidence here that Strong or Unstead thought that primary sources could be evaluated critically or used evidentially as part of an historical enquiry.

Strong and Unstead's texts support that strand within the argument presented here that calls into question what this study has termed "Dark Age" and "Golden Age" representations of post-war history education. These texts do not indicate that, across the board, there was an unquestioning allegiance to a single, unchanging tradition of knowledge transmission. Nor do they furnish evidence that history education was at this time triumphantly successful. Instead, they, alongside the other texts examined for this study, present a more complex picture characterised by diversity and change. Thus, analysis of these two authors substantiates and complements the main findings of earlier chapters and contributes new evidence to support the central arguments presented in this study.

Chapter Ten

Estella Matilda Lewis

E. M. Lewis's history education handbook, *Teaching History in Secondary Schools*, published in 1960, is the focus of this chapter. Her text addressed the needs of teachers working in secondary modern schools. It set out to raise student attainment by urging teachers to adopt different approaches to teaching and learning, including incorporating the practice of the use of primary source materials.

Lewis was critical of what she considered outmoded "traditional" history education methods and, like the other writers examined for this study, she presented an alternative set of aims and practices for teachers to follow. Her text, then, lends support to the view, noted elsewhere in this study, that through the lens of post-war published writing, history education in this period appears diverse and open to change.

Post-war history education as a "social practice" is seen in Lewis's career as a teacher. Her professional engagement with the development of history education was located within a network of institutions, namely the Historical Association, of which she was a member, and Furzedown Training College, which was affiliated to the University of London, Institute of Education, where she worked as a teacher educator.[524]

---

[524] Between 1947 and 1960, Lewis was Principal Lecturer in History at Furzedown Training College London, which was linked to the University of London, Institute of Education. Previous to this she had taught in a grammar school for 16 years. During the 1950s, the London Institute of Education was emerging as an important centre for history education studies. As well as writing *Teaching History in Secondary Schools*, Lewis contributed sections on secondary modern textbooks, books on prehistory, and books on costume for the London Institute of Education's (1962) *Handbook for History Teachers*, edited by W. H. Burston and C. W. Green and published by Methuen. Working at the Institute of Education, W. H. Burston published *Principles of History Teaching* in 1963. Lewis also participated in events organised by the London History Teachers Association.

Throughout the 1950s, Lewis was a member of the University of London, Institute of Education Standing Sub-Committee in History.[525] The minutes of their meetings record her involvement in the delivery of history education professional development courses. These show a sustained interest in the "problem" of teaching history to secondary modern school students and in the use of primary source materials.

The minutes of the Education Standing Sub-Committee in History record that in January and March 1953, she delivered an evening course for teachers of history titled "The Teaching of History in Secondary Modern Schools" held at Borough Road College, on Tuesday evenings between 6.30 and 8.00 pm. For this, Lewis delivered two sessions: the first was on using illustrative pictorial material and a second addressed, "The Backward Child and the History Lesson". This course was again offered in November 1953, where 47 teachers attended. It was offered in 1956, 1958, 1959 and 1960. In 1960 Lewis delivered separate sessions on illustrative, pictorial materials and sources for local history. In the foreword to her handbook, *Teaching History in Secondary Schools,* she stated that it was her involvement in these professional development courses that had formed the basis of her text. Her handbook drew on her experience as a history educator involved in the professional development of teachers. She was, therefore, well placed to exert influence over post-war history education.[526]

In 1953, a group of London teachers founded the London History Teachers Association "to further the interests of history teachers and the teaching of history, either acting independently or acting along with other Association or Associations having the same or similar objects, in any of the following ways:- (1) Promoting meetings of interest to teachers in Secondary schools; facilitating exchange by members of their experience of syllabus and method; (2) making available to members the results of research and revision; (3) providing opportunities for members to meet each other informally and socially; (4) experimenting in liaison work between Universities and Schools; (5) investigating the problems, scope and content of history teaching; (6) collaborating and consulting with examining bodies; (7) making representations of the views of members to official bodies." In 1958 the LHTA held a panel discussion on "Teaching History to the Non-Academic Child". The minutes of the LHTA are in the Newsam Library and Archives, catalogue numbers DC/LMT/A1/2 (1957–60) and DC/CMT/A1/1 (1953–57).

[525] The minutes of University of London, Institute of Education Standing Sub-Committee in History are housed in the Newsam Library and Archives, catalogue number IE/PER/B/160.

[526] Connections between university, schools, museums, art galleries, records offices, teacher training colleges and the Historical Association are reflected in the early career of Margaret Elizabeth Bryant,

Lewis's *Teaching History in Secondary Schools* was the first post-war handbook to take the teaching of history in secondary modern schools as its main focus. It was also the first handbook to present the case that *all* students attending secondary modern schools should receive a history education.[527] This position framed her discussion on the aims of history education and the role that primary source material should play in history education teaching and learning. It placed her in opposition to those who, at the time, argued that in secondary modern schools civics or social studies should replace history education in the final fourth year.

Written in a persuasive style, her writing had a distinctive personal voice that attended to issues concerning social class, identity and culture. She shared many of the concerns of other post-war writers examined here, yet her approach to history education aims and the role that source-material should play were, in important ways, her own.

The Newsom Report estimated that during the early 1960s approximately three-quarters of the student population attended secondary modern schools and a quarter attended grammar schools. To compare Lewis's text with IAAM's handbook for grammar school teachers (which was the subject of chapter eight) invites discussion of the secondary modern/grammar divide in post-war history education.

who in 1957 took the post of Senior Lecturer in Education with special reference to the teaching of history at the University of London, Institute of Education. Bryant had read history at Girton College, Cambridge (1935–1938) and trained to be a history teacher, taking the Cambridge Certificate in Education in 1939. Her first post was in the independent sector as "history mistress" at Walthamstow Hall School Girls Day and Boarding School. She then worked for the British Council (1944–1946) and was Education Officer for the Essex Records Office (1946–1948). Between 1948 and 1956, she moved into the state sector where she taught history at Dunraven secondary modern school in Streatham. At this time she worked at the Geffrye Museum and devised an experimental course in Museum Studies for schools. In 1961, she published *The Museum and the School*, a Teaching of History pamphlet for the Historical Association. In *The Museum and the School*, Bryant reported that the relationship between schools and museums had undergone rapid change during the 1950s. She wrote: "From the school side, teachers are more aware than ever before of the part which museums can play in purposeful and enjoyable study and experience." For Bryant's CV, see IOE Library reference IE/PER/B/160, and for her career: M. Bryant, My Life in the History of Education, *History of Education Society Bulletin,* 51 (Spring, 1993), pp. 33–9.

[527] In 1952, the Ministry of Education's *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23* discussed this issue briefly and it is clear that *Pamphlet No. 23* was an important influence on Lewis's writing. In 1954, W. H. Burston published *Social Studies and the History Teacher* (Historical Association Pamphlet) that discussed the value of teaching history to fourth-year students attending secondary modern schools.

In Lewis's text, students across this divide were categorised according to their "intelligence". Students attending grammar schools were described as "above average", "academic" and "examinable", while students attending secondary modern schools were described as "average", "below average", "backward", "retarded", "non-academic" and "non-examinable". [528] These were, for her, "natural" categories and she employed them unquestioningly.

Her case that history was a fitting subject for "backward" students was premised on the idea that it had to be tailored to their "special" needs. For it to work, she argued, it would have to be a different kind of history education from the one delivered to "academic" students in grammar schools. It was, she wrote, "almost certainly attempting the impossible" in expecting an average class in a secondary modern school to master the average grammar school syllabus.[529]

It was, Lewis argued, non-graduate teachers' lack of subject-specific knowledge that lay behind what she saw as the "failure" of history education in secondary modern schools.[530] She made these teachers her target audience and it was to them that she offered her guidance. It was her concern for these teachers' sense of "failure" that shaped her reforming ideas.

In her opening chapter, "Aims and their bearing on selection", Lewis addressed what the aims of history education for students attending secondary modern schools should be. She began by stating what she thought they were not. Her starting point was the experience of non-specialist teachers that she had encountered as a teacher trainer. Their confidence to teach, she reported, was low. Many thought, she stated, that they "can't teach history" and she cited one as

---

[528] The Newsom Report, *Half Our Future* (1963), p. 4. The report also stated that: "Last year, there were 3,668 modern schools in England, making up rather more than two-thirds of the total of all secondary schools. The 1944 Act changed the name and status of the old Senior Elementary Schools to Secondary Modern Schools, but at first changed little else. When the school leaving age was raised to fifteen in 1947, the country was faced with the enormous task of discovering how to provide an effective secondary education for a large part of the population which had never remained so long at school before" (p. 12).
[529] Lewis, 1960, p. 3.
[530] The Incorporated Association of Assistant Master's handbook, *The Teaching of History* (1950), which targeted graduate specialists also underlined the distinction, only in a different way.

having remarked: "History is slavery for me and slavery for the children." She summarised their experience as a "burden", a "failure" and "trouble" and reported that they found students "bored" and their work was of "poor quality" and "disappointing".[531]

Although a sense of failure permeated Lewis's analysis of the state of post-war history teaching in secondary modern schools, she opposed those who, at the time, argued that it should be dropped from the secondary modern school curriculum. Alarmed by low standards of teaching and by student indifference to the subject, she sought reforms that centred on rescuing history education by clarifying aims, and by reviewing content selection, syllabus design and teaching methods.[532]

A successful secondary modern school history education, she wrote, must be "inspired by clearly envisaged aims".[533] In the following passage, she confronted her opponents and, adopting a tone that was typically combative, made her case for having clarity of purpose. She wrote:

> What do constitute the aims of the advocates of history for children? Why do so many of us passionately reject the arguments of those who would remove history from the syllabus of the secondary modern school? What is it we feel we can offer to children through well-taught history? The answers to these questions supply the definition of the value of history to young people and thus point to the ends the teacher must keep in view and consequently – the point cannot be too often made – to the principles which must guide him in interpreting and shaping his syllabus.[534]

---

[531] Lewis, 1960, p. 2.
[532] The Newsom Report, in 1963, also took an optimistic view: "we are not confronted with a psychological barrier which prevents people of below average intelligence, that is to say about half the nation, forming a responsible and reasoned opinion about public affairs. Optimism is possible. The important thing is to discover and apply the means by which it can be justified" (p. 163).
[533] Lewis, 1960, p. 3.
[534] Lewis, 1960, p. 3.

In the following passage, Lewis posed her central question: how can students receiving an education that was predominantly vocational benefit from a non-vocational subject such as history? Or, put another way, what value can an "academic" subject such as history have for non-academic secondary modern school students?

In addressing the "problem" of history education and the non-academic student, Lewis was responding to the emergence of the secondary modern school curriculum and the raising of the school leaving age to 15, a consequence of the 1944 Education Act. Her history education for "non-academic" students was intended to meet the needs of a changing post-war society and economy, and in particular the needs of post-war manual workers. Lewis asserted:

> In an age when increasing pressure is being brought to bear on the schools to produce ever larger numbers of craftsmen and when technology has necessarily become the dominant concern of mankind, it is important that such time as is spent on a subject which provides interest of a different quality should be profitably used.[535]

Lewis's history education for "non-academic" students prioritised civic awareness and cultural assimilation. Secondary modern students destined to become manual workers would benefit most from a history education when it inducted them into a shared national culture. This, she suggested, would have lasting benefits for their role as responsible citizens and in their private lives as consumers of heritage and entertainment. Lewis looked upon students who attended secondary modern schools as culturally deprived. Her aims pursued a distinctive paternalistic civilising mission. She remarked:

> What we hope to do when we introduce children to history is enrich their lives, to widen their horizons. We desire that children who lack a rich cultural

---

[535] Ibid.

background at home should become free of a world in many ways different from their own, yet in which they can see the beginnings of their own.[536]

The benefits to these students lay, Lewis suggested, in teaching them to view themselves as privileged members of a national community bounded by a common heritage. In the classroom, this required students to identify themselves with a set of incontrovertible events associated with the nation's history. In a revealing passage, she wrote:

> We want them to enter into the heritage of their culture, a culture common to themselves and to both their ancestors and their contemporaries in different social and academic circles.[537]

Acquiring this benefit involved being taught a shared history. As the following passage shows, this was to be presented as a narrative of improvement for all. Lewis continued:

> They must realise that life has been different from that of their own time, and can be different again in the future; conditions have been improved in some respects, and must be still improved in others.[538]

Lewis's history education aims were civic and cultural. The purpose of a history education was, she thought, to prepare students to carry out their civic duties responsibly. At the same time, it should induct them into the dominant culture so that their private lives were culturally enriched.

She saw that teaching a narrative that focused on "outstanding" characters who had made a "significant" contribution to the improvement of the nation would

---

[536] Lewis, 1960, p. 3. In 1963, the Newsom Report, *Half Our Future,* took a similar view when it wrote that: "there is much unrealised talent especially among boys and girls whose potential is masked by inadequate powers of speech and the limitations of home background. Unsuitable programmes and teaching methods may aggravate their difficulties, and frustration express itself in apathy or rebelliousness. The country cannot afford this wastage, humanly or economically speaking" (p. 4).
[537] Lewis, 1960, p. 3.
[538] Ibid., p. 4.

"cultivate" students' civic sense of belonging to a national community. Those individuals in the past who had served the nation well and who had contributed to the advancement of "our civilisation" presented students with exemplary models of civic action. The aim of teaching history involved, Lewis wrote, meeting "the great and the good in our past".[539]

In the following passage, she highlighted "tolerance" and "sympathy" as virtues that secondary modern school students should acquire. Meeting the great and the good in her narrative would exemplify these virtues. She also suggested that her narrative should be honoured and celebrated. Lewis argued:

> Through their history lessons children should cultivate tolerance and sympathy (in the true sense of the word) as they identify themselves with fellow creatures of the past. We hope to people their world with men and women who served ideals, sought adventure, gave mankind new knowledge, added to the sum of beauty. We may even expect that some of our pupils will develop a sense of responsibility to the community as they begin to realise their debt to other races and other times.[540]

Lewis was in agreement with other post-war writers examined for this study in arguing that history education had an important role to play in shaping the moral outlook of students and in particular in making them aware of their social and moral responsibilities to other members in the community. Lewis wrote that history plays:

> a strong part in the development of a satisfactory personality by encouraging the growing capacity of the adolescent for feeling with and for others, and where the topic in hand has a strong human interest the tale should be

---

[539] Lewis, 1960, p. 11.
[540] Ibid., p. 4.

recounted with conscious art, skill being directed to the stimulation of the imagination, the stirring of sympathy, the enlargement of tolerance.[541]

Lewis challenged the idea that the aim of history education was to maximise content coverage. In her view, this may have been a valid aim for grammar school students preparing for examinations but was counterproductive when applied to students attending secondary modern schools. Far from promoting these students' learning, she argued, a concern with content coverage engendered boredom and disengagement.

In making this argument, she drew on A. N. Whitehead's theory of "inert ideas", which proposed giving time for students to consolidate their understanding because "facts only become knowledge when the mind plays around them".[542] Her reforming ideas centred on drastically reducing content coverage and allowing time for students to be actively involved in the process of learning. This freed up time and gave a major role to the use of primary source materials.

Lewis made the delivery of her civic and cultural aims dependent upon the implementation of a set of pedagogic reforms. Her move away from teaching a content-heavy outline narrative and her turning to teaching content-light discrete topics in depth was taken intentionally to give more scope for student activity. A remarkable feature of her statement was her insistence that students' engagement in learning should strive for a particular experience, one that was active, emotional, imaginative, creative and, above all, pleasurable. On this point, Lewis wrote:

> A teacher who is willing to try teaching in depth in this way is at least giving himself and his class a serious chance of sharing the pleasures many others have found in history. Such people maintain that history thus studied, albeit as simply as the age and aptitude of the children demand, opens wide doors of delight in entering which the sympathies are engaged, the emotions

---

[541] Lewis, 1960, p. 20.
[542] Ibid., p. 4.

touched, the imagination is stimulated and, at least now and then, teacher and taught share a creative experience.[543]

Lewis wrote that history education was a "gift" that teachers had in their possession to bestow that rewarded the public and private lives of individuals. For secondary modern school students, the "gift" was assimilation into the dominant culture. It enabled them to "enter into the heritage of their culture, a culture common to themselves and to both their ancestors and their contemporaries in different social and academic circles".[544] This was a matter of great importance to society, given what Lewis considered these students' home background to have been like. The world of secondary modern school students, she remarked, was:

> bounded by the close streets of a town, drab perhaps, or garish; the workplaces of parents and ultimately of themselves; the holiday resort little different in quality; we should be offering a stone instead of bread if we deepened their understanding of the material surroundings while keeping closed the doors through which they might glimpse broader vistas, greater people, ancient wrong or triumphant achievement.[545]

Lewis judged that non-specialists would find implementing her ideas challenging. It would, she wrote; require "courage" on their part to change their methods.[546] The way forward, she insisted, involved non-specialists teachers selecting content that would appeal to students' interests and ability: then, reducing its amount, teaching it in depth and involving students in its learning.

---

[543] Lewis, 1960, p. 6. When highlighting the importance of "pleasure", Lewis drew upon A. L. Rowse, who wrote in *The Use of History* (1946): "Let us begin with what is to me the most obvious, and perhaps the most appealing, pleasure it gives: the way a knowledge of history enriches and fills out our appreciation of the world around us under our eyes. It gives an interest and a meaning to things which perhaps we should not have noticed before, not only villages and towns and buildings, a church, an old house, a bridge, but even the landscape itself" (p. 31). Rowse further wrote: "An uneducated man has no sense of history. He does not know whether the house he sees is Victorian or Georgian, Elizabethan or medieval; or what it means if told" (p. 191).
[544] Lewis, 1960, p. 3.
[545] Ibid., p. 11.
[546] Ibid., p. 5.

Lewis's four-year course delivered what she termed the "story of our civilisation". This was a series of studies in depth that built students' sense of period or what she termed the "spirit of the age". "Our first aim", she wrote, "is not that they retain most of the information we give them, but that they grow up historically minded, with a feeling for the past."[547] Developing students' "feeling for the past" was through a period-by-period engagement with narrative materials, including primary source materials. She suggested that a study of the Tudor period, for example, might consist of four distinct units, one each on: Henry VIII, Elizabethan seamen, life in Shakespeare's England, and the early life of Queen Elizabeth.

The advantage of studying fewer topics in depth was the time it allowed for students to "enter into our heritage" and be engaged emotionally, imaginatively and creatively in a shared history. As the following passage showed, she made "entering into" a fundamental condition of achieving her general history education aims. She asserted:

> Only as children can enter in imagination into the ideas and events of the past does history have any value for them and fulfil any of the functions enumerated above.[548]

In Lewis's history education for "non-academic" students, primary source material was given an essential role. The level of practical guidance that she gave on the subject surpassed that of other history education writers examined for this study. Her approach was distinctive in the way it involved students dialogically in the process of learning and in the variety of her learning outcomes and, further, in the way source-work was made indispensable to achieving her general aims.

Lewis advocated an illustrative approach that involved the teacher reading to class a primary source extract as an accompaniment to teacher narrative exposition. For this, Lewis recommended literary sources, considering it a truism that "the more a

---

[547] Lewis, 1960, p. 55.
[548] Ibid., p. 4.

teacher delves into literature the more valuable his lessons will be".[549] Encouraging teachers to compile their own collections of "source extracts", she recommended they turn to Chaucer, Shakespeare, Raleigh, Milton, Pepys, Evelyn, Marvell, Herbert, Bunyan, Defoe, Goldsmith, Bronte, Dickens, Newbolt, Masefield, Kipling, Drinkwater and Housman. She also suggested reading carefully selected extracts from the Bible, Herodotus, Tacitus, Caesar, Froissart, Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, Raleigh and Gardiner.[550]

She also thought teachers should consider medieval chronicles, letters, journals, newspapers, memoirs, travel writers and historical novels. She thought it essential that teachers visit places of historical interest in their localities, such as castles cathedrals, mansions, churches, museums, art galleries and record offices. Her suggestions for using written local sources included court rolls, vestry minute books, Poor Law records and the Domesday Book.

In the following passage, Lewis explained how written source extracts could be used "illustratively" to enhance teacher exposition. Here, sources are presented as "windows" and the emphasis is upon arousing students' interest. It suggested that reading a source extract to class should be a carefully rehearsed dramatic performance engendering an intense experience of "entering into the heritage of their culture". Lewis wrote:

> The term "original sources" sounds academic, adult, if not possibly dull. But properly introduced, something which was actually written during the course of the events being described (often by an eye witness) will add a great deal to a lesson. A story gains tremendously in interest when the narrator can say,

---

[549] Lewis, 1960, p. 45.

[550] Her bibliographies included "collections of original source materials", which recommended the series *Picture Source Book for Social History*: M. Harrison and M. A. Bryant, *The Sixteenth Century* (1954); M. Harrison and A. A. M. Wells, *The Seventeenth Century* (1953), *The Eighteenth Century* (1955), and *The Early Nineteenth Century* (1957). Molly Harrison influenced Lewis's approach to using visual sources. Hinting at an earlier period of source-work activity at the beginning of the twentieth century, Lewis remarked: "Out of print is a very useful series entitled *English History Source Books*, ed. R. B. Morgan and E. J. Balley (Blackie, 1907). I have twice found the various volumes of this series lying at the back of classroom cupboards, long disused. They might be obtained second hand" (p. 207).

"These are the words he spoke" or "This is the letter she wrote", and so on. For the extract to make its full impact I think such preparing of the ground, such a "build up" is necessary. I mention that the sources must be properly introduced and indeed it is worthwhile to spend a moment to "put across" before starting to read. The readings of course should be well done. I find it helpful to practise them beforehand. And except where particularly exciting they should be kept short.[551]

Lewis wrote that there should be "ample opportunity for the well told story" and to augment this she thought that "a little collection of source readings is to my mind essential"; and that "such short readings are valuable illustrations of one's exposition".[552]

For students to "enter into the heritage of their culture", it was important, she stated, that source extracts appealed directly to students' interests. Developing this point, she reasoned:

I must admit that in any collection of, say, a hundred extracts deemed suitable for schools I have not usually found more than a score or so which would appeal to the eleven to fourteen age-range. I would never spoil the taste of the children for original material by reading them anything of the sort which they would find dull.[553]

For Lewis, the sources that would appeal to an "average child" were short and concerned with action and high drama. They had, she thought, a dual function. They enhanced a teacher's narration and could serve as the narration. On this last point, she argued:

Could any words of ours, however eloquent, match the account of Sennacherib the Assyrian's attack on Jerusalem given in Kings XIX? Herodotus'

---

[551] Lewis, 1960, p. 39.
[552] Ibid., p. 38.
[553] Ibid., p. 39.

brief description of Xerxes' fury when the storm broke his bridge of boats is always appreciated. Better known are Froissart's report of the Battle of Crecy; the passage from Foxe's Book of Martyrs describing the end of Cranmer, Latimer and Ridley; Raleigh's incomparable story of the last hours of "The Revenge".[554]

Source extracts, used in this way, were said by Lewis to "illuminate" the past: an image that had been used by the IAAM in their 1950 handbook *The Teaching of History*. In chapter eight it was noted that the IAAM had recommended a similar illustrative approach for grammar school students.

Like other post-war writers examined for this study, Lewis contrasted the "dullness" of rote learning with the "illumination" that engaged the interests of students. In common with other writers, Lewis thought that reading dramatic source extracts to students would transform their experience of learning. An "illuminated" narrative would be, she suggested, an intensely absorbing experience. She explained this point in the following way:

> the past is illuminated, its flesh and blood characters become important to boys and girls who have heard the words they spoke, have looked at the pictures they painted, have argued about the motives which impelled them, have in imagination participated in the events which interested them.[555]

It was important to Lewis that students attending secondary modern schools were given access to the same heritage as their grammar school counterparts.[556] She wrote:

---

[554] Lewis, 1960, p. 39.

[555] Ibid.,, p. 5.

[556] The phrase "parity of esteem" was used at this time to describe the relationship between grammar school and secondary modern provision as implemented by the Education Act 1944. Although, the status, curriculum and opportunities that each represented was markedly different they were to receive, according to the Education Act 1944, parity of financial provision. This was to suggest that though "different" grammar and secondary modern schools were of equal value.

To allow children in the secondary modern schools to remain ignorant of stories which are everyday knowledge to children being differently educated is to create a wholly unnecessary gulf between them. A strange way, indeed, of encouraging "parity of esteem".[557]

Lewis broadened her discussion to include what she termed an "investigative" approach to source-work. This was a teacher-led "investigation" of a visual or written source prior to, or instead of, narrative exposition. She saw this as an alternative to reading source extracts to enhance narration. Lewis clarified this distinction when she noted:

This employment of illustrations for the introduction of new material is far less common than their use to build on knowledge already conveyed.[558]

Making mainstream that which was "far less common" makes this aspect of Lewis's work cutting edge. Seeking to involve students in source-work aligned her with other leading post-war history educators such as Marjorie Reeves, Molly Harrison and Margaret Bryant.[559] Using source material "for the introduction of new material" stressed the importance of training students to "discover", "investigate", "actively learn", "deduce", "look deeply" and to "question" and "discuss". Lewis called this approach "looking and seeking". It invited students to find information

---

[557] Lewis 1960, p. 130.

[558] Ibid., p. 24.

[559] A work that took a similar "investigative" approach was Molly Harrison and Margaret Bryant's *Picture Source Book for Social History: Sixteenth Century*, published in 1951, in which the authors set out their case for students to learn about the past through a study of source material. They wrote:
 "I am sure you have wondered when you have read or have been told something that happened a long time ago, How Do We Know? Nobody living now could possibly have seen it happen and if they merely heard someone else tell about it – well, we can imagine how the story would have been altered in the telling.
"No – nobody living in the 20th century can possibly know by their own personal experience how a grand lady dressed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, what furniture a merchant would have had in his home then, how people travelled about or what they ate. So how *do* we know? Can we be sure about it, or is it all just guesswork?
"This book is partly an answer to that sort of question. For it is not by an author who is going to tell you about the 16th century; the actual 16th century people are going to tell *themselves*. How? – by letting you see some of the paintings, carvings, buildings, writings and so on which they made or created when they were alive" (p. 5).

about how people lived in the past through a study of their material culture. One of the most effective ways to approach this, she argued, was through a study of visual sources. Lewis asserted:

> I believe, that when entering their social heritage and thinking in terms of the everyday life of their ancestors, children gain most by looking and seeking with guidance of a well-informed person. So I repeat that a fair proportion of such lessons should be built round visual material. By this I mean something more than its employment merely to underline or illustrate a piece of narrative. This would surely be to miss all the opportunities for active learning which a good illustration presents. It stimulates curiosity and prompts comment and question, in fact engenders a bracing atmosphere in a classroom immediately on production.[560]

In the following passage, she considered some implications of taking this approach. Remarkably, she suggests source-work should resemble the approach taken by professional historians. Students should study the "actual remains of the past" by themselves, she wrote, looking to see what they can find. It is, she stated, a more effective way of learning than relying only on teacher exposition. Lewis argued:

> The greater part of the social history suitable for schools concerns concrete objects. We teach of homes, clothes, furniture, tools, machines, work, pastimes, artistic achievements and many other facets of the life of the past. I suggest that the story is the crystallisation of political history for children; the pictorial illustration should frequently be the instrument of the social history lesson. How much of the source material is in any case visual! It is strange to reflect that the experts in this field study the actual remains of the past, buildings, ruins, paintings, or museum pieces perhaps. But novices, children included, are expected to comprehend an oral account (admittedly simplified) instead of being allowed to use their eyes and look for what they can find – an easier process, after all. How absurd it is for a teacher to expend skill and

---

[560] Lewis, 1960, p. 22.

energy in giving a description of a Norman castle or an Elizabethan ship, instead of encouraging his class to study a good picture of it![561]

Visual sources should be used, Lewis wrote, as "vehicles of information in themselves" and students should learn "the difference between seeing and just looking". [562] This approach extended the non-specialists teachers' pedagogic repertoire by stepping back from completely dominating teaching and learning and becoming instead an "expert guide". This role, she wrote, involved them asking "such questions as will cause the class first to look deeper and then to ask themselves the reason for some of the things they can see".[563] Her "looking and seeking" source-work pedagogy demanded dialogic interaction between teacher and students and required the teacher to allow students a role in the "looking and seeking" of new information drawn from source material. The teacher did not relinquish their status as "expert" but was asked to exercise their authority in a different way. This involved developing the skill of leading a discussion and eliciting responses from students and listening and responding to what students had to say and, as the following passage shows, when to make a telling intervention and when to clarify and consolidate knowledge gains. She wrote:

> It is not enough to draw from the children all they can find in the pictures, even all they are able to deduce from what they see. The teacher must know when to give them what he can add, what they cannot discover without oral instruction.[564]

Lewis's examples of "investigative" source-work activities included a visual source-work exercise that began with students making simple observations of what they could see and then prompted by the teacher (expert guide) looking more closely deploying their prior knowledge, the teacher steering the "investigation" with carefully formulated questions and prompts.

---

[561] Lewis, 1960, p. 20.
[562] Ibid., p. 22.
[563] Ibid.
[564] Ibid., p. 23.

Looking at a picture of a sixteenth-century house, Lewis suggested the teacher ask students: "why build windows like that?" Followed by: "why were they built of wood and not stone?" As this example indicated, she thought it appropriate to ask challenging open questions.

Using four sections from the Bayeux Tapestry, she employed "looking and seeking" to prepare students for teacher narration. This exercise, estimated to take 20–30 minutes, began with the teacher explaining to students the nature and origins of the Tapestry. The teacher then guided the class to look closely for information about the Battle of Hastings. In this example, Lewis instructed teachers to guide the discussion towards preparing students for a narration on the Battle of Hastings. As the following passage explained, the investigation actively involved students in the process of knowledge transmission, fulfilling Lewis's general aim of enabling students to "enter into" the heritage of their culture. She wrote:

> A lively twenty or thirty minutes, with the class doing most of the talking, has thus set the scene for the narration of this all-important story. Now the class will be ready to sit and listen instead. I like to recount the events of the battle without interruption since it ranks, I think, among the great traditions of English history, and is worthy, in its intrinsic interests, as well as because of its ultimate importance in altering the course of our history, of all the art and skill of description at one's command.[565]

Lewis described this approach as "looking and seeking with the guidance of a well-informed person". For her, it was an activity of "close observation", "digging", "discovering" and "getting to work", an approach where students would be able to "offer their own descriptions and explanations".[566]

Lewis planned a lesson around a short extract from the *Report of the Commissioners on the Employment of Children in Factories* (1833). The aim of the

---

[565] Lewis, 1960 p. 27.
[566] Ibid., p. 22.

lesson was to extract the key facts relating to children working in factories through teacher-led guided study. The lesson began with the teacher introducing the topic "the rise of the factory system and the employment of children". Students were then asked to say what they would like to know about the topic. The teacher then read the source to the students and, as it is read, they were instructed to listen out for the answers to the questions they themselves posed. Lewis explained the task in the following way:

> It is easy to see what a satisfactory lesson could be planned round these readings. The teacher has given a general introduction on the rise of the factory system and the employment of children, and the class is full of questions as to the age of employment, hours of labour, wages and conditions. What better than to reply by reading some of these pages, telling the class to listen for the answers to their own queries.[567]

Lewis wrote that students "need specific training in intelligent digging" and part of her discussion involved training in specific skills.[568] This was information based and concerned with being able to select "quickly and intelligently facts relevant to the task in hand from a mass of material".[569]

Lewis's central concern was to enable students to "enter into the heritage of their culture, a culture common to themselves and to both their ancestors and their contemporaries in different social and academic circles".[570] This would, she thought contribute towards creating a more cohesive and stable post-war society. Propagating a sense of belonging to a common culture was a learning outcome in her discussion on the value of using local history source material. Lewis remarked:

> It is an observable fact that where there are large groups of rootless young people, who have been physically displaced, there is often less sense of

---

[567] Lewis, 1960, p. 42.
[568] Ibid., p. 35.
[569] Ibid.
[570] Ibid., p. 3.

responsibility to the community, less receptiveness to the best it has to offer, than in areas where the same families have stayed for some generations. Anything which can be done to make the newcomers free of the spirit of the fresh home, to help them to feel part of it, and take some pride in it, has to be attempted. To know what happened there in the past, to understand how it came to be as it is, to be shown the hidden interests in its street or field names, is to feel so much the less a "foreigner", an outsider.[571]

Lewis was keen to persuade her readers that identification with a common culture and place would enrich students' everyday lives. Her source-work-based history education would, she wrote:

provide a richer background to their normal pursuits, what will give significance to much which they might otherwise pass by unseeing.[572]

Her source-work would develop students' "sense of period". Possessing it, she argued, would deepen the pleasure of watching cultural programmes on television. On this she reasoned:

it is an asset if one can instantly "place" a stage set, a film, a portrait or an example of genre painting in its period. More and more people are watching plays on their television sets, and how much more satisfaction is there for those who can label the opening scenes as Elizabethan, or Victorian, than those for whom the play is just "historical".[573]

Lewis suggested that a "sense of period" could be developed through the study of paintings, which in turn opened students' eyes to the pleasures of visiting art galleries and museums. For her, this was also part of the "gift" that history education could bestow, which would allow students to "enter into our heritage". It is, she wrote:

---

[571] Lewis, 1960, p. 84.
[572] Ibid., p. 73.
[573] Ibid., p. 74.

a boon on children in whom they implant a desire to visit a gallery, and a pleasure in at least one aspect of painting. Where the subject of a portrait is an important personage here is another way of becoming familiar with him.[574]

Visits to castles, cathedrals, mansions and churches also provided cultural enrichment. These "legacies from our ancestors" were a source of pleasure that students would be encouraged to enjoy throughout the rest of their lives.[575] She suggested:

> The number of visitors to our castles, cathedrals, mansions and churches, ruined or well preserved, are very high indeed and increase yearly as more and more cars take to the roads. Here again history is an agent for deepening the enjoyment of ordinary life.[576]

For Lewis, entering into the heritage of our culture was necessarily a guided experience requiring the expertise of a well-informed person. She asserted:

> I think it could be argued that a visit to a fine, ancient church, in the company of one who understands beautiful buildings, could teach children more about "the age of faith" than many words expounding the theme.[577]

Like Molly Harrison, Lewis's approach stressed the importance of investigation as careful looking and aesthetic appreciation.[578] Lewis's rationale emphasised cultural assimilation and enrichment.

---

[574] Lewis, 1960, p. 77.
[575] Ibid..p 78.
[576] Ibid.
[577] Ibi, d.p. 79.
[578] Lewis cites and evidently drew heavily upon the work of museum educator Molly Harrison, who presented her case for source-work in *Learning Out of School*, published in 1954. Written for teachers, it provided advice on organising a museum visit and was reprinted throughout the post-war period. Harrison criticised the practice that confined students to gathering facts from information cards when encountering museum objects. She promoted an intimate engagement with the object through careful observation that invoked a personal and emotional response. The aims of her source-work were personal and social development rather than the discipline of history. She suggested that the museum was a place of wonderment where encountering museum objects

The "gift" of a history education for "non-academic" students was in sharing the pleasures and enjoyment of a common culture. Watching television, walking in the locality, exploring an art gallery, visiting a parish church, or being on holiday were experiences that would be deepened by a sense of period and a feeling for history that her approach engendered.

The type of source-work that Lewis proposed for students attending secondary modern schools did not require critical source evaluation, resolving conflicting testimony, or using sources as evidence as part of an open-ended historical enquiry. It was not a strong disciplinary approach.

Measured against the continuum of source-work practices outlined in chapter three, Lewis's use of literary source extracts was rooted in the illustrative. Read uncritically, students identified emotionally and imaginatively with the historical figures and actions contained in the storyline. This kind of absorption demanded that source extracts were received, as "windows" open unto the past, their accuracy and reliability left unquestioned. The illustrative side to her approach was pre-evidential and did not carry any, even weak, disciplinary features.

Lewis's "investigation" of the Bayeux Tapestry was also rooted in the illustrative. Even here the source was treated as a "vehicle of information". Her "looking and seeking with the guidance of a well-informed person" was an activity of "close observation", "digging", "discovering" and "getting to work", where students would be able to "offer their own descriptions and explanations". In this exercise, the Bayeux Tapestry was viewed as a "window" through which the events of the Battle of Hastings could be seen. Disciplinary questions concerning the source's perspective, reliability, accuracy and limitations were again not raised. Neither was the question "how do we know?" The source's provenance was given at the start of

---

widened students' experience, lifting them out from their limited drab home environments. In her view, museum visits developed students' whole personality. They inspired, stirred the imagination, cultivated sensitivities and sensibilities, and gave pleasure.

the lesson, which invited students to see the Tapestry as providing evidence, although this was not made explicit. Only here did her approach appear to be moving in the direction of a weak disciplinary approach.

This chapter has demonstrated that dominant contemporary accounts of post-war history education fail to find a place for writers like Lewis and as a consequence struggle to capture the elaborate social practice that played a part in producing her text. The production of her text and the range of her ideas sit uncomfortably with "dark age" and "golden age" simplicities.

Accounts of this period also seldom reflected on the role that women played in the development of history education. In previous chapters it has been noted that women had been active on IAAM and Historical Association committees. The texts examined here by Rachel Reid, Marjorie Reeves, Molly Harrison, Margaret Bryant and Estella Lewis add to this understanding by showing that female authors adopted a critical perspective when writing about history education.

In chapters six and eight it was noted that authors appeared to share a similar social background and a particular cultural bias. Lewis's benevolent paternalism, with its belief in the transformative power of historical knowledge to civilise the individual, is an undercurrent that is found in all of the texts examined here.

The language chosen by Lewis to discuss the grammar and secondary modern school divide exposed attitudes and assumptions concerning intelligence that she linked to social class. Her text confirms an earlier finding (noted in the analysis of the IAAM's 1950 text) that at this time authors broadly operated with two versions of history education: an "academic" model suitable for a selected minority and a "non-academic" model for the rest. Lewis pointed to a divide between specialist (grammar school) and non-specialist (secondary modern school) teachers. Her discussion of these divisions lends little support to the view that this was a "golden age" for history education.

Evidence of change within the "proposed" curriculum is seen in Lewis's answer to the question: how can an "academic" subject be taught to "non-academic" students, which saw her depart from the grammar school curriculum by reducing content coverage. A comparison between Lewis in 1960 with the Board of Education in 1946 is a measure of the extent to which pedagogic thinking changed during the 1950s. In 1946 teachers were instructed to teach a few facts, in 1960 Lewis instructed teachers to give their students an experience of "entering into the past".

A shift in metaphorical language is evident in texts by the IAAM, the Ministry of Education, Strong, Unstead and Lewis. The image of building a storehouse of knowledge persisted throughout the 1950s but alongside this there was a growing interest in the experience of "entering into the past". For Lewis and Unstead doing source-work was an emotional and aesthetic encounter in which primary sources were to be enjoyed pre-evidentially as information similar to that conveyed in textbooks. For their knowledge Lewis still made students reliant upon the authority of an expert guide. Students were not, in her view, in a position to question the authority of the knowledge put before them. However, although Lewis's approach to source-work were pre-evidential, this chapter has shown, that in some ways it was more experimental and more demanding than that suggested by the Board of Education in 1946, and for that matter, the IAAM in 1950.

The key to understanding Lewis's text was her insight that being free from O-level public examinations, teaching in secondary modern schools provided an opportunity to recast history education, a matter she had worked on throughout the 1950s. Lewis presented her readers with a distinctive model of knowledge transmission that represented a re-working of tradition. Free from the burden of preparing students for public examinations allowed, she believed, teachers to reduce the amount of knowledge to be transmitted. As a consequence this enabled Lewis to explore approaches to teaching that were accessible and engaging and included studying topics in depth, often using visual learning and dialogic methods.

Chapter Eleven

Post-war Responses to M. W. Keatinge:

IAAM, Kenneth Charlton and Gordon Batho

In this final chapter attention turns to two post-war writers who advocated a type of disciplinary source-work. Kenneth Charlton, in 1956, and then Gordon Batho, in 1962, championed what they termed the "source method". They both credited the origins of this approach to M. W. Keatinge's *Studies in the Teaching of History*, first published in 1910.[579] In their view, Keatinge had advocated teaching students to critically evaluate source material. They argued that this had a popular following during the early part of the twentieth century but had subsequently fallen out of favour.[580] In this chapter, Charlton's and Batho's advocacy of taking a sceptical approach to historical knowledge, based on their reading of Keatinge, undoubtedly provides further evidence of diversity and change within post-war history education writing.[581] This chapter examines, in detail, what they proposed.

 The authors examined in this study worked with a "stages" of learning development that framed their proposals for reform. This was referred to when estimating what students were capable of knowing and understanding when studying history. It also underpinned their view that students had a "natural" and "innate" love of romantic stories and it drew them to "active" learning as a core idea that would reform knowledge transmission. It informed their argument that "entering into the past" was the direction that post-war history education ought to take.

---

[579] The two key texts examined were K. Charlton, Source Material and the Teaching of History, *Educational Review*, 9(1) (1956), 57–63; G. R. Batho, Sources. In W. H. Burston and C. W. Green (eds) *Handbook for History Teachers* (University of London, Institute of Education, 1962), pp. 95–109

[580] M. W. Keatinge, *Studies in the Teaching of History* (A & C Black, 1910).

[581] The key texts examined were: Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools, *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools* (Cambridge University Press, 1950), *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools* (2nd edn) (Cambridge University Press, 1957), and *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools* (3rd edn) (Cambridge University Press, 1965).

In the texts so far examined, "rational" or "intellectual" approaches to learning about the past were downplayed, while "emotional" and "imaginative" engagements with knowledge were privileged. The "natural" place for a critical or analytical approach to knowledge was considered to be in the post-16 curriculum. In the pre-16 curriculum, "historical thinking" was mainly discussed in terms of finding factual information to augment storytelling.

There was general agreement among these authors that students of all ages and abilities would be able to respond emotionally and imaginatively to source material, finding their intrinsic properties stimulating and curious. It was generally accepted that a well-chosen source extract, artefact or picture could transport students back in time to experience past events as if, so it seemed, they were there.

Authors thought that the majority of students under the age of 16 would be able to appreciate that eyewitness testimony, artefacts or pictures provided accurate information about historical persons and events. They would be taught to view it pre-evidentially as information that was "true" because it was made at the time or because the person who wrote it was present when the event took place. Within these discussions, the disciplinary question, "how do we know?" about the past was never entirely absent. On this basis evidence in this study suggests that some authors, such as the IAAM and Unstead, were moving towards a "weak" disciplinary approach to source-work.

The analytical focus in this chapter is upon changing post-war approaches to source-work. It compares Charlton's and Batho's approach with the one taken by the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters (IAAM). Charlton and Batho both credited M. W. Keatinge with setting the terms of their approach. It is his influence over post-war history education writing that is now examined.

M. W. Keatinge's "source method"

The texts examined in this study indicate that Keatinge had a strong presence within post-war history education. Published in 1910, his *Studies in the Teaching of History* was included in reading lists for those training to be teachers throughout the 1950s and early 1960s. W.H. Burston and Gordon Batho, in separate articles for the Institute of Education's 1962 *Handbook*, included Keatinge's *Studies* in their recommended reading lists, as did the IAAM during the 1950s and early 1960s.[582] These authors represented him as a founding father of an English tradition of "critical" source-work advocacy, although, as will be shown, the value of his ideas for post-war history education divided opinion.

In 1910, Keatinge, in *Studies in the Teaching of History*, argued that reliance upon the transmission of factual knowledge had reduced history education to a failing school subject. To regain its standing, he insisted, history education had to deliver a level of formal training seen in more established subjects such as mathematics and science.[583] Keatinge argued that Edwardian science education had kept pace with developments in its academic field by introducing laboratory practices and by teaching students elements of scientific method. He concluded that the way forward for history education was to follow its example.

Keatinge described primary source extracts as school history's laboratory apparatus and drew upon the work of Langlois and Seignobos to formulate rules of procedure for the critical analysis of source material in the classroom.[584] This would, Keatinge argued, provide students with a form of training that would enable them to think critically and analytically and would guarantee the realisation of history education's main civic purpose, which was to contribute to the formation of an informed

---

[582] As late as 1975 the IAAM recommended that teachers read M. W. Keatinge's ideas on source-work in his *Studies in the Teaching of History* (1910). See IAAM (1975) *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools* (4th edn), p. 113.

[583] See Chapter 2, Scientific Method in History and the Problems of the School and Chapter 3, Contemporary Documents as a Basis for Method. In *Studies in the Teaching of History* (1910).

[584] Charles V. Langlois and Charles Seignobos 1897 work *Introduction aux études historiques*, (Introduction to the Study of History) was regarded by Keatinge as the standard work on the historical method, outlining how historians use primary source materials during the research process.

democratic citizenry. He reasoned that a training in historical method strengthened school history's claim that it was educating for life. Keatinge wrote that his source-work delivered vital civic skills because throughout their lives students would:

> on countless occasions need to analyse documents, to abstract them, and to compare them; he will seldom be freed from the necessity of inferring motives from actions and character from deeds.[585]

His "source method" was intended to complement and not replace teacher narrative exposition. In this approach, students routinely worked with source extracts. Reading source extracts would be close and in depth. They would be used to tackle open, small-scale enquiries set by the teacher.

As the following passage shows, Keatinge's source-work had differentiated learning objectives that departed from convention. He wrote:

> We must lead them in the history lesson to apply the more simple criteria of accuracy and of sincerity, we must train them to read closely and to extract from a document all the internal evidence that is to be found there, to compare and to rationalise conflicting accounts of characters and of event; and more important than all, though less showy, to summarise and to extract salient points from a series of loose, verbose, or involved statements. These exercises may involve little more than an almost mechanical process, or they may be devised so as to make demands upon the boy's whole ingenuity. Of whatever degree they may be, they necessitate classroom apparatus widely different from the conventional textbook.[586]

In Keatinge's approach, the setting of historical problems took different forms. These included a study of topic, character, motive, cause and change. In his "source method", the core activity was addressing questions of source accuracy, reliability,

---

[585] Keatinge, 1910, p. 35.
[586] Ibid., p. 39.

and author perspective. He proposed that a critical and analytical approach to sources should be introduced during the secondary phase of education for students aged 12–16. Importantly, in view of what post-war writers thought students were capable of understanding, he argued that critical and analytical source-work should *no*t be postponed until students had reached the age of 16.

Departing from convention, the "source method" involved students engaging with primary source extracts by themselves. Keatinge criticised practices that placed the history teacher as the active transmitter and the student as passive receiver. He noted that in Edwardian science lessons a different teacher–student relationship prevailed, one where students actively acquired knowledge and understanding through handling specialist apparatus and by applying a subject-specific methodology. He intended that the introduction of source-based exercises would have a similar effect upon the teacher student relationship in history classrooms.

Keatinge underlined that his "source method" training was not the equivalent of the research methods used by professional historians: it was training in elements of historical methodology, in particular, those associated with source criticism and analysis. Incorporating elements of "scientific history", he argued, would enable school history to stake a claim to being an autonomous school subject worthy of inclusion in the school curriculum. It was possible, he argued, for school history to resemble what it was that real historians do to the same extent that school science could resemble laboratory science.

The school textbook that Keatinge co-authored with N. L. Frazer in 1911 combined narrative exposition with exercises in source extract evaluation.[587] The first half conformed to Edwardian textbook convention by supplying a concise narrative of political events in English history for the period 55 BC to AD 1603. More unconventional was the second half, a collection of 187 primary source extracts accompanied by 218 "problems and exercises". Keatinge explained that the two

---

[587] M. W. Keatinge and N. L. Frazer, *A History of England for Schools with Documents, Problems and Exercises,* Part 1. 55 B.C. to A.D. 1603 (A & C Black, 1911).

halves were complementary. Narrative exposition and source extract studies were to be treated as mutually illuminating and as having equal measure. In the following passage, Keatinge and Frazer stressed the importance of "active" learning. They explained:

> The documents provided in this volume are intended to supply the apparatus for work which to some extent is analogous to that provided by the laboratory in the teaching of science. The pupil is given something that he can handle and manipulate – raw material that can be worked up in a number of different ways.[588]

In, *Studies in the Teaching of History* and in the textbook *A History of England for Schools*, Keatinge provided examples of his "source method". These show that he was mindful of the need to differentiate across ages and abilities and to provide different levels of challenge and difficulty.

For the highest level of difficulty he set exercises that, in his words, made "demands upon the boy's whole ingenuity". He demanded close, multiple readings of short and long primary source extracts taken from a wide range of authors and periods. In some instances students were asked to compare two, three or four extracts. The following three examples serve to illustrate the nature and degree of challenge that Keatinge and Frazer posed. They are drawn from the section on the Norman Conquest in their textbook A *History of England for Schools.* The first example invited students to read a short extract from "Chronicles of the Conquest" and then to complete the following empathetic exercise:

> Write a conversation between Duke William, a superstitious Breton lord, a greedy Angevin and a religious and scrupulous noble from Boulogne, who are

---

[588] Keatinge and Frazer, 1911, Preface, p. iv.

considering whether they will join him or not in his expedition against England.[589]

The next example asked students to read and compare three long extracts from Bede's *Ecclesiastical History*, the tenth-century *Old Irish Life of St Columba*, and the *Gesta Regum Anglorum* by William Malmesbury. Using these sources, students were instructed to:

Compare the lives of the clergy and monks in England at the coming of the Normans with the life led by St Columba.[590]

The third example asked students to study a long extract from a Saxon Chronicle and to use its internal evidence to gauge:

How far do you consider that the writer of this portion of the Saxon Chronicle is fair in his statement? [591]

In 1910, Keatinge had also advocated an illustrative use of sources to convey "atmosphere and stimulate the imagination" that augmented teacher narrative exposition.[592] It has been shown that the post-war writers examined for this study had no difficulty embracing this side of his work. It was, of course, his critical and analytical approach to source-work that divided post-war opinion. It is for this reason he was included in this study.

The post-war dividing line over Keatinge centred on his disciplinary question: "Can history be made into a real training school of the mind?"[593] Keatinge, as has already been explained, clearly thought so. In the Preface to their textbook, he explained

---

[589] Keatinge and Frazer, 1911, p. 378.
[590] Ibid.
[591] Ibid.
[592] Keatinge, 1910, Chapter 4, Contemporary Documents as Atmosphere: "they have also their value as giving atmosphere and stimulating the imagination, and it is frequently legitimate to employ them mainly for this purpose and to make the reasoning that can be done in connection with them a secondary matter. When used thus the documents need not always be placed in the pupil's hands, though they are more effective when this can be done" (p. 96).
[593] Keatinge, 1910, p. 38.

that his "training of the mind" had been trialled with students of varying ages and types and had proven to be successful.[594] What is significant, for this study, is that few of the writers examined in the previous chapters were prepared to accept his findings.

Keatinge's presence within post-war history education writing can be seen in the questions that authors addressed. Authors shared with Keatinge an interest in core questions such as: Can post-war history education do more than simply transmit knowledge by rote? Can students be more actively involved in their learning? What form of intellectual training can school history deliver? What role should source-work play in the development of historical thinking? What is the scope of students' historical thinking? Is the development of historical thinking age related? At what point in children's development should students begin to engage with historical sources critically and analytically? This level of interaction and question indicated a "long debate" over the transmission of knowledge. Post-war authors looked back appreciatively at the development of history education. They were aware of its contours and celebrated what they took to be its achievements and were critical of its failings.

Keatinge's presence in post-war history education is clearly seen in authors' responses to his proposal that secondary school students' aged 12–16 should be introduced to a critical and analytical training. To explore this development, two responses will now be examined. The first is the IAAM's cautious and in some ways dismissive response and the second is Charlton and Batho's more welcoming response to Keatinge's "source method".

The IAAM's response 1950-1965: "the illusion of laying bare the bones of history"

During the 1950s and early 1960s, the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters (IAAM) continued to take a cautious approach to Keatinge's "source

---

[594] Keatinge and Frazer, 1911, Preface: "The extracts have been tested with classes of varying age and type, and while primarily intended for the 'secondary' stage of school work, they are no less suitable for the upper standards of elementary schools" (p. v).

method". As the following passage, published in 1956, showed, the IAAM thought that it overestimated what it was students in the 12–16 age range were capable of doing. The IAAM stated:

> One way of employing source material may suggest itself, which is as a rule too ambitious for any but sixth-form pupils. This is the use of originals for research, comparison, or criticism. To attempt to develop critical powers by a "source method" is, generally speaking, to ask the pupil to run before he can walk.[595]

Cautiousness may explain the IAAM's observation that many teachers were underutilising source material. As late as 1965, the IAAM reported, "Source material was not widely used in schools".[596] Cautiousness alone, however, fails to account for the belligerent tone that some IAAM members adopted towards Keatinge's disciplinary ideas.

The 1965 edition of its handbook, *The Teaching of History* showed that the IAAM's position had, since 1950, changed very little. It continued to value source-work's illustrative role in support of narrative exposition for the age group 12–16, and did not depart from the view that it had held in 1950 that it was enough for students to uncritically accept historical knowledge. The IAAM prized sources when they aroused interest, rendered past events vivid, conferred authenticity, and provided factual information. The IAAM's "training of the mind" was concerned with acquiring knowledge. It was thought that Keatinge's "source method" was too difficult for most students in this age range to engage with. Occasionally, and then only for a few selected students, it was thought appropriate to address the question, How do we know?

Significant change can be seen ten years later in the fourth edition of the IAAM's *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools*, published in 1975, where Keatinge's

---

[595] IAAM, 1956, p. 79.
[596] IAAM, 1965, p. 45.

entire programme is no longer dismissed but strongly advocated. In a key passage, the IAAM noted:

> Skillfully used such work can promote speculation and discussion about a source's origin, meaning and purpose, and thus lead to a greater readiness in pupils to question and criticise standard authorities – textbooks and teachers. Pupils can begin to recognise conflicts and connections between different pieces of evidence; to detect bias and inconsistency; to evaluate materials in terms of its authenticity, relevance and completeness; to discriminate between fact and opinion; to assess different interpretations of the same evidence; to formulate their own hypotheses backed by reference to evidence, and to recognise that such hypotheses are merely opinions. Such work, at the highest level, can begin to instill some idea of what history really is – its qualitative aspects, its essence, as opposed to the more usual quantitative approach of merely covering a part of the factual content of the subject.[597]

In chapter 8 it was observed that that in 1950 some members of the IAAM had shown a cautious interest in Keatinge's disciplinary "source-method". This was also the case in 1965. It is evident that throughout the 1950s and early 1960s Keatinge's "source method" had been a central feature of the IAAM's discussions, a matter the membership thought they had to discuss.

Within the IAAM, those who were opposed to Keatinge's "source-method" viewed knowledge transmission and disciplinary source-work as incompatible and contradictory activities. The "source method" was, in their view, concerned with producing "academic" historians and consequently diverted time away from knowledge transmission. Deploying source extracts that were short in length, simple in language, and dramatic in type was acceptable but it was unacceptable to present students with sources, which were challenging in their language and length,

---

[597] IAAM (1975) *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools* p 86

for critical analysis. Opponents thought narrative exposition was far more important and had priority over source-work.

Decisively, the IAAM rejected Keatinge's central idea that most students in the 12–16 age range would be able to follow, to some degree, a course of training in critical analysis. Using "either-or" thinking, they dismissed it as being unrealistic. Critical analysis should, the IAAM correspondent asserted, be postponed on the grounds that it required a mature mind. Keatinge had assigned the majority of students an active role and had proposed routinely putting source extracts into their hands for independent study. The IAAM rejected this position, asserting that it had a place as an extracurricular activity.

It is important to underline the point that the IAAM's response in 1965 to Keatinge contained more than one viewpoint. The following passage adopted a less abrasive tone when discussing the use of sources to explore the evidential basis of historical knowledge. It began:

> The second aim to which sources may contribute is the arousing of interest in the question "How do we know?" Even young children in school should be made curious and about the origin of the history put before them in textbook form, and a few practical illustrations from sources are the best way of achieving this. One or two lessons devoted to this topic may be well worthwhile.[598]

This passage valued, up to a point, a "weak disciplinary" approach to source-work in the classroom. The IAAM's responses to Keatinge, then, contained mixed messages, suggesting that those within the IAAM who dismissed Keatinge out of hand did not have it entirely their own way. This more optimistic response indicated that there was room for manoeuvre over what could, and what could not, be accomplished with source materials. This extended to embracing Keatinge's idea that students themselves should handle source materials. In 1956, the IAAM stated:

---

[598] Ibid., p. 79.

But there are some extracts which can be properly used only by being put in the hands of the pupils, when that may be employed along with the textbook, as a basis for discussion and written work.[599]

During the post-war period, the IAAM published three editions of its handbook *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools*, the first in 1950, a second in 1956 and a third in 1965. Continuity rather than change dominated their discussions. There are indications that across this period the IAAM's position in favour of an illustrative role hardened.

In 1965, Keatinge's "training of the mind" still lay outside what the IAAM thought of as appropriate practice and drawing this line continued to be vital to the IAAM's post-war discussion. In 1965, it stated:

It would be dishonest to pretend that pupils can use documents in the way in which a researcher does. Even before the pupil looks at a document, the teacher has to select for him what he should look at. The background to the document, who wrote it, why it was written, what was omitted, and why – all of these questions and many others, which a research historian would have to ask, are generally beyond the abilities and faculties of a pupil in the junior or middle school.[600]

Not only were students incapable of thinking in disciplinary ways, the editing required to make sources accessible rendered them inauthentic. The IAAM explained:

If it is to be comprehensible, there has to be so much editing of most documentary material before it can be studied by a pupil, that even the illusion of laying bare the bones of history is difficult to maintain.[601]

---

[599] Ibid.
[600] IAAM, 1965, p. 80.
[601] Ibid.

In 1965, the IAAM was concerned that Keatinge's approach would undermine students' trust in narrative exposition by calling into question its evidential basis. The IAAM suggested that questioning the reliability of eyewitness testimony posed a dilemma. It reasoned:

> If one does not question the reliability of an eyewitness one is guilty of being uncritical; if one does question it, then its validity as a source has been damaged.[602]

In 1965, the IAAM excluded much of Keatinge's approach on the grounds that it was unrealistic. Knowledge transmission, as the following passage showed, continued to dominate its discussion:

> The real, and immensely valuable function of source-material in the junior and middle school classroom is as illustration – illustration of historical facts, the proof of which the young historian has to take largely on trust.[603]

It is significant, that a study concerned with challenging the "Great Tradition" is able to show that the IAAM thought it necessary to address Keatinge's approach to source-work. It showed that the IAAM was aware that students' historical thinking extended beyond the pre-evidential. For students studying A-level history this included evidential thinking. For others, historical understanding was limited to a weaker version – an appreciation that historical sources explain how the past is known.[604]

Kenneth Charlton and Gordon Batho: "divine discontent"

The IAAM's cautiousness represented a section of post-war history education opinion. It would be wrong to think that it represented the views of post-war history education as whole. To portray post-war discussions on source-work as

---

[602] Ibid., p. 45.
[603] IAAM, 1965, p. 45.
[604] Ibid., p. 46.

singular and static is to overlook their intensity and diversity. The texts examined for this study indicate that knowledge transmission and pre-evidential thinking was a dominant view within the official and unofficial post-war "proposed curricula. They also indicate the presence of minority positions that promoted weak disciplinary thinking.

Kenneth Charlton and Gordon Basho, as this section will show, responded to Keatinge in a very different way from the IAAM. Charlton's article 'Source Material and the Teaching of History' was published in the *Educational Review* in November 1956. It has the distinction of being the first post-war journal article to address the question of source material in the teaching of history.[605] Batho's article Sources was published in the prestigious Institute of Education's *Handbook for History Teachers* in 1962.[606] These two authors took similar positions on the role that source-work should play and this included advocating some of the ideas found in Keatinge's "source method".

Charlton and Batho were highly critical of the source-work that was being practised in post-war schools and made similar recommendations for how it should be reformed. They began their articles by reviewing the literature on source-work that had been published during the first half of the twentieth century. They drew on this to argue that a tradition of "critical" source-work had been in existence since the

[605] K. Charlton, Source Material and the Teaching of History, *Educational Review*, 9(1) (1956), 57–63. Aged 31 in 1956, Kenneth Charlton was a young lecturer in Education at the University College of North Staffs. Previously he had, between 1950 and 1954, taught history at Dalziel High School in Motherwell and Uddingston Grammar School in Glasgow. See R. Aldrich, Kenneth Charlton: 1925–2008, *History of Education: Journal of the History of Education Society*, 38(5) (2009), 601–3.

[606] G. Batho, Sources. In W. H. Burston and C. W. Green (eds) *Handbook for History Teachers* (University of London, Institute of Education, 1962), pp. 95–109. Earlier Batho had published two shorter articles on source-work: Archive Teaching Units: An Experiment in History Teaching, *Visual Education*, August (1957), 2–3; and Archive Teaching Units: The Progress of an Experiment in History Teaching, *Visual Education*, December (1958), 8–10.

first decade of the twentieth century. They cited M. W. Keatinge's, *Studies in the Teaching of History,* as the foundation text of this tradition and made his "source method" the benchmark against which their own recommendations necessarily had to be compared.

The following passage captured what was distinctive about their recommendations. It recommended developing in students an attitude of positive scepticism towards historical knowledge, for all students and not just for a privileged few. This was to be a regular and not an occasional practice. Their approach was distinctive in the way it thought all students should be taught to question the truth claims of historical accounts by placing centre stage the question "How do we know?" Discussing this point, Charlton wrote:

> The nature and use of source material, it is suggested, can be taught in the classroom by the constant application of the question "How do we know?" to the topic being studied. Where do these facts come from? What is the source of our information about this topic? These are questions which can and should be asked in every class of the secondary school, and which can be applied to any and every syllabus.[607]

Gordon Batho used the term "divine discontent" to describe the positive scepticism that he wanted students to adopt towards historical knowledge. This was very different from the IAAM's position that insisted that most students were incapable of questioning the accuracy and reliability of accounts and ruled that students have "to take largely on trust" the historical knowledge delivered to them by the teacher or textbook.

Batho borrowed the phase "divine discontent" from Miss W. Mercier, a history teacher who had worked at Manchester High School for Girls during the first decades of the twentieth century. Batho went out of his way to acknowledge his debt to Edwardian history educators. He declared:

---

[607] Charlton, 1956, p. 60.

The cultivation of this divine discontent remains one of the history teachers' greatest challenges and the responses proposed by his predecessors of fifty years ago still deserve serious consideration.[608]

Charlton and Batho thought they were standing on the shoulders of an earlier generation of history educators. Batho credited the Committee of Seven's 1903 report to the American Historical Association as a founding document of a movement within history education that advocated using sources to teach students something of the "nature of the historical process". Batho identified James Bryce and Albert Pollard as key figures in a formative phase of a disciplinary movement in England. He included in his article the following quotation by Pollard to underscore their contention that there had been a long-standing disciplinary thread running through the English tradition of history education. Pollard had written:

Reading history ready-made is to making it out for oneself from documents what looking on at a football match is to playing the game oneself, or what reading a detective story is to tracking out a criminal.[609]

Charlton and Batho both aligned themselves with this disciplinary tradition. They agreed with its stand against instruction by drill and embraced its reformist programme for a school history that nurtured curiosity and independent thought. During the course of a secondary school history education, Batho argued, students should acquire "a questioning attitude of mind". The cultivation of the questioning mind that will "seek out the truth for itself" was, he thought, one of history education's principal aims. He suggested that this would make a vital contribution to civic and social life. Batho wrote that it would enable students to subject truth claims

---

[608] Batho, 1962, p. 97.
[609] Pollard, quoted in Batho, 1962, p. 105.

in whatever form they may be presented, whether in a textbook or a newspaper or an advertisement on commercial television, to a searching criticism.[610]

Among the post-war authors examined for this study, both Charlton and Batho's approach is closest to Keatinge's "source method". They agreed with him that history education should be a training school of the mind and shared his optimism that most students were capable of a sustained active engagement with the question "How do we know?" that taught students to question the verisimilitude of historical accounts. Their main proposal, that students should cultivate a questioning attitude of mind, described by Charlton as "positive scepticism" and by Batho as "divine discontent", posed a challenge to the opponents of Keatinge who argued that source-work should be confined to the "pre-evidential" and the illustrative.

In their articles, Charlton and Batho did not give detailed examples of how source material was to be used in the classroom, as Keatinge had done, preferring to leave such matters to the discretion of teachers. Gordon Batho published two reports in the journal, *Visual Education,* on the development of a teacher training project, led by himself, to develop local history teaching archive packs for schools. In these two short pieces, the first, in August 1957, subtitled, "An Experiment in History Teaching" and the second, in December 1958, subtitled, "The Progress of an Experiment in History Teaching", Batho discussed the value of deploying "original sources" in the classroom. These show that, at this time, he thought that the primary purpose of using "original sources" was to arouse students' interest in history, to provoke students into asking questions, and to set them to find out information by themselves.

Batho's chief concern, in August 1957, was with revitalising teaching history by making "the lessons come to life". In December 1958, he repeated this goal, stating that the "primary object was to motivate rather than inform". He left the detail of

---

[610] Batho, 1962, p. 107.

how his archive packs were to be used to the "discretion of teachers", only stipulating that the sources selected should be accessible to students of all ages and abilities.

In December 1958, Batho came close to discussing history as an activity of enquiry when he wrote of the "questioning mind", which can "search out new truths and to see old truths in a different and inspiring light". At this time, Batho thought that the production of teaching archive packs by small teams of teachers working collaboratively was a valuable professional development exercise. It would make them better teachers. The production of these packs showed post-war teachers influencing the development of history education. Their production foreshadowed the *modus operandi* of the Schools Council History 14–16 Project (1972–76).[611]

In their articles, Charlton and Batho did propose that teachers deploy source materials *routinely* to teach students to "cultivate a questioning attitude of mind" towards historical accounts. Students were to gain insight into the nature of the discipline by being made aware that historical accounts are grounded in source material.

Charlton and Batho's training of the mind for students aged between 12 and 16 began with the teacher modelling "divine discontent". Students learnt to question by copying the teachers' example. Over time, they would be able to apply the "questioning attitude" themselves habitually and independently. Students were to be trained to distinguish between primary and secondary sources and to question their accuracy and reliability. Progression towards more sophisticated source-work thinking was said to depend upon the age, background and ability of the student. They recommended younger students begin working descriptively with sources before moving on to analytical work. Their proposals challenged delivering a

---

[611] See Batho, 1957 and Batho, 1958.

received body of knowledge. By suggesting that not all parts of the body of knowledge may be true, they opened the way for it to be contested.

Moving source-work from the margins to the centre of discourse challenged the IAAM's privileging of narrative exposition. Like Keatinge, both Charlton and Batho favoured a relationship between narrative and sources that was interrelated and co-dependent. This co-dependence of narrative and sources challenged the IAAM's view that the "questioning mind" was an occasional practice. Charlton and Batho recast it into a fundamental teaching and learning principle.

Charlton and Batho recast the rules of source-work engagement when drawn, as Keatinge had been, to the middle ground between narrative exposition and the historians' research methodology. They aligned themselves with Keatinge, when arguing that elements drawn from disciplinary history could be introduced into school history when handled with circumspection.

As with other authors examined for this study, both Charlton and Batho stressed the importance of selecting source materials that were accessible. In the following passage, Batho picked up this theme, when he wrote:

> Equally, it is hardly likely to promote a love of history if children in the lower forms of secondary schools are expected to read medieval documents, difficult of interpretation in themselves, like the Domesday Book, or a manorial court record, in the original Latin, even if they do relate to the children's own locality.[612]

Charlton and Batho were more sanguine over the language question. The IAAM thought it an insurmountable barrier to using the greater part of the corpus of written source materials. Charlton and Batho, while acknowledging language difficulties, thought they could be managed and were far less of an obstacle than the IAAM had assumed.

---

[612] Batho, 1962, pp. 103–4.

As late as 1965, the IAAM had dismissed the suggestion that students in the 12–16 age range could be trained to critically evaluate source material. Charlton in 1956 and Batho in 1962 took a different view. Batho argued that history education should train students to

> seek out the truth for itself and subject statements in whatever form they may be presented, whether in a textbook or a newspaper or an advertisement on commercial television to a searching criticism.[613]

Charlton and Batho both argued that promoting "the questioning mind" was an essential function of education and made it central to their plans to regenerate post-war history education.

The IAAM's training for pre-16 students cultivated emotional ties of community loyalty, identity and moral values. Only a small number of 16-year-old students were thought to possess the required intellect to critically analyse sources. Charlton and Batho's "cultivation of the questioning mind" elevated the role of the intellect for pre-16 students. In the following passage, Batho wrote that all students should acquire a critical attitude, which would

> remain with him, when he undertakes historical study for himself perhaps and when he faces the barrage of information which is inescapable in a society dominated by the mass media, and there should be opportunities for him to make his own discoveries based on his own reading and his own thinking. Source material is capable of providing exercises at a practical level in the lower school as well as in the upper.[614]

Charlton and Batho were both critical of post-war approaches to independent "project work"; in their view, it had deteriorated into an uncritical "compilation" of information. They called for changes that taught students how to distinguish

---

[613] Ibid., p. 107.
[614] Batho, 1962, p. 106.

between a primary and secondary source and how to test their reliability. Charlton insisted that sources included background information that helped students make critical sense of them.[615]

Charlton was critical of "project work" that did not test sources for accuracy and reliability, and thought it unacceptable that students were taught to accept knowledge on trust. His critique of "mere compilation" was a departure from the uncritical sources-as-information approach that the IAAM had advocated throughout the 1950s and 1960s. Charlton and Batho's position on "project work" was in line with Keatinge's proposal, which recommended that primary source material be read in context and questioned for reliability and accuracy. This was an ambition that the IAAM had shied away from.

Charlton and Batho were not alone in wanting to bring into the classroom disciplinary practices that exposed the sources of evidence that lay behind historical accounts and which reflected upon the nature of history.[616] Charlton cited Robert Birley's 1955 Historical Association pamphlet, *The Undergrowth of History*, applauding the manner in which it exposed the thin evidential basis of historical narratives such as Alfred and the cakes, Canute and the waves, and Drake's game of bowls. The issue of bias in textbooks had been a feature of the work of E. H. Dance: first in his 1954 study of school textbooks, *History Without Bias?* and later in his 1960 study, *History the Betrayer: A Study in Bias.* The "how do we know?" question was a feature of Marjorie Reeves' textbook series *Then and There* and Molly Harrison's picture sourcebooks.[617]

---

[615] In the post-war history education writing selected for this study, Charlton's article was the first to use the term "primary source".

[616] E. H. Dance, *History the Betrayer* (Hutchinson, 1960); M. E. Reeves, *The Medieval Village* and *The Medieval Town*, Then and There Series (Longman, 1954); M. Harrison and M. A. Bryant, *Picture Source Book for Social History: Sixteenth Century* (George Allen & Unwin, 1951); M. Harrison and A. A. M. Wells, *Picture Source Book for Social History: Seventeenth Century* (George Allen & Unwin, 1953); M. Harrison and A. A. M. Wells, *Picture Source Book for Social History: Early Nineteenth Century* (George Allen & Unwin, 1957); R. Birley, *The Undergrowth of History*, general series pamphlet (Historical Association, 1955).

[617] For example, see Reeves, *The Medieval Village*, 1954; Harrison and Bryant, 1951.

For both Charlton and Batho, conducting source-work in schools was constrained by limited curriculum time and resourcing. This made it difficult, they thought, for students to regularly practise source-based classroom exercises. What was achievable, as the following passage showed, was the cultivation of the habit of questioning truth claims. Batho clarified this point in the following way:

> The teaching of history in the lower forms of grammar schools and in secondary modern schools cannot involve more than occasional considerations of actual records but must still inculcate this critical attitude which is all important not only to the study of source material but also to the wellbeing of a democratic society.[618]

Charlton and Batho thought that to regularly work with students under the age of 16 on the sources that underpinned canonical narratives was too time-consuming.

Charlton and Batho both presented teachers with guidelines to inform their practice. These contained three main principles. First, a training of the mind should cultivate intelligence as well as memory. Second, training should develop positive scepticism. Third, the teacher should train students by modelling positive scepticism in the classroom. Charlton described his training of the mind in the following way:

> The pupil will have been introduced to the wealth of archive and record which is available for a study of the past. He will have learned to differentiate between primary and secondary sources, and, incidentally, have gained some insight into how textbooks are written and what reliance may be placed upon them. Above all, he will have come to realise that in Professor Butterfield's words, "the truth in history is no simple matter, all packed and parcelled ready for handling in the market place. And the understanding of the past is not so easy as it is sometimes made to appear." Through his history lessons he will have developed a constructive and positive kind of scepticism, and have

---

[618] Batho, 1962, p. 105.

received a training in which he will have learnt to make up his mind for himself.[619]

Like Keatinge, both Charlton and Batho recommended that training begin in the lower forms of secondary school with "descriptive references to sources" and a concentration upon "narrative material". Borrowing an exercise from Keatinge, they suggested that younger students (aged 12 and 13) could be set the task of drawing a map based upon information extracted from a medieval travellers' source, such as Marco Polo. They might visit a county records office, a local museum, or be shown in class a primary source to consider how the past is known. During the first years of secondary school, students were to be taught that historical knowledge is grounded in information drawn from primary sources.

Charlton and Batho both shared with the IAAM a desire to render history vivid and real and put students in touch with the past. The following passage from Batho suggested they thought that primary material had an important role to play in this endeavour:

> To see the signature of a great man who might otherwise remain but a name to them, to trace their own locality on an ancient map, to become familiar with the form of a charter or deed – such experiences as these convey the reality of the past very much.[620]

As training progressed, they suggested that students be introduced to the discipline of history, although at first by analogy. They suggested beginning with an examination of an incident in the school playground and an exercise suggested by Keatinge that considered the reliability of a newspaper report of a football match. They thought that by the time students had reached the age of 16, they would have developed sufficient independence of thought that they could make "critical reference to sources" and view accounts as historical interpretations.

---

[619] Charlton, 1956, p. 63.
[620] Batho, 1962, p. 104.

Charlton and Batho's guidelines were broadbrush. They offered teachers guidelines that were clear on direction but short on detail. The direction was to begin with descriptive work in the lower forms before moving on to critical work in the upper forms.

There was greater clarity in Batho's discussion of the post-16 curriculum. For students studying post-16 history, Batho asserted:

> It is possible to aim at developing qualities of historical judgment by a critical examination of some of the sources of our knowledge, carefully selected to match the capabilities of the students.[621]

Batho proposed that A-level examinations should test primary and secondary source critical analysis, citing the work of F. C. Happold as a precedent.[622] Batho suggested that sixth form students should:

> Consider in detail some source material, whether from printed extracts or from photostats of the original documents, chosen to illustrate the process by which our knowledge of the subject has been gained and preferably presenting more than one view of a controversial question.[623]

Charlton and Batho were both confident that students aged 16–18 selected on to A-level history courses were capable of conducting critical analysis. The intelligence of this elite group warranted them entry into disciplinary history. The practical and intellectual constraints that prevented "weak disciplinary and "strong disciplinary" approaches to source-work in the pre-16 curriculum had now fallen away.

The picture that emerges from this reading of post-war responses to Keatinge's "source method" is a mixed one containing shades of opinion. There was

---

[621] Batho, 1962, p. 104.
[622] F. C. Happold, The Case for Experimentation in Examinations: A Reply, *History*, April (1931). For a discussion of Happold, see Chapter seven.
[623] Batho, 1962, p. 104.

agreement that "evidential" source-work had a place in the 16-plus curriculum and "pre-evidential" source-work had a vital role to play in the pre-16 curriculum in creating atmosphere and arousing students' interest. There was agreement too that all students should have an elementary understanding that historical knowledge is grounded in primary source materials.

It was when taking an "evidential" approach in the pre-16 curriculum that clear differences emerged. In this chapter, it has been shown that the IAAM's response to Keatinge had been cautious, while Charlton and Batho both championed Keatinge's ideas.

Charlton and Batho's case for the cultivation of positive scepticism in the pre-16 curriculum represents a shift towards a "weak disciplinary" approach to source-work. By questioning the evidential basis of accounts, knowledge about the past was no longer taken for granted. Placing centre stage the disciplinary question "how do we know?", sources were now seen as providing evidence about the past. With reference to the continuum of source-work practices discussed in chapter three, this marked a shift from pre-evidential to evidential thinking.

The social practice that helped produce Charlton and Batho's texts supports what has been argued throughout this study, that there existed at this time an active history education community. Charlton and Batho's writing provides further evidence that post-war authors thought that history education could deliver different kinds of experiences, ranging from mechanical rote learning to a critical engagement with primary source materials.

In chapters six and eight it was noted that Reid and Toyne's work for the Historical Association during the early 1940s and the IAAM's handbook published in 1950 involved teacher involvement. The production of the University of London, Institute of Education's *Handbook for History Teachers* (1962), which included Batho's article, drew on a total of 110 contributors.[624] Together with Charlton's article,

---

[624] See chapter 4 p 112

which was published in the journal *Educational Review*, their work shows that it was a community that was capable of developing history education as an academic field of study.

Charlton and Batho's writing on source-work supports one of this study's central arguments, that within post-war history education writing there was diversity and change. Their texts show, with great clarity, that from the mid 1950s to the early 1960s an evidential approach to source-work was a feature of post-war history education writing. Their central idea, that *most* students were capable of developing a sceptical attitude toward historical knowledge, as opposed to accepting it unquestioningly as other texts had advocated, was a significant departure.

Charlton and Batho's writing set alongside the other texts examined for this study shows that post-war authors as a whole were concerned about the effectiveness of knowledge transmission. Sharing the aim of making history education more engaging and meaningful, they, in their different ways, refashioned the content and teaching methods of knowledge transmission.

Charlton and Batho did not view the development of history education as a single, unchanging "Great Tradition" in which the whole of the profession deferred to a mechanical model of knowledge transmission. Aligning themselves to a tradition in opposition to mechanical knowledge transmission their narrative of the history of history teaching contained competing traditions.

Charlton and Batho's writing supports an earlier finding, that post-war authors critiqued knowledge transmission in various ways. An imaginative and emotional engagement with knowledge had featured in authors such as Strong, Unstead and Lewis. In their work students were encouraged to "enter into the past." In Charlton and Batho's writing can be found evidence of a cerebral approach to knowledge transmission that invited students to challenge the truth claims of knowledge.

A key finding in this study is that Charlton and Bathos's writing embraced evidential thinking. To compare this with the Board of Education's text (1946) shows a discussion that spanned pre-evidential to the evidential thinking. Charlton and Batho's championing of the "questioning mind" was remarkable in the way it invited all students to question the truth claims of historical knowledge, something that other authors had considered impossible or undesirable.

Responses to Keatinge in this chapter underlines the inadequacy of describing post-war history education was a unified and unchanging "Great Tradition". They show that within the "proposed" curriculum there was at this time a range of position on the meaning of source-work and that these were contested. Authors such as Strong, Unstead, Lewis, Charlton and Batho contested history education and wrote with reference to a long debate over the nature of knowledge transmission. The IAAM's text republished throughout the 1950s contained conflicting positions, as did the Ministry of Education in 1952. The fifty-year debate that Charlton and Batho referred to, which had begun during the Edwardian period, shows that history education contained a number of traditions. These may be seen as strands within the "Great Tradition", or with the disciplinary tradition that Charlton and Batho identified as a counter-tradition at odds with the "Great Tradition". What these texts make clear is that knowledge transmission was fiercely disputed. Central to this debate was the apparent failure of history education to engage students in learning.

Despite these innovative and progressive ideas, Charlton and Batho's approach fell short of describing history education as an activity of enquiry, as the Schools Council History Project (1972-76) was later to do. Charlton and Batho wanted students to appreciate that knowledge had an evidential basis. They were not inclined to design units of study that invited students to use sources as evidence to address enquiry questions.

Conclusion

Often seen by critics and commentators as deserted and unchanging, the landscape of post-war history education in this study appears crowded and bustling with activity. Working within professional associations, authors seeking to shape the development of history teaching in schools are seen frequently contesting the nature and purpose of history education. It is a shifting, complex landscape that is at odds with "Dark Age" and "Golden Age" simplicities.

The findings of this study suggest that John Slater was right to argue in his "Dark Age" representation that the transmission of a received body of knowledge dominated how history education was practised in post-war classrooms – and how it was envisaged in published history education writing.

Reid, Toyne, Strong, Unstead and Lewis were convinced that students should be taught a celebratory, factual narrative of "our history" that cultivated in students a collective memory, national identity and civic awareness. This involved studying the lives of "great" individuals and canonical landmark events, leading to what Unstead and others called acquiring "a storehouse of knowledge". Many of the authors examined in this study took it as read that history education was knowledge based and that it was the role of the teacher to transmit historical information to students. Even Charlton and Batho, the most disciplinary of the authors examined here, did not go so far as to imagine history education to be an "activity of enquiry".

Reports on how history was taught in post-war classrooms made by the authors selected for examaintion in this study, lend support to Slater's assessment that students were taught to recall "accepted facts about famous dead Englishmen".[625] This study has found that when making this observation, authors were highly critical

---

[625] J. Slater, *The Politics of History Teaching: A Humanity Dehumanised?* (University of London, Institute of Education, 1989), p. 1.

of practices, such as teaching by rote. Whilst authors lent support to "Dark Age" representations of post-war history teaching, they also challenged and sought to reform it. Further, authors such as Unstead, Lewis and Batho presented a diverse picture of post-war history teaching. Not all post-war classrooms, they suggested taught by rote. The picture they presented of post-war classrooms was one that contained "dark" aspects alongside others that promised innovation and reform. They suggested that not all post-war teachers of history transmitted knowledge by rote. Their reporting indicated that classroom practice varied across all types of schools and that simple generalisations fail to capture all that was going on.

It is the diversity and complexity of authors' who wrote in the post-war period that impresses. The intensity and depth of their analyses, the references to a "long debate" and their commitments to reform, belie "Dark Age" representations that portray post-war history education as utterly complacent and static. All the authors examined in this study reflected deeply (in their own terms) upon the nature and purpose of history education. Reid and Toyne's, *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools* (Historical Association, 1944), The Ministry of Education's *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23* (1952) and the Institute of Education's *Handbook for Teaching History* (1962) were exceptional in this regard.

Accounts of the historical development of history education in the texts examined for this study are different from those found in "Dark Age" and "Golden Age" representations that were written later. According to post-war authors, history education had a rich theoretical tradition that had, during the first half of the twentieth century, changed the way history was taught. In their narrative, there were broadly two competing traditions: an older Victorian one based on rote learning and a modern one based on active engagement. Authors such as Reid and Toyne, Unstead, Charlton and Batho aligned themselves with the latter and juxtaposed the negative "dullness" of learning facts by rote with the positive "illumination" of active engagement that rendered the past vivid and real. Various authors celebrated, in different ways, the work of Thomas Arnold, Maurice

Keatinge, Alfred Whitehead, F. C. Happold and M. V. C. Jeffreys as "reformers" who had imbued "tradition" with agency and modernity.

There was a consensus among the authors examined for this study but it was not the "inherited consensus" that Slater had in mind, which placed centre stage an unquestioning allegiance to Victorian classroom values and practices. In fact, Slater's "inherited consensus" is more "untidy" than is generally recognised. The authors examined here, do however, fit very well his description of "sceptical moles".[626]

This study has found that authors "looked beyond" learning by rote in search of alternatives to Victorian classroom practices that challenged the post-war history education status quo. Lewis and Unstead, for example, were scathing in their criticism of teacher training courses, especially for non-specialist teachers, that perpetuated what Unstead termed the "legacy of dullness".

In 1950, it seemed to the IAAM that they were living in an "age of uncertainty", in which the purpose of history education no longer seemed clear-cut. This was how it appeared to all the authors examined in this study. To them, history education was held in low regard and was in danger of losing ground to other subjects such as social studies and civics, anxieties foreshadowing those expressed by Mary Price in her 1968 article "History in Danger."

Yet, alongside these concerns, a sense of possibility permeated the writing of post-war authors. Their discussions were not recitals but reappraisals that carried an expectation of change. They looked forward to a time when history education had a secure curriculum place and was taught by specialist teachers in well-resourced, purpose-built classrooms and where students took pleasure and delight in their learning.

---

[626] Slater, 1989, p. 1.

The authors examined for this study recommended changes to the content and delivery of knowledge transmission. This reforming impulse was reflected in the principle shared by authors that teachers should regularly review the knowledge to be transmitted: first, by keeping up to date with new academic research; second, by framing it to meet the changing needs of a society undergoing rapid change; and third, by selecting knowledge that matched the age, ability and interests of students. This desire on the part of post-war authors to review and manage knowledge transmission was fundamental to their view that history education was a "living" tradition, or what, in this study, has been termed a "social practice".

Curriculum development gained impetus from the principle that knowledge transmission should appeal to students' interests, arouse their curiosity and fire their imaginations. To enable this to take place, authors suggested a number of teaching strategies that were "in development", the most prominent being visual learning, local history and source-work.

In their texts, post-war authors can be seen discussing the fine details of knowledge transmission. Should students be taught a national narrative as selected periods in depth or as a continuous chronological narrative in outline? Should history education only convey knowledge drawn from the historical record or can world literature (literary heritage) be drawn upon as well? Should moral lessons be delivered directly or indirectly? What are the values that underpin modern citizenship? How can students be engaged in learning? What are students capable of knowing and understanding? What role should source material play? Should students be introduced to the discipline of history? It is incorrect to suggest, as a number of contemporary critics have done, that post-war educators did not discuss the nature and purpose of history education.

A key finding of this study is that contestation was most apparent in the battle authors waged against the rote learning of facts. As this study has demonstrated, it is clear that, although many authors of this period placed a value on learning factual

knowledge, they valued much else besides. It is their reconfiguration of post-war knowledge transmission that makes these authors' texts significant.

Unlike "Dark Age" and "Golden Age" representations, the authors examined for this study did not take "recalling accepted facts about famous dead Englishmen" to be the main purpose of history education. A distinctive characteristic of their writing is its opposition to history education based solely upon "recalling accepted facts".

Many authors argued that history education should engage the "whole person" and not just memory. Along with memory, they included emotions, imagination, reason, moral sense and aesthetic sensibility. This reconfiguration was intended to deliver a range of history education experiences that they associated with "entering into the past" imaginatively, emotionally, aesthetically and intellectually. They spoke about delivering a "sense of the past" acquired through an intense personal engagement with storytelling, source materials and creative activities. Engaging students in the process of knowledge transmission was fundamental to these authors' aims, yet Reid, Toyne, Strong, Unstead, Lewis, Charlton and Batho approached this in different ways – there was no single agreed solution to what "engagement" meant. A key finding of this study is that the texts revealed a level of thinking about the aims of history education that has not been fully recognised in contemporary writing.[627]

Analysis of the work of authors who were examined for this study lend some support to Slater and Sylvester's assessment that heritage education; moral education and citizenship were the dominant aims of post-war history education. None of the authors departed from the view that history's main purpose was to prepare students to take their place in society as dutiful and responsible citizens. This did not mean, however, that they were in complete agreement as to what this actually meant.

---

[627] Support for this judgement is found in a pioneering article on the aims of history education by A. Rogers, Why Teach History? The Answer of Fifty Years, *Educational Review*, 14(2) (1962), 152–62.

In their aims statements, Estella Lewis and Charles Strong both placed great emphasis on a "civilizing mission" to assimilate "non-academic" (working-class) students into the dominant culture, defined as "our heritage", which would turn, in Strong's words, "wayward children into citizens".[628] They stressed the importance of shaping students' identity and personality to improve standards of public taste by training students to make productive use of their leisure time. Their concern with building social cohesion through cultural assimilation was present although not nearly so pronounced as in the IAAM's aims for "academic" students.

The authors examined for this study presented pedagogic aims that they considered necessary for the realisation of their dominant civic aims. Invariably, their aims statements began with learners' needs, agreeing that history education should aim to satisfy students' "innate" love of heroic stories and stimulate their "natural" curiosity about the past. Authors made student engagement a *sine qua non* of history education learning.

Pedagogic discussion centred on making storytelling more engaging through careful story selection and by including activities (such as using primary sources) that evoked the sense of "entering into the past". This could best be achieved, they thought, by studying selected periods in depth (a patch study) to develop students' "sense of the past". Studies such as these, which were "for their own sake", were viewed by authors as "new" and "in development".

A feature of these discussions was that students should take some responsibility for their own learning by becoming more engaged in the process of knowledge transmission. To involve students, authors turned to "finding information", "research" and "investigations", which, they argued, were skills that would help keep at bay the "hidden persuaders" of a manipulative mass media. An engagement with local history, they argued, forged a sense of belonging to the community and made students more discriminating consumers of heritage and culture. Central to

---

[628] Strong, 1950, p. 21.

this discussion was the idea that, at its heart, history education should be a personal and pleasurable experience.

A comparison of earlier with later texts suggests a shift in emphasis in how aims were discussed across the period under review. Charlton and Batho's elevation of "divine discontent" (positive scepticism) and the disciplinary question "How do we know?" into a central aim for all students was not so evident in texts before Charlton's 1956 journal article.

A key finding of this study is the importance of context to understanding post-war history education as a "social practice". This study has found that authors operated within a set of overlapping contexts. The IAAM's handbook (1950) pointed to an international context when reflecting upon the "momentous changes" that had taken place before, during and after the Second World War. Across texts, there are passages that reflect an economic context of financial stringency placing limits on the development of post-war history education. A policy context is seen in references to the 1944 Education Act, which framed much of their writing. The personal backgrounds of authors, their gender, social class and experience of history education highlight the importance of social landscape in shaping post-war history education.

In this study, there has been a focus on the institutional contexts within which authors worked. As well as working individually, this study has found that educators worked collectively on large-scale writing projects, which took, in some cases, many years to complete. The outstanding example of this was the Institute of Education's 1962, *Handbook for History Teachers*. Other impressive collaborations include Reid and Toyne's 1944 Historical Association pamphlet, *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools*, and the IAAM's handbook, *Teaching History in Secondary Schools*, published in 1950. This study has also drawn attention to the emergence of the London Institute of Education as a centre for history education studies, revealing that during the 1950s and early 1960s it was central to the creation of a sophisticated pedagogic discourse.

Those seeking confirmation from these texts that post-war history education was a "Golden Age" will, on the whole, be disappointed. They will have to contend with the IAAM's damning report in 1950 that:

> The average secondary school pupil leaves school with a confused mass of knowledge, and – even worse – with a hatred of the subject, having been forcibly fed with historical facts and theories which bear no relation to his tastes, aptitudes, or mental capacity.[629]

The impression given in these texts is one of islands of good practice located within a sea of mediocrity. Authors wrote very positively about graduate specialists; sixth form teaching; learning outside the classroom; active creative approaches to learning; the deployment of source-material, and the use of film and slide projection. Acknowledging the achievements of authors, which were considerable, a case has been made in this study for considering this as a creative period for history education writing.

A key finding in this study is that post-war history education writing on source-work is a strong indicator of diversity and change in post-war history education. Authors advocated the use of primary source materials, lending support to Richard Aldrich's view that source-work had been a feature of history education writing long before the emergence of "New History" during the early 1970s. Employing a continuum model of source-work approaches, this study has found that post-war advocacy fell short of promoting a "strong disciplinary" approach to source-work as seen, for example, in the Schools Council History 13–16 Project (1972–76), which envisaged source-work to be, in David Sylvester's words, an "activity of enquiry".

The continuum model of source-work approaches shows that source-work advocacy among post-war authours ranged from "illustrative" to "weak disciplinary". Authors' interest in an illustrative approach remained constant throughout the

---

[629] IAAM, *The Teaching of History* (Cambridge University Press, 1950), p. 1.

period under review, while there is some evidence to suggest that interest in the "weak disciplinary" had, by the end of the period, intensified.

Aldrich's contention that post-war approaches to source-work varied is supported by the texts. The most common recommendation was using short source extracts to "illuminate" teacher narrative exposition. This treated sources "pre-evidentially" as "windows" through which the past could be directly accessed, where the information provided was to be taken on trust.

Post-war authors commonly recommended a range of illustrative approaches that evoked emotional and imaginative engagements. They suggested that teachers use sources at the beginning of a lesson to introduce a topic and arouse students' interest and curiosity, and during lessons to make teacher exposition "come to life", making students "feel" what it was like to live in the past. Used in this way, sources engendered feelings of beauty, awe and wonderment.

Some post-war history education authors also recommended using sources to "investigate" the past. Lewis's "looking and seeking", for example, treated sources "pre-evidentially" as information to be taken on trust. In her "investigations", students were tasked to find factual information to add to their "storehouse of knowledge" to be deployed in creative activities including writing, acting, model making, project work, presenting and discussing. In all these pre-evidential tasks, sources served to verify the knowledge being transmitted.

A key finding in this study is that as early as 1956 Kenneth Charlton recommended that all students be trained to regularly ask, "How do we know?" and that this marks a shift in what authors thought students were capable of accomplishing with source material.

Throughout the period under review, authors had discussed the possibility of using sources to address with students the disciplinary question "How do we know?" opening up the possibility of students seeing sources as providing evidence about

the past. Their discussions on the use of artefacts, local sources and eyewitness testimony shows that moving from the "pre-evidential" to the "evidential" was never entirely out of the question.

That most of the authors examined were cautious about taking a "weak disciplinary" source-work approach, preferring to assign it an occasional role, is significant. The texts suggests that there were three main reasons why this was so. The first was the learning theory that dictated that most students under the age of 16 were incapable of thinking critically and analytically. The second was that it would take time away from the task of transmitting a body of knowledge. The third was that asking, "How do we know?" would undermine the knowledge being transmitted by revealing it to have been constructed rather than self-evident. Kenneth Charlton's championing of M. W. Keatinge in 1956 (and later by Batho in 1962) is remarkable in the way it was prepared to "look beyond" these three positions. Charlton's argument that all students should be taught to appreciate the evidential basis of historical accounts underlines the diversity and change that characterises post-war history education writing.

This study provides a challenge to the claim that post-war history education was a featureless landscape. Whilst not seeking to challenge the status of the Schools Council History 14-16 Project (1972-76) as marking a radical departure from tradition, this study has demonstrated that elements found in post-war history education writing foreshadowed its work. This is seen in anxieties expressed by many authors that post-war history education was "in danger". A view that predated Mary Price's 1968 article, generally regarded to be the starting point for the SCHP. Foreshadowing is also seen in post-war authors' preoccupation with engaging students' by making history education "relevant", by studying selected periods in depth for its own sake, and in using source-work to draw attention to the evidential basis of historical knowledge. Without diminishing the originality and impact of the SCHP it can be seen as having continued work carried out by post-war history educators to renew the teaching of history and consequently having contributed to a much longer debate over the nature of history education.

It is curious that post-war history education authors have so readily been dismissed as unimportant. This study has shown that embedded within privileged networks they contributed to a vigorous post-war history education discourse that contested the aims of history education and explored approaches to source-work. The ambitions contained within these texts were diverse, whilst the texts were in themselves a force for change.

Understanding the post-war "proposed" history education curriculum as a social practice and discourse recognises its complexity, diversity and fluidity. The research that has been conducted upon it in this study is at an early stage. The findings of this study, therefore, should be treated as provisional, their validity dependent upon further research.

Taking the research forward to a second stage, whilst continuing to pursue this study's three research questions, would examine the published work of Molly Harrison, William Burston, Margaret Bryant and Marjorie Reeves. Work on disciplinary approaches to source-work would examine post-war Archive Teaching Packs focusing on those produced by Newcastle University, the Jackdaw Series, and Essex County Records Office; whilst, work on the aims of post-war history education would draw on the content of Teacher Training Courses in London.

A rewarding aspect of the current research has been the archival work that has shed light on history education as social practice and discourse. Going forward this would focus on the work of the History Standing Sub-Committee at the Institute of Education, and secondly, meetings held by the London History Teachers Association.

Moving to a third stage, other lines of enquiry suggest themselves. To bring balance to a field, where grammar school history education has taken centre stage, attention might be placed upon the teaching of history in secondary modern schools, which has been, in research terms, *the* neglected sector. Rewards are to be had in examining the post-war idea of a specialised history classroom, including

architectural plans, resources and technologies. The texts examined in this study showed that it was thought girls and boys responded to the study of history in different ways, inviting a gender analysis post-war curriculum planning. Finally, texts examined for this study report a "crisis" in early post-war history education. It would be valuable to understand the forces that brought this about.

This study has demonstrated the value of using published post-war history education texts as sources for the study of education from 1944-1962. Analysing these texts has shown that far from being singular and unchanging, post-war discourse among history educators was diverse, dynamic and thought provoking. It has shown that working within professional associations, post-war authors engaged in a shifting, complex discourse that discussed the purpose of history education and sought to influence history teaching in schools. Recovering a past that had been forgotten, this study challenges the view that there had been an intellectual vacuum at the heart of history education during the two decades that followed the end of Second World War.

Bibliography

Archival research was conducted in the Newsome Library and Archive Special Collections, Institute of Education Library. UCL. 20 Bedford Way, London. The sources examined were:

Background material on Estella Lewis: The minutes of University of London, Institute of Education Standing Sub-Committee in History 1949-1959 catalogue number IE/PER/B/160.

Burston and Green (eds.), *Handbook for History Teachers* (1962): History Editorial Board 1957-1961 - Papers of meetings held to discuss the publication of the handbook for history teachers. Reported to the History Standing Sub-Committee (1 folder). IE/2/ABS/19

Academic Board Standing Sub- Committee on History 1949-1962 (Ref: IE/2/1/2/2)

Margaret Elizabeth Bryant: Staff File reference IE/PER/B/160,

The IAAM *The Teaching of History (*1950): Minutes for the meetings held by the committee of teachers (October 1946) (AMA/F 4).

The London History Teachers Association: The minutes of the LHTA are in the catalogue numbers DC/CMT/A1/1 (1953–57) and DC/LMT/A1/2 (1957–60)
Teacher Training: IOE archive, University of London, Institute of Education Handbooks ULIE1/; IOE archive, Regulations and Syllabuses for the Teachers Certificate ULIE 2/.

Materials in Print

Aldrich, R. (1984) New History: An Historical Perspective. In A. K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee and P. J. Rogers (eds) *Learning History.* London, Heinemann, pp. 201–24.

Aldrich, R. (1990) The National Curriculum: An Historical Perspective. In D. Lawton and C. Chitty (eds) *The National Curriculum.* Bedford Way Series. University of London, Institute of Education, Kogan Page, pp. 21–34.

Aldrich, R. (1992) History in the National Curriculum in England: An Historical Perspective. In A. K. Dickinson (ed.) *Perspectives on Change in History Education*. Institute of Education University of London, Chameleon Press, pp. 32–40.

Aldrich, R. (2003) The Three Duties of the Historian of Education, *History of Education*, 32(2): 133–43.

Aldrich, R. (2006) *Lessons from History of Education: The Selected Works of Richard Aldrich*. London, Routledge.

Aldrich, R. (2009) Kenneth Charlton: 1925–2008, *History of Education: Journal of the History of Education Society*, 38(5): 601–3.

Aldrich, R. and Dean, D. (1991) The Historical Dimension. In R. Aldrich (ed) *History in the National Curriculum.* Bedford Way Series. University of London, Institute of Education, Kogan Page, pp. 93–113.

Apple, M. and Christian-Smith, L. (1991) The Politics of the Textbook. In M. Apple and L. Christian-Smith (eds) *The Politics of the Textbook.* London, Routledge, pp. 1–21.

Ashby, R. (2011) Understanding Historical Evidence: Teaching and Learning Challenges. In I. Davies (ed.) *Debates in History Teaching.* London, Routledge, pp. 137–47.

Ashby, R. and Edwards, C. (2010) Challenges Facing the Disciplinary Tradition: Reflections on the History Curriculum in England. In I. Nakou and I. Barca (eds) *Contemporary Public Debates over History Education*. Charlotte, NC, Information Age Publishing, pp. 27–46.

Ashby, R. and Lee, P. (1987) Discussing the Evidence, *Teaching History*, 48: 13–17.

Atkinson, P. (1985) *Language, Structure and Reproduction: An Introduction to the Sociology of Basil Bernstein.* London, Methuen.

Atkinson, R. F. (1978) *Knowledge and Explanation in History*. London, Macmillan.

Ball, S. J. (2008) *The Education Debate: Policy and Politics in the Twenty-First Century*. Bristol, Policy Press.

Ball, S. J. and Goodson, I. (eds) (1984) *Defining the Curriculum: Histories and Ethnographies.* London, Falmer Press.

Barzan, J. and Graff, H. F. (1985) *The Modern Researcher* (4th edn). San Diego, CA, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Batho, G. R. (1957) Archive Teaching Units: An Experiment in History Teaching, *Visual Education*, August, pp. 2–3.

Batho, G. R. (1958) Archive Teaching Units: The Progress of an Experiment in History Teaching, *Visual Education*, December, pp. 8–10.

Batho, G. R. (1962) Sources. In W. H. Burston and C. W. Green (eds) *Handbook for History Teachers*. London, Methuen, pp. 95–109.

Beales, A. C. F. (1937) *A Guide to the Teaching of History in Schools*. University of London Press.

Beales, A. C. F. (1957) Fifty Years of Historical Teaching. In *The Historical Association 1906-1956.* London, Historical Association, pp. 99–112.

Beattie, A. (1987) *A History in Peril*. London, Centre for Policy Studies.

Berghahn, V. R. and Schissler, H. (eds) (1987) *Perceptions of History: International Textbook Research on Britain, Germany and the United States*. Oxford, Berg.

Bernstein, B. (1971) On the Classification and Framing of Educational Knowledge. In M. Young (ed.) *Knowledge and Control.* London, Collier-Macmillan, pp. 47–69.

Bernstein, B. (1981) Codes, Modalities and the Process of Cultural Reproduction: A Model, *Language in Society*, 10: 327–67.

Bernstein, B. (1986) On Pedagogic Discourse. In J. Richards (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education.* New York, Greenwood, pp. 205–40.

Bernstein, B. (1990) *The Structuring of Pedagogic Knowledge.* London, Routledge.

Birley, R. (1955) *The Undergrowth of History*, General Series Pamphlet, Historical Association.

Board of Education (1905) *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary School.* London, HMSO.

Board of Education (1908) *Teaching of History in Secondary Schools*, Circular 599.

Board of Education (1918) *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools.* London, HMSO.

Board of Education (1923) *Report on the Teaching of History*, Educational Pamphlets No. 37. London, HMSO.

Board of Education (1926) The Hadow Report, *The Education of the Adolescent.* London, HMSO.

Board of Education (1927) *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools.* London, HMSO.

Board of Education (1931) The Hadow Report, *The Primary School.* London, HMSO.

Board of Education (1933) The Hadow Report, *Infant and Nursery Schools.* London, HMSO.

Board of Education (1937) *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools.* London, HMSO.

Board of Education (1938) The Spens Report, *Secondary Education with Special Reference to Grammar Schools and Technical High Schools.* London, HMSO.

Board of Education (1946) *Handbook of Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned in the Work of Public Elementary Schools.* London, HMSO.

Booth, M. B. (1969) *History Betrayed?* Harlow, Longman.

Bracey, P., Gove-Humphries, A. and Jackson, D. (2011) Teaching Diversity in the History Classroom. In I. Davies (ed.) *Debates in History Teaching.* London, Routledge, pp. 172–85.

Brown, C. K. F. (1948) *The History Room*, Historical Association, Pamphlet No 86.

Burke, P. (1980) *Sociology and History.* London, Allen & Unwin.

Burke, P. (ed.) (1991) *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Burke, P. (2001) *Eyewitness: The Uses of Images as Historical Evidence*. London, Reaktion Books.

Burke, P. (2005) *History and Social Theory* (2nd edn). Cambridge, Polity Press.

Burston, W. H. (1954) Explanation in History and the Teaching of History, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 2(2): 112–21.

Burston, W. H. (1963) *Principles of History Teaching.* London, Methuen.

Burston, W. H. (1962) The Place of History in Education. In W. H. Burston and C. W. Green (eds) *Handbook for History Teachers*. London, Methuen, pp. 1–14.

Burston, W. H. and Green, C. W. (eds) (1962) *Handbook for History Teachers.* London, Methuen.

Burston, W. H. and Green, C. W. (eds) (1972) *Handbook for History Teachers* (2nd edn). London, Methuen.

Byrom, J. (1998) Working with Sources: Scepticism or Cynicism? Putting the Story Back Together Again, *Teaching History*, 91: 32–35*.*

Cam, H. (1961) *Historical Novels*, General Series Pamphlet, No. 48, Historical Association.

Cannadine, D., Keating, J. and Sheldon, N. (2011) *The Right Kind of History: Teaching the Past in Twentieth-Century England.* Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.

Carretero, M. (2011) *Constructing Patriotism: Teaching History and Memories in Global Worlds*. Charlotte, NC, Information Age Publishing.

Chancellor, V. (1970) *History for their Masters: Opinion in the English History Textbook 1800-1914.* New York, Augustas M Kelley.

Chapman, A. (2009) Constructing History 11-19. In H. Cooper and A. Chapman (eds) *Constructing History 11-19.* London, Sage, pp. 1–5.

Charlton, K. (1956) Source Material and the Teaching of History, *Educational Review*, 9(1): 57–63.

Charlton, K. (1960) *Recent Historical Fiction for Secondary School Children (11-15 yrs),* Historical Association, Teaching of History Leaflet No. 18.

Charlton, K. (1962) Historical Fiction. In W. H. Burston and C. W. Green (eds) *Handbook for History Teachers.* London, Methuen, pp. 176–82.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2000) *Research Methods in Education* (5th edn). London, Routledge.

Collingwood, R. G. (1993) *The Idea of History* (rev. edn). Oxford University Press.

Coltham, J. and Fines, J. (1971) *Educational Objectives for the Study of History: A Suggested Framework.* London, Historical Association.

Crawford, K. (1995) A History of the Right: The Battle for Control of National Curriculum History 1989-1994, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 43(4): 433–56.

Crook, D. (2007) School Broadcasting in the United Kingdom: An Exploratory History, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 39(3): 217–26.

Culpin, C. (2002) Why We Must Change History GCSE, *Teaching History*, 109: 6–9.

Dance, E. H. (1954) *History Without Bias?* London, Council of Christians and Jews.

Dance, E. H. (1960) *History the Betrayer: A Study in Bias*. London, Hutchinson.

David, R. G. (2000) Imagining the Past: The Use of Archive Pictures in Secondary School History Textbooks, *The Curriculum Journal*, 11(2): 225–46.

Davies, A. K. and Cowie, L. F. (1962) Syllabus Construction in the Junior and Secondary Schools. In W. H. Burston and C. W. Green (eds) *Handbook for History Teachers.* London, Methuen, pp. 15–25.

Davies, I. (ed.) (2011) *Debates in History Teaching*. London, Routledge.

De Beer, E. S. (ed.) (1955) *English History in Pictures: Stuart Time.* London, Historical Association.

Department of Education and Science (1985) *History in the Primary and Secondary Years: An HMI View*. Inspectorate of Schools (England and Wales). London, HMSO.

Deuchar, S. (1987) *History and GCSE History.* London, Centre for Policy Studies.

Deuchar, S. (1992) *Bogus History?* York, Campaign for Real Education.

Dickinson, A. (2000) What Should History Be? In A. Kent (ed.) *School Subject Teaching: The History and Future of the Curriculum.* London, Kogan Page, pp. 86–110.

Dickinson, A. K. and Lee, P. J. (1978) *History Teaching and Historical Understanding*. London, Heinemann.

Dickinson, A. K., Gard, A. and Lee, P. J. (1978) Evidence in History and the Classroom. In A. K. Dickinson and P. J. Lee (eds) *History Teaching and Historical Understanding*. London, Heinemann, pp. 1–20.

Donovan, M. S. and Bransford, J. D. (2005) *How Students Learn: History in the Classroom*. National Research Council. Washington DC, National Academies Press.

Drefus, H. L. and Rabinow, P. (1982) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics.* University of Chicago Press.

Drummond, A. H. (1929) *History in School: A Study of Some of its Problems*. London, Harrap.

Dwyer, F. J. (1962) The History Room. In W. H. Burston and C. W. Green (eds) *Handbook for History Teachers.* University of London, Institute of Education, Methuen, pp. 51–7.

Dwyer, F. J. (1972) The History Room. In W. H. Burston and C. W. Green (eds) *Handbook for History Teachers.* University of London, Institute of Education, Methuen, pp. 137–45.

Dymond, D. (ed.) (1929) *A Handbook for History Teachers*. London, Methuen.

Dymond, D. (1930) *A List of Illustrations for Use in Teaching History in Schools*. London, Historical Association.

Elliott, B. J. (1975) The Development of History Teaching in England for Pupils aged 11-18 years, 1918-1939. Unpublished PhD thesis.

Elliott, B. J. (1980) An Early Failure of Curriculum Reform: History Teaching in England, 1918-1940, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 12(2): 39–46.

Elliott, B. J. (1994) The Impact of the Second World War upon History Teaching in Britain, *Journal of Educational Administration and History*, 26(2): 153–63.

Elton, G. R. (1967) *The Practice of History*. London, Fontana Books.

Elton, G. R. (1970) What Sort of History Should We Teach? In M. Ballard (ed.) *New Movements in the Study and Teaching of History.* London, Temple Smith, pp. 221–33.

Evans, R. J. (1997) *In Defence of History*. London, Granta Books.

Evans, R. J. (2011) The Wonderfulness of Us: The Tory Interpretation of History*, The London Review of Books*, 33(6): 9–12.

Fairclough, N. (2003) *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London, Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2004) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Fines, J. (1967) History Tomorrow, *New Education*, 2(12): 17–19.

Fines, J. (1968) Archives in School, *History*, 53(79): 348–56.

Fines, J. (1969) *A Select Bibliography of the Teaching of History in the United Kingdom*. Helps for Students of History, No. 77. London, Historical Association.

Fines, J. (ed.) (1969) *Blond's Teachers' Handbook*. London, Blond Educational.

Foster, S. J. and Crawford, K. A. (2006) *What Shall we Tell the Children? International Perspectives on School History Textbook.* Charlotte, NC, Information Age Publishing.

Foucault, M. (1969) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York, Random House.

Foucault, M. (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977.* Brighton, Harvester Press.

Gardiner, J. (ed.) (1990) *The History Debate: A History Today Book.* London, Collins and Brown.

Gee, J. P. (2000) *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London, Routledge.

Gee, J. P. (2011) *How to do Discourse Analysis: A Toolkit*. London, Routledge.

Gentilcore, D. (2010) Anthropological Approaches. In S. Berger, H. Feldner and K. Passmore (eds) *Writing History: Theory and Practice.* London, Bloomsbury, pp. 165–86.

Goodson, I. F. (1988) *The Making of Curriculum: Collected Essays.* London, Falmer Press.

Goodson, I. F. (1998) *Subject Knowledge: Readings for the Study of School Subjects*. London, Falmer Press.

Goodson, I. F. and Marsh, C. J. (1996) *Studying School Subjects*. London, Falmer Press.

Gordon, P. and Lawton, D. (1978) *Curriculum Change in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.* London, Hodder & Stoughton.

Gordon, P., Aldrich, R. and Dean, R. (1991) *Education and Policy in England in the Twentieth Century*. London, Woburn Press.

Gosden, P. (1983) *The Education System Since 1944.* Oxford, Martin Robinson.

Hall, S. (ed.) (1997) *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. London, OU/Sage.

Happold, F. C. (1928) *The Approach to History*. London, Christophers.

Happold, F. C. (1928) A New Type of Question in History Papers, *History*, 13, 126–30.

Happold, F. C. (1931) The Case for Experimentation in Examinations: A Reply, *History*, April, 37.

Harris, R. and Haydn, T. (2008) Children's Ideas about School History and Why They Matter, *Teaching History*, 132: 40–9.

Harrison, M. (1950) *Museum Adventure: The Story of the Geffrye Museum.* University of London Press.

Harrison, M. (1954) *Learning Out of School: A Brief Guide to the Educational Use of Museums*. London, Educational Supply Association.

Harrison, M. and Bryant M. A. (1951) *Picture Source Book for Social History: Sixteenth Century.* London, George Allen & Unwin.

Harrison, M. and Wells, A. A. M. (1953) *Picture Source Book for Social History: Seventeenth Century*. London, George Allen & Unwin.

Harrison, M. and Wells, A. A. M. (1955) *Picture Source Book for Social History: Eighteenth Century.* London, George Allen & Unwin.

Harrison, M. and Wells, A. A. M. (1957) *Picture Source Book for Social History: Early Nineteenth Century.* London, George Allen & Unwin.

Haydn, T., Arthur, J. and Hunt, M. (2001) *Learning to Teach History in the Secondary School: A Companion to School Experience.* London, RoutledgeFalmer.

Historical Association (1957) *The Historical Association 1906-1956.* London, Historical Association.

Historical Association (2005) *Curriculum Development Project*: *History 14-19*. London, Historical Association.

Hodder, I. (2002) The Interpretation of Documents and Material Culture. In D. Weinberg (ed.) *Qualitative Research Methods*. Malden, MA, Blackwell, pp. 263–6.

Howells, G. (1999) Life by Sources A–F: Really Using Sources to Teach AS History, *Teaching History*, 128: 33–6.

Husbands, C. (1996) *What is History Teaching?* Buckingham, OUP.

Husbands, C., Kitson, A. and Pendry, A. (2003) *Understanding History Teaching: Teaching and Learning about the Past in Secondary Schools.* Buckingham, OUP.

Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools (1931) *Memorandum on the Teaching of History* (2nd edn, revised). Cambridge at the University Press.

Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools (1950) *The Teaching of History.* Cambridge University Press.

Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools (1956) *The Teaching of History* (2nd edn). Cambridge University Press.

Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools (1965) *The Teaching of History* (3rd edn). Cambridge University Press.

Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools (1975) *The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools* (4th edn). Cambridge University Press.

Jager, S and Maier, F. (2009) Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of Foucauldian Critical Discourse Analysis and Dispositive Analysis. In R. Wodak and M. Meyer (eds) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* London, Sage, pp. 34–61.

Jarvis, C. H. (1917) *The Teaching of History*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Jeffreys, M. V. C. (1940) The Study of History in Schools. *The New Era*, 21: 162–4.

John, P. (1991) The Professional Craft Knowledge of the History Teacher, *Teaching History*, 64: 8–12.

Jones, B. R. (1973) *Practical Approaches to the New History: Suggestions for the Improvement of Classroom Method.* London, Hutchinson Educational.

Jones, G. and Ward, L. (1978) *New History Old Problems: Studies in History Teaching*. University College of Swansea Faculty of Education.

Jordanova, L. (2000) *History in Practice*. London, Arnold.

Keating, J. and Sheldon, N. (2011) History in Education: Trends and Themes in History Teaching 1900-2010. In I. Davies (ed.) *Debates in History Teaching*. London, Routledge, pp. 5–17.

Keatinge, M. W. (1910) *Studies in the Teaching of History.* London, A & C Black.

Keatinge, M. W. and Frazer, N. L. (1911) *A History of England for Schools, with Documents, Problems and Exercises*. London, A & C Black.

Keatinge, M. W. and Frazer, N. L. (1920) *A History of England for Schools, with Documents, Problems and Exercises, Part 1. 55 B.C. to A.D. 1603* (2nd edn). London, A & C Black.

Kedourie, H. (1988) *The Errors and Evils of the New History*. London, Centre for Policy Studies.

Kitson, A. and Husbands, C. with Steward, S. (2011) *Teaching and Learning History 11-18: Understanding the Past.* Buckingham, OUP.

Lang, S. (1990) Mr History: The Achievement of R. J. Unstead Reconsidered, *Teaching History*, 58: 24–6.

Langlois, C. V. and Seignobos, C. (1902) *Introduction to the Study of History*. Available at: www.gutenberg.org/files/29637/29637-h/29637-h.htm.

Lawton, D. (1982) *The End of the Secret Garden?: A Study in the Politics of the Curriculum* (2nd edn). University of London, Institute of Education.

Lee, P. J. (1983) History Teaching and Philosophy of History, *History and Theory*, 22(4): 19–49.

Lee, P. J. (1994) Historical Knowledge and the National Curriculum. In H. Bourdillon (ed.) *Teaching History*. London, Routledge, pp. 41–8.

Lee, P. J. (2001) Putting Principles into Practice: Understanding History. In M. S. Donovan and J. D. Bransford (eds) *How Students Learn: History in the Classroom*. National Academies National Research Council. Washington DC, National Academies Press, pp. 31–78.

Lee, P. J. and Shemilt, D. (2003) A Scaffold not a Cage: Progression and Progression Models in History, *Teaching History*, 113: 13–23.

Lee, P. J., Slater, J., Walsh, P., White, J. and Shemilt, D. (1992) *The Aims of School History: The National Curriculum and Beyond.* London, Tufnell Press.

Lewis, E. M. (1960) *Teaching History in Secondary Schools.* London, Evans Brothers Limited.

Little, V. (1990) A National Curriculum in History: A Very Contentious Issue, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 38(4): 319–34.

Low-Beer, A. (1974) Books and the Teaching of History in Schools, *History*, 59(3): 392–404.

Lowe, R. (ed.) (2000) *History of Education: Major Themes,* vol. 3: *Studies in Learning and Teaching*. London, RoutledgeFalmer.

Lowenthal, D. (1985) *The Past is a Foreign Country.* Cambridge University Press.

MacAleavy, T. (1998) The Use of Sources in History, *Teaching History*, 91: 10–16.

McCormick, R. and Murphy, P. (2000) Curriculum: The Case for a Focus on Learning. In M. Ben-Peretz, S. Brown and B. Moon (eds) *Routledge International Companion to Education.* London, Routledge, pp. 204–34.

McCulloch, G. (2002) Secondary Education. In R. Aldrich (ed.) *A Century of Education*. London, Routledge.

McCulloch, G. (2004) *Documentary Research in Education, History and the Social*

Sciences. London, RoutledgeFalmer.

McCulloch, G. and Richardson, W. (2000) *Historical Research in Educational Settings*. Buckingham, OUP.

McDonald, K. (2001) Social Documents. In N. Gilbert (ed.) *Researching Social Life* (2nd edn). London, Sage.

McGovern, C. (2007) The New History Boys. In R. Whelan (ed.) *The Corruption of the Curriculum*. London, Civitas, pp. 1–14.

Mangnall, R. (1856) *Historical and Miscellaneous Questions* (4th edn). New York, D Appleton.

Marriott, K. (1940) *English History in English Fiction.* London, Blackie.

Marwick, A. (1987) *The Nature of History.* Basingstoke, Macmillan Education.

Marsden, W. E. (2000) Historical Approaches to Curriculum Study. In R. Lowe (ed.) *History of Education: Major Themes,* vol. 3: *Studies in Learning and Teaching*. London, RoutledgeFalmer, pp. 3–39.

Marsden, W. E. (2001) *The School Textbook: Geography, History and Social Studies.* London, Woburn Press.

Marten, C. H. K. (1938) *On the Teaching of History and Other Addresses*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell.

Matthew, H. C. G. and Harrison, B. (eds) (2004) *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Oxford University Press.

Matthews, D. (2009) *The Strange Death of History Teaching (Fully Explained in Seven Easy-to Follow Lessons)*. Derek Matthews.

May, T. (2001) *Social Research Issues, Methods and Process* (3rd edn). Buckingham, Open University Press.

Megill, A. (2007) *Historical Knowledge, Historical Error: A Contemporary Guide to Practice*. University of Chicago Press.

Middell, M. (2010) The Annales. In S. Berger, H. Feldner and K. Passmore (eds)

Writing History: Theory and Practice. London, Bloomsbury, pp. 108–23.

Mills, S. (1997) *Discourse*. London, Routledge.

Ministry of Education (1952) *Teaching History, Pamphlet No. 23.* London, HMSO.

Ministry of Education (1959) *Suggestions for the Consideration of Teachers and Others Concerned with the Work of Primary Schools*, Chapter XV, HMSO, pp. 275–88. Available at: www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/primary/.

Moore, A. (2015) *Understanding the School Curriculum: Theory, Politics and Principles*. London, Routledge.

National Curriculum Working Party Group Final Report (England and Wales) (1994) In H. Bourdillon (ed.) *Teaching History*. London, Routledge, pp. 27–41.

Newby, P. (2010) *Research Methods for Education.* Harlow, Longman Pearson.

Newsom Report (1963) *Half Our Future: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England).* London, HMSO.

Norwood Report (1943) *Report of the Committee of the Secondary School Examinations Council appointed by the President of the Board of Education in 1941.* London, HMSO.

Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) (2011) *History For All: History in English Schools 2007/10.* Available at: www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/413714/History_for_all.pdf.

Paltridge, B. (2012) *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction* (2nd edn)*.* Bloomsbury Discourse Series. London, Bloomsbury.

Phillips, I. (2008) *Teaching History: Developing as a Reflective Secondary Teacher*. London, Sage.

Phillips, R. (1998) *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Education Politics.* London, Cassell.

Phillips, R. (2004) Government Policies, the State and the Teaching of History. In J. Arthur and R. Phillips (eds) *Issues in History Teaching*. London, Routledge, pp. 10–

24.

Pickles, E. (2010) How Can Students' Use of Historical Evidence be Enhanced? *Teaching History*, 139: 41–51.

Platt, J. (1981) Evidence and Proof in Documentary Research, *Sociological Review*, 29(1): 31–66.

Plowden Report (1967) *Children and their Primary Schools: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education* (England). London, HMSO.

Portal, C. (ed.) (1987) *The History Curriculum for Teachers.* London, Falmer Press.

Price, M. (1968) History in Danger, *History*, 53(79): 342–7.

Prior, L. (2003) *Using Documents in Social Research.* London, Sage.

QCA (2007) *History Programme of Study for Key Stage 3 and Attainment Targets.* Available at: www.qca.org.uk/curriculum.

Reeves, M. E. (1954) *The Medieval Town.* Then and There Series. Harlow, Longman.

Reeves, M. E. (1954) *The Medieval Village*. Then and There Series. Harlow, Longman.

Reid, R. R. and Toyne, S. M. (1944) *The Planning of a History Syllabus for Schools*. Historical Association, Pamphlet 128.

Roberts, M. (1990) History in the School Curriculum 1972-1990: A Possible Dialectical Sequence: Thesis, Antithesis, Synthesis? *The Curriculum Journal*, 1(1): 65–75.

Rogers, P. J. (1978) *The New History: Theory into Practice.* London, Historical Association.

Rogers, P. J. (1984) Why Teach History? In A. K. Dickinson, P. J. Lee and P. J. Rogers (eds) *Learning History*. London, Heinemann, pp. 20–38.

Rogers, P. J. (1987) The Past as a Frame of Reference. In C. Portal (ed.) *The History Curriculum for Teachers.* London, Falmer Press, pp. 3–21.

Rowse, A. L. (1946) *The Use of History.* London, Hodder & Stoughton.

Ryle, G. (1949) *The Concept of Mind*. London, Hutchinson.

Rusen, R. (2004) Historical Consciousness: Narrative Structure, Moral Function, and Ontogenetic Development. In P. Seixas (ed.) *Theorizing Historical Consciousness*. University of Toronto Press, pp. 63–85.

Samuel, R. (1994) *Theatres of Memory,* vol. I: *Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*. London, Verso.

Samuel, R. (1998) *Island Stories: Unravelling Britain: Theatres of Memory, Volume II* (ed. Alison Light). London, Verso.

Schama, S. (2010) My Vision for History in Schools, *The Guardian*, 9 November. Available at: www.guardian.co.uk/education/2010/nov/09/future-history-schools.

Schwab, J. J. (1964) The Structure of the Disciplines: Meanings and Significance. In G. Ford and L. Purgo (eds) *The Structure of Knowledge and the Curriculum.* Chicago, IL, Rand McNally, pp. 6–30.

Schools Council History 13–16 Project (1976) *What is History? Teachers' Guide.* Edinburgh, Holmes McDougall.

Schools Council History 13–16 Project (1976) *A New Look at History.* Edinburgh, Holmes McDougall.

Scott, J. (1990) *A Matter of Record Documentary Sources in Social Research*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Scott, D. (2008) *Critical Essays on Major Curriculum Theorists.* London, Routledge.

Seixas, P. (1999) Beyond Content and Pedagogy: In Search of a Way to Talk about History Education, *Curriculum Studies*, 31(3): 317–37.

Sellar, W. C. and Yeatman, R. J. (1930) *1066 and All That: A Memorable History of England, comprising all the parts you can remember, including 103 Good Things, 5 Bad Kings and 2 Genuine Dates.* London, Methuen.

Sharp, M. (ed.) (1955) *English History in Pictures: The Later Middle Ages.* London, Historical Association.

Shemilt, D. (1987) Adolescent Ideas about Evidence and Methodology in History. In

C. Portal (ed.) *The History Curriculum for Teachers.* London, Falmer Press, pp. 39–61.

Shemilt, D. (1980) *History 13-16 Evaluation Study: Schools Council History 13-16 Project*. Edinburgh, Holmes MacDougal.

Shemilt, D. (1991) Preface. In P. Lee, J. Slater, P. Walsh and J. White (eds) *The Aims of School History: The National Curriculum and Beyond*. The London File: Papers from the Institute of Education. London, Tufnell Press, pp. 1–8.

Silverman, D. (2006) *Interpreting Qualitative Data* (3rd edn). London, Sage.

Slater, J. (1989) *The Politics of History Teaching: A Humanity Dehumanised?* Institute of Education, University of London.

Smith, N. (2010) *History Teacher's Handbook.* London, Continuum.

Smith, P. (2001) Why Gerry Now Likes Evidential Work, *Teaching History*, 102: 8–13.

Steele, I. (1974) A Study of the Formative Years of the Development of the History Curriculum in English Schools 1833-1901. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Sheffield.

Steele, I. (1976) *Developments in History Teaching.* London, Open Books.

Steele, I. (1980) The Teaching of History in England: An Historical Perspective, *History Teaching Review*, 12(1).

Stretton, G. (1957) A Record of the First Fifty Years. In *The Historical Association 1906–1956.* London, Historical Association, pp. 5–55.

Strong, C. F. (1958) *History in the Secondary School.* University of London Press.

Strong, C. F. (1961) *Early Man and the First Nations.* University of London Press.

Sylvester, D. (1976) *A New Look at History Schools Council History 13-16 Project.* Edinburgh, Holmes McDougall.

Sylvester, D. (1994) Change and Continuity in History Teaching 1900-93. In H. Bourdillon (ed.) *Teaching History*. London, Routledge, pp. 9–23.

Tosh, J. (2000) *The Pursuit of History* (3rd edn). Harlow, Longman.

Trease, G. (1948) *Tales Out of School.* London, Heinemann.

Unstead, R. J. (1953) *The Middle Ages.* London, A & C Black.

Unstead, R. J. (1955) *Looking at History in Britain from Caveman to the Present Day*. London, A & C Black.

Unstead, R. J. (1956) *Teaching History in the Junior School.* London, A & C Black.

Unstead, R. J. (1957) *People in History: From Caractacus to Alexander Fleming.* London*,* A & C Black.

Unstead, R. J. (1962) *The Medieval Scene, 747-1485.* London, A & C Black.

Van Sledright, B. (2002) *In Search of America's Past: Learning to Read History in Elementary School.* New York, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Whitehead, A. N. (1929) *The Aims of Education and Other Essays*. London, Macmillan Company.

Williams, G. A. (1962) *Guide to Sources of Illustrative Material for Use in Teaching History*. London, Historical Association.

Williams, R. (1961) *The Long Revolution*. Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Wineburg, S. (2001) *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the Past.* Philadelphia, Temple University Press.

Young, M. F. D. (2008) *Bringing Knowledge Back In: From Social Constructivism to Social Realism in the Sociology of Education.* London, Routledge.