



Durham E-Theses

History in the secondary school curriculum: Some considerations for drawing up a syllabus

Danziger, E.C.

How to cite:

Danziger, E.C. (1973) *History in the secondary school curriculum: Some considerations for drawing up a syllabus*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/9730/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

HISTORY IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM :

Some Considerations for Drawing up
a Syllabus

E.C. Danziger

Abstract of
Thesis presented for the degree of
Master of Education
to the University of Durham.

1973

ABSTRACT

It is obviously no longer acceptable to a large sector of educationalists to regard history as a necessary evil whose survival, although a constant source of complaint, is nevertheless conceded. It is both desirable and necessary, therefore, to provide reasons which will satisfy not only these critics but others less antagonistic to the subject, of the justification of the place of history in the secondary school curriculum. This study therefore, set itself the following objects : first, it aimed to put the case for the study of history in secondary schools. To do this it was necessary to summarise some of the conclusions regarding the nature of history. What is it that we are defending and how is it viewed by those who attack it? This done, it proposed to see what provisions are laid down by current curriculum theory regarding the criteria for the inclusion of subject matter in the secondary school curriculum. Moreover, it was recognised that by submitting history to the supposedly neutral arbitration of curriculum theory, certain limitations or prescriptions might be laid upon it if a favourable judgement were returned.

In the event, justification was found in curriculum theory for the inclusion of history in the secondary school curriculum, and it did prove to be the case that, as a condition of that justification, a certain redirection of the focus of history courses was perhaps indicated.

The second concern of this study, therefore, was to examine some of the other features which have bearing on the organisation of history curricula, and in particular those, the negligence of which had given rise to some of the current disillusionment with history as a secondary school subject. The areas of concern chosen were the syllabus itself, the influence of examinations, the capacity of the pupil to profit from a study of history, and the ability of the teacher to communicate such study profitably. These were the factors, it was felt, which imposed the greatest restraints upon the teaching of history, and no conclusions drawn from curriculum theory would be remotely viable unless they took these restraints into account. From the prescriptions offered in the first part of this study, with due regard to the limitations imposed upon them by the issues raised in the second part of this study, the third part proposed to offer some considerations for drawing up a history curriculum. These considerations, in the main, arose from a detailed expression of a set of objectives for history teaching. It was felt that it was a lack of this clarity that was responsible for much of the current dissatisfaction with the teaching of history. These objectives were linked to the learning experiences and content which were most urgently prescribed by the principles examined in part one : finally, procedures were suggested for evaluating with what success these objectives have been achieved. These objectives, learning experiences, content, and evaluation are intended, in sum, to form the basis for a secondary school history curriculum.

HISTORY IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL CURRICULUM :

Some Considerations for Drawing up

a Syllabus

E.C. Danziger

Thesis presented for the degree of

Master of Education

to the University of Durham.

1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER ONE	
The Stimuli to this study	1
The Proposed direction of this study	13
CHAPTER TWO	
The Nature of History	16
The Nature of Schoolroom History	21
History and its Critics	25
CHAPTER THREE	
The Aims of the Curriculum	29
The Place of History in the Curriculum	39
CHAPTER FOUR	
The Function of the Syllabus	49
Syllabuses of Content	53
Syllabuses of Method	57
Syllabuses of Integration	66
Summary	69
CHAPTER FIVE	
How Examinations affect Curriculum Construction	70
The G.C.E. Examinations	71
The C.S.E. Examinations	78
Conclusions	83
CHAPTER SIX	
How Pupils affect Curriculum Construction	86
Pupils' Attitudes to History	87
Is History a Peculiarly Adult Discipline?	91
The Possibility of reducing pupils' difficulties with History	98
Conclusion	104
CHAPTER SEVEN	
The difficulties of the history teacher today	106
The problems of the teaching profession as a whole	108
The openness of history teaching to change	112
Conclusion	120
CHAPTER EIGHT	
A Set of Objectives for teaching history	122
Conclusion	151

APPENDICES	Page
A - Taxonomy of Objectives for teaching history . .	153
B - History Syllabus in Use at a Comprehensive School	157
C - History Syllabus in Use at a Grammar Technical School	164
D - Objectives for A Social Studies Programme adopted by the School City of South Bend, Ohio, 1949.	169
E - A Questionnaire submitted to serving history teachers in County Durham	170
F - Bibliography	171

CHAPTER ONE

The stimuli to this study

This study has received much stimulus through being written at a time when history teaching is the subject of considerable controversy. Many of the disputants are not agreed whether this is a time of flux or a time of crisis for history teaching. In fact, the range of fronts on which the weaknesses of history teaching is being probed is itself illuminative, and it may be most useful to begin by looking for a moment at the State of History Teaching in our Schools today.

Articles such as that by Thomas Turner, entitled Crisis in History teaching, which appeared in The Times of 12th May 1971, have had some success in conveying a rather stereotyped point of view about the state of history teaching in our schools, to the interested public. It is that "history has been shown in the recent inquiry by the Schools Council to be downright unpopular with middle of the road adolescents" and that faced with the queries "What is the relevance of this subject in terms of the child's future?" and "Would anything be lost if we merged this subject with others?" head-teachers have "found history to be wanting" (a favourite phrase, this).

What is remarkable about this article is the stance Mr Turner, Head of a History Department at a College of Education, chooses to adopt in the face of this threat to his subject. "What is the system of history teaching now under attack?" he asks. "It tries to present perspectives of the past which will open up a solid landscape of mainly English and European history. A context is thus created within which...candidates are conditioned to express what are really quite difficult concepts about politics and economics while the more humane instructors try hard to sugar the pill with history clubs and visits

to museums.."

The "remedy" of which Mr Turner appears most to approve, however, is one which "takes its stand on the needs of the child". (Who would be so inhumanitarian as to quarrel with this?) "This is the school of thought which most insists on the virtues of direct investigation of historical and archaeological sites and collections, or records and artifacts, which seeks to involve the child in various modes of creative expression through the encouragement of skills like drama, movement, personal writing, and the use of audio-visual equipment." Note that "history clubs" and "visits to museums", clearly terms of disparagement in context, have become "various modes of creative expression" and "direct investigations of historical... collections".

Then follows the inevitable magisterial summary. "My own conviction is that, if the values of historical thinking and experience are to survive, it is essential for historians to give ground. Chronology in the form of imposed syllabuses backed by textbooks full of potted generalities must give way to genuine inquiry supported by source materials." What ought to set the teeth of any historian on edge is Mr Turner's conviction that by fostering "genuine inquiry", a historian will be "giving ground". If history is not about genuine inquiry, then it is about nothing. If professional educators such as Mr Turner feel that inquiry is being inefficiently grafted into the classroom, then it is the educators and not the subject who are at fault.

"We may yet live to see a Nuffield History" is the ringing conclusion with which Mr Turner ends his article. Pleasant a thought as it is, it is a remote prospect if historians can offer solutions to the problems of history teaching only in terms of "Learning to work in

teams with geographers and English teachers and even social science enthusiasts." Nuffield mathematics did not come into being on the assumption that mathematics was an unsound area of knowledge but that it was being badly taught in the classroom.

Mr Turner seems to be representative of a wide cross section of opinion which has been hoodwinked by sociologists, psychologists, and archaeologists (amongst others) into thinking that the fairly limited areas of concern peculiar to their disciplines are alien to history. The American S.S.R.C. puts this case even more explicitly. "Historians who have made social science part of their thinking are not satisfied to regard history only in terms of events...the related concepts of structure and process provide a highly useful thread in the analysis of causation...they enable the historian to...analyse the outbreak of World War I not so much in terms of assassinations and ultimatums, as in terms of the social (and especially the economic and political) structures of the national states involved."¹

This is, I hope, a very extreme example of the current disillusionment with history. If educationalists are genuinely of the belief that no historian ever "took the lid off" events until the social scientist condescended to show him how, then it is hardly to be wondered at that the state of history teaching gives rise to some gloom today.

At a rather higher level, S.W.F. Holloway complains that "academic history is an intellectually invertebrate affair...The solution is simple but drastic...History must become scientific both

¹S.S.R.C. (U. S. A.), "Problems of Historical Analysis", in Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools, ed. by E.W. Fenton, New York, 1965.

in aim and method. In other words, history and sociology must become one."² What benefits does Holloway expect to follow from this union? He instances the anticipated benefits by reference to a demographic case study. The "sociologists assumptions are explicit and public. They are open to inspection...the results can be tested by others. Historians, by contrast, reside in 'a private world inhabited exclusively by penetrating but unfathomable insights and ineffable understandings'"³ such was the verdict, quoted by Holloway, of R.K. Merton. Again we find ourselves confronted by an all but unrecognisable view of history. The historian's world is anything but private - if he does not lay his evidence out before his readers, lucidly and fathomably, he has no hope of making his case. Whose procedures have been more open to inspection than, for instance, Maitland's or Namier's?

Martin Roberts is another who has been beguiled into thinking that history is not modish enough. His article begins with the finding that 100 children in grammar schools placed Social History equal first with Political History in order of interest. From this, and from the fourth placing of Economic History, he concluded that "there seems good reason to believe that the interest in social and economic history should be described less as 'historical' than 'sociological'."⁴ Later he complains that "we lack a precise definition of the term 'history' itself. Thus we have been unable to

²S.W.F. Holloway, "What History Is and what it Ought to be", in Studies in the Nature and Teaching of History, ed. by W. Burston and D. Thompson, London, 1967, p. 13.

³S.W.F. Holloway, *op.cit.*, p. 17.

⁴M. Roberts, "Contemporary Problems of With form History", *History* Vol. LIII, p. 393.

chart the boundaries between sociology and history".⁵ But why this insistence on being able to do so, one might ask? Roberts feels that without a definition of the "distinctive character" of our subject, aims, methods, and examinations will remain crude and unsatisfactory.⁶

Many more instances could be produced to illustrate the first of the vital factors affecting the teaching of history in our schools today: that there is a widespread ignorance or confusion about the nature of history, its aims, and its practice, and if one cannot avoid the conclusion that some of the writers quoted above ought to have known better, it is arguable that this situation is largely the fault of historians, whose communication with both the public and with fellow educators is obviously both insufficient and inefficient.

There is a general desire to find lines of demarcation behind which to confine history: however, the very elusiveness of such lines tells its own story. History is the "sum of human self knowledge", and will intrude into the preserve of any other discipline, no matter how securely it feels itself fenced in. If educators wish to emphasise the areas of history that have to do with geography and English literature, then there are simpler ways of ensuring this than directing historians to "work in teams with geographers and English teachers".⁷ Alternatively, there are many reasons why such team teaching might be thought useful, but amongst them ought not to be the conviction that only by dilution can history be made palatable.

⁵M. Roberts, op.cit., p. 401.

⁶M. Roberts, op.cit., p. 402.

⁷T. Turner, "Crisis in History Teaching", Times, 12/5/1971.

Of all the boundary disputes, that between history and sociology seems the least productive. Will historians and sociologists not always be using the same data, whatever their specialist concern? Will the work of the sociologist today, not be the staple of the historian's diet tomorrow? Historians are so often represented as condemning sociologists for their methodology or the subject of their inquiry. Both propositions are absurd. Historians have indeed been very willing to borrow from sociologists where their methods have been thought applicable. Tape recorder and questionnaire have become accepted components of the local and contemporary historian's equipment. Demography and class movements have long been fields which have engaged the attention of historians. What historians do resent are the pretensions of sociology - that somehow the "facts" of sociology are more objective than the "facts" of history, that the particular findings of a sociologist have general applications, and are hence more relevant than the findings of a historian.⁸

Turner quoted with a reverent nod an article by E.E.Y. Hales entitled "School History in the Melting Pot". Hales and Turner are,

⁸It has been suggested that the division between historians and sociologists lies even deeper, that it is a temperamental one. Why do students see "history as authoritarian and sociology as progressive"? Why do historians, generally speaking, seem to be conservative, sociologists radical? Of course once this divergence is established, it will obviously be self-perpetuating, but its origins may lie in the fact that whereas the sociologist simply takes a structure and dismantles it, finding it strong here, and weak there, perhaps top-heavy or with unsound foundations, and prescribes explicitly or implicitly the amendments to adjust this imbalance, amendments which all too often strike others as radical or anarchist; a historian seeks only to explain how this structure, rotten and creaking as it may be, came into existence. In explaining this, he is often interpreted as excusing it, and indeed, an understanding of the origins of even the most corrupt institutions may, or even should, breed a certain tolerance, albeit cynical, which could contribute to a conservative frame of mind.

however, poles apart. Hales begins by ruing the failure of "The House of History, as Trevelyan conceived it" to become "the framework of...the curriculum because it was never built."⁹ Hales placed the responsibility for that failure not on the materials, but on the builders.

Hales notes that Recent History and World History are "the answers of many teachers of history determined to withstand the charge that history is irrelevant,"¹⁰ just as our Victorian ancestors taught Patriotic History and Liberal Constitutional History because this was what they thought most relevant. But the real reason why history was in the melting pot, concluded Hales, was because it "is scarcely possible to teach Recent History and World History in the same way as we taught the other periods of history. 'Period' divisions now hinder rather than help."¹¹ "Every generation will have to consider afresh the principles of selection and the paths that may usefully be followed."¹²

Hales' reasons for the state of flux in the teaching of history seem to be very sound. What is surely happening is not that sociologists are exposing history to be no more than "an aggregate of discreet insights"¹³ but that the teaching of the subject in schools has not kept pace with the changing views of what areas within it are relevant.

⁹E.E.Y. Hales, "History in the Melting Pot", History Today, Vol. XVI, 1965, p. 202.

¹⁰E.E.Y. Hales, op.cit., p. 207.

¹¹E.E.Y. Hales, op.cit., p. 207.

¹²E.E.Y. Hales, op.cit., p. 209.

¹³S.W.F. Holloway, op.cit., p. 17.

It may well be, too, that why it has not done so is because to do so is a task of daunting difficulty. But it must be attempted, and that, if anything, is what a Nuffield History might usefully concern itself.

The failure of history to carry the new areas of relevance into the classroom is a highly complex one. The main point to be conceded is that there is a wide divergence of opinion today on what the "new areas of relevance" are. Our Victorian and Edwardian predecessors enjoyed very much greater conformity of opinion than do educationalists today. The people of England (and of the world) who, in Chesterton's day, "never had spoken yet", are very much heard today: in 1938 Czechoslovakia was "a faraway country of which we know nothing", now countries like Ethiopia and Uruguay command our recognition of their place in world affairs. Then too, while some countries now see patriotism as a bad influence, others must promote it to consolidate an identity they have so recently won. Some countries, or sects, feel history ought to be entirely free of ideology, while others uncompromisingly base the teaching of history upon it. Small wonder that history teaching is in a state of flux. Thus this study sees as the second problem affecting the state of history teaching in our schools today, the difficulty of satisfying all the demands made upon the subject by any process of selection of content matter.

The third factor having bearing on the state of history in our schools today is one which has until recently been taken very much for granted - the receptivity of the pupil to the subject. Chapter VI will investigate this issue in greater depth, with reference to educational psychology, so here only the symptoms of what may or may not be a disease will be discussed. Even here there is scope for a variety of interpretations. The poll in Enquiry One is a typical

example. 29% of the boys and girls interrogated thought history a useful subject. Only art, music, and religious instruction ranked lower. 40% of the boys and 41% of the girls thought history interesting. Only foreign languages, religious instruction and music ranked lower. A sobering state of affairs indeed. This table has been the source of many Jeremiads about the state of history in our schools.¹⁴

Yet even these statistics repay careful examination. First, the children polled were those who were due to leave school at 15, hence our least academically oriented children, whereas History undeniably is one of the least practical subjects in their curriculum. It is as we might expect that metalwork, woodwork, and physical education are the three most popular subjects with the boys, and that housecraft, typing, and needlework are in the first four subjects chosen by the girls.

Next, although few enough children thought history interesting, they do not seem to have been any more enamoured of other unpractical subjects. Of the boys, only 8% more thought mathematics interesting and 6% more thought current affairs interesting. With the girls, current affairs, mathematics, science, and geography were only marginally preferred to history. The lesson here seems to be that if we want to "sell" history to the "Newsom" children, we will have to make it a more practical subject. As the I.A.A.M. put it, "one of the main justifications for the complaint (happily less heard these days) that school history is dull derives from teaching the right

¹⁴School's Council, Enquiry One, London, 1968, pp. 57-60.

history at the wrong level."¹⁵ Similar polls conducted in Scandinavia and America have arrived at much the same results. Clearly there is no cause to be smug (as the I.A.A.M. were accused of being for the innocuous expression of optimism quoted above): yet only thirty years ago (when history, by all accounts, was much duller than it is now) Pritchard found that history was the third most popular subject in boys' schools and the second in girls' schools.¹⁶ Statistics can, as always, be found, or manufactured, to prove whatever one wants to prove.

The tables put out by the Central Statistical Office for the decade 1960-70 show that not only the numbers but the proportion of children writing G.C.E. "A" Levels in history has been continually increasing. It is still third only to mathematics and English, although this may of course reflect the choice offered in schools rather than the inclinations of the pupils.¹⁷ Even in the C.S.E. which was, of course, specially designed for less academic children, history is the subject taken by fourth most pupils, while of the children polled by Enquiry One, most of whom would not be entered for external examinations at all, 85% of the boys, and 88% of the girls were being taught history. At present, therefore, the pressure on history is rather one of articulation than for survival.

There are signs, however, that history is growing conscious of the need to become more articulate. A vast amount of literature is circulating on the philosophy and rationale of teaching history. A

¹⁵I.A.A.M., The Teaching of History, Cambridge, 1965, p. 11.

¹⁶L. Pritchard,
British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. V, 1935, p. 157.

¹⁷Central Statistical Office, Social Trends, HMSO 1970, p.128.

periodical devoted entirely to this subject now appears twice yearly. There is a profusion of articles on this topic in journals with a wider focus such as History. There is considerable international exchange of ideas on the teaching of history. A number of different aids to instruction are being marketed. Projects to investigate the "modernisation" of history teaching have long been under way in America. While all this introspection is not always highly self critical, at least it goes some way towards absolving history teachers of the charge of complacency.

Therefore the last factor relevant to the state of history in our schools today that it is proposed to raise here is the disparity between the theory being dispensed by pamphleteers and departments and colleges of education, and what seems to take place in the classrooms.

At one end of the school spectrum, change is often said to be stifled by the examinations. There is little profit in a progressive policy in the classroom if it cannot be geared to the criteria by which the ability of both pupil and teacher is usually measured. It is often pointed out by defenders of the examining system that most boards offer an ever widening range of subjects on which a school may choose to be examined, that (with eighteen months notice) a teacher may even submit his own syllabus if none of those offered meet with his approval, and failing this, he is at liberty to transfer the entry of his pupils from one board to another. Examinations, too, are being subjected to the spotlight - experiments are constantly being made with modifications such as objective testing or forms of continuous assessment. The much applauded mode-3 examinations in the C.S.E. are a combination of almost all the devices referred to above. Yet no system has yet been implemented which has managed to

circumvent an over-reliance on the power of memory: the memory, what is more, of other people's opinions. English literature suffers from the same ravages at the hands of examinations, and a controversial article by Professor Harry Rée in the Times Educational Supplement complained that the same state of affairs pertained in the examinations written by students at the Colleges of Education.¹⁸

At the other end of the school system, the same excuses cannot be made for teaching that takes no account of new ideas, or the new opportunities open to teachers of the humanities. But there, there are other reasons. Budgeting difficulties, disciplinary problems, lack of proper facilities all contribute to a reluctance to experiment. But there is also good reason to believe that history teachers know little of the ideas being aired in their field, and more will be said on this point in chapter VII. In America refresher courses for history teachers have been heavily subsidised by the relevant State Department (and have been criticised for communicating the content rather than the nature of the latest historical conclusions and research). Whether or not they are imperfect, however, they cannot help but remind teachers that they ought not to cease to learn when they leave the university or training college. In the supplementary questions to the poll in Enquiry One, history was singled out as being particularly open to criticism by the pupils, under the heading of unsatisfactory teaching methods. No account of the state of history in our schools today can ignore the fact that in secondary schools, teachers are not taking up the challenge to their subject as spiritedly as educators outside the classroom.

¹⁸H. Rée, "The Real Examination Results", Times Educational Supplement, 6th November 1970, p. 2.

All in all, the state of history in our schools today gives rise neither to despondency nor complacency. Certainly it is in a state of flux, one which, it is suggested, is largely the result of a cumbersome adaptation to the new areas of relevance with which history must concern itself. Change is slow, both because teaching is a conservative profession (note remarks elsewhere on examinations and classroom methods) and because there is no clear agreement on the goals towards which change ought to be directed. Because change is so slow, there is, inevitably, some dissatisfaction both amongst educators and educated, and such dissatisfaction often looks for drastic remedies where more patient ones seem to be having little effect.

The proposed direction of this study

It is obviously no longer acceptable to a large sector of educationalists to regard history as a necessary evil whose survival, although a constant source of complaint, is nevertheless conceded. It is both desirable and necessary, therefore, to provide reasons which will satisfy not only these critics but others less antagonistic to the subject, of the justification of the place of history in the secondary school curriculum. This study therefore, set itself the following objectives : first, it aimed to put the case for the study of history in secondary schools. To do this it was necessary to summarise some of the conclusions regarding the nature of history. What is it that we are defending and how is it viewed by those who attack it? This done, it proposed to see what provisions are laid down by current curriculum theory regarding the criteria for the inclusion of subject matter in the secondary school curriculum. Moreover, it was recognised that by submitting history

to the supposedly neutral arbitration of curriculum theory, certain limitations or prescriptions might be laid upon it if a favourable judgement were returned.

In the event, justification was found in curriculum theory for the inclusion of history in the secondary school curriculum, and it did prove to be the case that, as a condition of that justification, a certain redirection of the focus of history courses was perhaps indicated.

The second concern of this study, therefore, was to examine some of the other features which have bearing on the organisation of history curricula, and in particular those, the negligence of which had given rise to some of the current disillusionment with history as a secondary school subject. The areas of concern chosen were the syllabus itself, the influence of examinations, the capacity of the pupil to profit from a study of history, and the ability of the teacher to communicate such study profitably. These were the factors, it was felt, which imposed the greatest restraints upon the teaching of history, and no conclusions drawn from curriculum theory would be remotely viable unless they took these restraints into account. From the prescriptions offered in the first part of this study, with due regard to the limitations imposed upon them by the issues raised in the second part of this study, the third part proposed to offer some considerations for drawing up a history curriculum. These considerations, in the main, arose from a detailed expression of a set of objectives for history teaching. It was felt that it was a lack of this clarity that was responsible for much of the current dissatisfaction with the teaching of history. These objectives were linked to the learning experiences and content which were most urgently prescribed by the principles examined in part one:

finally, procedures were suggested for evaluating with what success these objectives have been achieved. These objectives, learning experiences, content, and evaluation are intended, in sum, to form the basis for a secondary school history curriculum.

CHAPTER TWO

The Nature of History

In the first chapter it was detailed that it had been thought necessary to begin investigating the place of history in the curriculum by giving some account of the nature of history. To begin at any other point would be to invite confusion about what precise areas of concern one is attempting to locate in the curriculum. The cutting description of history as "one damn thing after another" is all too widely known. It is not for instance, on behalf of any activity that would lend itself to such a jibe, that representations are being made.

The nature of history has been the subject of much attention from eminent historians, historiographers, educationalists and philosophers. To attempt to add to or amend these would be both presumptuous and superfluous. It is here proposed only to offer some synthesis of the most widely held views of the nature of history, not in order to impose any uniformity or to detect a common purpose, but simply to place on record at the outset those assumptions of which use may be made later in this study. In particular, it is proposed to give attention to those aspects of the nature of history, which have implications for the aims of teaching history, and the aims of studying history, as without such considerations, a discussion of the nature of history may be meaningless in the school situation.

One might derive some rather deceptive courage from the fact that the question "What is history?" can be most easily answered at the most basic level. History is the study of man's past, in society. Many disciplines elude even such fundamental definition. However, the question follows - how is the story of man's past derived? - and immediately the floodgates of controversy are opened. It was more

widely held in the last century than it is today that history simply existed, and awaited "discovery" by historians. This was the philosophy that inspired Ranke's famous dictum that the facts should be allowed to speak for themselves and Acton's instructions to contributors to the Cambridge Modern History that it should not be possible to detect where any one writer had taken up or left off the narrative.

The point is that the story of man's past has been accumulated by historians, and must therefore be thought to be the victim of their interpretation and limitations. A duality in the nature of history is thus exposed. On the one hand history is the whole of the human past - on the other it is merely those parts of it which can conveniently be assimilated into the work of historians. Concern with this problem has been frequently expressed. "The basic facts belong to the raw materials of the historian, rather than to history itself".¹ W.H. Burston uncompromisingly bases his book The Principles of History Teaching on the statement "The ultimate test of any assertion about the nature of history is whether it is in practice what historians actually do".² We need "to start with history as a going concern, the actual work of historians".³ The current attitude seems to be, therefore, that history can only be approached via the limited objectivity of historians.

To some this is seen as detracting from the merits of history as a subject for study. The opinion of R.K. Merton that "historians... reside in a private world inhabited...by...unfathomable insights" was

¹E.H. Carr, *What is History* (London 1962) p. 5.

²W.H. Burston, The Principles of History Teaching (London 1963) p. 27.

³G.C. Field, "Some Problems of the Philosophy of History", in (Proceedings of the British Academy 1938) p. 56-7.

quoted in Chapter 1. Such criticism might merit more serious refutation, firstly, if it were true, and secondly, if the case for the study of history rested on its claims to be regarded as a science. However, it does not claim to be so regarded: it is, as shall be seen later, on its humanitarian virtues that its claims rest. No one would think to damn the study of English literature because poets and authors "reside in a private world inhabited by unfathomable insights".

Yet even such discussion appears to concede a principle which is by no means here being conceded. The objectivity of (good) historians is not limited by their ill will, or their professional incompetence, but by their unavoidable involvement in the times in which they live. It has been said often enough that "each age re-writes its own history". This point of view has gained ground to the exclusion of almost all contrary views. "The past", pronounced E.H. Carr "is encapsulated in the present: history is an endless dialogue between past and present."⁴ And it is only in this sense that it is suggested that the nature of history is confined by the objectivity of historians.

Yet it must be recognised that the past is to a great extent vulnerable to the manipulation of historians. Far from the facts speaking for themselves, it has been clearly demonstrated by the more cynical spirits who succeeded, and reacted to, Ranke that it is only after they have been selected and arranged that they "speak for themselves". Indeed, "every fact which the historian establishes presupposes some theoretical construction".⁵ Hook quotes as the archetypical example the census statistics which, though in one sense the

⁴E.H. Carr, op.cit., p. 24.

⁵S. Hook, "Education in the Age of Science", Daedalus 1959, p. 324.

barest of facts, have of course been interpreted by the organisation and classification in which they are presented. Thus even the most unexplanatory skeletons of "fact" are the victims of some compiler's concern. Thus is the dilemma of the modern historian exposed: he must present as clinically detached a narrative as possible, while knowing himself, or at any rate repeatedly being told to know himself, to be inseparable from the subjectivity of his own age and his own frame of reference. "He must act like a scientist although historical objectivity cannot exist".⁷ Once again, however, far from diminishing the value of the study of history, this element of human evaluation can be said to enhance it.

To what use, then, and for what purpose, do historians manipulate facts? Facts are simply the raw materials which enable the historian to construct a "significant narrative". But of what is this narrative significant? It is significant of the fact that "no one can write history without a point of view"⁸ and that that point of view is, consciously or unconsciously, "a theory of human nature which you do not derive from history but which you bring to it."⁹ It is significant, therefore, of a human viewpoint. And for what purpose does the historian propound this point of view? When all other answers have been offered and analysed, only one seems to withstand any assault.

⁷J.H. Plumb, Crisis in the Humanities (London 1964) p. 30.

⁸L.R. Perry, "The Covering Law Theory of Historical Explanation" in Studies in the Nature & Teaching of History edited by W.H. Burston & D. Thompson.

⁹W.H. Burston in "The Nature and Teaching of Contemporary History" in Studies in the Nature & Teaching of History edited by W.H. Burston & D. Thompson, p. 53.

That is the one given by Collingwood that "history is for human self-knowledge. It teaches us what man has done and therefore what man is."¹⁰ Some such philosophy must inspire the study of all these so-called humanities, and it is this essentially humanitarian purpose that must ultimately justify the study of history. This far from penetrating observation is nevertheless, too often in danger of obscurity by the weight and minuteness of research, and perhaps needs correction such as that administered by Professor H. Trevor-Roper in his inaugural lecture History, Professional and Lay: he felt the need to remind his hearers that ... "the central object of humane studies is the study of man. Humane studies can only bear a limited amount of specialisation. They need professional methods, but always for the pursuit of lay ends."¹¹

So much history teaching fails, even though its detractors do not express themselves in these terms, not because it is unhistorical, but because it is not humanitarian. To take one prevalent example: if a teacher dictates notes to his pupils, and then evaluates their performance by the accuracy with which they can reproduce these notes, he will have taught them little about human nature. Such notes might be couched in terms of impeccable historiography, but they beg the issue that history is to some degree subjective, that it is of the arts, and cannot be passively received as though no contrary interpretation were possible.

A start has been made, then, in probing the nature of history. It is the study of the human past in society, it is the "work of historians", it is essentially humanitarian. Our next concern is to discover whether

¹⁰R.G. Collingwood, The Idea of History (Oxford 1946) p. 318.

¹¹H. Trevor-Roper, History, Professional and Lay (Oxford 1957) p.5.

any distortion or abasement of these qualities takes place when history is adapted for teaching purposes.

The Nature of Schoolroom History

It has already been proposed that true historical objectivity is unattainable even when consciously pursued. How much less likely is its attainment, then, when the study of the human past in society is purposefully pared to meet the needs of schoolchildren? That process usually involves accounting for the existence of those institutions, conflicts, and situations which most immediately concern the pupil. Yet it is undeniable that to trace for instance, our parliamentary system back to the two knights and squires who left each shire at Edward's bidding, is somewhat to endow the development of this institution with "an illusory air of inevitability".¹² It is probable, too, that the departure of these knights will take on an importance which in their own times was wholly unwarranted. Such impressions are created often enough by historians who do not have the excuse of needing to be relevant to the experience of schoolchildren. It would not be far-fetched to say that historians like A.J.P. Taylor have made their reputations by restoring to history the role of accident, coincidence, and pure chance, which the nineteenth century historicists had removed from it. The Unification of Germany was regarded as the ultimate fruition of Bismark's grand design long before Professor M. Jeffreys published the "line of development" theory, or any pragmatist obtained intellectual respectability. Bismarck, of course, could account for the Kaiser, the Kaiser for the

¹²P. Thornhill quoted by D. Thompson, "Colligation and History Teaching" in Studies in the Nature and Teaching of History op.cit. p.106.

Great War, the Great War for Versailles, and Versailles for Hitler. It is a chain of cause and effect known only too well to modern schoolchildren. The emergence of what Oakeshote dubbed the "practical past" is, therefore, by no means the inevitable sequel of relating history to the experience of a schoolchild.

Teachers are thus sternly warned against the dangers of using the past to explain the present. Yet on the other hand they must continually have recourse to the well-tried educational principles of proceeding from the known to the unknown, from the particular to the general, and to explain by drawing analogies from the present to the past. It has been suggested above that what all "historians actually do", like it or not, is to disclose a relationship between past and present. Yet it is against the design of such relationships that purists admonish. The problem thus faced by the teacher seems all but insuperable. Yet can the relationship disclosed by the teacher not be "rather the relation of contrast than the relation of evolution"¹³?

Our second task was to see how the "work of historians" would be affected if grafted on to the classroom situation. The work of the (good) historian is approached with a particular frame of reference and a specialist's attitude to his materials. It is perhaps most aptly given expression in the dictum that "the chief object of the historian...should be to make it plain that in history...there can be no verdict without a trial."¹⁴ What skills then, does the historian bring to the business of conducting a good trial? Are these skills

¹³Ministry of Education, Pamphlet 23 (H.M.S.O. 1952) p. 18.

¹⁴M. Beloff, "The Study of Contemporary History" (History Mar. 1945) p. 84.

attainable in the ordinary classroom situation? Provided that it is always borne firmly in mind that these skills are means towards the end of human self-knowledge, and not that end itself, then they are eminently worth communicating in the classroom.

"I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of (students who leave the university) have acquired habits of thought and analysis, an approach to fact and argument which adds something positive to the skill and experience they will acquire in whatever profession they choose to enter."¹⁵

Of what do those "habits of thought" and "approach to fact" consist? They have been listed as "the retentive memory, the observant eye, the capacity for accurate and exhaustive statement"¹⁶, "accuracy in apprehension and statement, ability to distinguish what is relevant and select what is important, the weighing of evidence, the detection of bias, the distinguishing from truth from falsehood, or at least the probable from the impossible"¹⁷. It is immediately obvious that these skills will by no means be easily or universally acquired, but they are one of the few pathways to that state of "extending the sympathies, broadening the outlook"¹⁸ in which we would wish history pupils to find themselves. In all these skills children can be trained and of many of them they may remain unaware unless they are pointed out to them.

The third task which we set ourselves was to test the humanitarian nature of history against the yardstick of the classroom. The immediate reaction to this factor must be that whether or not human self-knowledge will be successfully distilled from history, or whether or not history

¹⁵J. Hurstfield, History in the Vith Form (Historical Association 1964) p. 3.

¹⁶G. Prothero, Why should we learn history? (Edinburgh 1894) p.18.

¹⁷I.A.A.M., The Teaching of History (Cambridge 1960), p.3.

¹⁸G.M. Trevelyan, History & the Reader (London 1945) p. 18.

is the best source from which to distil it, for most children, apart from English literature, capable of equally stunning irrelevance, it is probably the only one offered.

However, if it is well suited to this task, the reason is that it is "for self-knowledge" because its components are the sum of human self-knowledge. Trevelyan's stately pronouncement is concerned with the same principle - "History is the house in which all subjects dwell."¹⁹ To few people other than historians is permitted the indulgence of saying as Montaigne said, "I am a man, and nothing that is human is beneath my interest."

The humanitarian nature of history therefore has implications which extend far beyond the history classroom. "It becomes the subject above all others giving a cultural education."²⁰ It is studied "to give cohesion and deeper meaning to the rest of the curriculum, providing the context for all that the pupil sees around him."²¹ Thus the humanitarian responsibilities laid on the doorstep of the historian are heavy indeed. To history falls the task of transmitting understandings and attitudes which will be employed in the study of every subject in the curriculum.

Small wonder that those who accept this responsibility see the knowledge of human nature and the ability to enter imaginatively into other men's minds as leading to infinite possibilities. "Knowledge of the past", said the Dutch philosopher P.J. Blok, "can serve to a better understanding of the present. And a good understanding

¹⁹H.M. Trevelyan, op.cit. p. 27.

²⁰I.A.A.M., op.cit. p. 5.

²¹C.S.E., Examination Bulletin no. 1 (H.M.S.O. 1963), p. 50.

of the present is one of the best guarantees of a wise treatment of this present, with a view to the things which the future will bring us."²² "The end and scope of all history being to teach us by example of times past, such wisdom as may guide our desires and actions."²³ This is the highest hope held out on behalf of history, that a knowledge of the past may enable man to construct a utopian future. By this criteria therefore, no one can less afford to be ignorant of history than politicians. To them we entrust the direction of our future.

The humanitarian nature and purpose of history, if what has been said above has any truth in it, simply vindicates the attempt to teach the subject in the classroom. It must be recorded then, that the capacity of history to sustain such pretensions is continually being challenged. From Hegel - "The one thing that one learns from history is that no one ever learns very much from history" - through Henry Ford to Professor Jerome Bruner, history has been under attack.

History and its Critics

Its detractors blaze away from a number of points of vantage. They claim that history is not the whole story of the human past, but is only that part of it which educators wish to impose upon the young. They claim that the "work of historians" is something that cannot be adequately understood until adulthood, and, that in any event, it is only the conclusions and not the modus operandi of the historian that

²² P.J. Blok, quoted in G.J. Renier, History, its Purpose and Method (London 1961) p.225.

²³ Walter Raleigh quoted in A.L. Rowse, The Use of History (London 1946) p. 21.

are communicated in the classroom. They claim that the bulk of the subject matter and the complexities involved render its humanitarianism impotent.

These objections must be briefly discussed, although, as indicated at the beginning of this chapter, what is sought here is not a justification of history, but a statement which will enable us to locate more precisely a possible place and role for the subject in the curriculum.

The first of the criticisms detailed above is concerned with the susceptibility of history to become a vehicle for indoctrination. But does the incontrovertible truth of this release us from, or confirm us in, our obligation to teach history? The fate of history in the Soviet Union is often instanced as an example of the dangerous potential of history. "I care not who makes the laws of a country, if I have the making of its songs. Not less true would it be to say 'if I have the making of its primary school historical manuals'".²⁴ Is this not a more sinister but no less valid expression of the idea that it is the duty of history to convey to a pupil his "political inheritance"? This concept is currently losing ground, although, as the following exchange may show, not without resistance:

"Dr. Cole replied that...it would be presumptuous of either him or Lord Langford to dictate to children what they should do. 'Balderdash', commented Lord Langford, and then left."²⁵

The problem is as much that there is little certainty about what parts of history will be valuably transmitted as whether we are right to hand down any values at all. "What had changed was the notion about

²⁴C. Oman, On the Writing of History (London 1939) p. 44.

²⁵The Times (17/4/71) p. 2.

what that tradition was and what was important to us within it."²⁶

History, therefore as servant or master, has unpredictable effects. But it ought not to be fought shy of for this reason. It is for history of high integrity and good intent that a brief is being held, not for history that has been distorted in "bad faith", in Sartre's phrase.

The second criticism detailed above concerned the difficulty which children find in approaching the "work of historians". Chapter 6 looks into the spread of age and intellect for whom such activity is meaningful. Some writers, faced with the scale of the challenge, are frankly defeatist. "I doubt the wisdom of teaching history to schoolchildren at all"²⁷ says Professor Elton. But there is reason to believe that even if many of the historians' tools are imperfectly used, that they can be used well enough to warrant instruction being given in their use. Then too, there are complaints that in the school-room the work of historians is neglected, and that there the only concern is with their conclusions, and while this has been largely true, and even if significant efforts are being made now to remedy this situation, a distinction must be maintained between the nature of the subject, and its maltreatment by those who teach it. Is it a weakness of history or a weakness of education that these criticisms attack?

The last criticism detailed above concerned the failure of history to communicate any human self-knowledge because of the sheer bulk of the work, the pressure of examinations and the complexities of the understanding required. It has been recognised how destructive of their aims are the first two factors, and such recourses as the "patch"

²⁶ Ministry of Education, op.cit. p. 15.

²⁷ G.R. Elton, The Practice of History (Sydney 1967) p. 145.

method of teaching, and the Mode-3 examination of the C.S.E. are trying to repair that damage. History as it has for too long been taught, has contributed all too little to human self-knowledge, and is paying for that omission by the need to defend its very life against those who would destroy it, but history as it might be taught can yield what is claimed on its behalf, and from the ordeal by fire through which it is presently passing, a more self-conscious, volatile, and less anachronistic subject may emerge.

CHAPTER THREE

The Aims of the Curriculum

The broader spectrum in which we would wish to find a place for history is the secondary school curriculum. Today the importance and the difficulty of making a proper assessment of the curriculum has been recognised by the formation of a separate branch of study which specialises in the construction of the curriculum. The tendency is to look for blueprints for curriculum construction from this infant scion of educational philosophy, whereas the curriculum specialist is equally anxious to demonstrate his inability to provide such information.

In an area where so much confusion exists, it is necessary to be absolutely clear on fundamental principles. What, then, is a curriculum? It is suggested that it is "a design of a social group for the educational experiences of their children in school".¹ In other words it is the overall organisation of a pupil's educational experience. What, then, is meant by statements such as "There are no signs in curriculum studies, either in England or elsewhere, of detailed attention being given to the integration of the curriculum as a whole."² Can the curriculum, unless prefaced by some specific subject reference, be concerned with anything less than its "integration...as a whole"?

What procedures must be followed then, by the social group which wishes to design the educational experiences of its children in school? Wheeler suggests that the following approach be adopted:

¹G.A. Beauchamp, Curriculum Theory (Illinois 1961) p. 34.

²J.F. Kerr, "The Problem of Curriculum Reform", Changing the Curriculum edited by J.F. Kerr (London 1968) p. 27.

- a) The selection of aims, goals and objectives.
- b) The selection of learning experiences calculated to help the attainment of these aims, goals and objectives.
- c) The selection of content.
- d) The organisation and integration of learning experiences and content.
- e) The evaluation of b), c) and d) in attaining a).³

This procedure, rational and well constructed as it is, is obviously heavily dependent on a clear statement of a) - the selection of aims, goals and objectives - as b), c), d), and e) follow directly upon such an explication. However, although educationalists are generally ready to commit themselves as to objectives, there is a decided unwillingness in the Western world today to make any commitment upon the aims of education. To be able to make such a commitment is to visualise with some certainty, the society for which such education is a preparation. In an age when "doubt has replaced faith as a test of scholarship"⁴ there is a general reluctance to lay claim, no matter how unassertively, to such a certainty.

This was not, of course, the case forty years ago or more, nor is it universally the case today. To the Consultative Committee for Secondary Education it seemed "scarcely possible to exaggerate the importance of education for citizenship".⁵ And elsewhere in the world there seems often to be less diffidence about the statement of aims.

³D.K. Wheeler, Curriculum Process (London 1967) p.30.

⁴B. Wilson, The Youth Culture and the Universities (London 1970) p. 53.

⁵The Consultative Committee for Secondary Education (H.M.S.O. 1938) p. 150.

"The history of American Secondary Schools suggest that two fundamental and closely related purposes have become dominant: the development of the individual and the maintenance and improvement of American democracy." ⁶

In Russia, Lenin's pronouncement still holds good that "we must declare openly...the function of the school...It is to construct a Communist Society."⁷ And in certain communities bound by religion, or patriotism which feels itself threatened, there is also a clearer statement of aims.

"Now the evaluation is more mature, because it realises that the Christian ethic is the one philosophy adequate to meet modern needs. It is therefore the basis of the Congregation's thought, its *raison d'être* as a teaching unit, and the integrating principle in its system." ⁸

Or

"It is from history that we must learn that every one of us is a favoured fellow traveller on the road of life which extends from Source (God) to final goal (Christ). The meaning of history lies in the fact that we have received it from the revelation of God." ⁹

In England, however, a more hesitant attitude prevails today. This hesitation seems to be derived from two sources - firstly, a lack of faith in the power of education to bring about the desired patterns of society, and second, a complete absence of certainty as to what those patterns should be. "Education is too uncertain to permit the possibility of human engineering"¹⁰, commented Professor Peters, conveying rather sinister overtones, by the use of the word "engineering",

⁶W.M. Alexander, The Changing Secondary School Curriculum (New York 1967) p. 3.

⁷H.G. Rickover, Education for All Children (New York 1967) p. 7.

⁸M. Idinscott, The Quiet Revolution (Edinburgh 1966) p. 291.

⁹M.J. Swart, The Meaning, Purpose, Nature and Value of History (University of Port Elizabeth 1972), p. 16.

¹⁰R.S. Peters, Ethics and Education (London 1966) p. 32.

to the whole concept of curriculum design at all. The Plowden Report was forced, after a specific investigation into the point, to conclude that "general statements of aims...tend to be little more than expressions of benevolent aspiration...which may have a rather tenuous relationship to the educational practices which actually go on there."¹¹ They resorted to consulting a number of "distinguished educationalists"¹² (unnamed) who all "confirmed the view that general statements of aims were of limited value, and that a more pragmatic approach for the purposes of education was likely to be more fruitful."¹³ Of course, it is not its fruitfulness but its precision in defining the "purposes of education" that is in question. "The ultimate purpose of education" was Professor Bantock's verdict, "is clarification of the world of nature, the world of man, and of the internal world of sensation and reflection, of emotion and cognition."¹⁴ Would it be possible to develop a curriculum upon such a statement of aims? The problem has perhaps been devastatingly summed up in the verdict that "aims can only be expressed in terms of faith, hope and charity."¹⁵

However, as was said earlier, lack of clarity on the nature of aims is largely the result of a lack of certainty as to the society in which those aims are to find expression. That lack of certainty results chiefly from the rapidity with which society has changed and is changing. There is a widespread apprehension lest the aims presented

¹¹The Plowden Report, Children and their Primary Schools (H.M.S.O. 1966) p. 186.

¹²The Plowden Report, op.cit. p. 186.

¹³The Plowden Report, op.cit. p. 186.

¹⁴G.H. Bantock, The Implications of Literacy (Leicester 1966) p.16.

¹⁵W.K. Richmond, The School Curriculum (London 1971) p. 176.

for education today will be out-dated almost before they are promulgated. What is sought after is a curriculum sufficiently elastic to accommodate the ideals of yesterday, today, and those preposterous unknowns of tomorrow. A curriculum specialist describes the dilemma of educationalists as follows:

"If the curriculum remains static in a dynamic society... it is likely that the education which is meant to induct the young into society and to promote an intelligent understanding of it, will cater only for needs and values which no longer exist...studies therefore, will necessarily be directed only towards things as they are and might be - that is, with descriptive subject matter - but also with the normative, with the idea of what society ought to be and with the possible impact of this upon the school." ¹⁶

The Plowden Report thought that the prime need of schoolchildren was to be "adaptable"¹⁷. Is our age, then, one so much more beset by uncertainties than any other? Is this the first era in which we have had to be warned that "new pupils...presuppose the need for new curricula"¹⁸? Or is it merely the first in which the aims of education have been adequately related to the pressures placed upon them by the society in which they are to operate?

Curriculum development is enormously complicated by the variety of authorities who feel themselves entitled to some share in its shaping. The expectations of the pupils themselves, their parents, the teachers, head teachers, governing bodies, the examination boards, local education authorities and the current political ideologues will be sufficiently diverse to make all but impossible the selection, to refer to Wheeler's design for curriculum process, of unanimously acceptable aims, and hence

¹⁶D.K. Wheeler, op.cit. p. 15.

¹⁷The Plowden Report, op.cit. p. 185.

¹⁸W.K. Richmond, op.cit. p. 16.

of learning experiences and content calculated to help the attainment of these aims. These complications might be regarded as being permanent considerations affecting the statement of aims upon which curriculum development may proceed. Of more particular concern to contemporary educational problems are other pressures listed by W.K. Richmond in an excellent analysis of factors promoting change.¹⁹ There is a universal trend towards a longer school life, coupled with a simultaneous tendency towards earlier physical maturity. There is a sharply declining demand for unskilled and semi-skilled labour, coupled with a growing need for occupational adaptability. There is a continuing growth of leisure time, augmented by the greater expectation of life; and a decrease in distinction between the role of the sexes. All these factors must obviously, to some extent, alter the requirements of education whose fulfilment is expressed in terms of aims.

It is not merely the difficulty of arriving at any concensus of opinion upon the aims of education which hinders the progress of curriculum development. A number of constants are actively resistant to change. One is what has been described as "the institutionalised power of a subject-centred curriculum".²⁰ This should not be taken to decry the subject-centred curriculum, but to indicate, by virtue of the deep entrenchment in universities, colleges and schools of subject-centred study, one of the factors which inhibits a completely fresh approach to curriculum construction. Another is the apparent reluctance to dispense with a reliance upon examinations, which themselves seem always to be lagging in the far rear of educational advance. Another is the conservatism of the teaching profession, dealt with more

¹⁹W.K. Richmond, *op.cit.* pp. 16-22.

²⁰W.K. Richmond, *op.cit.* p. 25.

fully in Chapter 7 which gives rise to such complaints as "One baffling aspect in involving teachers in changing a curriculum is their lack of faith in their own ability to tackle curriculum revision."²¹ And "in the school situation...little premium is placed on experimentation."²² When it is remembered, however, that nearly all of the existing school subjects are of very recent implementation, some optimism about the adaptability of education may be justified.

However, if the formulation of aims appears to grow more and more difficult, is some comfort to be derived from the fact that objectives are being defined with more and more precision? By objectives we mean "those changes in pupil behaviour which it is intended to bring about by learning."²³ Does more precise formulation of objectives constitute that "more pragmatic approach to the purposes of education" which the Plowden Report hoped would be "more fruitful"? Nevertheless, despite the feeling that "aims are 'out', objectives are very decidedly 'in'",²⁴ there seems to be something slightly artificial about objectives that are not rooted in any educational philosophy, i.e. encompassed by a set of educational aims. It seems, too, that where aims cannot be agreed upon, objectives soon may lose some of their precision.

Wheeler's design for curriculum process is, in the presence of such lack of commitment, so difficult to implement, that curriculum specialists have resorted to inverting the process. Nisbet tried to

²¹H. Taba, Curriculum Development (New York 1962) p. 464.

²²H. Taba, op.cit. p. 463.

²³R.W. Tyler, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction (Chicago 1949) p. 69.

²⁴W.K. Richmond, op.cit. p. 175.

define the contribution each of the most widely taught school subjects could make to a possible set of aims or objectives,²⁵ and earned the rebuke that this was "illicit curriculum process in that it derives goals from subject matter instead of selecting subject matter with a view to achieving goals...The criteria most likely to be used are those which are most readily available."²⁶ Miss Taba suggests

"that both for the sake of curriculum improvement and for the development of sounder curriculum theory, the sequence in the method of developing curriculum designs needs to be inverted. Instead of starting with general designs, a start needs to be made with reconsidering and replanning learning-teaching units as the first step in curriculum development...it is possible also that this inversion of the sequence in curriculum building will help bridge the gap between theory and practice... curriculum guides which are evolved from and implemented by concrete learning-teaching units prepared by teachers should be easier to introduce to the teaching staffs...and are more likely to affect classroom practice than do the current guides which stop short of any guidance for converting the rather sketchy schemes into instructional practices."²⁷

Whatever conclusions are reached, or are not reached, on aims and objectives, it will still be incumbent upon us to select learning experiences which will further these aims and to select "content" from which to derive such learning experiences. In particular, it is the business of this study to determine whether that content should include the study of history, and if so, which particular learning experiences the study of history will be called upon to effect.

"What agreement can be reached in the midst of this uncertainty about the objectives of English education?" asks the Plowden Report. "One obvious purpose is to fit children for the society into which they will grow up...for such a society they will need above all to

²⁵S. Nisbet, Purpose in the Curriculum (London 1957).

²⁶D.K. Wheeler, op.cit. p. 181.

²⁷H. Taba, op.cit. p. 441.

be adaptable and capable of adjusting to their changing environment. They will need to be able to live with their fellows, appreciating and respecting their differences, understanding and sympathising with their feelings."²⁸ S. Hook considered the chief obligation of education to be to enable children to "understand the society in which they live."²⁹ The Newsom Report concluded that "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 freeman even though he has the vote."³⁰

The same need to fit the child for his place in society underlies the first half of Nisbet's statement of the "practical Objectives of Education", that is, "Adjustment to the Environment." Unprescriptive though these conclusions are, it might timidly be suggested that their common ground is a feeling that education should prepare a child for the society which embraces the school.

If this is the case, what learning experiences and what content should such education prescribe? If education is to fit a child for life, then is there not "one subject matter for education" and that is "life in all its manifestations"³¹? Thus it is said that "education must be practical, realistic and vocational"³² if it is to be clear to pupils that the subject matter for education is life in all its manifestations. On these grounds there seems slender support for

²⁸Plowden Report, op.cit. p. 185.

²⁹S. Hook, op.cit. p. 334.

³⁰The Newsom Report (H.M.S.O. 1963) p. 163.

³¹A.N. Whitehead, Aims of Education (London 1929) p.11.

³²Plowden Report, op.cit. p. 232.

history of which Whitehead scathingly said "from which nothing follows"³³. However, for better or worse, it is the past which has moulded the present. The present is the outcome of the ideals, conflicts, stresses, pressures, accidents and intentions of the past.

One might be tempted to say that nothing is more important to an understanding of the society in which one lives than a knowledge of its historical development. "The general thesis is that without the tempering influence of history, there is danger of great distortion in a picture of current social reality."³⁴ To someone unaware, for instance, of the enormous advance in social welfare over the past century, the present condition of people in economically depressed areas may seem criminally oppressive. To someone ignorant of the "Scramble for Africa" the Africans' treatment of their apparent benefactors today might appear incomprehensibly ungrateful. Therefore it seems essential, in order to satisfy almost all expressions of educational aims, that at least some history be studied. This history may differ in some aspects from that taught in most schools today: it may not be taught, as it usually is at present, to the exclusion of most other humanities or social sciences: it may or may not be taught in isolation as a separate subject: but the case for the study of some history will, however, be very hard to shake.

³³A.N. Whitehead, op.cit. p. 29.

³⁴E.W. Fenton, Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools, edited by E.W. Fenton (New York 19) p. 111.

The Place of History in the Curriculum

Having submitted our case for the inclusion of the study of history in the secondary school curriculum to the supposedly impartial arbitration of curriculum theory, it follows, that we must accept the obligations laid upon us by that verdict. That verdict constitutes an imperium to teach that history which throws most light on the society in which the pupil lives. Here again we are not free of value judgements, /as we must now decide which areas of history throw most light on the present. They will not necessarily be those dealing with contemporary, or near contemporary history, although these will not be able to be omitted. It might well be thought, however, that the study of the government of Ancient Greece or the establishment of parliamentary control in 17th Century England threw more light on the present than relatively more recent periods. It might be thought that the study of a completely unrelated civilization such as that of the Incas, by way of contrast, threw light upon aspects of the society in which the pupil lived which he might too readily take for granted. Nevertheless, there are two principles involved here, which cannot be tampered with. One is that, whatever history is chosen for study, the pupil should understand, or be made to understand, where lies its relevance to the society in which he lives. The second is that "we must allow no child to leave school under the delusion that history stops. Still less should we isolate something called Current Affairs or Social Studies from the historical background to which they belong."³⁵ It is because syllabuses which stop short at 1939 or even 1914 have all too often been responsible for the "illusion that history stops" that history is sometimes seen as

³⁵C.F. Strong, History in the Secondary School (London 1964) p. 59.

being unable to contribute to the pupil's understanding of the society in which he lived. Thus the first obligation laid upon history by the processes of curriculum development is that it should put the world in which the pupil will find himself into its proper historical perspective.

As well as starting now, it seems essential, if we are to explain the society in which we live to a pupil, that we start here and now. This is where the world of the pupil takes visible shape, no matter how directly or indirectly that shape reflects pressures in distant capitals or even foreign markets. It may be too that lack of understanding of a pupil's immediate environment produces attitudes which distort (or simply prevent) his thinking on national and international issues: for instance, how many political parties exist simply by capitalising on feelings of local racialism? Therefore, if history is to make its proper contribution to helping a child to understand the society in which he lives, it seems necessary that it should encompass local, regional, national and international history. There are few societies today which can be understood unless all of these have been put into their proper context.

The last broad condition imposed upon history by its acceptance by curriculum theory is that if it is to contribute to an understanding of the society in which the pupil lives, it must play its part in developing those skills which enhance understanding: that is, it cannot be content with a simple communication of fact, what Bloom and his associates categorised as "Knowledge", but it must proceed to those other skills identified by them as Comprehension, Application, Analysis, Synthesis and Evaluation.³⁶

³⁶B.S. Bloom and associates, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives (London 1956).

To summarise these conclusions, then, if we justify the teaching of history by reference to educational aims, and curriculum theory, it seems necessary, whatever other history is taught, (and there may be room for much more) to teach children something of contemporary history, something of very recent history, and something of the development of the great institutions of our own times. It seems necessary to teach children something of parochial history and regional history, as well as of national history and international history. It seems necessary to teach history too, in such a way that it promotes understanding and not merely knowledge or retention of it; otherwise history will never fulfil that guardianship for which Newsom believed it to be specially qualified, of protecting children from being "easy game for the hidden persuaders"³⁷.

It must be asked, then, whether anything is being asked here, of history, which it is unable to fulfil, or which, in fulfilling, may so distort it as to defeat the purpose of its participation? In Chapter 2 were expressed the fears of some writers that, if the past were used to explain the present, it would be so selective a treatment of the past that it would be historically unrecognisable. "If the study of history is to make some specific contribution to the present and its problems, it must be the past as it actually was, and not the past specifically selected and used for its practical value."³⁸ Professor Butterfield, even more categorically, thought that "any concept of history as an explanation of the present becomes anti-historical. Its logical conclusion...would be the study of the present

³⁷Newsom Report, op.cit. p. 163.

³⁸W.H. Burston, Principles of History Teaching op.cit. p. 27.

without reference to the past."³⁹ However, what such criticisms seem to tilt at is not bad theory but bad practice. Would Professor Butterfield contest that the present can be understood more fully through a study of the past? Probably not. What he would contest is that the present is the inevitable, or only possible outcome of the past. Where this impression exists it is due to methods that certainly do deserve to be labelled "anti-historical" - such methods, after all, violate the principle that "a historian attempts to make clear exactly what possibilities of action a particular situation contained"⁴⁰ - but to use history to explain the present is not, per se, anti-historical. The history which was demanded of us was that which threw most light on the present, and if we are to put forward the present as the only possible outcome of the past, we have, of course, not illuminated the present but obscured it. On the other hand, it must be recognised that the present is the only frame of reference available to pupils in their study of the past, and in taking advantage of the concession that "present experience is both the basis from which the study of the past must be commenced, and a useful way of firing interest: but it does follow...that the present (is a) starting-point, and not more, to the study of the past"⁴¹ we will assuredly be at the starting-point more often than at the finishing-line.

The next possible target for criticism is the principle of teaching contemporary history. This principle has seen so many

³⁹H. Butterfield, The Whig Interpretation of History (London 1931) p. 31.

⁴⁰W.B. Gallie, Philosophy and the Historical Understanding (London 1964) p. 123.

⁴¹W.H. Burston, Principles of History Teaching op.cit. p. 90.

proponents and defenders in recent years⁴² that it is not proposed to add to their number here. Suffice it to say that there remains a body of opinion which regards contemporary history as unteachable, or without value, because of the impossibility of even approaching our own times with the proper degree of historical objectivity. Judging by the number of courses which deal with contemporary history under such names as Current Affairs or World Events, there must also be people who deny the very existence of contemporary history. On the other hand, as it is now thought by most historians that absolute objectivity is unattainable no matter what period of history is being studied, contemporary history is no longer felt to be quite as disadvantaged on this score. Second, as long as it is made incontrovertibly clear that the study of contemporary history is undertaken with certain reservations, that many of one's conclusions may be overturned within a few years, and that fresh evidence may contradict what we now believe to be fact, it could prove to provide even greater opportunities for the exercise of the historian's skills than does less recent history. Another still more powerful argument for the study of contemporary history is that if knowledge of contemporary history is not learned in the classroom, where will it be learned but from television, tabloids, and political demagogues? And imperfect though the classroom approach may be, it is surely the lesser of the two evils.

Another concept which has been attacked from a variety of standpoints is that of teaching national history. Some attack it for producing too chauvinistic or xenophobic an attitude, some because it is now too narrow, and that the world has so shrunk that only international

⁴²vide G. Barraclough, History in A Changing World (Oxford 1955) for the best presentation of an argument to break down the resistance to teaching contemporary history.

history will do, some because it too cannot possibly be approached sufficiently objectively, and some because it does not extend the pupil's imagination and sympathy sufficiently. However, the same arguments must be raised against these objections as were raised previously: that national history, well taught, will not produce too chauvinistic an attitude, nor restrict the extension of pupils' sympathies and imaginations. It is not national history, but badly taught national history, that such criticisms in fact are levelled at. Why there has been a reaction to national history is because so often it seems to be taught to the exclusion of all other history. The tendency has been, too, to try to cover the whole of the national history, which has resulted in a rather hurried coverage. But if this second principle is sacrificed, then there will be room to right the wrongs of the first. And if this error is righted, then one would expect to hear fewer suggestions such as the strange one that pupils would benefit more from the detailed study of the history of a foreign country than of their own.⁴³ The vital point here is that, no matter how national history may, in the past, have abused its position, it is still the history which is most important to an understanding of the society in which a pupil lives, and cannot therefore be omitted, or merely skimped.

As for local history, it is often alleged that it is dull. It is also pointed out that very rarely are adequate books available. Both these objections must be met by teachers themselves. Neither of them touch the principle that some local history is a curricular necessity. The difficulties here offered must challenge and not deter.

⁴³W.H. Burston, Principles of History Teaching op.cit. p. 174.

Then, before leaving the selection of content, it must be noted that there are many educationalists who believe that the content of history courses is entirely irrelevant and that all that matters is how we teach history. Bruner's dictum that we aim to transmit "not the conclusions but the mode of enquiry of the specialist"⁴⁴ has been echoed many times. "The problem at school level is not as is sometimes concluded, to keep up to date with the conclusions of historical research, but more to teach the nature of conclusions."⁴⁵ Elsewhere, the debates about what should be included in history courses have been dismissed as "silly academic arguments"⁴⁶. As this point is more fully dealt with in Chapter 4, it will not be elaborated here. It is necessary to point out, however, that, although this study would not dispute that "a sense of what facts are" is more important than "a knowledge of the facts"⁴⁷, that sense may be beyond the intellect or the maturity of so many pupils of school-leaving age⁴⁸, that some care must be devoted to the consideration of what residual knowledge will be gleaned, if the hoped-for "sense of what facts are" is not successfully imparted. Even if it could be assumed that the "mode of enquiry of the specialist" is being practiced with complete success by every member of the class, it seems no more than common sense that the

⁴⁴J. Bruner, "The Importance of Structure", Teaching of the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools op.cit. p. 82.

⁴⁵W. Lamont, "A Black Paper reconsidered", Teaching History Vol. I No. 2 p. 201.

⁴⁶R. Brown, "History as Discovery: an Interim report on the Amhurst Project", in Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary schools op.cit. p. 445.

⁴⁷R. Brown, op.cit. p. 444.

⁴⁸vide Chapter 6 for a fuller discussion of this problem.

material on which these skills are to be practiced can be chosen with varying degrees of usefulness. A carefully planned study of the feudal system may equip a pupil with the skills to understand and evaluate capitalism and communism, but it does not automatically enforce such evaluation, and it seems only sensible that, rather than risk neglect or ignorance of factors as fundamental today as these, that such skills may be taught via a study of them.

The last broad target for criticism is the capacity of history to promote understanding of a pupil's environment or to promote the intellectual skills to which it claims to give particular access.

Once again, these criticisms seem to rest on bad practice rather than bad theory. Certainly no understanding is derived from taking down dictated notes and reproducing them as fully as possible in essay form. Certainly no intellectual skills are transmitted by studying a single text book and accepting its interpretation as holy writ. But this is simply to say that these methods cannot achieve these ends, not that history is incapable of doing so. There is a more complex problem involved here, and that is that the success of history teaching is so often called into question because so much of its intended effect falls into what Bloom and his collaborators called the Affective Domain. Of how much achievement here the school is capable is almost unknown. The study made by J. Douglas, for instance, seemed to indicate that the influence of the school on a child's attitudes was very much less even than had formerly been supposed.⁴⁹

Three things are being called into question here. First is the ability of the school to make any impact upon the Affective Domain. "The capacity of education in general and of schools in particular to

⁴⁹J. Douglas, Home and the School (London 1964).

assume a leading role in changing the society and particularly the social structure has been seriously questioned."⁵⁰ Second is the wisdom of the schools in attempting to make any impact upon the Affective Domain. "In contrast, our schools dissipate their energies on marginally useful courses, on life adjustment training...while neglecting the one thing that no other agency can do (i.e. technical training."⁵¹ Third is the right of the school to make any such impact. "Neither should a school be concerned about social conditioning, partly because it works against tremendous odds and therefore is ineffectual, partly because the socialisation of the individual is the very means of squelching the creativity and independence of the intellect."⁵²

What the school can, in fact, best do is to test how successfully it has affected the Cognitive Domain, and it has long been argued, and will be looked into again later, that not only does the school do this very inefficiently, but by that inefficiency negates most of the success that might have been achieved in the Affective Domain. On the other hand many of the objectives of the Affective Domain are within easier reach if those of the Cognitive Domain have been met. "Valuing", for instance, can be but perfunctorily achieved if Analysis, Synthesis and Evaluation have not been exercised. However, if it is the case that history partakes of the overall difficulties of the school in transmitting more than knowledge, it has certainly nowhere been satisfactorily proposed that any other of the humanities would be more successful in doing so.

⁵⁰H. Taba, op.cit. p. 389.

⁵¹W.M. Alexander, op.cit. p. 3.

⁵²A. Bestor, "Education and its Proper Relation to the Forces of American Society", Daedalus 1959.

In summary, then, this chapter has attempted to locate the role of history in the curriculum. Directed by the rules of curriculum process to begin by selecting aims, goals and objectives, it is found that the only certainty possible in such selection was that it could not be attempted with any certainty. Nevertheless it was felt that it could be ventured that education is for life and that therefore, it should help children to understand the society in which they lived. It was felt, then, that without any knowledge of history, a child's understanding of the society in which he lived would be seriously impaired. However, history's credibility had been undermined by the teaching of much history that could do little or nothing to aid a child's understanding of the society in which he lived, and therefore it was necessary to state clearly that the history which could best achieve that, would be based on recent history, local and national history, and would offer opportunities for the exercise of certain mental skills.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Function of the Syllabus

In Chapter 1 it was explained why it was thought necessary to attempt a new ratiocination of history: at present not only were its own practitioners somewhat disillusioned about its nature and purpose, but there were critics who saw, not without good reason, in such uncertainty, added justification for removing it from the curriculum altogether. Chapter 2 defined, therefore, what was understood by the term "history" and thus established for what it was that ratiocination was being sought. Chapter 3, then, asked broader questions. It asked what the purpose of education was, and suggested that this purpose was to prepare a child for life. This preparation involved enabling a child to understand the society in which he lived. It was felt that without a study of history such an understanding was impossible. It was felt, too, that these terms of reference imposed an obligation to place some emphasis on certain aspects of history. The next step would be to organise those aspects into a practicable syllabus.

A practicable syllabus however, has to take into account very much more than aims and objectives. It has to take into account the changes it undergoes at the hands of teachers, its reception by pupils, its assessment by examination or any other means, its constriction by the time available to it, and its openness to misinterpretation or re-interpretation. A practicable syllabus must also examine to what extent its aims or objectives are translatable in terms of content or direction for study. The practicable syllabus will recognise, therefore, that between its intentions and its performance may lie a yawning breach. Syllabuses are of those things that must be honoured more in

the spirit than in the letter of their laws. Syllabuses may prescribe the study of local history, for instance, but, as happened in one of the schools investigated in the course of this research, a very ambitious and imaginative programme of local history had to be abandoned when two senior history teachers left simultaneously, and their replacements, brought in from other parts of the country, felt unequal to teaching something so parochial without a period of acclimatisation. Syllabuses may prescribe that children be taught the skills of historical thinking, and may be successfully employed towards such ends, but little will be achieved while examinations ask questions such as "Describe the various types of school which provided for the education of the working-class child during this period"¹. Syllabuses may look towards the benefits supposedly derived from the teaching of history but ignore the inability of children to understand the concepts or the time span or the principles of equilibrium involved. The influence of teachers, examinations, and the development of the pupil are more fully examined in the following three chapters.

Whatever assumptions it may make, or fail to make, the syllabus must nevertheless reflect a philosophy of history. Even if the syllabus seems to be no more than "the statement of the content and order of study"², it is, in effect, the visible expression of an underlying philosophy of history. The syllabus that deals exclusively with the national story reflects the conviction that this is the history which will most benefit the pupil. The syllabus that studies "patches" in great depth reflects the feeling that history is as much or more

¹University of London G.C.E. A-Level History, January 1971, q.52.

²W.H. Burston, Principles of History Teaching op.cit. p. 109.

concerned with method as with matter. The syllabus that combines the study of history with allegedly related disciplines reflects the conviction that school subjects must be no more compartmentalised than is the life for which they are preparing the child. Syllabuses which seem continually to expand, to absorb more material, lay themselves open to charges such as "historians seem dedicated to the theory of total recall"³. Syllabuses which stop fifty years short of our own time reflect the apprehension that it is not possible to teach recent history, with sufficient objectivity. Therefore, although a syllabus cannot express the whole of an educational philosophy, it is wholly the product of such a philosophy, and requires therefore to be far more self-conscious of its aims and objectives than is sometimes the case.

The syllabus and its implementation work by a process of constant interaction upon each other. For instance, just as the teacher, to some extent, circumscribes the syllabus, so does the syllabus circumscribe the teacher. The school syllabus will obviously be linked to the teaching aids and textbooks at the disposal of the teacher, while continuity will force teachers who are new to schools, or whose classes are new to them, to embark upon, or complete, programmes that are inimical to them. In some respects, the modern "integrated" courses are most binding of all upon the teacher, because in addition to the limitations mentioned above, he may be tied to some sort of co-operation with the English, art, geography, or religious knowledge departments. Influential as the syllabus is upon teachers who find its restrictions irksome, where paramountly it asserts itself to be more than a mere agenda of business to be conducted is where the teacher

³J.H. Plumb, op.cit. p. 28.

all too willingly submit to its limitations. The caricature of the teacher who wields the syllabus like a guillotine is a familiar one, clipping off the edge of any interests that stray outside the prescribed limits, covering the ground as mechanically as a long-distance runner.⁴

However, it is not only the blinkered and the blue-printed who use the syllabus in this way. Many a young teacher receives no other form of guidance on how and what to teach his charges. Even if more fortunate, not wanting to pester his seniors too often for advice, he will turn to it again and again for judgements on the pacing, structure and emphasis of his curriculum. The less sure he is of his subject matter, the more willingly he will permit the syllabus to dominate him. It is in those "additional subjects" which the aspirant candidate is asked to state his preparedness to teach, that the teacher and syllabus most detrimentally combine to undermine the true purposes of education. Yet what are the alternatives? To let the novice flounder without a life-line of any sort? Deprive him of the syllabus, and he will soon find other "authorities" on which to base his work, who have with less thought and less responsibility drawn up an agenda to be inexorably worked through in a year. Thus a heavy responsibility falls upon the syllabus: to give guidance but not dictation, to those who would otherwise be without direction, while providing for the sensibilities of teachers, who, within a broad framework, want no further restraints upon the creativity of their own programmes. It will be instructive to see with what success syllabuses in use today shoulder this responsibility. What philosophy of history do they reflect? How has their implementation modified the intention of their design?

⁴See E. Hlshen, This Right Soft Lot (London 1969) for a highly entertaining description of such a teacher.

What problems have they been unable to overcome? From the answers to such questions, we may be able to make recommendations for the drawing up of a better syllabus based on the principles outlined in Chapters 2 and 3.

Syllabuses of Content

The norm against which all deviant syllabuses tend to be measured is what is often called a traditional syllabus. The traditional syllabus is basically the history of Britain within the broad framework of Western Civilisation, taught in chronological order. Although it does not make any conscious discrepancy of emphasis between one part of the syllabus and another, it tends to be fuller on modern history simply because so much more is known of it. This syllabus has dominated history courses in English schools for the past fifty years.

What philosophy of history does such a syllabus reflect? It reflects, firstly, the feeling that the chief responsibility of history is to acquaint children with the history of their own nation. There is currently a reaction to such belief, based on the feeling that the nation is now both too large and too small a unit to provide either identity or unrestricted vision. Yet when it was first implemented, such a syllabus did reflect the nineteenth century preoccupation with nationalism and the necessity to inculcate patriotism. Yet nowhere in the course of these researches was any recent statement of educational objectives in Britain found, which so much as mentioned either of these goals. On the other hand, if education is to help children to understand the society in which they live, then the national history will undeniably loom large in the syllabus: what is less defensible is that it should do so to the exclusion of all other history.

The second philosophical implication of the traditional syllabus is that it can assimilate indiscriminately the whole of the national history. As time passes, the traditional syllabus will obviously have to choose between a shallower and shallower treatment of its subject matter or omitting various of its sections. So far, it has resisted both alternatives. The result is that the syllabus has become more and more crowded, giving rise to the complaint that any hope of subjecting the facts to proper historical analysis has to be subordinated to the inexorable pressure of the sheer material bulk. At the same time this reluctance to admit that any fact is dispensable must accept responsibility for promoting a hopeless attempt to retain them all. If history is not to be "a rote coverage of facts"⁵, not only is it the case that "selection is essential and it has to be ruthless"⁶ but it must be seen to be so. It is apparent that the Hadow Report's admonition to schools to "secure that no large factor should be entirely omitted...the whole period at least from the Romans to the present should be covered in some form"⁷ still strikes a sympathetic chord in most teachers of history.

The third statement made by the traditional syllabus about its philosophy of history is that not only is chronology important to history, but that it is important that history should be studied chronologically. Of course, if responsibility is accepted for teaching the complete history of any topic, then there is little argument against a chronological treatment. It is only when a selection of subject

⁵R. Brown, op.cit. p. 450.

⁶D.G. Watts, Environmental Studies (London 1969) p. 101.

⁷The Hadow Report, The Education of the Adolescent (H.M.S.O. 1926) p. 200.

matter has been forced, and made, that it is relevant to declare that

"we are not convinced that the course has to march from A to Z, 'covering' what happened in between...To be sure, history...is a chronological narrative, but more important than narrative, it is relationships...put down in time...It is somehow critical that a student who has studied American history should know that the Revolution preceded the Civil War: but it by no means follows that the only way for him to do that is to study the Revolution in October, and the Civil War in January."⁸

Last, the traditional syllabus also proposes that it is capable of executing its brief in isolation. Well taught, it will be reinforced by its relationship to literature and geography, for instance, whenever necessary, without needing to resort to the contrivance of an integrated course. Whereas this is perhaps true, its effect appears often to have been to make teachers fight shy of the areas of common ground, resulting, in the case of history, in a story that is too exclusively political in character.

Because the authority of the traditional syllabus has for so long been almost unchallenged in English schools, it has drawn upon itself fire which should more properly have been directed at other targets. The traditional syllabus is often accused of transmitting history as an accepted body of knowledge to be received unquestioningly by the pupil. It is alleged, too, to create an over-reliance on the textbook. It may be true that the incidence of these shortcomings is highest where the syllabus is of the traditional type, but to suggest that they follow naturally from it, is unfair. History comes across as an accepted body of knowledge when, first, there is no time available to dispute it, and second, when it is treated as such by the teacher. It is not the syllabus itself which is wholly responsible for either situation. The

⁸R. Brown, op.cit. p. 445.

traditional syllabus is also accused of being unjustifiably concerned with moral issues. These moral issues are "enshrined in efforts and achievements of which a particular society is rather proud"⁹. The sum of these efforts and achievements is viewed as a "heritage" which the traditional syllabus is concerned to transmit to its pupils. Yet once again, these failings are not an automatic product of the traditional syllabus, even if they are felt not to be sufficiently discouraged by it. Indeed, most arrangements of historical material would deal far more efficiently with moral issues and with communicating a heritage than does the traditional syllabus.

A deviation from the traditional syllabus which deserves brief mention is the move to teach World History. Syllabuses of World History are gaining ground with the erosion of belief in the virtues of patriotism, but they do after all simply advocate the same approach as the traditional syllabus, to a different body of subject matter. World History stands or falls by its selectivity, yet the universal complaint made against such syllabuses is that they attempt far too much in too little time. Practitioners of World History have also encountered difficulties which it is hoped will not discourage them: first, there is a complete absence of satisfactory textbooks and teaching aids - historians still seem to hark back to H.G. Wells as the only successful author of World History yet: second, they find that World History, with its involvement in foreign ideologies, economics, systems of government, social organisation and religions, poses considerable problems for pupils.

⁹A. Smith, Some problems in the theory and practice of History. Teaching in English Secondary Schools (unpub. thesis, Oxford 1964) p. 104.

Syllabuses of Method

Other syllabuses have grown up largely in reaction to the shortcomings of the traditional syllabus. It was obvious to many that this now attempted to cover so much ground that no exercise of historical skills was possible. More than forty years ago, it was being said that "the real solution is to be found in doing less and doing it in the right way."¹⁰ And more recently, "If the methods suggested in this paper are to be successfully pursued, then a drastic cutting down of the amount of material taught must be undertaken."¹¹ No less important was the conviction that history was, in the terminology of Chapter 2, as much "the work of historians", as "the story of the human past in society". It was widely felt that if a thorough training in historical thinking was given to pupils, it scarcely mattered on what subject matter it was practiced. This training could only be effected by a study of a quite limited period in some depth, hence the system which advocated the use of such training is generally known as the "patch" method.

What philosophy of history does this syllabus reflect? First, as has been said, it believes that method is more important than matter. It aims to teach the "language" rather than the "literature" of history. It believes that what is required are the "skills to handle data, not merely exposure to more material"¹². Provided these skills are communicated, their applicability to any data may render a focus on any particular data irrelevant. True as this is, it contains, of course,

¹⁰H.A. Drummond, History in School (London 1929), p. 24.

¹¹K. Charlton, in the Educational Review Vol. 9 (November 1956) p.62.

¹²P.D. Thomas, "The teaching of History in the United States in the Era since Sputnik", Teaching History Vol. 1 No. 4 (November 1970) p. 280.

one vital provision: what must obviously be known are the consequences, if the skills in question are not communicated to the pupil, and how likely it is that this occasion will arise. To take the second problem first, the evidence attests again and again to the failure of history teaching to achieve its declared aims; it is gradually being brought home to teachers that children find much greater difficulty with history than is generally supposed. Chapter 6 examines in more detail the areas with which children find most difficulty, the reasons for these problems, and the methods by which they might be simplified. Current opinion inclines to the belief that it seems impossible to take for granted that the "language" of history will be successfully taught to children. If this is the case, will the "literature" of history not assume a greater importance? It may be literature most imperfectly understood, or at a very simplistic level of comprehension, but whereas it may be possible to teach language and communicate almost nothing, it seems to be the case that of literature, some traces rub off on even the least aware pupils. Nor can it be assumed that those who successfully learn the language of history will practice it on the literature of the "society in which they live". Lack of interest, pressure of time, or merely apathy, may undermine such practice. Therefore, if history is to help children to understand the society in which they live, it cannot (and need not) run the risk of leaving children to learn the literature of their own time from sources far less responsible, objective, and well-informed than the classroom. The principles underlying the "patch" method are wholly admirable, but let them be practiced on content that is relevant to the overall objectives of education - it is not easy to be persuaded that matter is entirely unimportant, or that the arguments about "what history

should include" are only "silly academic" ones.¹³

In practice, syllabuses based on the "patch" method do not appear vastly different from those based on the "traditional" syllabus. Note the similarity of the syllabuses to be found in Appendices B and C, yet B professed to the traditional approach, and C to the "patch" method. Their similarity becomes still stronger when it is known that the "traditional" teacher admitted rarely to covering the allotted ground for any one year, yet always beginning at the proper place for the next, therefore, in terms of content, teaching something suspiciously like the "patch" method. Where in fact the difference lay was in the method by which the same ground was covered. The "patch" teacher used little exposition, made it a point of honour never to dictate notes, and encouraged the class to gather as much of their material themselves as they could, whereas the traditional teacher relied largely on oral exposition, and dictated notes. Syllabuses based on the "patch" method seem generally to treat their patches in chronological order. They confine them, often as not, to British history (if for no other reason than only here do sufficient source materials exist in English). They give equal weight to the value of all eras of history. The effect of the "patch" method, has, therefore, been to refine rather than to subvert the traditional syllabus.

Another reaction to the traditional syllabus based on method rather than matter is Professor Jeffreys' Line of Development theory, which, although pronounced by the Ministry of Education to have had "the widest influence of the new approaches"¹⁴, was not encountered in practice in any of the schools visited during the course of this

¹³ R. Brown, op.cit., p. 445.

¹⁴ Ministry of Education, op.cit. p. 16.

study. Professor Jeffreys started from the wholly reasonable premise that one would not begin by saying "I will study history", but that the "rational attitude is that of a person who states 'I am concerned with this or that problem and cannot fully understand it without studying its historical development'".¹⁵ He would then deal with topics such as transport and architecture, especially chosen to suit the ages and abilities of the pupils. Professor Jeffreys' proposal satisfies many of the demands of curriculum theory. Lines of Development are easily related to "life in all its manifestations" and do preserve a certain integrity of subject matter while making obeisance to another potentate - child-centredness. In many respects it will be of significant aid in helping children "to understand the society in which they live". Where it seems more vulnerable to attack is from the professional historian. Its focus seems so narrow that concern has been voiced as to the success with which it can serve the humanitarian purposes of history. Does the triumphal march from papyrus and stylus, to remote-entry-data-input, give any opportunity for indicating "what possibilities of action a situation contained"? Will it make clear that even today whole peoples are without a single word of written literature? The Line of Development theory seems to have suffered with the erosion of confidence in the concept of progress. "The cardinal error", says Barraclough, "is the false analogy from natural science to historical science. The ideas of evolution and natural selection may be germane to the process by which the human species rose towering above the animal species: they are not germane to the history of man in civilised societies."¹⁶

¹⁵M.V.C. Jeffreys, History in Schools: the study of Development (London 1939) pp. 42-43.

¹⁶G. Barraclough, History in a Changing World (Oxford 1955) p.226.

What philosophy of history does such a syllabus reflect? It reflects first, the conviction that history is a practical subject which can be called upon to solve practical problems. Whether history can sustain such a utilitarian role is, unfortunately, less certain. Trevelyan, for instance, thought history to be of the same category as poetry. It implements also the theory that what distinguishes history from other disciplines is "developmental perspective", in Professor Jeffreys' phrase. Even if this distinction is accepted, the developmental perspective derived from such study, seems so self-consciously imposed, and so little a natural and untutored movement, that it may obscure the vision which it is intended to illuminate. The Line of Development syllabus, by emphasising the developmental perspective, also relegates content to a secondary place. If it is this perspective for which we chiefly study history, then there is no reason to believe that one topic, any more than another, will serve this purpose. It tends also to deal with "themes" rather than with men or ideas, and themes of some permanence such as "transport" or "architecture". It would be difficult to tackle "communism" or "the Renaissance" by this method. It may be that its proper application is in the primary rather than the secondary school, and certainly much use has been made of it there.

It will be seen that the reactions to the traditional syllabus seem in many cases to be no less open to objection, and this, in part, accounts for the continuing domination of the traditional syllabus, in spite of all onslaughts against it. It would, however, not only bare a gloomy prospect for the future of history, but also confirm much of its critics' complaints, if it were not possible to overcome the weaknesses of current history syllabuses except by the introduction of new weaknesses. Thus it was that much interest greeted the emergence,

in America, of something called the New History, and this in turn, must be investigated to see how successful it has been in putting its educational philosophy into practice, and how accurately this philosophy conforms to the requirements of the overall aims of education.

The sense of disillusionment with history was apparently even stronger in America than it was in England, and when threatened with the possibility that "the time may come when historians may wake up to discover that what happened to the classics has happened to history"¹⁷, a number of conferences were promoted to see what could be done to stave off this evil hour. At one such, to which university lecturers, school teachers, professional historians and educational administrators were invited to contribute, the university lecturers and tutors were asked what they felt they ought to be able to assume about their students' preparation. The reply given was that they wanted not

"so much a knowledge of facts - these were after all broadly available - as a sense of what facts were, of what history was. Above all they should be able to assume a capacity to doubt, to ask questions, to criticise. To do this, the high school teachers in the group replied that they had to be able to give the student...historical evidence about which the student could ask questions, and from which he could seek to draw his own conclusions."¹⁸

The undertaking which set out to make such materials available is generally known as the Amherst Project.

"What we are doing in brief, is trying to find out as much as we can about the implications of a method of studying history ...the so-called 'discovery' method, which encourages inductive learning. We have been called 'The New History'...the emphasis is on developing...a sense of the structure of the discipline."¹⁹

The key word here is "structure": for their preoccupation with the concept of structure, those working on the Amherst Project are

¹⁷R. Brown, op.cit. p. 444.

¹⁸R. Brown, op.cit. p. 445.

¹⁹R. Brown, op.cit. p. 445.

indebted to Professor Jerome Bruner, who has long championed the idea that "the continuity of learning that is produced by...transfer of principles is dependent upon mastery of the structure of the subject matter. The more fundamental the idea learned...the greater will be its breadth of applicability to new problems."²⁰ This is obviously sound and traditional enough educational philosophy, but one can scarcely imagine that any historian in possession of those "fundamental principles" which we apply broadly to new problems, would not have disclosed them by now. Bruner then addresses himself to the practical application of the theory of "structure".

"The first and most obvious problem is how to construct curricula that can be taught by ordinary teachers to ordinary students, and that at the same time reflect clearly the basic or underlying principles of various fields of enquiry. The problem is two-fold: first, how to have the basic subjects re-written in such a way that the pervading and powerful ideas and attitudes relating to them are given a central role: second, how to match the levels of these materials to the capacities of students of different abilities at different grades in school." ²¹

He has, however, not seemed to touch on the history teacher's problem at all. What Bruner has done is to cite those problems which he is able to answer. What the teacher of history wants to know is how to determine the fundamental principles on which Bruner alleges his subject to be based. When touching on this point, Bruner's step is distinctly less confident.

By way of answering the history teacher's problem, Bruner details with evident approval a social science course run by the sinister sounding Educational Services Incorporated, the concern of which was Man. No better start to a humanities course, one would agree. The

²⁰J. Bruner, "The Act of Discovery", in Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools op.cit. p. 83.

²¹J. Bruner, "The Importance of Structure", in Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools op.cit. p. 172.

leitmotiv of this course is three questions : "What is human about human beings? How did they get that way? How can they be made more so?"²² Bruner continues..."the five great humanising forces are tool-making, language, social organisation, the management of man's prolonged childhood, and man's urge to explain his world."²³ This didactic and uncompromising statement might well elude the critical scrutiny of the reader if he did not keep his guard up. What it conceals is that these are by no means the questions or the answers which automatically arise from the study of Man. They are the questions that Bruner's control group has chosen to ask. One might say, why this pre-occupation with the exclusively human? Life and death and our response to our environment and many other things we share with lesser forms of life might be just as pertinent areas of study. This is not to say that the concerns instanced by Bruner are invalid, but that there is no reason to believe that they would be accepted universally as the principles on which the structure of the humanities is founded.

The real difficulty with Bruner's thesis is that he may be applying to the humanities a sense of form derived from the sciences, and more properly relevant to them, whereas there are many who believe that it is one of the special properties of the humanities to be without an analysable structure of a scientific nature. The structure which the Amherst Project is concerned to disclose is, therefore, the structure of a method of study rather than the structure of a corpus of knowledge; hence Dr. Brown's conviction quoted previously,²⁴ that content was too unimportant even to warrant discussion.

²²J. Bruner, Towards a Theory of Instruction (New York 1963) p.74.

²³J. Bruner, Towards a Theory of Instruction op.cit. p. 75.

²⁴Vide note 13 of this chapter.

The "New History" is thus another programme of study - it seems impossible to use the word "syllabus" - which subordinates matter to method. The rationale of that method is the act of discovery. "It is my hunch that it is only through the exercise of problem solving and the effort of discovery that one learns the working heuristics of discovery."²⁵ To enable children to undertake the "exercise of problem solving", units are being prepared at Amherst, which may provide the raw materials from which to work out solutions. In practice, this has proved to be a largely successful compromise²⁶ with the demand for the use of primary sources, such as has been made in England for many years now (though with little enough effect). Where difficulties have arisen, is over the question of how much guidance, in this respect, to offer teachers. Bruner, knowing that "the success of any course depends on how well it is handled by a teacher" felt that such competence was best assured by "trying to deal with it by the nature of the guides we are providing teachers."²⁷ In the social sciences, these guides were eventually produced by a team working under E.W. Fenton, to cover the pupil's last four years at school. Dr. Brown, on the other hand, felt that the course was likelier to be well handled by the teacher if he were provided with the raw materials, but not subjected to the restrictions of an externally designed syllabus. As was suggested earlier in this chapter, such freedom might lead to some spectacular successes, but would certainly involve some equally spectacular failures.

²⁵J. Bruner, "The Act of Discovery" op.cit. p. 133.

²⁶For a fuller account of the success of the Amherst Project, see C. Spirey, "History and Social Studies Projects in America", in Teaching History Vol. I No. 4 (November 1970) pp. 285-6.

²⁷J. Bruner, Towards a Theory of Instruction (New York 1963) p.97.

Syllabuses of Integration

The last broad organisation of history syllabuses which demands a detailed examination is the integrated syllabus. Integration can, of course, take many forms. It varies from a theoretical co-operation between separate subjects under some corporate heading, to a fully synthesised course with a broadly humanitarian base. It would be futile to try to take account of all the known permutations. The educational philosophy to which the integrated syllabus subscribes is that school subjects lend themselves to compartmentalisation no more than does life, and just as in life, demands are made upon all aspects of one's training simultaneously, so in education, it should be made clear that all disciplines overlap to a certain extent, and that they are in some degree dependent upon each other. If the one subject matter for education is life in all its manifestations, then the fact that each individual subject merely contributes to an integrated, compound, whole must always be made apparent to the pupil.

If the involvement of other subjects is thought to introduce issues which will be outside the historian's competence to resolve, it must be recorded that little help is forthcoming from impartial authorities on the issue of whether to employ integrated or individual subject courses. "When the organising centres which define the substance of learning are selected to develop elements from a single field, a single-subject pattern emerges. When the teacher seeks to develop simultaneously diverse organising elements, a broadfields or core pattern emerges."²⁸ If he eventually opts for a separate-subject curriculum, he may learn from another curriculum specialist, that the philosophical foundation for this curriculum is Essentialism, and

²⁸D.K. Wheeler, op.cit. p. 234.

that its view of the child is based on a theory of natural evil.²⁹

The historian can, however, state how far his own goals will be advanced or retarded by the inclusion of history in some sort of integrated syllabus. If history is the house in which all other subjects dwell, then least of all, ought it to suffer from billeting with other subjects under one roof. Such co-habitation may make plainer how history is constantly drawing on geography, geology, literature, religion, archaeology, and economics - to name but a few - to supply some expertise or test some conclusion. However, it must be stressed that because history is the house in which all other subjects dwell, this relationship and this indebtedness ought to be plain whether the subject is integrated or not. History is not regarded today as that pre-occupation with "past politics" which in the last century it was pronounced to be. History is about everything, and everything is on hand to reinforce history. If there is no way other than an integrated syllabus to bring this home to pupils, teachers, and syllabus designers alike, then no better argument for integration exists.

However, integration of the syllabus does not automatically achieve an integration of knowledge, by any means. Just as an individual subject can successfully be made to disclose its relationship both to other disciplines and to life, so the most highly integrated course can fail on both these counts. "Integration is something that happens in an individual whether or not the curriculum is organised for that purpose."³⁰ Nor must the difficulties involved in administering such courses be under-estimated. The problems of arriving at some agreement on aims, objectives, and methods, are considerable. Such courses report

²⁹T.C. Venable, Philosophical Foundations of the Curriculum (New York 1967).

³⁰H. Taba, op.cit. p. 299.

a high failure rate where there is unequal enthusiasm for the venture in different departments. Yet all these problems can be overcome, and if educational aims so dictate, must be overcome.³¹

Another variant of the integrated course which, by virtue of its topicality, deserves special attention, is the Humanities Project, born out of the Schools Council Working Paper No. 11. This considers large themes such as war, or conflict between the sexes: it tackles them from a wide range of standpoints although it makes no distinction between the areas of historical, literary, or sociological concern: it provides children with a complete range of material from which to draw conclusions, consisting of broadsheets, posters, excerpts from literature, photographs, maps and statistical tables. Even if one takes issue with the compilers on almost all their working principles, it must be conceded that these projects have been carefully and imaginatively drawn up. What seems to be less sound is the principle of tagging on to the end of five years of study of separate subjects, a year of "Humanitarian" studies, in which those subjects seem to be effaced from the curriculum. What does such a course say for secondary school education? In effect, that it has been a diversion for children. Now that they are about to leave school, a benevolent authority will introduce them to life. If the matter, or the method, of the humanities project is genuinely believed to be the best preparation for life that the school can offer its charges, (and with this there may be some agreement) then this ought to have been the basis of the whole of their secondary school education, and not merely an appendix designed (one might almost think) to discredit all that they have been taught before.

³¹Vide Appendix "D" for an example of a Social Studies program which has been successfully employed in a mid-Western American secondary school.

Summary

If this discussion seems to have denigrated the syllabuses in use today without offering any constructive suggestions, this is mostly to indicate how varied are the pressures of the history syllabus. If one were to attempt the construction of a syllabus without taking into account the effects that teachers, pupils and examinations have upon it, one would simply duplicate some of the failings of the syllabuses treated here. It has also hoped to show that a syllabus must be founded on clearly stated aims and objectives and must remain true to them. In this respect, for instance, the pre-war educationalists, who made far fewer pronouncements on the nature of education, were more honest than their contemporary counterparts. They believed in the ability of history to communicate certain moral truths and their history books, "Bad King John" and all, made no bones about their right to do so. Hence, for instance, the emphasis laid on the Magna Carta, the first Parliament, and the Reformation. Today, far less sure about the virtues of Anglicanism, patriotism, and democracy, these episodes still loom large in the history taught in schools. The aims of education in general, and the contribution to these aims of history in particular, were discussed in Chapters 2 and 3. It remains now to see what restraints upon those aims must be taken into consideration before attempting to embody those aims in a history syllabus.

CHAPTER FIVE

How Examinations affect Curriculum Construction

Examinations are the favourite whipping boys of history teachers. There are few topics which command such unanimity as the retrogressive influence of examinations, their reactionary nature, and their unhealthy domination of the syllabus. Although there is much justification for many of these complaints, a definite willingness on the part of teachers to submit to these impositions has been partly responsible for this situation. Widespread recognition of the ways in which a syllabus can be distorted by examinations, has given rise to a number of experiments with examining procedures, such as project work, or oral examinations, or continuous assessment. None has yet been sufficiently successful to threaten the traditional type of written examination. All such devices concede, in fact, one important principle, which itself has, on occasion, been challenged, and that is the indispensability of some form of assessment or evaluation of a pupil's work. Whether such assessment is always necessary, or to what extent it serves the purposes of history, is a matter which must be decided by society as a whole, so closely are its rewards geared to the visible proofs of educational attainment. However, while the present attitudes to some form of assessment prevail, it is absolutely fundamental that the form of the examination be envisaged when designing the syllabus. The life blood of so many history courses has been completely stemmed by the tourniquet of the examining systems that it is no longer acceptable to excuse a bad course on the grounds that it has been diverted from its intended direction by the examinations. It must now be assumed that this will be the fate of all syllabuses unless provision is made against it, by prescribing at the same time as the syllabus itself is drawn up, a procedure for examining which reinforces the educational aims of the

course. In this respect, the conditions for the submission of Mode-3 syllabuses to the C.S.E. boards hold out the highest promise for the future of the teaching of history in secondary schools, in that a statement of aims and objectives and a specimen examination scheme must accompany any proposed syllabus. A teacher who thinks his course out from start to finish in this way will almost inevitably produce a more purposeful and cohesive syllabus.

There are two points of vital importance to be taken into consideration here. One is that the examinations no less than the contents for the method of the course, must reflect a philosophy of history. The other is that examinations offer a unique opportunity to reinforce and to safeguard the aims of the course. Where the attainment of pupils, teachers, and schools are all but invariably measured by examination results, it is inevitable that the examination offers an incentive to adhere to educational aims, of a kind that cannot be provided elsewhere in the curriculum. Therefore it may be instructive to begin an investigation of the effect of examinations upon the syllabus, by analysing the two main examinations available to English schoolchildren, to see what philosophy of history they claim to reflect, what philosophy of history they reflect in fact, and to what extent they attempt, by their examination techniques, to enforce that philosophy of history upon examination candidates.

The G.C.E. Examinations

The G.C.E. examinations, by virtue of having been longer in the field, have borne the brunt of the rising tide of dissatisfaction with the examination system. The comments which follow are derived from a study of all nine boards, and it might be felt that even more qualifications are deserving of mention, than have been recorded here.

The G.C.E. is set, of course, at Advanced and Ordinary levels, and while some educationalists feel that the examinations should make some distinction between these grades, others, believing that the professional historian and the primary school child are engaged in the same activity, think it fundamental that all history examinations will be of the same type. There are no pronouncements available on the attitude of the G.C.E. boards to this debate, but it is obvious that, in practice, no board makes any significant distinction of approach between its A and O level examinations, and hence it was decided that discussion of the G.C.E. examinations need not be divided into two sections.

The first point which strikes an investigator is the similarity between the syllabuses offered by all nine boards. In all cases there is an almost total concentration on British and European history. Most boards offer one option in American history, and some an option which includes some Commonwealth history. Some boards offer a subject known by some such name as "Europe and the Modern World from 1870 to the present day"¹ and four of them a subject entitled "World Affairs since 1919". The Southern Universities Board offers an option entitled "Modern History and Contemporary Society" which seems to be the only attempt to bring history, by that name, up to our own times, as distinct from truncating it at, for instance, 1919, and superimposing a "World Affairs" option upon it. However, these "World Affairs" papers have been carefully and imaginatively constructed. All give due attention to the place of Africa, Asia, and the Communist bloc. All make some concession to the current feeling that world affairs are no longer exclusively political and provide for the study

¹J.M.B. A Level Regulations.

of, for example, technology and its effect on contemporary society. The Southern Universities A level option "Modern History and Contemporary Society" explicitly declares that "particular emphasis will be placed on the process of economic, social and intellectual change". This is encouraging as far as it goes, but it should be stressed that many boards do not even offer one such option.

No board has done away with divisions into chronological periods. Many boards offer courses going as far as 1955 (other than the World Affairs option) but none, in 1971, went further, and a good many went no further than 1939. When one considers, too, that with most children the whole syllabus is very rarely covered, it is obvious that E.E.Y. Hales' remark that "recent history and world history are the answers of many teachers determined to withstand the charge that history is irrelevant"² does not even have as wide an application as, in this slightly disparaging context, he would have intended for it. However, the signs are that the syllabus is approaching our own times more closely than it used to, and the examiners' reports indicate that more and more pupils take advantage of this proximity.

Very few of the syllabuses express any philosophy of the subject at all. The Oxford and Cambridge Schools Examination Board specify that certain "patches" must be studied in conjunction with certain outline periods, and this is obviously expressive of the feeling that history needs to be studied in depth. More common, however, are provisions such as that in the Oxford Local Examinations Board which divide the period being examined into two smaller periods, and specify that two questions must be answered on each sub-section, a well known device to prevent teachers from covering no more than a portion of

²E.E.Y. Hales, op.cit., p. 207.

the course for the purpose of cramming candidates, and effectively a deterrent to study in depth.

The expectation is that the focus will be largely national. The Welsh Board insists that at least one question must be answered on Welsh affairs, but otherwise no specific local history is demanded. The University of London "welcome local illustrations of national trends", which is perhaps as much and as little as can be done. Certainly if a school wishes to make a more intensive incursion into local history, it will need to submit a paper of its own.

On occasion, but by no means invariably, there is direction from the boards, as to the skills they wish to test. Some quite plainly say on occasion that their chief concern is with category one (knowledge) of Bloom's Taxonomy. "A mainly descriptive rather than analytical treatment of the main features of the British Constitution: some knowledge of the chief historical landmarks in the development of the constitution will be expected."³ "The papers include a compulsory question requiring factual knowledge of dates, events, personalities, and the identification of places on a map."⁴ Such injunctions must rest content with a promotion of the power of memory.

On the other hand, some boards try to steer away from this position. "The syllabus is intended only as a general guide to the subject matter to be studied, and questions may be set on topics which are not specifically mentioned. Each alternative will include questions designed to give candidates an opportunity of showing powers of critical argument or logical deduction appropriate to O level."⁵

³Welsh Joint Education Committee O Level, 1971.

⁴Oxford Local Examination Board O Level, 1971.

⁵J.M.B. O Level, 1971.

This is a very promising stance, even if one fears that the teacher unsure of his subject matter would fight shy of such a free hand. On the optional general paper which may add to a candidate's marks but can never subtract from them, it is stated that "questions will be designed to test general historical understanding, and detailed knowledge will not be expected".⁶

In general, however, concern for historical understanding is more often felt in the examiner's reports than in the specifications of the syllabuses themselves. For instance, the University of London's Examiners' report for 1969 says of the history papers that "examiners expect candidates to realise that looking at a history question is an elementary exercise in English comprehension" and that they "are looking for evidence that the candidate possesses real historical understanding"⁷. However, a sampling of the questions asked by this Board seem to indicate a limited opportunity to display such understanding. From the A level paper of January 1971 ... "How was the defence of north Britain organised in the second century?" (Question 4) "Give an account of the extent and organisation of either the metal or the pottery industry in Roman Britain." (Question 5) "Describe the chief features of a large villa in Roman Britain." (Question 9) Such questions are as dull as they are ineffective.

Another complaint registered by this board is that "most candidates think of history as political history only and ignore social, economic, and cultural aspects of their chosen period ... History is to be a way of life and not just a series of isolated events which

⁶Oxford & Cambridge Schools Examination Board O Level, 1971.

⁷University of London Examiners' Report for O Level (History) 1969, p. 110.

have been summarised in popular textbooks. Students far too often enter the examination room with the same equipment which their grandparents used." However, take a typical period division such as The U.S.A. 1783 - 1865. Ten questions are asked, only three of which do not require a specifically political answer. These three, incidentally, concerned immigration, education, and slavery, all offering excellent opportunities for demonstrating the link between socio-economic and political factors. Yet even here the Board chose to ask "Indicate the nature and extent of immigration into the United States after 1830", rather than "How did immigration to the United States after 1830 affect the political structure of the country?" A question of this kind would stress the homogeneity of history: it would affirm that history is a "way of life" of which politics is but a part. As for students "entering the examination room with the same equipment that their grandparents used", might this not be partly attributable to the fact that the work required of them is so little different from that required of their grandparents?⁸

The examiners' reports continually deplore their awareness that candidates are being "crammed" for the examination: that half-understood facts are being repeated parrot-fashion, and that there is still a blind reliance on the authority of the textbook. "Question 22 had few takers but Question 23 was again very popular." "Again Question 51 was most popular, the whiff of grapeshot appearing in almost every answer." "Even less are they impressed with candidates who have heard but not understood and write of 'German Mao'". "There was an unwillingness to state the obvious (presumably because it had not been

⁸Vide W. Lamont, "The Uses and Abuses of Examinations in Teaching History", in M. Ballard (ed.), New Movement in the Teaching of History, London, 1971.

spelled out in the classroom) and candidates lacked confidence in their own judgement or powers of criticism." However, there seems to be no awareness of the board's responsibilities for this position, or any signs of a fresh approach to these anomalies. One of the obvious factors which militate against a candidate venturing or even exercising his own powers of criticism, is that so often he is released from the need to do so, because there are either no questions which require it, or there are sufficient which do not, to enable him to avoid those that do. It would be a brave candidate who would elect to write on "'The baptised Sultan of Sicily'. Consider this description of Frederick II." rather than "Why was the Latin kingdom of Constantinople so short-lived?" It is unrealistic to expect a candidate to risk the hazards of historical debate, when he loses nothing by straightforward enumeration. One of the very commendable features of objective testing is that strenuous efforts are made by pilot-testing to ensure that all the questions are of approximately equal difficulty. On the other hand, one does not need the examiners' report to realise that the essay-type questions set by the G.C.E. boards are of widely varying complexity.

The point is that the boards are all too unprescriptive. They must therefore assume a correspondence of opinion between themselves and the schools on the skills for which they are testing. Their reports indicate, however, all too clearly that they are often disappointed. But if historical understanding is the prime requirement of the boards, why do they not ally some firm statement to this effect, with an allocation of marks which will support such a statement, and the construction of questions which will promote such historical understanding? One cannot altogether escape the conclusion that the G.C.E. examining boards are to some extent responsible

both for the criticism which is currently being levelled at the teaching of history in schools, and the dissatisfaction which they themselves express in their examiners' reports.

The C.S.E. Examinations

The C.S.E. examinations were launched in full awareness of the dissatisfaction felt with the G.C.E. examinations. This awareness has manifested itself principally in two ways: first, the examining boards generally make clear statements that what they aim to test is historical understanding: a teacher could not reasonably seek support for factual spoon-feeding in the prescriptions of the C.S.E. boards. Second, the C.S.E. examinations have, by substituting for the two-hour written test, a combination of examinations, project work, and oral assessment, made some small contribution towards debasing the value of mere memory as an aid to passing examinations. The C.S.E. boards have consciously and deliberately offered to the individual teacher a considerable degree of freedom. The school assessment even in Mode-1 syllabuses (external examinations offered by the boards) counts for a fifth of the total grading of each pupil: but still more open-handed is the highly regarded Mode-3 syllabus, which permits the school, subject to moderation by the boards, to set and mark its own examinations. The G.C.E. boards, of course, have long permitted schools to submit their own syllabuses, although not to set or mark the examinations written on them. This facility has, however, been taken up by such a minimal proportion of schools, that it is without surprise that we learn that the percentage of schools applying to submit Mode-3 syllabuses is currently less than 20% over the whole country, of which a vast preponderance are located in the areas of three boards only. These three boards, it is interesting to note, have effectively provided an incentive to

schools to submit Mode-3 syllabuses by offering very few options themselves in the Mode-1 syllabus, one of them as few as two options. Also of interest is that the pupils entered for Mode-3 examinations achieve higher proportions of grade-I passes (in some regions more than double those achieved by pupils writing Mode-1 papers) but also higher proportions of "ungraded" classifications. Most historians would welcome some method of assessment that would significantly spread the level of attainment over a wider range.

Why this development seems to be a step in the right direction is not because syllabuses set by teachers will necessarily be better than those submitted by the boards, but simply because it seems probable that a teacher who has been forced to intellectualise his syllabus and his methods towards so practical an objective, is likely to be a very much better teacher for it. Nor are standards likely to drop because, as was said before, the directions to schools wishing to submit a Mode-3 syllabus are quite explicit that a statement of aims and objectives must accompany the syllabus as well as a specimen examination scheme. No psychological expertise is required to realise what gains will be made in terms of personal interest, motivation, and faith in the value of one's work, if these conditions are met.

Of particular value is the Mode-3's contribution to the delicate relationship between the teaching syllabus and the examination syllabus. G.E. Whalley has argued that the chief danger of external examinations occurs when the examination syllabus dictates the teaching syllabus - a well expressed view of a hackneyed situation - and that if they are to be identical, the latter must be drawn up first.⁹ Clearly, one of the virtues of the Mode-3 syllabus is that it will

⁹University of London Examiners' Report, O Level, 1970.

enable the teacher to lead the examination and not the examination the teacher.

Teacher assessment is, of course, but one of the means towards the ends previously stated: to promote historical understanding, and to reduce the reliance on the power of memory. Unequivocal statements to this effect show a welcome degree of conviction. "The examination will aim to test historical understanding and appreciation as well as fact."¹⁰ "Above all, the examiner will ask himself if the project material ... shows a line of historical development. He will not be impressed with mere collections of fact or repetitions of classroom work."¹¹ "All methods are designed to establish whether the pupil has understood the historical material upon which he has been working."¹² To counteract a reliance on mere memory, the encouragement of projects, map work, and lecturettes is stated quite uncompromisingly. Also explicit in the pronouncement of the boards, the lack of which was regretted in almost all the G.C.E. syllabuses, is a positive philosophy of history. "The syllabus should show them how [their own world] has developed, and should attempt to explain it as it is today ... so that they will prove worthy and responsible citizens of a wider world."¹³ "The panel supports the view that the 16 year old pupil should be able to see the relevance of history to his own life and to the circumstances of our own time."¹⁴

¹⁰G.E. Whalley, The G.S.E. (University of Leeds, 1969) p. 48.

¹¹East Anglian C.S.E. Board, 1970.

¹²North Region Examining Board, 1972.

¹³Yorkshire Region Examining Board, 1968.

¹⁴North Region Examining Board, 1968.

In view of this high endeavour, therefore, it is a little disappointing to note that many of the examination papers do not look conspicuously different from the G.C.E. "O" level papers. The standard format seems to be a division between one word or one sentence answers, and essay or paragraph type questions. The former cannot test anything beyond category I of Bloom's Taxonomy, and worse, can encourage retention of the trivial and the irrelevant. Whether the latter does so, depends largely on the questions set. One development which would support the boards' declared aims is the "directed" essay. "Using the following outline, trace the development of the railway system of Britain. George Stevenson - the "Railway Mania" - the Parliamentary train - the amalgamation of railway companies - nationalisation - the Beeching plan."¹⁵ Or, "Using the following outline, show how Hitler increased German power between 1935 and 1939..."¹⁶ Most of the essay type questions, however, are less imaginative. "Write a paragraph on any three of the following. (a) The October Revolution (b) Lenin and the peasants (c) The industrialisation of Russia (d) Stalin's policy in Europe." Or, "Describe the part played by Japan in the Second World War."

It must be remembered, of course, that the C.S.E. must cater for a very wide range of abilities, and if all the questions were designed to give grade-I candidates the opportunity to display historical understanding, it is clear that the potential grade-5 candidate would be entirely overwhelmed. Whether the necessary balance has yet been struck is debatable. Pertinent, true, in this context, is the fact that the examiners' reports rarely show concern over lack of

¹⁵Yorkshire Region Examining Board, 1970.

¹⁶North Region Examining Board, 1968 (Part II).

insight but often over lack of knowledge. "Few seemed to know the part played by Aneurin Bevan in creating the National Health Service." "Few had heard of the important finds of natural gas by the Dutch."¹⁷

In terms of content, the philosophy of the C.S.E. boards has had varied but not unpredictable results. In general, it is fair to say that there is a concentration on very recent history. No board does not carry the syllabus to the present day. Some progress has been made too in emancipating the syllabus from its traditional division into periods. There is a fairly even distribution of "themes" or "topics" (e.g. the History of Transport, the History of English Agriculture, Homes and Dress throughout the Ages) which Professor Jeffreys would have recognised as very similar to the Lines of Development which he propagated 30 years ago. There is a greater, although not a complete, commitment to world history. One of the impressions retained by an observer is that, generally speaking, content, per se, is slightly less important to the C.S.E. than to the G.C.E. Whatever its shortcomings, the C.S.E. is unmistakably an advance in syllabus formation and examination techniques. After five years its success is irrefutable, yet its impact on the G.C.E. boards has been negligible. J.M. Lloyd reports of a Mode-3 "O" level paper in Applied Science and Technology which was accepted by the Oxford Local Examination Board in 1969, showing this board not unwilling, at any rate, to have its hand forced, but of a general movement in this direction there is no sign.¹⁸ Certainly, if history is to play

¹⁷North Region Examining Board, Examiners' Report, 1969.

¹⁸J.C. Lloyd, "Mode-3 "O" Level in Blyth County Grammar School", in Bulletin 6 (Schools Council, Nov. 1968), pp. 144-47.

the role envisaged for it by educationalists of all specialisms, there will have to be a change in examination techniques reflecting the more volatile philosophy of the subject which prevails today.

Conclusion

It is sometimes held that examinations will never advance significantly until some form of objective testing is introduced. It is a complaint often heard in conjunction with other more dubious proposals for the reform of history teaching, some of which were alluded to in the first chapter of this study. The inference all too often is that objective testing is, per se, a superior form of testing : this, in fact, must depend on the individual test : what may be true is that it is a superior form of assessment. As for the tests themselves, by now everyone has been made aware of the difficulties of constructing these efficiently. Looking at a great number of different multiple choice type tests, one is struck by two things which most, but not all, have in common. First, was that on occasion, although intelligence was being expertly tested, to perform well, the pupil needed to have studied no history.¹⁹ Second, did multiple choice questions not often seem to impose rather uncompromising limitations on problems which perhaps rightly defy such containment? "Multiple choice answers suffer from ... bluntness ... they do violence to the subtlety of the understanding they claim to probe."²⁰

¹⁹ Amongst these was an otherwise ingeniously designed test, prepared specifically with C.S.E. in mind, by the Leicester University School of Education in 1963. M. Booth (op.cit.) goes rather farther in his reservations about the subject matter of this test, calling it "capricious and tending to concentrate on the trivial."

²⁰ M. Booth, A critical analysis of the Secondary School History Curriculum (unpublished M.A. (Ed.) thesis, University of Southampton, 1967), p. 46.

On the other hand, multiple choice tests can, too, focus attention on issues of great delicacy in ways which would not be possible by orthodox testing procedures. As this possibility is discussed at greater length in the final chapter of this study, one example may serve here. It would, for instance, ordinarily be difficult to test the understanding of the relationship of the Renaissance to the Voyages of Discovery, yet a multiple choice test may, perhaps, force the issue with a question such as this.

Which of the following statements is true?

- a. The voyages of discovery sparked off the new eagerness to learn which we associate with the Renaissance.
- b. The voyages of discovery are one of the features of the new eagerness to learn which we associate with the Renaissance.
- c. It is entirely co-incidence that the voyages of discovery and the Renaissance happened at the same time.
- d. The voyages of discovery did nothing to accelerate the eagerness to learn which we associate with the Renaissance.

As examination techniques grow more and more sophisticated, there is less reason for them to do other than to tackle the aims and objectives of education directly, expecting no allowances to be made on their behalf by pupils or teachers, and accepting fully their own responsibilities for the failure of achievement to measure up to expectations. Similarly, it is less and less possible to design a curriculum without giving due thought to the means by which the attainment of aims and objectives is to be measured, because the tendency of examinations to distort or obscure those ends has been proved beyond any dispute. In chapter 3 was reproduced what is thought to be the classical process for curriculum design.²¹ It is a five-part

²¹D.K. Wheeler, op.cit., p. .

process, the fifth of which is the evaluation of the success with which the first part is being achieved, the selection of aims, goals and objectives. The relevance of this process to an analysis of examinations is that it will be seen that not until all the elements of that curriculum design have been completed can a curriculum be said to have been constructed. We must think of examinations, therefore, not as outside agents exerting an independent influence on a curriculum, but as integral parts of the curriculum themselves.

CHAPTER SIX

How Pupils affect Curriculum Construction

In some subjects, syllabus construction has to take careful account of the stage of development reached by the pupil. It would not be possible to teach calculus, for instance, to a first form child, both because of its own complexities, and because it can only be taught after certain other sections have been understood. It is not normally thought that this restraint is one that binds the history syllabus. There are no sections of history which are thought to be "elementary" by nature, or which are thought to be too difficult to be taught to younger children. Any era of history can be taught to children of any age, and it is the approach rather than the content, that will be modified to suit the pupils. Yet do historians not take too much for granted with this reasoning? Is it the case that all history is on a par with regard to its handling by pupils? It may be that in drawing up a history curriculum, we do need to take as much account of the development of the child as in drawing up a mathematics or science curriculum. It may be, on the other hand, in investigating the suitability of historical material to the pupils' development, we will disclose not a "layer" structure, but evidence of certain restraints which must be borne in mind, by practitioners of any history syllabus at all stages.

It is only comparatively recently that attention has been directed to the extent to which methods of history teaching take account of the suitability of the subject matter to the child. The interests of history students have often been examined, but the ability of the child to assimilate the material seems to have been insufficiently questioned. This is perhaps chiefly because history

is a peculiarly adult discipline, and employs abilities such as the sense of equilibrium and time which the adult takes so much for granted that it does not occur to him that the child might be less well equipped to use them. One teacher interviewed said, "After I'd been teaching for about six years, I suddenly realised that the boys found history difficult: not to remember, but to understand." This misconception about the ability of children to grasp the subject is probably a common and fundamental one. The adult, with his wider range of experience against which to relate concepts, is surprised to find that words like "church", "justice" and "crown", either mean nothing to his pupils or mean something very different to them than to him.

History teachers have always known that their communication with pupils could be improved. For this improvement, they have traditionally tended to turn to historians or philosophers. The result is that they have examined the nature of history, the purpose of history, the justification for history, and the contents of the syllabus - and history teaching is much better for it - but these researches did not disclose a no less important truth - that children often find history, even as a simple story of past events, a difficult subject.

Pupils' Attitudes to History

Enquiry One¹ was able to throw some interesting light on this issue. It must be remembered that Enquiry One polled only those children who were to leave school at the age of 15, and hence would derive most of its information from the average and below average sectors (in terms of academic achievement) of the schoolgoing population.

¹Enquiry One (The Schools Council, H.M.S.O., 1968).

It found, as has been mentioned before, that 29% of the children thought history useful, and 40% thought it interesting. There is an obvious link here: if they did not find it useful, they would be less likely to find it interesting. The only subject which was thought to be significantly more interesting than useful was physical education, by the boys. (64% against 53%)² It is worth remarking that the reverse did not apply. The usefulness of some subjects was admitted although they were not thought to be interesting, e.g. mathematics 93% and 52%, English 90% and 53%.

This much, although not flattering to history teachers, will not have taken them by surprise. Enquiry One went on to ask pupils why boring subjects were so regarded. The reason most often given (by 43%) was that they "did not understand them", "that they were not good at them" and that "the subject was not explained enough".³ Thus is at the root of this lack of interest not the unpalatability of the subject matter but the fact that children feel themselves to be out of their depth? The next most frequently given reason was that "the same thing all the time (sic), teachers went on and on, slow, lack of variety", by 43% of 15 year old boys and girls. The conclusion drawn by the compilers of Enquiry One was that too slow or too full an explanation was just as boring as an inadequate one. Although this is certainly true, "lack of variety" need not imply that all explanations have been understood. It seems possible that children may feel that the same unknown quantities are being irrelevantly propounded at them week after week.

²Enquiry One, op.cit., p. 60.

³Enquiry One, op.cit., p. 79.

"Uselessness" was the reason advanced next most often (by 21% of 15 year olds overall). After that, more specific criticisms of teaching methods were cited. "We have to listen all the time", "It was all notes, just sitting writing notes isn't very interesting." "No discussions, just questions. We have to look up the answers."⁴ No one will be surprised by these answers. The general inference is that for the sort of pupil from whom Enquiry One will have drawn the majority of its sample, history will not be seen as a practical enough subject, and that their participation in the lesson will be insufficiently active. A small percentage of the children added other reasons for being bored by the subject such as that it appeared to be old fashioned, or irrelevant, or that they simply disliked the teacher.

 / The conclusion that children's dislike of subjects is occasioned less by incompatibility than incapacity is reinforced by the answers given by children to the question, "How would you like these subjects to be made better?" Most wanted "better explanation, recapitulation" (cited by 23%). The next need was thought to be for "more time" (by 19%) - evidence again that a real difficulty in grasping the subject matter is the major cause of discontent among children. / However, if the early school leavers find history dull because it is insufficiently practical, will it follow that it will be more interesting to those children who are less reliant upon the concrete operational stage of thought? Such would in fact appear to be the case. Dale and Jones, whose research was conducted only in grammar schools, found that 85% of the children they questioned liked history.⁵ When Pritchard polled schools "where

⁴Enquiry One, op.cit., p. 79.

⁵R. Dale and I. Jones, "The Interest shown by boys and girls in the principal aspects of history in grammar schools" (Educational Review, Vol. 10, 1957) pp. 69-78.

the teaching and the academic standards were known to be good" he found that history was the third most popular subject.⁶ Until the recent expansion of courses available to University students, history was the arts subject read by most undergraduates. It would seem that where history is understood, it is enjoyed, and that where it is enjoyed, it is thought at least sufficiently useful to warrant continuing its study beyond school.

These figures perhaps also lend support to the often levelled accusation that grammar school methods of history teaching have been grafted by ex-grammar school boys and ex-grammar school teachers into the comprehensive schools and the secondary modern schools, and that these methods, setting aside the issue of whether or not they are suited to grammar schools, are definitely unsuited to less academic children. Why such conclusions may alarm history teachers is through their implication that different ability groups may need to be taught history by different means. However, the reverse has not been proved - that the methods best suited to the average child will not work on the grammar school pupil. After all, the "practical history" usually advocated for less intelligent children is much closer to Burston's ideal of "what historians actually do"⁷ than the text book expatiated, note-taking, essay-writing, and opinion mongering which is alleged, and not wholly without foundation, to be the staple of candidates for G.C.E. examinations. Are history teachers not, time and time again, turning to new aids and new media to enliven and brighten their lessons?

⁶R. Pritchard, "The relative popularity of secondary school subjects" (*British Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 5, 1935) 157-179.

⁷W.H. Burston in The Principles of History Teaching, op.cit., p. 15.

Yet is what is most required not a competent explanation of these lessons? Because new aids and new media often do help to explain, to arrange material clearly, and to untangle complex issues, they serve to "enliven" lessons by clarifying them. But as long as they are thought to do duty more as entertainment than exposition, they will perhaps strike their target only obliquely.

Of course, the conclusions drawn from Enquiry One need not be accepted unquestioningly. It must be stressed, too, that the link between lack of interest and failure to understand a subject was established over the whole curriculum and could apply less strongly in the case of history than in other subjects, although the reverse seems likelier. In either event, the findings of Enquiry One illustrate how needful some knowledge of the mental processes of the child is to our understanding of the basic problems of teaching history.

Is History a peculiarly adult discipline?

In the discussion of these mental processes, like so many others engaged in related studies, this study will begin with Piaget. Much publicity has been given to recent attempts to question the validity of Piaget's findings. Although these efforts have received more attention from the popular press than from professional psychologists, it is possibly not without benefit that Piaget's almost sacrosanct inviolability is being challenged. Nevertheless, what Piaget unquestionably provides is the most useful frame of reference against which to plot intellectual development, and it is as much for this reason as for any conviction of the soundness of his ideas, that Piaget is here used as our starting point.

Piaget's basic contention is that a child's ability to think proceeds in three stages. First, is the pre-operational stage when the child is able to cope with representations but is unable to

perform operations upon them. He is not able to establish a relationship between one object and another or, consequently, to handle any kinds of concept. Second, is the concrete operational stage when the child is able to organise representations into the generalisations which we call concepts, but only in as far as existences go, not possibilities. Third is the formal operational stage, when he is able to go beyond the evidence presented to him to the formulation of hypotheses about it. Piaget did not tie these stages to any range of ages, nor did he propose that at any one time a child's thought was representative of one stage only.

Why Piaget's conclusions cannot be ignored by history teachers is, first, because it is often contended that history makes the bulk of its demands on the formal operational stage, and second, that many pupils either reach this stage only after they have left school, or do not reach it at all. If this could reasonably be proved to be true, it would go some way towards accounting for the disillusionment with school history which was expressed in Enquiry One.

On what grounds, therefore, can history be said to dwell particularly in the domain of the formal operational stage? First, history cannot of course be experienced directly, but only through the remaining evidence. In a sense, therefore, even if taught as "concretely" as possible, history is always dealing with possibilities rather than existences. The most concrete of evidence - a stone age flint or a Roman pot - may be an uncharacteristic survival, or have religious or cultural associations which remove its real significance from the child's experience. Such problems as the difference in styles between the lower and upper windows of a cathedral are not easily solved by a generation which has seen the raising of Coventry cathedral in five years. More important still, however, is the fact that so little

historical data is concrete. So much of it consists of the acts and utterances of men, from which we infer their intentions. It is undeniably the case that "History requires psychological insights"⁸ which are granted sparingly not only to children, but to the majority of adults.

Second, no less important than the fundamentally abstract nature of history is the fact that it overwhelmingly concerns the doings of adults. Thus even the most simple of narratives involves an exercise of the imagination. Adult ambitions, emotions, and affiliations underlie the most banal accounts of wars fought or laws passed. Think, too, of what sort of demands are made upon the pupil by such questions as "What would you have done, if you were Philip II, to ensure the Armada's chances of success?" Such studies call for "comparisons between almost nothing in the lack of experience and naivete of the pupil, and about everything conceivable in the adult's complex working out of his aims and ambitions."⁹

This is not to say, however, that such questions should not be asked. We saw, in chapter 2, how often "extension of the imagination" was cited as one of the main benefits of learning history: it is particularly well suited to do so because of the opportunities it provides for burrowing under the skins of other men and other ages. What is implicit in this reasoning, however, is that such exercises of the imagination should not be thought easy for the pupil. Nor is there general agreement as to the extent to which a teacher is capable of making such exercises easier. Coultham points out that whenever the

⁸E.A. Peel, "Some Problems in the Psychology of History Teaching" in Studies in the Nature & Teaching of History, op.cit., p. 160.

⁹E.A. Peel, op.cit., p. 160.

teacher presents something unfamiliar and apparently complex to a class, the natural resort is to illustration by analogy thereby "lowering the level of thinking from the formal to the concrete stage."¹⁰ E.A. Peel, however, is sceptical about the usefulness of analogy formation. "The relationship invoked by the teacher is not always the one perceived by the pupil.[^] What evidence is there that analogies are formed spontaneously by the learner? The answer is almost wholly negative."¹¹ Perhaps, too, the bluntness of an analogy - its necessary employment of a lower common denominator - sometimes conceals the subtlety of understanding which it aims to project. To understand why Dreyfus was convicted, against all the evidence, or why Sir Walter Raleigh was executed, demands a liberation rather than an identification with contemporary values which is, of course, the privilege of very few adults. How much harder for the child, then, to combine this foray into other mores and other centuries with the additional journey into adulthood.

The actual ages at which children are thought to be capable of handling such abstractions show some slight variations. Inhelder and Piaget demonstrated that the capacity to think in terms of opposing and balanced forces - cause and effect, in the historian's terms - "does not appear to be well established until the ages of 13, 14 and upwards."¹² Case and Collinson thought that formal thinking was not attainable until 15 years old.¹³ Hallam proposed that "most of the

¹⁰J. Coultham, The Development of Thinking and the Learning of History (Historical Association Pamphlet, 1971), p. 16.

¹¹E.A. Peel, op.cit., pp. 179-180.

¹²E.A. Peel, op.cit., p. 162.

¹³R. Case and J. Collinson, "The Development of Formal Thinking in Verbal Comprehension" (British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 32, 1962).

pupils below the chronological ages of 16.2 years were reasoning at the concrete level: they were able to use the evidence before them but not to postulate hypotheses."¹⁴ By any yardstick, therefore, it would seem that the greater majority of British children leave school as, or before, they become capable of formal thought.

History is also a particularly adult subject because of the huge time span involved. Because today history is seen as having a tight temporal framework, it should not be assumed that this has always been, or indeed is universally, the case. "Conceptions of time and history, far from being natural and self-evident, are largely conditioned by the prevailing social and intellectual climate."¹⁵

Jahoda quotes the study by E.E. Evans-Pritchard of the Nuer, who have not only no words to express a time span of longer than two years, but also have no expression equivalent to "time". Think how purely fictional was the chronology of the Greeks. Even the Romans, whom we imagine to have been more systematic, commonly reckoned their years by the tenancy of the consulship.

What is neither natural nor self-evident to the adult, but has been learned over millenia, is even less so to the child. "We judge time by various criteria, astronomical, physiological, social, epochal and geographical ... most of all by changes occurring in our own life span."¹⁶ "The total experienced time, including past, present and future, all of which are present in mind and affect action, changes from a span of three days with 5-6 year olds, to a span of three

¹⁴R. Hallam, "Logical Thinking in History" (Educational Review, Vol. 19, 1966-7) p. 171.

¹⁵C. Jahoda, "Childrens' concepts of time and history", (Educational Review, Vol. 15, 1963), p. 95. }

¹⁶E.A. Peel, op.cit., p. 163.

seasons with 10-11 year olds, a span of three years with the pre-adolescent and finally to spans of five years in the case of the adolescent."¹⁷ Hence the terms of reference by which a child can apprehend historical time are perhaps totally inadequate. Since this study is concerned chiefly with history teaching in secondary schools, it is of some comfort that Oakden and Sturt considered "around the age of eleven to be a turning point in the development of concepts of historical time: it is only after that that the past becomes differentiated into various historical periods."¹⁸ The concensus of opinion appears to be, however, that the concept of historical time is "not achieved on a par with adults until about 16."¹⁹ No less significant is Pistor's contention that "the increase in historical understanding of time is more a function of mental maturation than purely formal teaching."²⁰ In other words, it is not something which can be forced even by the most aware of teachers. Friedman claims too, that "the Intelligence Quotient has a marked, but not high, correlation with" the historical understanding of time.²¹ If this were true, it would mean that a fully developed sense of historical time would not be present even in children who, in other respects, are able to think at the formal operational level.

¹⁷E.A. Peel, op.cit., p. 164.

¹⁸E. Oakden and M. Sturt, "The Development of the Knowledge of Time in Children" (British Psychological Journal, Vol.XII, 1922), p.333.

¹⁹E.C. Friedman, "Time concepts of Junior and Senior School Pupils and adults" (The School Review, Vol. 52, 1944), p. 237.

²⁰F. Pistor, "Concepts of historial time" (Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XXXIII, 1939), pp. 293-300.

How necessary is this sense, however, to a proper understanding of history? It seems possible that without it, some appreciation of the large sweeps of history may be lost - the spread of Christianity, the decay of imperialism, the growth of communications - but the ability to penetrate the surface of a given moment, as the "patch" method aims to do, should not be seriously impaired. On the other hand, although chronology today is thought to be of less importance to the understanding of history, it is recognised that even "the relating of historical events to their consequences and antecedents is also a temporal feature."²² The tendency today is to believe that "more important than narrative, (history) is relationships put down in time."²³ These temporal relationships which children are said to find particularly difficult are indeed the essence of a mature understanding of history.

History can also be said to make especial demands upon formal thinking, and therefore pose especial problems for children, because it is necessarily communicated via language which is at a high level of abstraction. It has already been touched upon in this chapter that constant recourse must be had to "the generalisations which we call concepts".²⁴ To make the correct particularisations from generalisations such as church, crown, middle class, law and French involves a highly sophisticated process of thought. Various tests have been carried out to test the ability of children to absorb such concepts correctly. Peel quotes the study made by Werner and Kaplan²⁵ of the

²²E.A. Peel, op.cit., p. 162.

²³R. Brown, op.cit., p. 445.

²⁴J. Coltham, op.cit., p. 23.

²⁵E.A. Peel, op.cit., p. 172.

ways in which children arrive at the meaning of an unfamiliar word encountered in the general context of English or History. They found that it was very rarely that the correct meaning was the one thus deduced. Coltham²⁶ and Wood²⁷ found that in the development of common historical concepts there was a clearly defined progression with age, ranging from a "King lives in a castle far away" to "a King is a person who may rule his country by himself, may rule it in co-ordination with advisers or a government, may simply be a figurehead." Such inquiries stress how little the teacher can take for granted in the domain of the semi-specialist vocabulary by which the historian must communicate. Even in less specialised areas, a general facility for self-expression is vital to a mature study of history.

The possibility of reducing pupils' difficulties
with history

So far this chapter has been concerned to give evidence that children find history a difficult subject: to propose reasons why this should be so, and to relate these difficulties to the psychological development of the child. However, even if it were possible to prove that history is a particularly difficult subject below the VIlth form, this would be reason neither for abandoning the subject nor for reducing it to a level of anecdotal irrelevance.[↓] What should be hoped for as a result of this study is a surer knowledge of what may or may not be attempted with children, what particular obstacles may negate the success of such attempts, and perhaps how they may best

²⁶J. Coltham, Junior School Children's understanding of some terms commonly used in the teaching of history (Unpub. Ph.D. thesis, Manchester, 1960).

²⁷D.M. Wood, Analysis of the Definitions of Social Relations in Childhood (Unpub. M.Ed. Thesis, Nottingham, 1964).

be overcome.

In a recent study, J.B. Coltham addressed herself to the problem of promoting the development of thinking²⁸: in general terms, she concluded that curiosity was the sine qua non of promoting intellectual growth. Curiosity has to be nurtured by confronting it with matters new, startling or stimulating.

At first, almost everything a child encounters meets one of these criteria, but as he grows older, his curiosity begins to be channelled into narrower and narrower fields - what we normally call interests. Hence, if it is possible to reconcile what is to be taught with the child's interests, the likelier it is that good use will be made of the child's natural curiosity. "This motivation can be further strengthened if the learner both understands the goal towards which he is working and has an idea of how successful he is being in his efforts."²⁹ "The younger the learner, the more important is the immediacy of the feedback to motivation."³⁰ She thought therefore that involvement and challenge were the media by which intellectual development had to be advanced. The use of language she termed the "enabling factor", while finally, she regarded the experience of social interaction as desirable for the satisfactory development of thinking.

The real problem was how to apply these tenets to the study of history. As stated above, she believes in nurturing interest by "going with the grain" of the children's interests: however, what

²⁸J. Coltham, The Development of Thinking and the Learning of History, op.cit.

²⁹J. Coltham, op.cit., p. 23.

³⁰J. Coltham, op.cit., p. 24.

may interest one child will probably bore another: the course, therefore, should offer opportunity for involvement for a wide range of interests. Challenge she suggests offering by new approaches to unfamiliar material; by arousing conflict in the learner's mind. To improve the pupils' facility with language, she does not scorn the use of vocabulary lessons. She also suggests classifying concepts after particular instances have been encountered - using Judas, Guy Fawkes and Quisling to illustrate the word "traitor" rather than by explaining "traitor" by reference to relevant cases. To employ social interaction profitably she proposes discussions using small groups, gently guided as to how a proposition can and ought to be examined. Although it would be unrealistic to expect Miss Coltham to produce a panacea for all the problems of history teaching, these suggestions seem a slightly disappointing return for her close analysis of Piaget's work, and the particular obstacles to the development of thought which she anticipates in the teaching of history. All except perhaps the vocabulary exercises will be part of the practice of any good teacher who knows that nothing defeats his purposes more easily than boredom. At this point in time, however, any research which attempts to combine psychological theory with classroom practice must be especially welcome.

If it is the case that curiosity is the key to the development of thought, then in what ways must the teacher allow the interests of the children to influence his approach to history? What is not implicit in such reasoning is that the teacher should fashion the syllabus around the preoccupations of his pupils, much less fall in with their every whim. This would be to take no account of the importance of his duty to arouse and nurture new interests of which the children are yet unaware. On the other hand, this "duty" is all too often the justification for imposing on classes material which

interests neither the teacher nor the children, on the basis that they will all be grateful for it one day in the future. Teachers, generally having less control over their choice of subject matter than their methods, often make manifest their feeling that no matter how brightly they tackled some topics, they are working with a mould which has already been irreversibly hardened. Such attitudes inevitably communicate themselves to the children. This cyclic re-conditioning is a factor which must be taken into account when analysing the studies of pupils' interests which are published from time to time.

T. Cairns found that amongst a sample of 8000 children there was a definite preference for history that was romantic and unfamiliar, and which was slanted towards people rather than things. He concluded that "it was distinctly uninteresting for children to begin with the commonplace present..."³¹ It is undoubtedly the case that where local and social history are taught by the same largely expository means as are used, with greater justification, in teaching constitutional or political history, that children will find them distinctly uninteresting. However, this would probably not be the conclusion of Messrs. Steel and Taylor, whose current project on family history has given promise of encouraging results,³² or of J. Fines who reports, in a survey of the use of archive-type materials, that "ten year old children of very mixed ability found little difficulty in transcribing

³¹T. Cairns, Interest in History shown by Secondary School Pupils (Unpub. M.Ed. thesis, Durham, 1953), p. 38.

³²L. Taylor and D. Steel, Family History (Phillimon Press, 1971).

a very crabbed 19th century survey of their own village."³³ The use of such materials may well effect a considerable change in what areas of history are found most enjoyed by pupils. All this is by way of saying that it seems most likely that childrens' interests are far from inherent: just as "social attitudes are not innate, but are acquired or learned through contact with the group or community"³⁴ so is the "involvement" of the pupil.

Thus it seems that one might legitimately question whether studies such as Cairns' do not perhaps measure the interests that have communicated themselves to the children - i.e. which of the topics dealt with by the teacher have most interested their pupils, rather than which interests are "located" in the children. Even if the childrens' interests seemed a desirable criterion on which to base a history syllabus, it would seem that no value-free method of measuring such interests has yet been devised. However, this would not render the findings of researches into childrens' interests worthless, by any means: they are a pointer to which areas of history are being best and worst taught. Dale and Jones, for instance, found that amongst boys, military and economic history were the most popular, religious and cultural history the least liked, and that amongst 15 year old girls, biography and social history were the most popular, cultural and economic history the least liked.³⁵ My feeling is that such interests probably reflect a similar gradation of interests among the adult members of their communities and particularly amongst their teachers.

³³J. Fines, "Archives in Schools" (History, Vol. LIII, 1970), p.351.

³⁴J. Jahoda, op.cit., p. 95.

³⁵R.R. Dale and I. Jones, op.cit., pp. 69-78.

However, even if we accepted that such findings genuinely reflected the interests of the pupils, to what solutions would this commit us? Ought we now to shape the syllabus around these preferences? If we resign ourselves to the premise that military history is fascinating but religious history is tedious, how do we separate them in practice? From Babylon to Ulster, what has been more military than religious history? And on what basis was this distinction made clear to the pupils interviewed by Dale and Jones? Once again, we seem to meet the undesirability as well as the impracticability of trying to carve up history into areas of concern.

Dale and Jones concluded that "interest cannot be the sole factor which decides the historical topics which are taught in our schools but it is an important one."³⁶ Although such interests may influence the methods by which such topics are taught, there seem to be factors with stronger claims to decide the topics which are taught in our schools: for instance, the demands of the whole curriculum, the ability of children to make the necessary transfer from the particular to the general and the nature of the subject itself. These considerations led to the advocacy, in chapter 3, of weighting the syllabus towards modern and local history. This appeared best to satisfy the obligation laid upon history by the demands of the whole curriculum: if this seems to conflict with the childrens' desire for history that is romantic and biographical, then the solution must be not to turn to remoter periods for these ingredients, but to instil these ingredients into modern and local history.

³⁶R.R. Dale and I. Jones, op.cit., p. 76.

Conclusion

This chapter has suggested that insufficient account is generally paid to the difficulties which children find with learning history. It is not irrelevance or tedium but a genuine incomprehensibility which is the chief cause of dissatisfaction with the subject among schoolchildren. Some ideas were advanced as to why history should appear to children to be a particularly difficult subject, both with regard to its own nature and the stage of development attained by the learner. To try to equate that psychological development with the unusual demands of the subject, it has been suggested that to make use of the childrens' interests was the key factor. The possibility of beaming the curriculum more directly at such interests, insofar as they can be known, was examined, and thought perhaps to be a case of confused priorities: was it not rather the case that childrens' interests should be more urgently attracted to the curriculum?

The concern of this chapter is to stress the fact that in varying degrees, children find history a difficult subject, and while this is so, many of the benefits claimed to accrue from its study are unlikely to be realised. There can be no doubt that unless this can be achieved, much of the discussion that both precedes and follows this chapter will be negated. To select the aims, goals and objectives of history teaching without due regard for their potential adaptation to the pupil is meaningless. Learning experiences calculated to help in the attainment of these aims and objectives cannot be selected without a sure knowledge of the capacity of the pupil. In the selection of content we would do well to take some account of the interests and aptitudes of the pupil. If those conditions have been met, it is more likely that these learning experiences will be

successfully organised and integrated with the content selected.

In other words, for the meaningful construction of a secondary school history curriculum, this investigation into pupils' reactions to the subject has been vitally necessary.

CHAPTER SEVEN

The difficulties of the history teacher today

Before proceeding to some practical considerations, there is one other restraint upon curriculum construction which must be borne in mind, and that is the capacity of teachers to handle existing syllabuses competently or to adapt to innovation in syllabus formulation successfully.

One of the most striking things about history teaching in contemporary schools as opposed to those, for instance, of fifty years ago, is that today a considerably greater effort is required of the teacher. In the days when what the history teacher communicated was "fact", then it would be legitimate practice to use The Text Book and the stick. Now it is suggested that the teacher should be governed by all sorts of other criteria. It is not "fact" but the ability to handle "fact" that he is to inculcate. To do this he must provide source materials upon which children can practice these skills. These materials will not concern themselves as exclusively as before with the national story: they will cast their net both more widely and more narrowly: the teacher will have to continue to read and to learn to keep pace with a subject which is now viewed to be as dynamic as it was once thought to be static. These readings may well take him beyond the previously charted limits of history - to geography, sociology, archaeology, geology, and the fine arts. The teacher may well have to provide the source material upon which children can practice the new skills required of them himself, selecting from an amorphous mass, those which he feels are most relevant to his courses. To establish this relevance, he may have to formulate his objectives clearly and personally at the beginning of the course - something which previously he may have borrowed unquestioningly from

his peers. He may have to justify his examinations in terms of those objectives, instead of evaluating merit on the exactness with which the answers reproduce the sources. The teacher will have been made aware that few children find history easy and that patterns and words whose understanding was previously taken for granted may now have to be delicately explained, perhaps by unfamiliar means such as programmed instruction texts. He will be under pressure to present his course by methods which involve infinitely more preparation than the old expository methods, for example, film strips, projects, drama, slides, maps and time charts, on most of which he will receive only the barest guidance from written authorities. History, once considered to be amongst the easier teaching subjects in the curriculum, is now, by virtue of the vagueness of its boundaries, and perhaps especially because of its responsibility to convey the new attitude that "doubt has replaced faith as the test of scholarship",¹ amongst those subjects which most taxes the skill of the teacher.

More than this, it is increasingly being suggested that unless the history teacher is able to overcome these challenges, many of the objectives towards which his new skills are directed, will be partly or wholly negated. In the second chapter of this study, for instance, it was pointed out that no method of history teaching would of itself impose an historical treatment upon the subject from an uncomprehending teacher. Provide such a teacher with collections of original sources and they will become holy writ in just the same way as the text book did. If, as was suggested, the purpose of history is essentially humanitarian, then it will be the teacher's responsibility to ensure that this is not obscured by methodology, or the quest

¹B. Wilson, Youth Culture and the Universities (Faber, 1970), p. 53.

for information. This point was taken further in chapter 4, where the interaction between teacher and syllabus was discussed. Just as the syllabus can restrict and confine the teacher, so a teacher's ignorance, antipathy, lack of experience or apathy, can reduce to impotence the most creative of syllabuses. The reading undertaken for this study seemed to confirm the opinion quoted in chapter 4, that "the success of any course depends on how well it is handled by the teacher"². There seemed good grounds for supposing, therefore, that anyone concerned with history teaching in secondary schools should pay as much attention to the role of the teacher (and, paramountly, perhaps, to his own awareness of that role) as to reforms of the syllabus, or to innovations in methodology. It seems that such reforms or innovations may be almost without effect or may have unforeseen and unintended results if there is not an equal adjustment on the part of the teacher: on the other hand, if the principles underlying such reforms of the syllabus or methodology are efficiently communicated to teachers, perhaps the focus on method and content will be seen to be of secondary importance. It is essential, therefore, that we now focus our attention on the history teacher himself. How well equipped is he to play his part in the new roles envisaged for history? How receptive is he to the introduction of new ideas? What will be required of him if he is to direct the development of the subject, and possibly even to protect it from critics who feel it to have outlived its usefulness?

The problems of the teaching profession as a whole

The first condition that commands our attention is that it is not the history teacher alone whose role is undergoing a fundamental

²J. Bruner, Towards a theory of Instruction, op.cit., p. 97.

change. The whole profession could be seen to be at the crossroads. In a much quoted article, Bryan Wilson has emphasised the contrast between the "literati" of the pre-industrial age and the modern teacher: the former the exclusive guardians of a sacred body of knowledge, unchanged and unchanging, to be handed on to the few within the protected world of the seminary: the latter engaged in a task infinitely more delicate "because whilst data has to be transmitted, so has the liveliness of mind which challenges every interpretation of data".³ It is the very problem whose complexities we have been probing on behalf of the history teacher for much of this study. What it means is that even the first, and hitherto the best defined, of the teacher's roles, that of instructor, is currently under considerable strain.

That this should be the case is partly the cause of, and partly the result of, the erosion of another and more contentious of the teacher's roles, that of agent of socialisation. In the absence of any general agreement on political, religious, moral and professional values, the teacher is too often caricatured as a "virtuous conformist"⁴ fighting a rearguard action against the permissive society. Schools are dubbed "museums of virtue"⁵ transmitting values not operative in society as a whole. Constant friction over trivia such as modes of dress, choice of idols, and exercise of manners are symptomatic of this increasing estrangement. This estrangement is illustrated by the discrepancy often found between the teacher's view of his role, how the

³B. Wilson, op.cit., p. 53.

⁴P.W. Musgrave, The Sociology of Education (Methuen, 1965), p.257.

⁵W. Waller, The Sociology of Teaching (Russell, 1961), p. 34.

teacher believes that the parent and the pupil view his role, and what in fact they require of it. Evidence has been advanced that teachers seem generally to see their task in intellectual and moral terms.⁶ They believe, however, that pupils regard their task largely in personal terms, and that parents are indifferent to the teacher's task as moral tutor, but place greatest emphasis on the child's social advancement. The evidence collated by Musgrove and Taylor⁷ would seem to indicate that parents and teachers hold, in fact, closely similar positions. The parents valued moral training almost as highly as did teachers although ascribing scarcely less importance to social advancement. Such findings, if true, would suggest that the conflict generated by the teacher's role as agent of socialisation is largely imagined, and certainly unnecessary. This, if true, would enable the teacher, with more confidence, to assume, or resume, the role which his pupils regard as his primary one, that of instructor. Children would seem to "consider most important, his ability to teach, to encourage learning, to explain and to have a sure background of knowledge."⁸

Enquiry One, on the other hand, found some degree of difference between the school objectives thought to be important by teachers and parents.⁹ Parents, of boys especially, seemed to be primarily interested in advancing their children's careers, while teachers declared

⁶B. Riddle, "Role conflicts perceived by teachers in four English speaking countries" (Comparative Education Review, Feb. 1970).

⁷F. Musgrove and P.H. Taylor, Society and the Teacher's Role (Routledge, 1969).

⁸P.H. Taylor, "Children's evaluation of the good teacher" (British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 32 (3) 1962).

⁹Enquiry One, op.cit. Part II Chapter II.

more interest in developing the child's personality. Teachers, and particularly head teachers, stressed the importance of arousing the child's interests and awareness, a goal to which parents were apathetic and children positively hostile.

The teacher's greatest challenge today, therefore, seems to be to prove himself worthy, by the new criteria, if they be different from the old, of resuming that mantle of "institutionalised leadership"¹⁰ which is a sine qua non if he is to fulfil his other functions successfully. That may be best achieved by an apparent reversion to the mores of the pre-industrial "literati" - i.e. by an effective assertion of specifically professional competence. His authority must ever-increasingly derive, not from the relationship between adult and child, but from the proof he can offer his pupils of mastery both of his subject and his professional techniques. This is, after all, the basis on which other professions - doctor and patient, lawyer and client - lay claim to authority. And, of course, the teacher's obligation to do so is all the stronger since his "clients", unlike the lawyer's or the doctor's, are not usually at liberty to express their dissatisfaction with him, by withholding their patronage from him.

There is, of course, no way by which we could establish how far the teacher of today meets such standards, but a few statistics may be quoted here with reference to the currently accepted standards of professional competence. In 1969 approximately 36% of all teachers in English and Welsh secondary schools were graduates. Of these graduates, 76% were teaching in grammar schools, and only 24% in other secondary schools. Of the total graduate force 4% had graduated with

¹⁰W. Waller, op.cit., p. 189.

first class honours, and 55% with second class honours.¹¹ Although this is not meant to convey the impression that a degree is synonymous with professional competence, these figures do indicate a possible area in which the teacher's demonstrable authority might be enhanced.

The openness of history teaching to change

Turning specifically to the history teacher, he is, as one would expect, a more elusive subject to put under the microscope. To provide a better informed analysis of what his identity is, and hence how one might best assist his problems, and enlist his support for any proposed reforms of history teaching in secondary schools, a number of serving teachers were approached and asked to answer a brief questionnaire. The great majority were questioned orally in the hope (well-founded, as it emerged) that some useful discussion would arise from the questions, but a few submitted their answers in writing. The size of the sample (thirty teachers) precludes one from making any strong empirical claims about these conclusions: any apparent generalisations, therefore, are offered with proper reservations about their wider applicability: indeed the purpose of this survey was not to provide proof of any theories, a priori or de facto, but to offer guidance on areas which might repay further examination.

As the school system in County Durham is undergoing a program of reorganisation which has no direct parallel in other parts of the country, it would be simplest to employ the following classification: that, of the thirty teachers, ten were teaching in what approximated to grammar schools, seven in comprehensive schools, six in secondary modern schools, five in independent schools, and two were teaching 'A'

¹¹Statistics of Education, Department of Education & Science, H.M.S.O. 1971, Vol. 4, Tables 16-18.

and 'O' level pupils of schoolgoing age, in colleges of further education. Twelve were heads of department, which, although a possible source of distortion, brought me into contact with those teachers who wielded the greatest influence over the classroom situation. Section A of the questionnaire, which is reproduced in the Appendix, was put to heads of department only.

Section B was, to some extent, the *raison d'être* of the questionnaire. It was felt, however, that to confine the questionnaire to such inquiries might produce more guarded, and hence less valuable, responses. This section was designed to establish to what extent teachers were accessible to the media which sought to re-educate them or affect some change in their attitudes. It was strongly motivated by curiosity about the apparent discrepancy between the considerable volume of literature on the teaching of history which issues from the presses, and the seeming immunity of the subject as taught in the classroom to such persuasions. The responses given to section B may throw some light on this discrepancy.

There was significant agreement amongst the teachers interviewed that the courses in Method of History which these teachers had attended at Institutes or Colleges of Education were of very little use to them now. Most teachers were grateful for the practical opportunities to teach that these courses had provided, but the consensus of opinion was that the theory contained in such courses was either irrelevant or simply wrong. However, it must be noted that there was a very low level of expectation of such courses: most teachers felt that they were almost frivolous: it was only when you got into the classroom yourself that you were able to hammer out some really "workable" precepts. It may be that the disillusionment produced by these first encounters with instructional theory built up a lasting resistance to

any later infusions: it is certain, at any rate, that only two out of the thirty teachers professed to reading any of the professional periodicals on the teaching of history, only two had read any book on the subject in the last calendar year: only in one school was there any conscious interchange of ideas, and none had attended any courses on the subject in the last calendar year. It may be that in this last respect, history teachers feel they are more poorly served than other of their colleagues: the Plowden report found that "the small amount of time and number of teachers involved courses in history, geography and environmental studies are disturbing"¹² and that a large percentage of those teachers who were of the opinion that there was a shortage of courses available which they would want to attend, were involved in those subjects. However, lest history teachers be thought to be either too discriminating, or discriminated against, over the whole range of the profession, Brian Cane found, in a survey carried out on behalf of the N.F.E.R. that 50% of teachers evaluated the courses which were currently available to them as being of "Limited or very little immediate benefit to their teaching."¹³

No conspicuous regret for this state of affairs was encountered: often a guiltless self-reproach - "I suppose I really ought to read up a little more" - which seemed largely founded on the belief that no amount of theory could ever affect the paramount importance of the classroom situation.¹⁴ (It must be remembered, too, in fairness to

¹²Plowden Report, H.M.S.O. 1967, p. 360.

¹³B. Cane, In-service Training (N.F.E.R., 1969) p. 4.

¹⁴I have recently seen this judgement almost precisely echoed, in a very different context, by B. Davies, of the University of London Institute of Education, in a paper on "Initiating and Sustaining Group Activity" with regard to Teachers' Centres. "Several American studies of teachers underline their conceptual simplicity, their intuitive rather than rational approach to classroom events. They showed that

these teachers, that of the thirty, ten had been teaching for less than six years and might therefore reasonably feel that what theory they had absorbed in their Method of History courses ought to be by no means obsolete yet.) However, there was certainly no resistance at all to the principle of re-education: the impression gained was that, provided attending courses or studying the relevant literature would repay the effort, and provided that something could prod them into making that effort, it was one that would be undertaken with goodwill and co-operation. This, too, corresponded with Cane's findings: "few were antagonistic to the idea that in-service training was a necessary part of professional life".¹⁵

The alienation of the practising teacher from the theoretical work on the subject was further emphasised by the comments made by teachers of more than six years service on matters arising from section C. One was teaching a line-of-development type syllabus but had not heard of the line-of-development theory (and it is not implied that his classroom work was necessarily the poorer because of it), two were teaching a very refined form of the patch method but had not heard the term itself, and perhaps rather more surprisingly, there was a general equation of the terms "humanities" and "arts". Almost without exception these teachers of longer service were hostile to the principle of an integrated syllabus - i.e. one in which history was combined with other disciplines, but when pressed as to what they understood by this term, had only the vaguest idea of what it implied or else were under a variety of strange misconceptions. Yet, as a

they tended to hold opinionated rather than open attitudes towards alternative forms of teaching practice. Their attitudes tended to be a product of their work situations.

¹⁵B. Cane, op.cit., p. 4.

group, they were not resistant to new ideas per se. Particularly in the field of teaching aids, their store-rooms bore testimony to an almost over-willingness to experiment with new text-books, time charts, maps, film strips and collections of source materials.

However, the impression gained was that those which suited them best were absorbed into their existing patterns of teaching, so that rather than their courses bearing the imprint of these new ideas, the new ideas tended to bear the imprint of their courses - an observation again made without any intention of disparagement.

This inquiry did no more than support the findings of others that there is considerable theoretical goodwill amongst teachers to the principles of re-education and innovation in the method and matter of their subjects, but that such goodwill finds little practical expression. This may be due in part to apathy, in part to the natural conservatism of the profession, but must be largely attributable to the fact that no sufficiently good reasons have been advanced to attract the history teacher to programs of in-service training. If it is felt that the history teacher is in need of re-training, then first, that need must be communicated to him; secondly, he must be satisfied that the measures proposed to meet that need will effectively do so; and third, such measures must be designed in such a way that their impetus will not fall short of the classroom. The Nuffield Mathematics and Chemistry programs succeeded because they met all these conditions. They first convinced teachers that their concern was with something genuinely new and worthwhile: the courses which propagated their content were efficiently organised: but most teachers are agreed that their particular strength lay in the admirably simple equipment and the superbly written text books around which the courses were based. However, not all Mathematics and Chemistry teachers chose

to adopt the new modes, and not all who attended the courses put them into practice in the classroom. How much more complex is the case of the History teacher; for what is at stake here is much less a fresh program than an attitude to any program. All the most recent developments in the teaching of history are effectively transferring the subject from the Cognitive to the Affective domain. Not Fact (a Cognitive aspect) but an attitude to Fact (an Affective aspect) is to what the emphasis is currently shifting. For this reason it is particularly difficult to convince teachers that their present approach (if it is) is inadequate. Whereas most intelligent people will accept that new areas may be opened up or new methods developed of which they are ignorant, and of which they would do well to learn more, they will less readily concede that their fundamental relationship with their subject is unsound. Then assuming such a conviction were possible, because the Affective domain is so tenuous an area, and because it is necessarily so subjective, there would be corresponding difficulty in persuading teachers that the relevant courses were in fact achieving their declared purposes. And last, to ensure some continuation of these principles into the classroom would be all but impossible: to compound the substance of such courses into a text book would be totally self-defeating - what must remain with the teacher is rather a readiness to discard all text books.

The object of this discussion is not to show that history teaching is immutable, or that if it is thought to require remedy that that remedy will be impossible to apply - indeed it is not - but that if change is desired it cannot be achieved overnight. People who talk wistfully of a Nuffield History are barking for the moon: changes in attitudes must be brought about slowly, and there is no certain knowledge of what level of attainment has been reached.

If teachers are to exercise their new responsibilities in the Affective domain properly, it seems that a beginning must be made in the colleges and universities, where history courses do not always seem to take sufficient advantage of their opportunity to show how subjective a thing is fact, how little merit there is in the power of sheer memory, how wide ranging are the concerns of history, and how various are the sources by which the matter of history can be made available to us. Courses in teaching methods in Departments and Colleges of Education are often blamed for not fostering a sufficient spirit of enquiry - and indeed this chapter may earlier have appeared to do so itself - but these courses are, after all, concerned primarily with teaching techniques: it is the academic courses which preceded them - or which sometimes run concurrently with them - which ought to lay the foundations for that spirit of enquiry. Where else can a teacher be produced who knows that he "must continue to learn if he is not to deny his professional status. The teacher who is continuing to develop will communicate this to his pupils."¹⁶

It is common knowledge that those teachers who are most in need of "continuing development" by in-service training or any other method are least likely to engage in it. It is interesting to note, too, the topics on which teachers are said most to want in-service courses. Highest need was thought to be for "Operation and application of new apparatus and equipment with practice opportunities. Next was for "Planning and developing syllabuses in detail so that content is relevant to the modern child and arranged in teachable units."¹⁷ The message is

¹⁶Cittins Report, Primary Education in Wales (H.M.S.O. 1967) p. 511.

¹⁷B. Cane, op.cit., p. 21.

quite clear - teachers want guidance, clearly signposted with visual aids and educational psychology; they want, in short, a blueprint to follow; whereas history, on the other hand, must largely be directed today towards establishing the frailty of blueprints, towards the creation of self-sufficiency of learning in the teacher, which he in turn, must communicate to his pupils.

In this connection it is worth concluding with observations on a similar position arrived at in America a few years ago. There, some eight to ten years ago, as has already been recounted, there was sufficient turmoil in the teaching of history to justify the coining of the term "The New History". What the New History consists of was discussed in Chapter 4. Basically, it is the principle that history is a way of looking at things, that it is not evidence but an approach to evidence, and that that approach is best taught by direct access to the evidence itself. The United States government were sufficiently impressed to launch a huge program of summer schools to "bring history teachers into contact with historians". These summer schools were viewed as a process of "recharging batteries"; their rationale was that history is a continuing process of reassessment and discovery: as E.H. Carr put it, that the past is "encapsulated in the present": and that history teachers needed, therefore, the stimulus of acquaintance with the latest historical interpretations. But these schools were a sore disappointment to some commentators.

"To the extent that they stimulate and excite, these institutes will make livelier teachers because livelier people. But... in the last analysis they will not accomplish much. So long as they teach conclusions, even new conclusions, they will not... be getting to the heart of the problem. The real challenge is to get across to teachers not conclusions but the nature of conclusions, and to give them some sense of how an awareness of that bears on what they might be doing in a classroom." ¹⁸

¹⁸R. Brown in E. Fenton, op.cit., p. 448.

On the other hand he notes that few more interesting discoveries had been made than the

"wholly accidental one that summer writing sessions for teachers who are preparing units are enormously valuable for teacher training and retraining... What we do is to provide our group with a library and six weeks of completely free time to put together a unit of historical sources designed for teaching purposes. This task requires them to do two things that a surprisingly large number have never done before. One is to be a historian...the second is to think about how they can use history in a classroom and why they are there anyway." ¹⁹

This extract has been quoted in full because it seems to emphasise one of the most complex factors in teacher training. Those teachers who had received such re-training passively were thought unlikely to benefit greatly from it. Those teachers who had actively engaged in the central process of historical research were thought to have derived great advantage from it. Although this is as we might expect, it means too that those teachers for whose use those classroom units were devised will be in a scarcely better position than those who attended the lectures on the latest historical conclusions. It may be that the spirit of enquiry can never be acquired second hand: that it is a wheel of sorts which each teacher is required to re-invent for himself. And if this should be felt to be the case, then it is all the more important that children be asked to perform the same process, i.e. to be provided with the raw materials of history, and to be required to draw from them the conclusions which might be drawn by a professional historian.

Conclusion

What are the implications of this analysis of teachers' attitudes for the construction of the history curriculum? It seems, first, that,

¹⁹R. Brown in E. Fenton, op.cit., p. 448.

as yet, it would be unrealistic to expect a lead in progressive methods to be given in the classroom. Teachers will need to be given clear directions as to the aims of history syllabuses and the methods by which these may be realised. On the other hand, it seems true that any syllabus whose underlying philosophy is not apprehended and identified with, by the teacher, will be, by that very omission, robbed of its vitality. It seems, therefore, that some considerable pains must be taken to spell out the aims and objectives of history courses plainly and unambiguously, so that they can be purposefully handled not only by teachers but also by their pupils. Where reforms of history curricula are concerned, it has been repeatedly proved that nothing can be left to trust.

CHAPTER EIGHT

A Set of objectives for teaching history

It remains now to offer some set of proposals based on the conclusions arrived at in the preceding chapters. The purpose of this study has been to examine the considerations for drawing up a history curriculum. It first examined with what justification history laid claim to a place in the secondary school curriculum: it found that the terms on which that justification was claimed imposed certain conditions on the teaching of history of which the syllabus would have to take account. How accurately, then, could a syllabus reflect the philosophy from which it sprang? It seemed to be that syllabuses in current use seemed sometimes to have been diverted from their intended direction. By what restraints, then, was curriculum construction bound?

Did the evaluation of aims and objectives by examinations distort the role of the syllabus? If so, was this a necessary distortion? Why had it taken place? How could it be avoided?

How did the process of the child's psychological development limit or refine the aims and objectives of the syllabus? Which of these limitations were inevitable? Which were the result of un-informed or corrupt practice? How could these limitations be reduced?

To what extent could teachers influence a syllabus? What identification between the teacher and the syllabus was possible? Could this identification be increased? If so, how?

The answers to all three of the questions which conclude the above paragraphs were seen to lie in a clear and unambiguous statement of aims and objectives. If examinations did distort syllabuses, it was because they took advantage of the absence of any other sign-posting to impose their own directions on the course. If pupils did

seem unable to realise too many of the supposed aims and objectives of history courses, this was perhaps because too often they were unaware of what those aims and objectives were. If teachers did lack identification with syllabuses, and seemed too little open to the sources from which they might learn the means to achieve a changed relationship with their subject, this too was because, in terms of stated aims or objectives, syllabuses were too vague. Their imprecision was an effective bar to a closer relationship with the teacher. All these considerations, therefore, indicated that the importance of a clear, thorough statement of aims and objectives was central to the efficient execution of a history curriculum.

Turning again to the requirements of curriculum theory, it was seen in Chapter 3 that a standard procedure for curriculum construction had been advanced. This was:-

- a) the selection of aims, goals and objectives;
- b) the selection of learning experiences calculated to help the attainment of these aims, goals and objectives;
- c) the selection of content;
- d) the organisation and integration of learning experiences and content;
- e) the evaluation of b), c), and d) in attaining a).¹

One of the merits of adopting such a process was the structural integrity which it would enforce upon the curriculum. Learning experiences would have to be justified in terms of aims and objectives. Content would have to be selected to advance those aims and objectives. It would only be those aims and objectives with which evaluation could legitimately concern itself. There should be no possibility, as is so

¹D.K. Wheeler, op.cit., p.30.

often said to be the case today, of syllabus and examination "pulling in different directions". The price to be paid, however, for this structural integrity, was again a clear initial statement of aims and objectives. By any criteria, it seemed that this was where curriculum construction had to begin.

This point can be reinforced by contrasting the procedure advocated here, with the situation which prevails today. It is hard to believe that there can be any human activity whose professed aims are currently approached as obliquely as those of history teaching. Some of those aims were enumerated in chapter 2. Amongst them were that the aim of history is to confer "human self-knowledge", "to give cohesion and deeper meaning to the rest of the curriculum", or to "make it plain that in history there can be no verdict without trial". It is not proposed to repeat here all the aims proposed in chapter 2. Objectives were more sparingly advanced, and were not expressed in behavioural terms: the following however, were classifiable as objectives: that the pupil should develop "the retentive memory, the observant eye, the capacity for accurate and exhaustive statement", "accuracy in apprehension and statement, ability to distinguish what is relevant and select what is important, the weighing of evidence, the detection of bias, the distinguishing of truth from falsehood, or at least the probable from the impossible". With what learning experience and content, then, are these aims and objectives currently enforced? The answer is that those learning experiences consist predominantly of the presentation of a largely narrative treatment of the national past. How is the achievement of those objectives evaluated? By the almost invariable requirement to write a number of essays whose heaviest demand is on the simple power of memory. Diagrammatically one might represent a curriculum constructed on such lines like this:

OBJECTIVES	LEARNING EXPERIENCES	CONTENT	EVALUATION
1) The pupil is able to identify the criteria by which valid material can be recognised. 2) The pupil is able to distinguish between fact and opinion. 3) The pupil is able to detect bias in historical writing.	1) Exposition by teacher 2) Reinforced by reference to text-book. 3) Note-taking or note-making to reinforce areas of especial difficulty or importance.	1) Chronologically organised treatment of British history 2) Possibly concentrated focus on a very small period of time.	1) Essays requiring evidence that the chronological narrative has been retained or understood.

Put like this, it is obvious that achievement of the objectives stated above must be taken largely on trust, because they are simply not the subject of the subsequent evaluation. In chapter 3 it was recounted that aims are thought today to be capable of expression only in terms of "faith, hope, and charity", and this may be unavoidable, but the same excuse cannot be advanced on behalf of objectives. It seems very probable that the dissatisfaction with the teaching of history in schools, which was retailed in the first chapter, is largely attributable to this imprecision.

The proposals which follow are based firmly on the belief that curriculum construction begins with the selection and statement of aims, goals and objectives, and that learning experiences, content and evaluation can be organised to advance these aims, goals and objectives directly, and need not resort to any other approach. The statement of aims is, as has been suggested before, necessarily couched in broad, visionary, long-range terms. They are often felt to

have no connection with the events that take place in the classroom. In order to be utilisable in the classroom situation they must be converted into precise definitions of objectives in so far as is possible. But this ought not to mean that aims are thought to have no function in curriculum construction. Aims give direction and shape to the selection of objectives. Therefore although a teacher's practical work must be principally concerned with advancing the attainment of objectives, he must never lose sight entirely of the aims which underlie them. Nor would it seem desirable in any similar situation that pupils should remain ignorant of the aims of their activity. Therefore both for the sake of the teacher and of the pupils, it is advocated that the right preface to a history course is to discuss the philosophy of the course, and, therefore, presumably, of history. This proposal is less intimidating in practice than it sounds. It is an open examination of the problem, "Why do we study history?" If, as was suggested in chapter 2, we study history so that "we may see what man has been and therefore what he is", so that we may gain a deeper understanding "of the world in which we live", and so that we may develop the intellectual habits which the historian brings to bear on any problem with which he is confronted, then these are the points which ought to emerge from such a discussion.

Such discussions can be profitably undertaken with children at all stages of secondary schooling. Teachers who have engaged upon them will be all too familiar with responses such as: "History is what the kings and queens did". "History is about battles and dates." "If the book might be wrong, then what are we reading it for?" "What's the French Revolution got to do with us?" Yet the very inadequacy of these responses underlines the urgent necessity of conducting such

discussions. It may be that by the very young or the very dull they may not be perfectly understood, but the effort must be made if we are to amend the present situation where pupils see so much of their energy being channelled into remembering too many meaningless facts, only to have their lack of historical understanding decried. It seems essential, too, that such discussion be undertaken not only before the beginning of the course, but at regular intervals throughout it, perhaps not less than once a term. The danger of raising these issues at the beginning of the course and not returning to them again is that they tend to be categorised by pupils and teachers alike as irrelevant, wholly academic, (and probably uninteresting) diversions - once put aside, the real business of memorising "facts" can begin. However, if such discussions are undertaken with some regularity, then it is more difficult to conduct the remainder of the course as if it were unaffected by them. This is one of a number of proposals which will emerge in the course of this chapter to tackle the problems of history teaching directly, even to the point of forcing, bluntly upon the attention of pupils, those very delicate and often scarcely tangible results at which we aim.

The objectives into which the aims of history teaching may be converted, demand precise and accurate definition. "Objectives are explicit statements descriptive of the competence and traits which a programme develops in those who engage in it."² Objectives, therefore, will be defined in terms of the activity not of the teacher, but of the pupil. They demand, first, a clear statement of

²P. Dressel, College and University Curriculum (New York, 1968), p. 41.

the behaviour of the pupil when he has attained the objective: second, they may require a definition of the conditions under which this behaviour will occur: third, they will define the criteria by which this behaviour will be regarded as acceptable. If these stipulations are met, then a careful statement of objectives should provide teachers and pupils with essential guidance as to the direction of the course, the organisation of learning experiences, and the relevant evaluation.

This degree of precision in the definition of objectives is not always easy, especially in the humanities, where, as was suggested in chapter 2, so many of the objectives lie in what Bloom classified as the Affective Domain - those which are concerned with the development of attitudes and values. Even in the Cognitive Domain they are by no means straightforward, and this study has felt that to go beyond the Cognitive Domain is, at this stage, unrealistic. Bloom's taxonomy begins with the category "Knowledge" and so must any taxonomy of the objectives of teaching and studying history. The following might serve as a basis for formulating objectives in this category.

1.00 Knowledge

The pupil knows specific facts such as names, dates or events. These specifics will, in sum, form the syllabus. Considerations for syllabus construction have been discussed previously in this study, so it may be sufficient merely to summarise them here. Whatever these specifics include, they ought not to omit those which aid the child's understanding of the society in which he lives. These specifics must vary therefore, according to locality, region, country, rural and ethnic groups. Their identity must be the subject of value judgements by the educational authorities, the school, and

finally by the teacher himself.

If the syllabus is to further the child's understanding of the world in which he lives, then it has been urged that it must give direct attention to the child's immediate environment: in other words, it cannot exclude contemporary history. Nor, does it seem, can it afford to teach contemporary history via a chronological narrative which will seek to place it in its "linear context". It was recounted in chapter 4 how increasingly impossible it is becoming to do justice to this type of syllabus. No less important than the sheer bulk of material involved are the hard facts of secondary school organisation. "My syllabus is dictated by the fact that after the third year, the children make a choice between history and chemistry", one history teacher has been quoted as saying. It seems, therefore, that for those pupils who, for whatever reason, give up history in the middle of their schooling, history has not advanced beyond the Tudors and Stuarts. Even for those who persevere until their seventh year, it may go no further than 1914. It would seem vital, therefore, that in each year of schooling, some contemporary history be studied. Perhaps in each year, one term might be devoted to contemporary history, therefore ensuring that however short is the child's historical training, he will have been given some guidance as to how he might apply it to that "society in which he lives".

The next obligation placed upon the syllabus to help the child to understand the "society in which he lives", is to select some content which makes plain the relation of each individual to those larger issues which usually monopolise the attention of history syllabuses. In this respect, work which is being done by a Southampton school on "family history" is particularly well directed,

and many schools, of course, run highly successful courses on local history.

It does not seem to be of primary importance that the separate components of a history syllabus bear no internal relationship to each other. If they have no other connection than their essential contribution to the development of the child, then their relationship to each other will still be close enough.

The learning experiences which will aid the attainment of knowledge of specific facts and all the other objectives in this category, may include formal exposition by the teacher of a lecture type: the class may reinforce this exposition by simple reading assignments of secondary sources such as text-books. Retention may be assisted by viewing films and listening to records or tapes. The organisation of these learning experiences may be confirmed by note-making, précis work, and summarisation.

Evaluation will require the recall and recognition of test items. This may be done in a number of ways. If the objectives of the course are intended to go no further than knowledge of specific facts, then it is legitimate practice to test for simple recall, by asking questions such as "Which Czar ruled Russia at the time of the Revolution?" However, it is not normally expected that the objectives of history courses will stop here.

It must be recognised what learning process is involved in the answering of such questions. It may be that "important" names have been underlined in the text-book: they may have been the subject of a quiz: certainly they will become the only targets for the fingers: which scan the printed page in quest of likely subjects for just such questions. It may be argued that the better a candidate understands the Russian Revolution, the likelier it is that he will be able to

answer such a question, but it is equally possible that he might answer a whole such paper without a glimmer of historical understanding or that he might have a very good grasp of the basic issues involved, and yet be unable to answer such questions. However, for the moment, recall and recognition are our concern, rather than historical understanding.

The requirement to recall and recognise specific facts, begs two questions. The first is, what particular aspect of a question such as "Which Czar ruled Russia at the time of the Revolution?" do we consider valuable? Why is his identity considered to be important to the average British school child? If the Russian Revolution is being studied, then unquestionably it seems vital to know that pre-Revolutionary Russia was ruled by a Czar: equally it seems vital to know what a czar is, and to know what features of his rule rendered him vulnerable to revolutionary action: but to know his name and number, dull though history must be if represented solely in terms of institutions rather than personalities, seems of secondary importance.

The second issue raised by test questions such as "Which Czar ruled Russia at the time of the Revolution?" is whether this is the only way, if such knowledge is thought to be important, to evaluate the attainment of this objective? It seems that this question could be reconstructed to test or simple recall while introducing, at the same time, an aspect of elementary historical understanding.

Nicholas II is important to the study of the Russian Revolution because

- (a) he was the Czar who abolished feudalism.
- (b) his son had haemophilia.
- (c) he was the Czar who ruled Russia at the time of the Revolution.
- (d) he was the founder of the Communist party.

Phrased in this way, a number of requirements seem to have been satisfied. To answer this question correctly, evidence has had to be given of simple recall and recognition. It might be suggested that the value of the recall has been debased by the prompting it receives from the question. It is true that the value of the fact of memorisation involved has been perhaps debased, but why should the exercise of recall - directing the attention of the mind - not have been refined by this contextual significance?

If the options offered by this question had involved thought processes of greater complexity, it would perhaps be argued that the test for simple recall had been confused or obscured by the demand for higher skills. If, for instance, the question had asked:

Nicholas II is important to the story of the Russian Revolution because

- (a) he allowed the government to fall into the hands of the Czarina and Rasputin.
- (b) the first democratic institutions in Russia were introduced in his reign.
- (c) he was the Czar who ruled Russia at the time of the Revolution.
- (d) he committed Russia to fighting in two disastrous wars.

then it is possible that an error in the value judgement required here, could conceal the fact that the candidate was able to recall the identity of the Czar who ruled Russia at the time of the Revolution. As the multiple-choice question was originally phrased, however, it does not seem reasonable that the same excuse could be offered on behalf of a mistaken answer. The correct option is matched with an inaccuracy (a), a triviality (b), and an absurdity (d).

For the candidate who can recall the identity of the Czar there is little opportunity for confusion here. Nor is there any real demand on the skills of a more sophisticated kind. The only exercise of

judgement required is the choice between (b) and (c), and it may reasonably be asked of what value is knowledge which is unable to make the correct distinction between these two?

Another means by which knowledge of specific facts could be evaluated is by essays or paragraphs requiring merely factual information. However, even the most straightforward essay involves the attainment of objectives other than knowledge of specific facts. Detailed discussion of evaluation by essay writing will therefore be postponed for the moment.

1.20 The pupil should know of chronology, sequence of events, the relationship of cause and effect.

Knowledge of these factors seems integral to a study of history. However, once again, a careful definition is demanded of what we understand by these objectives. What is not understood by this, is the requirement to know, as a numeral, the date of any historical event. Rather, it is a sense of the location of events in a chronological framework: a sense that not only do certain events precede certain others, but that it could not be otherwise: that is, a sense that the later event was, in part, the outcome of the earlier one. If this is understood, it will effectively preclude evaluation by such questions as, "In what year did the Russian Revolution break out?" How can it be justified that, to schoolchildren in Brixton, Bristol, or Brest-Litovsk, it is of importance that the Revolution occurred in 1917 rather than in 1916 or 1918? What does seem justifiable is that they should know that it occurred not six, nor six hundred, but sixty years ago. And if this is the case, then this is how the question should be phrased:-

The Russian Revolution took place approximately

- (a) six years ago
- (b) sixty years ago
- (c) six hundred years ago
- (d) in the time of Christ.

Even this degree of precision may be meaningless to younger children. Chapter 6 demonstrated how underdeveloped is the sense of time in most children of school-going age. Therefore it might be still more relevant to phrase the question as follows:-

The Russian Revolution took place approximately

- (a) in your own lifetime
- (b) after your father was born
- (c) after your grandfather was born
- (d) before Christ was born.

Evaluation of knowledge of sequence of events is another objective which seems capable of direct testing. The following example will test both recall and recognition, and the sense of historical development:-

Place the following events in the order in which they occurred:-

- (a) the Bishops' Book
- (b) the execution of Strafford
- (c) the long parliament
- (d) the short parliament
- (e) the Civil War.

The following example directly evaluates a knowledge of the relationship of events to each other:-

Questions 24-29 all concern the French Revolution. You are asked to decide whether these statements are causes of the French revolution, or something that happened during the revolution, i.e. an event of the revolution, or whether they describe a result of the revolution. If they are none of these, or if they contain a mistake, mark them as false.

F = false, C = cause, E = event, R = result. F C E R

24. The Revolution occurred in France, because France was the most backward country in Europe.

	F	C	E	R
25. The women of Paris marched on Versailles to demand that the King return to Paris with them.
26. The people of France had been inspired to revolt by the teachings of writers like Voltaire and Rousseau.
27. It became possible for any Frenchman who was clever enough to rise to any position in the country.
28. The power of the king was so great that there seemed no way of limiting it except by revolution.
29. The storming of the Bastille frightened the royal family into escaping from Paris.

Essay testing will also evaluate a knowledge of chronology, sequence of events, and relationship of cause and effect, although once again, many more skills than these will be demanded by essay testing.

The learning experiences which will promote the attainment of these objectives may also be more directly attuned to them, than is presently the case. Exercises of "anticipation" can develop the sense of cause and effect. Classes can be given data of a pre-revolutionary situation, and can then be asked to construct what they imagine the post-revolutionary situation to be. Why have they thought this or that likely to occur? Answers will have to be expressed in terms of cause and effect.

1.30 The pupil knows both specifically historical terminology, and terminology commonly used in history.

In the first category will be terms such as crusade, feudal, renaissance, or cavalry: in the second, terms such as church, revolution, blockade, nationalism, colony.

Knowledge of these terms cannot be allowed to derive from encountering them in context. They must be defined, exemplified, and elaborated both in and out of the contextual situation. Before any programme of constitutional history is begun, for instance, the vocabulary of the subject must be understood.

The learning experiences may involve the creation of situations analogous to the one to be studied. For instance, the class can be supposed to have a grievance. They elect a spokesman to present their case to the head teacher. The candidate receiving the most votes is chosen. Is this a democratic choice? The candidate falls ill and nominates a friend to substitute for him. Is this a democratic process of succession? No pains can be too great to establish the conceptual accuracy of these definitions.

Evaluation, once again, is achieved only very superficially by asking pupils to define "nationalism" or "aristocracy". Uncomprehending cramming can reap rich rewards in these situations. Objective testing of the multiple-choice type is better able to evaluate knowledge of such terminology. Alternatively, pupils could be asked to employ the terminology required, in an exercise such as this:-

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| 7 ... Democracy | A. Rule by the rich |
| 8 ... Tyranny | B. When the head of the state is elected by the people |
| 9 ... Aristocracy | C. Rule by the people |
| 10 ... Monarchy | D. When the head of the state inherits his or her position |
| 11 ... Republic | E. Rule by the nobles |
| | F. Rule by force |
| | G. Rule by one man |
| | H. When the head of the state wears a crown |

In the dots next to the numbers in the left hand column, write the letter next to the phrase in the right hand column, which matches the word in the left hand column. If you think that democracy means "Rule by the rich", put "A" next to no. 7.

1.40 The pupil knows historical interpretations, the possibility of conflicting interpretations, and the existence of historical controversies. The objectives are beginning to move towards the areas of possible overlap with categories other than knowledge, but the primary concern is still that the pupil should know of these interpretations rather than that he be able to evaluate them, or assess their validity.

The learning experiences which will promote this objective will be largely passive, but their purpose will be to show that because history is an art and not a science, it is possible to come to a different conclusion by using a selection from the same set of data.

1.50 The pupil knows the source materials available to the historian, the uses to which source material may be put, and the secondary sources to which the historian may refer.

Although the learning experiences to promote this objective can be passive, they lend themselves to activity methods. Project work and assignments will introduce children to both primary and secondary sources. Jackdaw kits, if used with care, can acquaint children with the historian's encounter with primary sources. Visits to museums can offer opportunities to show how wide is the range of possible primary source materials. An excursion to the scene of a battlefield is an investigation of a primary source material: to visit a battlefield, and not to emphasise this point as clearly as possible, is to negate much of the impact of such an exercise.

Evaluation of this objective, often thought to be impossible, is also compatible with the direct methods of objective testing.

The following samples may offer some ideas on this possibility:-

Three of the following questions could be answered by simply looking up in the text book or encyclopaedia. For the fourth, some understanding of history is required. Which is that?

- (a) Why did Napoleon win all his earlier battles and lose so many of the later ones?
- (b) Where did Napoleon first make a military reputation for himself?
- (c) Who commanded the army which arrived just in time to turn the tide against Napoleon at Waterloo?
- (d) When did Napoleon have himself crowned as Emperor?

If you found a Grecian bowl like the one here illustrated at Scarborough

- (a) You could prove that the Greeks had settled in Scarborough in ancient times.
- (b) You could prove that the Greeks had visited Scarborough in ancient times.
- (c) You could suggest that the Greeks had visited Scarborough in ancient times.
- (d) You would know that it was either a forgery, or that it had been stolen from a museum, and abandoned in Scarborough.

From the category of knowledge, Bloom's taxonomy moves on to "intellectual abilities and skills", that is, the "organised modes of operation and generalised techniques for dealing with materials and problems."³

2.00 Comprehension

The pupil knows what is being communicated when confronted with sources, both primary and secondary, verbal and non-verbal.

Bloom identifies three stages in Comprehension. The first is Translation. Translation is a simple re-phrasing of material in a

³B. Bloom, et al. op.cit., p.

form of communication other than that in which it was originally expressed. Accuracy will be the criterion by which success in meeting² this objective is gauged. Translation is the process which is almost always in operation in the study of history. Every page read by a pupil is subconsciously subjected to a process of translation. Every sentence spoken by the teacher undergoes a process of translation in his hearers' minds. Translation can be promoted and evaluated by exercises such as paraphrasing, comprehension tests, and in the case of non-verbal material - cartoons, photographs, or museum exhibits - short essays to test accuracy of comprehension.

2.20 Interpretation

The pupil is able to re-arrange or re-view material in such a way that evidence is given of his grasp of the thought of the work as a whole.

It is this process which is required in summarisation, or precis work, or in the selection of one particular aspect of material from a whole. For instance, to trace Napoleon's military career from a biographical study, involves the rejection of all aspects not specifically military, which is an interpretative skill of a specific kind.

2.30 Extrapolation

The pupil is able to extend the given data to determine possible implications, consequences or effects, which are in accordance with the given data but not explicit in it.

The following example attempts to promote and evaluate the ability to extrapolate. This question would follow a study of the industrial revolution:

Study the accompanying table and answer the questions which follow.

Year	Millions of yards of thread spun in England	Estimated number of workers engaged in spinning
1755-63	2.5	16,000
1764	2.5	16,000
1765	4.8	19,000
1766	5.1	22,000
1767-68	5.1	22,000
1769	7.3	25,000
1770-83	7.6	27,000
1783-93	7.2	26,000
1794	7.4	28,000

- 1) Why do you think there was such a sharp increase in the amount of thread spun in the years 1765 and 1769?
- 2) Why do you think the amount of thread spun did not increase between 1783 and 1793?
- 3) Did the workers have good reason to fear that the new inventions would put them out of work?

Interpretative exercises such as that which follows also demand that the pupil extend the given data to establish a relationship with other material which is either hypothocated or remembered. This example would be suitable only for senior pupils:

The Unification of Italy - Interpretative Exercises.

In the Italy of 1859, it was impossible to play with the forces of nationalism, inflame them to a fever pitch of expectations and then dash all hopes by so tortuous a policy. During the fighting the many nationalist groups of Central Italy had sprung into action, expelling petty rulers and preparing for liberation. They could not now afford to stop, to allow 1859 to become a mere repetition of 1849 (D. Thompson Europe Since Napoleon).

- i) At whom do you think the criticism in the first sentence is aimed, and how far do you think that this criticism is justified?
- ii) What were the practical results of the fact that in 1859, the nationalist groups of central Italy 'could not now afford to stop' ?
- iii) What had happened in 1849 that the Italian nationalist groups of central Italy could not allow to be repeated in 1859 ?

3.00 Application

The pupil is able to apply the ideas, rules, principles and theories learned in one situation to the circumstances of another.

This will involve the application of knowledge, comprehension, analysis, synthesis and evaluation, not only from one historical situation to another but also to situations which are not specifically historical. This objective, in fact, simply re-states the time honoured educational principle of transfer of training.

The learning experiences which will further this objective must exercise the facility for problem solving. Comprehension, Interpretation, and Extrapolation will be required in order that the pupil may judge which principles will be applicable to other situations. Simulation techniques and games demand the application of principles learned in one situation to what is probably a fictional situation devised for the purpose of advancing the skill of application. These techniques are becoming more and more expert, and the recent activity described by Tansey and Unwin⁴ indicates that what has previously been regarded largely as a diversion, may play an increasingly important educational role in future.

However, the most frequent demand upon the skill of application will be to real situations. Real situations will demand either, that principles learned are applied to material of which the pupil has no knowledge, or that they be required to be applied to material known to the pupil, in ways of which he has not previously thought.

Some of the exercises already quoted, in fact, demanded a certain degree of Application. A question which asks candidates to pair political definitions with historical figures is an exercise in the

⁴P.J. Tansey and R. Unwin, Simulation and Gaming in Education, London, 1971.

application of knowledge of historical terminology. The question which asked candidates to identify causes and effects was an exercise in the application of what is sometimes referred to as the principle of equilibrium to the circumstances of the French Revolution. To some extent, questions 1 and 3 of the interpretative exercise ask that candidates should apply general observations to the particular details of Italian unification. When a class is asked to identify which of four statements is a fact and which is an opinion, they are, in fact, applying the concept of fact and opinion to the particular items with which they are being confronted. An essay question such as the following is also a taxing exercise in Application:

"It is always easier to start a Revolution than to stop one." How true is this of the French Revolution?

So many well constructed exercises and test items seem to be testing application of one of the categories of knowledge and, as was suggested earlier, it might reasonably be asked of what use is knowledge of which a pupil is unable to make an elementary application. It may be that, in history, application is an objective which ought not to be too self-consciously pursued, because, unlike the sciences, history does not attempt to disclose general principles which are of universal application under given conditions.

4.10 Analysis of Elements

The pupil is able to break historical material down into its constituent parts.

In other words, he is able to distinguish dominant ideas from subordinate ones, relevant material from irrelevant material, to distinguish between facts and opinions, to detect the structural

organisation of a communication, to detect unstated assumptions.

There is considerable overlap between the objectives of Analysis and those of Comprehension and Evaluation. For instance, exercises in summarisation or précis have, in fact, required pupils to distinguish between dominant and subordinate ideas, and perhaps relevant and irrelevant ones. Yet, in general, it is true to say that it is possible to comprehend a passage, without having the skill to break it down into its constituent parts.

Some of these skills are so integral to a successful study of history that they require specific training and evaluation. To promote the growth of the facility to distinguish between fact and opinion, and relevant and irrelevant material, speeches from historical situations may be analysed in terms of the objectives above, newspaper reports may be analysed, or political broadcasts or polemical writing. The vital point to be considered in this context is that all material must be presented to pupils as the subject for critical scrutiny and not a source of unassailable authority. Any other approach will stifle the facility for analysis.

The following examples may illustrate possible methods of evaluating Analysis of Elements:-

Three of the following sentences contain opinions. One contains a fact. Which sentence is that?

- (a) Napoleon was the greatest military genius in history.
- (b) You can never have too many men on a battlefield.
- (c) Napoleon said, "You can never have too many men on a battlefield."
- (d) In spite of his genius, Napoleon's reign was a disaster for France.

Martin Luther

A) This account of his life was written by a Roman Catholic.

Martin Luther, a miner's son, was born at Eisleben in 1483. In July 1505 he applied to become a monk at the monastery of the Augustinians in Erfurt. Less than two years later, he was ordained a priest, without so far having made any study of

religion. In 1511 he was sent to Rome, and behaved there like any normally devout Catholic pilgrim.

In 1512 he claimed to have a visitation from the Holy Ghost about St Paul's words, "You will be saved by faith". Why did this religious problem become of such importance? It was because Luther, by attacking the Pope's financial policy, won the support of not only those people with money, but of all those Germans who suffer from the inferiority complex that they often feel in regard to the Italians.

In 1525 he went through a form of marriage with an ex-nun. His friends did not approve of the marriage, but hoped that the influence of his wife would cure him of his habit of making coarse jokes. It did not, for his speech and his writings grew coarser with the years until at the end of his life they passed all bounds of decency.

B) This account was written by a Protestant.

Martin Luther was the son of a miner of Eisleben. The death of a friend so shocked him that he entered a convent of Augustinian hermits. He was ordained priest in 1507. In 1511 he was sent on business to Rome, a visit which opened his eyes to the extravagance of the papal court. In 1512 he completed his doctorate in the study of religion.

Luther's beliefs were sparked off by the particularly unpleasant methods used by Tetzl to raise funds for the building of St Peter's by the sale of indulgences. The essence of Luther's beliefs was that man is "justified" or saved "by faith alone". He received widespread support from princes and scholars. When the Pope sent him a notice of excommunication he burned the letter publicly, a gesture which excited all Germany and most of Europe.

In 1525 Luther married Katherine von Bora, who, with several other nuns, had left her order. The marriage was happy and successful and Luther's home became the centre for a continuous stream of visitors and admirers. Luther wrote tirelessly. His language and humour could be coarse, as well as vivid, but he was always a dominant and sincere reformer.

- (1) In paragraph 3 of the first account there are three sentences. Two of these sentences contain fact and the other one contains opinion. Which is the one which contains opinion?
- (2) What do you think is gained by adding a sentence of opinion to two of facts?
- (3) From these two accounts piece together a dated summary of Luther's life from 1483-1512.
e.g. 1483 ----- born at Eisleben
1505 ----- etc.
- (4) Which of the facts in the first account are proved false by facts which appear in the second?
- (5) Why does the author of the first account use the word "claimed" in line 7 of his biography?
- (6) How does the first account explain the fact that Luther received so much support?
- (7) Is this explanation likely to have any truth in it?
- (8) Is there any reason for believing that one of these accounts is fairer than the other?

- (9) Why do you think that the author of the first account says that when Luther was ordained a priest he had had no religious training?
- (10) Does this tell us anything about the church as well as something about Luther?

4.20 Analysis of Relationships

The pupil is able to detect the relationships between the elements of a passage.

This implies that he is able to recognise whether a premise is supported by relevant facts, whether the facts are operative upon the conclusion, and whether the conclusion is consequent upon the premise: a high degree of logical ability is being aimed at.

Although there is a possibility that objective testing may disclose analyses which were not self-evident to the pupil, it can be used to test analysis of relationships.

Indicate whether the following statements are true or false by entering a tick in the appropriate column.

	True	False
(a) If the law is the supreme power in the land, then it follows that even the king has to obey it.
(b) If the king believed in the Divine Right, then it follows that he believed he need not obey laws which had been made by mere men, as he had been appointed by God.

If one of the following events had not occurred, the other three events would probably not have happened either. Which is that one?

- Louis accepts the throne of Spain on behalf of his grandson.
- Colbert dies, in 1683.
- Louis expels the Huguenots from France.
- William of Orange accepts the throne of England.

4.30 Analysis of Organisational Principles

The pupil is able to detect the organisational principles upon which a communication is based. This may involve detecting the motive of the writer, or the bias of the writer, the technical restraints of the communication (limited time or space, or the nature of his audience).

The evaluation of these skills has been implicit in some of the earlier exercises. The exercise, previously quoted, on Martin Luther, as well as testing for Analysis of Elements, also disclosed the function of the organisational principles of each passage.

The problem of teaching history in such a way as to promote the detection of bias has received much attention recently,⁵ although the problems still seem to be much clearer than the solutions. The learning experiences which will promote the detection of bias will concentrate on heightening the awareness of the presence of bias, and on examining the effects of bias upon the material concerned. Evaluation of the success with which this has been achieved is not easily devised, and the following examples may possibly be less objective than is presupposed by their format:-

If you were writing a biography of Louis XIV, which was entirely favourable to him, which one of the following points would you leave out?

- a. He broke the power of the nobles.
- b. He built the palace of Versailles.
- c. He encouraged artists and architects.
- d. He rid France of her Protestants.

and

which of the following statements betrays a bias towards Napoleon, which betrays a bias against Napoleon, and which is entirely neutral?

	For	Ag.	Neut.
a) The Prussians arrived at the battle of Waterloo at 4.15 p.m.
b) Napoleon would have won the battle of Waterloo had Wellington not been saved by the Prussians.
c) Napoleon delayed the start of the battle of Waterloo because he was troubled by stomach ulcers.
d) Napoleon suffered the fate of all tyrants when defeated at Waterloo.

⁵E.H. Dance, *History the Betrayer*; London, 1960 is perhaps the fullest analysis.

5.00 Synthesis

The student is able to put together elements and parts so as to form a whole. The pupil is able to organise ideas into a coherent historical narrative or argument. The pupil is able to formulate hypotheses (perhaps historical interpretations) and to explain the procedures for testing them (for instance, by stating under what conditions they would be found to be true).

The learning experience in the study of history which almost invariably tests for synthesis is the requirement to write an essay. As it is upon this exercise that the English examining boards have chosen to rely almost exclusively, it is necessary to ask how accurately the essay form evaluates the skill of Synthesis. Certainly it is the case that the essay form can provide opportunities to combine the skills of Knowledge, Comprehension, Application and Analysis into a meaningful pattern which did not exist previously. However, many essay questions rather ask candidates to construct a pattern which is known to be in existence already. For instance, to ask candidates, "Why did the Rôyalists lose the Civil War?" is to demand little creative effort of them. It is common knowledge that the reasons for the Royalist defeat have been so minutely analysed, and that these analyses are so widely available, that such a question will principally evoke the rote-learning or simple recall which has resulted from previous coverage of the material. Some activity of Synthesis is still required to ensure that the interpretations thus recalled are combined into a meaningful narrative, but this is not the aspect of Synthesis in which a historian is most interested. The capacity for Synthesis which the historian would like to evaluate will be as valid if practised on material which is totally unfamiliar to the pupil as if practised on material with which he is familiar.

However, the problems of presenting the pupil under test conditions with material which is entirely new to him, have meant that tests have had to be conducted on material with which the pupil is familiar. The problem, then, is quite clearly to ask the pupil to create from this familiar material a pattern which is new to him, hence still making greater demands on knowledge than is desirable, but nevertheless involving the pupil in some creative activity. However, it is patently obvious that the examining boards, by asking the same essay questions year after year, often in the precise words used on a previous occasion, have effectively debased the need for creativity by an enormous premium on memory. Even a question such as, "Did Bismarck consciously plan war with France to complete the Unification of Germany?" although demanding considerable historical ability when initially encountered, will be reduced to a matter of recall (knowledge) if asked a second time and a third. Therefore, if not only Synthesis, but any of the skills beyond the category knowledge are to be evaluated at all, it seems absolutely essential that the questions devised by the examiners should challenge the creativity of the candidate afresh each year.

The second area in which evaluation by essay-writing is particularly vulnerable to criticism, is in the inequality of the demands made upon pupils by the choices offered in a paper. It was commented upon, in chapter 5, that it is unrealistic to expect a candidate to attempt a question which makes demands on intellectual skills and abilities if he loses nothing by answering questions which demand only simple recall.

The third difficulty arising from evaluation of essay-writing or any other activity which involves Synthesis, is that no criteria have yet been devised whereby such activities can be evaluated

objectively . Procedures for evaluation can be refined, such as those devised for evaluating original composition, but they will ultimately depend on a subjective assessment.

Essay-writing is not the only learning experience which involves Synthesis, and particularly with younger children, assignments, projects, or collections of museum-type exhibits are valid exercises in Synthesis.

6.00 Evaluation

The pupil is able to make judgements about the value of historical material.

"Value" is judged either by criteria determined by the student or those given to him. The pupil will be able to judge if material has "value" in terms of accuracy, consistency, or effectiveness of communications.

In many respects, the dividing line between Analysis and Evaluation is unidentifiable. Analysis of relevant and irrelevant facts, of the relationship between a premise and the facts offered in support of it, and of the relationship between premise and conclusion, are essential to successful Evaluation. However, a pupil may disclose the relationship between a premise and its supporting facts, without making the necessary inference regarding the "value" of those facts. Are they the only ones available to the author? Are they the ones which best support his argument? Are they likely to have been accurately stated? Have they been adequately documented? Is the author's conclusion likely to be the correct one?

Evaluation in history should not usually be concerned with judgements which cannot be made with distinct criteria in mind. It is not the business of historians to determine whether laws or governments are "good" or "well-meaning" or "unfair". Historical evaluation

is more concerned with applying criteria such as an author's initial assumption (internal) or the body of known evidence on a topic (external) to the expression of a communication.

The learning experiences to promote the skill of Evaluation must involve first a study of criteria by which historical material can be judged. This may be based upon the knowledge of historical methodology which was stated as an objective earlier. It will, then, involve the presentation of material in such a way as to encourage the ability to Evaluate. This means that as much freedom of opinion as possible must be encouraged, lest the absolute criteria by which historical material must be judged are confused with the authoritatively imposed criteria of the learning situation. Classroom discussion may achieve this freedom of opinion but it is likelier to be a product of a seminar-type lesson.

Evaluation of the skill of Evaluation is also significantly made by essay-type questions. A question such as:

Professor de Kiewet said of the causes of the Great Trek that they could be broken down into the native question, the Hottentot question, and the slave question. How accurate do you think this judgement is?

demands that the pupil evaluates the known causes of the Trek against the criteria advanced by Professor de Kiewet.

Interpretative exercises can focus the exercise of Evaluation upon specific criteria or on specific material. If we add to the interpretative exercise quoted earlier the question "Do you think that the writer has exaggerated the effect of Napoleon's intervention upon the situation in Italy?" an element of Evaluation is being demanded. Objective tests can also assess how successfully this objective has been attained, although perhaps more easily in terms of internal than of external criteria. The following example may illustrate this point:-

Which of the following questions do you think it most important to be able to answer?

- a. Which famous inventors were not British?
- b. Where did Richard Arkwright set up his Frame?
- c. Why did the Industrial Revolution begin in Britain?
- d. How many threads could the Spinning Jenny spin at once?

You learn for the first time the theory that Chamberlain's Policy of Appeasement, far from being a timid surrender to Hitler, was what gave Britain the breathing space to catch up with the German armed strength. Do you regard the following statements as important in support of such a theory, as possibly of importance, or as irrelevant?

	Imp.	Pos.	Irr.
1) England developed the Spitfire in 1939
2) This view is supported by Major Harold Balfour in his autobiography
3) Chamberlain was almost ignorant of the true strength of Britain's armed forces
4) Chamberlain had been warned by the Admiralty that it was in no position to wage war in 1938

Conclusion

These objectives have attempted to take into account all the considerations for drawing up a history curriculum that have been discussed in this study. They have proceeded directly from certain aims (stated in chapter 2): they have been developed in accordance with the requirements of "classical" curriculum process, as stated in chapter 3 . Chapter 3 also retailed the observation that curriculum theory often appeared to be unrelated to the actual problems encountered in the classroom situation. These objectives, then, were not formulated until the restraints imposed on curriculum process by syllabuses, examinations, teachers, and the capacity of the pupil had been considered.

This is not the first detailed statement of the objectives of teaching history to be formulated, although it may be the first to

proceed from the particular considerations treated here. These objectives have, moreover, been linked, as far as was thought desirable, to learning experiences and content, both of which were thought, with certain essential reservations, to be best determined by the circumstances of the individual class, school, locality or teacher.⁶ These objectives have also been linked more firmly to methods of evaluation which would, it is hoped, not only evaluate, but promote the attainment of these objectives. It remains only to say that a curriculum founded upon the aims and objectives expressed in this chapter has been employed with some success in a secondary boys' school (although the greatest benefits to be reaped from such a course may be apparent perhaps only after the pupil has left school). These expressions of optimism are voiced in full awareness of the enigma discussed in the first chapter of this study, that history teaching seems strangely impervious either to criticism (and it is subjected to much) or to the ever increasing volume of advice, practical and theoretical, which is dispensed upon the subject.

6

See Appendix A for a diagrammatic summary of the objectives in this chapter.

APPENDIX A

TAXONOMY OF OBJECTIVES FOR TEACHING HISTORY

OBJECTIVE	LEARNING EXPERIENCE	EVALUATION
1.00 <u>Knowledge</u>		
1.10 <u>Knowledge of Specifics</u> The pupil knows specific facts, such as names, dates or events.	Formal exposition by teacher. Reading assignments (of text-books and other materials). Films, records, tapes. Note-taking or note-making. Summarisation, precis work. Drill exercises.	Open ended questions. Objective exercises. Paragraph-writing. Essays requiring factual treatment.
1.20 <u>Knowledge of Chronology, Sequence of Events, Relationship of Cause and Effect</u>		
The pupil knows the chronological framework of history. He knows that there is a relationship between one event and those which post-date it in time.	As above. Sequencing exercises. Exercises in 'anticipation'.	Objective testing. Essay writing.
1.30 <u>Knowledge of Terminology</u>		
The pupil knows terms commonly used in history, and terms with specifically historical uses.	Definition. Simulation exercises.	Objective testing.
1.40 <u>Knowledge of Historical Interpretations</u>		
The pupil knows historical interpretations, knows that there can be conflicting interpretations, and that historical controversies exist.	Formal exposition e.g. demonstration of opposing viewpoints. Reading assignments.	Objective testing. Essay writing.

OBJECTIVE	LEARNING EXPERIENCE	EVALUATION
1.50 <u>Knowledge of Historical Sources</u>	As above, <u>and</u> Project work. Assignments. Museum visits. Excursions.	Objective testing.
2.00 <u>Comprehension</u>		
The pupil knows what is being communicated when confronted with historical material, both primary and secondary, verbal and non-verbal.		
2.10 <u>Translation</u>	Paraphrasing exercises. Comprehension exercises.	Paraphrasing. Comprehension tests. Essays.
The pupil is able to rephrase material in a form other than that in which it was originally expressed.		
2.20 <u>Interpretation</u>	Summarisation exercises. Precis work.	Summarisation. Precis work. Essays, short paragraphs.
The pupil is able to re-arrange or re-view material in such a way that evidence is given of a grasp of the work as a whole.		

OBJECTIVE	LEARNING EXPERIENCE	EVALUATION
<p>2.30 <u>Extrapolation</u></p> <p>The pupil can extend data given to him to determine possible implications, consequences or effects, which are in accordance with the given data but not explicit in it.</p>	<p>Comprehension tests. 'Anticipation' exercises.</p>	<p>Comprehension tests. Interpretative exercises.</p>
<p>3.00 <u>Application</u></p> <p>The pupil is able to apply the knowledge and comprehension learned in one historical situation to those learned in another.</p>	<p>Problem solving exercises. Simulation techniques. Games. Confrontation with new situations or new demands of old material.</p>	<p>Objective testing. Interpretative exercises. Essays.</p>
<p>4.00 <u>Analysis</u></p>		
<p>4.10 <u>Analysis of Elements</u></p> <p>The pupil is able to break historical material into its constituent components.</p>	<p>Comprehension exercises. Interpretative exercises. Unauthoritarian approach to source material.</p>	<p>Comprehension tests. Interpretative tests. Objective tests.</p>
<p>4.20 <u>Analysis of Relationships</u></p> <p>The pupil is able to detect the relationships between the constituent components of a passage.</p>	<p>Logical thinking training.</p>	<p>Objective testing.</p>

OBJECTIVE	LEARNING EXPERIENCE	EVALUATION
<p>4.30 <u>Analysis of Organisational Principles</u></p> <p>The pupil is able to detect the organisational principles (e.g. bias) on which historical communications are based.</p>	<p>Training in analysis. Comprehension exercises.</p>	<p>Objective tests. Comprehension tests.</p>
<p>5.00 <u>Synthesis</u></p> <p>The pupil is able to put together historical elements and parts so as to form a whole.</p>	<p>Essay writing. Project work. Assignments. Study plans.</p>	<p>Essays.</p>
<p>6.00 <u>Evaluation</u></p> <p>The pupil is able to make judgements about the value of historical material</p>	<p>Seminars. Reading assignments. Critical appraisals of texts.</p>	<p>Essays. Interpretative exercises. Objective tests.</p>

APPENDIX B

HISTORY SYLLABUS IN USE AT A COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL

AIMS

1. Historical Knowledge. All pupils should be acquainted with the history of their own country in particular and of its contexts - Europe and the World - in general. Until the end of the fourth year, therefore, when half the school because of the specialisation required by external examinations abandon history, the syllabus embraces history from the earliest times to the present day. Pupils taking the subject at Ordinary Level for the G.C.E. make a detailed study of English and European history 1688-1815 in the fifth year; Sixth Form Advanced Level candidates study English and European history from the late eighteenth century to the nineteen-thirties (broadly). Examinations aside, the whole Sixth Form follows a course of one year in Modern (20th century) World History.
2. The aim in Junior and Lower Middle School is, as Locke put it, to delight rather than to teach; the approach should be romantic, emotional rather than scientific and intellectual. Curiosity about the ways and means of the past should be aroused and satisfied, the imagination stimulated by the stories and achievements. Personality as well as taste for the subject will be developed thereby.

FORM I Age 11+ 3 periods per week.

The Ancient World from Early Man to the Decline of the Roman Empire, with emphasis on (a) the developing skills of Prehistoric Man and British examples, (b) the civilization of the Near and Middle East, (c) the Aegean Civilization, and (d) Roman Empire and Roman Britain.

The main aim is to show the life of those times. Outstanding events - e.g. Greece's struggle with Persia - and personalities - e.g. Alexander the Great - are to be treated imaginatively and in some detail. Written work is to be simple, with more emphasis on illustrating, diagrams and simple time charts.

- (a) Prehistoric Man - the Stone and Metal Ages. Tools, weapons, homes, mode of life, progress, migrations to Britain. Stonehenge. Celts.
- (b) The River Valleys and the Fertile Crescent.
 - (i) Mesopotamia - Building, agriculture, writing, etc. The House at Ur. Sumerians. Hammurapi. The Assyrians. Babylon.
 - (ii) Egypt The Red and White Kingdoms. The Pyramid Age. The Egyptians and Death. Writing, papyrus, etc. Metals. The calendar. Thutmose and the Empire; Amenhotep and God.
 - (iii) Persia - very briefly.

(c) The Aegean Civilization.

- (i) Crete. Cnossus (Sir A. Evans)
Bull-leaping. The Minotaur.
- (ii) Greece. Homeric Age - Troy. Gods.
City states - Sparta and Athens. Contrasting
education and ideals. Games, Olympia.
The struggle with Persia - Marathon, Salamis,
etc. Delian League.
The glory of Athens - Parthenon, etc. Pericles.
Decline - Peloponnesian War (brief).
- (iii) Alexander the Great.

(d) The Roman Empire - main emphasis on Britain.

Time chart of main developments up to Birth of Christ.
Carthage.
Caesar - Antony - Augustus.
The Army.

Invasion and Conquest of Britain: (a) Caesar; (b) 43 A.D. to
Agricola, (c) Military and Civil Zones; Forts and towns;
villas; roads. (d) The Wall.

Decline of the Empire: (a) General picture.
(b) Collapse in Britain - Saxon Shore, etc.

FORM II Age 12+ 2 periods per week.

Britain from the Saxon Conquest to the end of the Middle Ages (1485)

European affairs, where applicable, must not be neglected.

The chief aim is broadly as for the first year, but with developing time-sense; more use of time charts can be made. More written work - descriptive and imaginative - should be practised, more systematic note-taking introduced. Model making should be used - a model-making society encouraged. This period lends itself very much to such activities. Local history - cathedral, castle, local saints, etc. - will figure prominently in this year's work. Visits.

1. Saxon Conquest and Settlement.
 - (a) Their original home; characteristics, mode of life, ships, etc.
 - (b) Saxon village, agriculture. Emergency of the kingdoms and the Heptarchy.
 - (c) The Conversion - personalities, stories, Synod of Whitby. Maps.
2. The Vikings. Similar treatment to 1(a).
Alfred. Danelaw. Daneland. Canute.
3. The Norman Conquest.
 - (a) Edward the Confessor; the Godwins, William of Normandy.
 - (b) The drama of 1066. The Bayeux Tapestry.
 - (c) Norman settlement after 1066:
 - (i) Organisation (Feudalism).
 - (ii) Manor and Castle.

4. The Church after 1066
 - (a) Monastic Orders. Cathedral and Monastery.
 - (b) The Crusades.
 - (c) Crown and Mitre.
5. Empire Makers. Hundred Years' War.
 - (a) Henry II and the Angevin Empire.
 - (b) Edward I and 'Great Britain'.
 - (c) Edward III and Black Prince.
 - (d) Henry V.
6. King versus Baron.
 - (a) John and Henry III.
 - (b) Richard I and Henry IV.
 - (c) Social aspect: Tournament, Heraldry.
7. The breakdown of the Middle Ages.
 - (a) Black Death and Peasant's Revolt.
 - (b) Wars of the Roses.
 - (c) Henry VII and the End of Feudalism.

FORM III Age 13+ 2 periods per week.

Britain from 1485 to 1714, with more attention paid to Europe and to the expansion of British and Europeans overseas

More can now be made of movements and groups (the "gang" instinct is at work), of leadership, and of the rise of Britain in the world. More training will be given in accurate memorisation, outline history, dates. The relationship of one period or movement with another is better understood than in earlier forms.

1. The New Age:
 - (a) Renaissance: the new learning and the new art. Great figures.
 - (b) Results of the Renaissance:
 - (i) The reformation and the Counter Reformation.
 - (a) Europe: Luther and Calvin; Jesuits and Inquisition; Philip II.
 - (b) Britain: Henry VIII to Elizabeth; Mary Queen of Scots; Armada.
 - (ii) The Age of Discovery and the New World.
 - (a) Great European Navigators and new empires: "Indies".
 - (b) Elizabethan Sea-Dogs. The Navy (Henry VII - Hawkins) -project work on ships, etc.
 - (c) Colonisation and Trade (follow-up of b).
 - (i) East - East India Company - from Indies to India. Dutch.
 - (ii) West - Virginia and New England.
 - (iii) Commodities - including slaves.
2. Life in Tudor England:

Towns; enclosures; unemployment. Theatre.

3. Crown versus Parliament: First Phase.
 - (a) Early Stuarts. Divine Right. Religious factors (by-product of 1(b)(i)).
 - (b) Civil War and Commonwealth. Cromwell.
4. Crown versus Parliament: Second Phase.
 - (a) Restoration and James II.
 - (b) Glorious Revolution and William III. Revolution Settlement.
 - (c) Defence of the Revolution: Scotland, Ireland, Louis XIV.
5. The Beginning of the Second Hundred Years' War.
 - (a) Louis XIV's France - threat to Europe.
 - (b) Louis XIV's Jacobitism - threat to England's Revolution.
 - (c) Louis XIV's New France - threat to English colonies and trade.
 - (d) The Spanish Succession War. Marlborough.
 - (e) Treaty of Utrecht and its significance.
6. Crown and Parliament. Final Phase.
 - (a) Anne and Bolingbroke.
 - (b) The coming of the Hanoverians: Parliament safe.

FORM IV Age 14+ 3. (4E-4).

Mainly British History, but also as in Form III, from 1714 to the Present day.

Develop on similar lines to last year: more "cause and effect" history; more strictly political throughout, but a thorough treatment of economic and social developments (especially in IVE) will be given. Use of radio, but particularly of T.V., programmes will be a feature of the course. Pupils studying no more history at school will leave with an all-round knowledge of how their twentieth century arrived! Those proceeding to Vth form study will have been well prepared.

1. The Colonial Struggle with France and the First British Empire.
 - (a) The situation in North America and India.
 - (b) The Seven Years' War and William Pitt.
 - (c) The American War of Independence and the collapse of the empire.
2. Parliament in the Eighteenth Century.

Walpole and the Whig "system". George III. Pitt the Younger.
3. The French Revolution.
 - (a) Causes and course to 1795.
 - (b) Effect on Britain.
4. Napoleon Bonaparte.
 - (a) The "heir to the Revolution".
 - (b) The wars - part played by Britain.
 - (c) The effect of the Revolution and Napoleon on Europe.

5. The Agrarian and Industrial Revolutions.
 - (a) Agrarian - Causes and Effects.
19th Century - Golden Age and Decline after 1870.
 - (b) Industrial - Domestic System.
Inventions - Factory System. Economic and Social Results.
The Labour Movement to the Labour Party.
Modern developments from the early ones.
 - (c) The Revolution in Transport - from Canals to Motorways.

6. Britain after 1815 - Political: The Growth of Democracy.
 - (a) The Reform Movement. Radicalism. The Reform Bills.
 - (b) The Age of Reform:
Whig into Liberal; Tory into Conservative;
Peel, Disraeli, Gladstone.
The Liberal Welfare State (Asquith, Lloyd George, Churchill).
The Socialist Welfare State (Atlee).
 - (c) The Emancipation of Women.
 - (d) The House of Lords.

FORM V Preparation for G.C.E. an Ordinary Level 4 - 5 periods a week.

A. English History 1689-1815

1. The Revolution Settlement:-
 - (a) Constitutional; (b) Religious; (c) Scotland and Ireland;
 - (d) Foreign Policies (France).

2. The Colonial Struggle with France:-

The Treaty of Utrecht - the "Birthday of the British Empire".
Anglo-French rivalry up to 1756: (a) in N. America; (b) in India.
The Seven Years' War 1756-63: (a) in N. America; (b) Clive in India; (c) in Europe's Pitt's policy; (d) at Sea - importance of sea-power.
The Treaty of Paris - The First British Empire.

3. The Breakdown of the First British Empire:-

The Colonial System in the 18th Century.
Causes of the dispute with the American Colonies.
The American War of Independence:
(a) Course. (b) Reasons for British defeat.
(c) Importance of Sea-power (French).
(d) Warren Hastings in India.

4. Constitutional Politics of the Period (see also 5).

The Party System - Whigs and Tories.
Parties during reigns of William (and Mary) and Anne.
Constitutional evolution during reigns of George I and George II (Walpole).
State of parliament and politics by 1760 (Newcastle).
George III's attempts at personal government. (John Wilkes).

5. The Whig Supremacy (see also 4).

Causes and nature.

Jacobitism up to 1745. The Act of Union with Scotland.

Sir Robert Walpole (and the Duke of Newcastle).

Position of Pitt (the Elder).

Causes of decline; George III.

Rise of the Tories; Pitt the Younger.

6. Methodism and its influence on 18th century England.

England (society and religion) in 18th century.

The Wesleys and Whitfield. Their ministry and its effects.

Evangelicalism and Humanitarianism.

7. The influence of the French Revolution.

Influence on English life, thought and politics.

The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars:-

(a) 1793-1802

(b) At sea - importance of sea power. Nelson.

(c) The Continental System. Economic warfare.

(d) The Peninsular War. Wellington.

(e) The Hundred Days and Waterloo.

(f) India. Pitt's India Act; Cornwallis; Wellesley.

(g) Ireland. Grattan. The Rebellion. The Union.

8. The Industrial and Agrarian Revolutions.

(1) Agrarian: (a) Agriculture at the beginning of the period.

(b) Improvements.

(c) Enclosures.

(d) Results on (i) output, (ii) social life of the countryside.

(e) Farming during the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars.

(2) Industrial: (a) The Domestic System; the textile industries before the revolution.

(b) Inventions: Textiles, Iron, Steam.

(c) The Factory System - results on social life - "class".

(d) Economic ideas; laissez faire; Combination Laws.

9. Life, Literature and Art of the period.

B. European History 1689-1815:

1. Louis XIV's foreign policy.

2. Effect of Glorious Revolution on English foreign policy - especially relations with France.

3. The War of the Spanish Succession 1702-1713. The Treaty of Utrecht. Marlborough.

4. The regent Orleans.

5. Spain and Europe 1713 - 1740.
6. North Eastern Europe to 1723: Peter the Great and Charles XII. Hanover.
7. Austria and Prussia to 1748: The Pragmatic Sanction and the Silesian Wars. Hanover.
8. The Diplomatic Revolution and the Seven Years' War.
9. The Enlightened Despots:
 - (a) Frederick the Great;
 - (b) Joseph II;
 - (c) Catherine the Great.
10. The Partitions of Poland.
11. The French Revolution:
 - (a) France before 1789 - social, political, religious, economic causes.
 - (b) Main stages and events up to 1799.
12. Napoleon Bonaparte.
 - (a) Early career and the coup d'etat of 18 Brumaire.
 - (b) Consulate and reorganisation of France.
 - (c) Napoleonic Europe and Wars.
 - (d) Downfall of the Empire.
 - (e) Congress of Vienna.

APPENDIX C

HISTORY SYLLABUS IN USE AT A GRAMMAR TECHNICAL SCHOOL

GENERAL PHILOSOPHY OF TEACHING HISTORY

1. The greatest question in any history syllabus is the one of selection. It is possible to attempt to cover a wide syllabus from the creation of the earth to the present day in a chronological sequence, but it is felt that such method leads only to a hurried, sketchy study and the covering of certain topics, not for any intrinsic value they might have, but 'because they are there'. The basis method adopted will therefore be a 'patch' method within a basic chronological framework.
2. Each 'patch' will be basically a 'Civilisation' and the emphasis will be on the legacy this civilisation has provided for modern day. Each 'patch' will be studied in depth to provide a detailed understanding of the period according to the level of ability of the class.
3. There will be a deliberate attempt to avoid teaching purely English history and to avoid a nationalist bias.

FIRST YEAR1. PREHISTORY

- a) Formation of the Earth and earliest forms of life.
- b) Dinosaurs.
- c) Prehistoric Man - emphasis on how man learned new techniques and advanced:
 - i) Old Stone Age - Neanderthal Man - Homo Sapiens - cave paintings at Altamira and Lascaux.
 - ii) New Stone Age - Windmill Hill Folk.
 - iii) Bronze Age - Beaker Folk - Avebury Stone Circle - Silbury Hill.
 - iv) Stonehenge.
 - v) Iron Age - Celts - Maiden Castle.

2. EGYPT

- a) Outline of political history - from uniting of the two Kingdoms to Cleopatra.
- b) Development of Writing.
- c) Pyramids - burial of the dead.
- d) Discovery of Tutankhamen's Tomb.
- e) Religion - various gods - role of priests in society - Amenhotep IV.
- f) Development of Agriculture.

3. GREECE

- a) Where the Greeks came from - legend contrasted with archaeology - Schliemann and Troy.
- b) The Age of City State - Athens and Sparta - comparisons.

- c) Strengthening the country from outside invader - the Persian Wars - Marathon, Thermopylae, Salamis.
- d) Greek Literature - Homer - extracts from "The Odyssey".
- e) Greek Drama - development of the theatre - playwrights - excerpts from plays.
- f) Life in fifth century Athens - architecture - the Parthenon - social life - costume - Olympic Games.
- g) Greek Gods and Mythology.
- h) What happened to the Greek civilisation?

4. ROME

- a) Foundation of Rome - compare legends and archaeological evidence.
- b) Attempts at different types of government - Kings - Republic.
- c) Punic Wars.
- d) Building of the Empire - notable emperors, e.g. Augustus, Nero, Trajan, Constantine, etc. Comparison and evaluation.
- e) The Romans come to Britain - Julius Caesar's two invasions - 43 AD invasion.
- f) Life in Roman Britain - town and villa - Roman Wall.
- g) The Roman Army.
- h) Pompeii.
- i) The legacy of Rome - Latin language - Roman literature - Roman Law - Roman Roads.
- j) Why the Roman civilisation declined and collapsed - comparisons with other civilisations.

SECOND YEAR

1. THE VIKINGS

- a) Origins of their way of life.
- b) The Viking Longship - their voyages.
- c) Religion and sagas.
- d) Invasion of Britain - Alfred.
- e) Did they have a civilisation?

2. MEDIAEVAL EUROPE

N.B. References must not be just to British history.

- a) Events of 1066 - Battles of Fulford, Stamford Bridge, and Hastings. Bayeux Tapestry.
- b) Feudalism. Domesday Book.
- c) Life on the Mediaeval Manor.
- d) Mediaeval Church - its importance in the life of the people - monasticism and its importance - the friars - pilgrimages - conflict of Henry II and Becket - the Crusades.
- e) Mediaeval towns - description, development and importance.
- f) The Mediaeval Tournament.
- g) Mediaeval Architecture - examples - development of the parish church (c.f. churches in area) - the Cathedrals (Britain and Europe).
- h) Mediaeval Arms, Armour and methods of fighting - Heraldry - 100 Years' War.
- i) Mediaeval literature and what it shows about mediaeval life -

its value to the historian - Canterbury Tales, Piers Plowman, Arthurian legends, Song of Roland, Nibelungenlied - general discussion on legends and their origin.

j) Development of the Castle.

3. RENAISSANCE AND REFORMATION

- a) Renaissance - definition and characteristics.
- b) Its influence on art - printing - gunpowder - political ideas (Machiavelli) - voyages of discovery.
- c) Life and work of Michelangelo - an example of Renaissance man and his times.
- d) Effects of Renaissance on religion - the Reformation in Europe and Britain in broad outline only.

4. THE ELIZABETHAN AGE

- a) Character of Elizabeth.
- b) Elizabeth and Mary Queen of Scots.
- c) Elizabeth and Philip II - causes of war - the Armada.
- d) The Elizabethan navy.
- e) Francis Drake - life story.
- f) Rebellions against Elizabeth - Tyrone, Northern Earls, Essex.
- g) Life of Shakespeare - development of the theatre - Elizabethan dramatists - excerpts from plays.
- h) Life in Elizabethan England: the people - dress and food - houses - sports and pastimes - the Poor Law.

THIRD YEAR

1. HISTORY OF AMERICA

- a) Red Indians - early type of civilisation.
- b) Aztec civilisation - Pizarro.
- c) Inca civilisation - Cortez.
- d) Columbus.
- e) Early settlers - Virginia, Jamestown - Pilgrim Fathers - Pennsylvania - New York.
- f) Struggle between Britain and France - Louisbourg, Braddock's expedition - the Seven Years' War.
- g) Characteristics of the Thirteen colonies.
- h) War of American Independence - causes and battles - the making of the American constitution - George Washington.
- i) The opening up of the West (1790-1860) - the legends of the "Wild West".
- j) Causes of the Civil War - main battles. Results.
- k) Reconstruction and the Rise of Big Business to 1914.

2. THE FRENCH REVOLUTION AND NAPOLEON

- a) Causes of the Revolution.
- b) Course of the Revolution - main characters - Marat, Danton, Robespierre - The Reign of Terror.
- c) Rise of Napoleon.
- d) Napoleon's career - Egyptian campaign - war against Europe - Trafalgar.
- e) Nelson and the British navy - life on the ships - Spithead Mutiny.

- f) Peninsula War - 1812 Campaign - Waterloo - Hundred Days.
- g) Society in France under Napoleon - internal reforms.
- h) Why Napoleon fell from power - good and bad points - legacy in Europe.

3. BRITAIN BECOMES AN INDUSTRIAL NATION (to 1914)

- a) The Agricultural Revolution in the eighteenth century - old system - improvers: Tull, Townshend, Bakewell - enclosure movement. Results.
- b) The Industrial Revolution - iron and steel, textiles, mining, pottery, improvement in communications. Results.
- c) The Railway Age - construction, finance, organisation, etc.
- d) Mining in the 19th century - especially in North of England.
- e) Public Health in the 19th century - improvements in medicine and sanitation - housing developments.
- f) Religion - Methodism and its impact - the Evangelicals: Wilberforce and Shaftesbury - decline in religion in late Nineteenth century.
- g) Life in a Victorian Household.
- h) Law and Order - Elizabeth Fry - police force - penal reform.
- i) Developments in education.
- j) A picture of life in Edwardian England.
- k) Developments in central and local government - how the country is governed today.

FOURTH AND FIFTH FORMS

ORDINARY LEVEL G.C.E. COURSE

Northern Joint Board Examination Syllabus - alternative G - Britain and the Modern World 1870 to Present Day.

Only period after 1914 to be covered.

1. The First World War - land and naval campaigns.
2. Peace Treaties 1919-1920 - terms and criticisms.
3. Causes of the 1917 Russian Revolution. Events of the Revolution, Why the Bolsheviks seized power. Foreign and domestic policy of Lenin. Trotsky. Foreign and domestic policy of Stalin to 1939.
4. Germany after the war - the Weimar Republic. Rise to power of Hitler - events and reasons. Hitler's domestic and foreign policies.
5. Political doctrines of Communism and Fascism.
6. Reparations. Disarmament.
7. Turkey and the Middle East 1918-1939.
8. Italy after the war - rise to power of Mussolini. Mussolini's foreign, colonial and domestic policies.
9. The Far East 1918-1939.
10. The League of Nations: organisation, attempts to strengthen it, successes and failures.
11. The Spanish Civil War - causes and events. Spain under Franco.
12. The World Depression and its effects.
13. The succession states between the wars: Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia.
14. France between the wars - political divisions and policies.
15. Britain between the wars - post war problems. Lloyd George. Macdonald. Baldwin. The Great Strike. The Second Labour Government. National Governments (1931-1939). Foreign Policy 1918-1939.

16. United States between the wars - post war isolationism. The return to 'normalcy'. Hoover and the Depression. Roosevelt and the New Deal.
17. Causes of the Second World War. Events in outline.
18. Russia after the war: Stalin. Khrushchev.
19. U.S.A. after the war.
20. The Cold War 1947-1958.
21. Britain after the wars: Labour Governments (1945-1951) and Conservative Governments (1951-1964).
22. The British Empire and Commonwealth 1918-1960. Ireland.
23. France after the War: The Fourth Republic (1946-1958): the Fifth Republic and de Gaulle.
24. Germany after the war - recovery under Adenauer.
25. Italy after 1945.
26. The Balkans after 1945.
27. The United Nations.

SIXTH FORMS

ADVANCED LEVEL G.C.E. COURSE

Northern Joint Board - Syllabus C alternative D

- i) Europe 1789-1870
- ii) Britain 1815-1870 + selected documents.

Notes on General Sixth Form Method

1. No dictated notes or duplicated notes to be issued.
2. Work to be done so far as possible by pupils themselves under very strict guidance, relaxing as they progress.
3. Work sheets to be issued on specific topics with outline of notes to be made, and details of books to be consulted, with page references. Topic then to be covered in class with discussion from pupils and guidance and comments from teacher.
4. Full use to be made of maps.
5. Difficult topics to be covered directly by teacher with pupils taking notes - these topics to become fewer as the course progresses.
6. Basic teaching will be on the tutorial system with pupils contributing continually to the topic under discussion.
7. Emphasis will be placed on the divergent views expressed by prominent historians on topics - short quotations direct from works of reference to be encouraged.

APPENDIX D

OBJECTIVES FOR A SOCIAL STUDIES PROGRAMME

Adopted by the School City of South Bend, Ohio, 1949.

CHILDREN NEED TO UNDERSTAND (knowledge)

1. That all peoples of the world are in some way dependent upon each other and must get along with each other
2. That our world is constantly changing
3. That events, discoveries, and inventions may improve some ways of living but create problems in others
4. That people have established communities and governments to meet their needs
5. That groups develop traditions, values, and ways of doing things, and new generations learn these from their elders
6. That the physical geography of a place affects the way people live

CHILDREN NEED TO LEARN HOW (skill)

1. To seek information from many sources and to judge its validity
2. To organize facts and form generalizations based on facts
3. To carry on a discussion based on facts and to make generalizations or conclusions
4. To plan, to carry out plans, and to evaluate the work and the planning
5. To accept responsibility as part of living
6. To develop a set of values for judging right and wrong actions

CHILDREN NEED TO BECOME (attitude)

1. Willing to undertake and carry through a job to completion
2. Anxious to help others and to work with others for desirable group goals
3. Appreciative of others like and unlike themselves

APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE SUBMITTED TO SERVING HISTORY TEACHERS
IN COUNTY DURHAMSection A (Submitted to Heads of Department only)

1. What % of your department are graduates?
2. What % of your departmental work is done by history specialists?
3. What is your text-book and teaching materials allowance?
4. How free a hand do your subordinates have in choosing their own syllabus?

Section B

1. Do you find that your University courses are of any use to you now?
2. Do you subscribe to any periodicals on the Teaching of History?
3. Which of the many books published recently on the Teaching of History have you found most useful to you?
4. Have you attended any in-service courses on the Teaching of History?
5. Is there any departmental discussion of policy, or philosophy?
6. How do you keep pace with the most recent developments in the Teaching of History?

Section C

1. Are you under any pressures when choosing your syllabus?
2. Do you feel yourself under any pressures from the inspectors?
3. Do you feel yourself judged by the examination results of your classes?
4. On what basis do you choose your syllabus?

Section D

1. Do you feel that your organisation or treatment of the syllabus reflects any philosophy of the subject?
2. Do you teach local history?
3. Do you teach contemporary history?
4. Do you teach world history?
5. Do you teach history chronologically?

Section E

1. How do you train historical judgment, critical ability or historical imagination?
2. Do you make any concessions to less academic boys?
3. What particular evidence of distinction do you look for in your brightest pupils?
4. Do you have/foster any teaching links with other departments in the school ?
5. What particular changes would you like to see in the teaching of history in the secondary school?

APPENDIX F

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, W.M.: The Changing Secondary School Curriculum, New York, 1967.
- Ballard, M.: (ed.) New Movements in the Study and Teaching of History, London, 1972.
- Bantock, G.H.: The Implications of Literacy, Leicester, 1966.
- Barraclough, G.: History in a Changing World, Oxford, 1955.
- Beauchamp, G.A.: Curriculum Theory, Illinois, 1961.
- Blishen, E.: This Right Soft Lot, London, 1969.
- _____ : Roaring Boys, London, 1965.
- Bloch, M.: Apology for History, Manchester, 1954.
- Bloom, B.S. and associates: Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, London, 1956.
- Board of Education: Report of Consultative Committee on the Education of the Adolescent (Hadon Report), London, 1926.
- Burston, W.H.: The Principles of History Teaching, London, 1963.
- Burston, W.H. and Thomson, D. (ed.): Studies in the Nature & Teaching of History, London, 1965.
- Butterfield, H.: The Whig Interpretation of History, London, 1931.
- Bruner, J.: Towards a Theory of Instruction, New York, 1963.
- Carr, E.H.: What is History?, London, 1962.
- Collingwood, R.G.: The Idea of History, Oxford, 1946.
- Coultham, J.: The Development of Thinking and the Learning of History, Historical Association Pamphlet, 1971.
- Dance, E.H.: Half Our Future, Newsom Report, London, 1963.
- _____ : History without Bias, London, 1954.
- _____ : History the Betrayer, London, 1960.
- Dearden, R.F.: The Philosophy of Primary Education, London, 1968.

Department of Education & Science, Schools Council: Society and the Young School Leaver, London, 1967.

_____ : Enquiry 1 - Young School Leavers, London, 1968.

Department of Education, Arts & Science: Towards World History, London, 1967.

_____ : Children and their Primary School (Flowden Report), London, 1967.

Douglas, J.: Home and the School, London, 1964.

Dressel, P.: College and University Curriculum, New York, 1968.

Drummond, H.A.: History in School, London, 1929.

Elton, G.R.: The Practice of History, Sydney University Press, 1967.

Fenton, E.W. (ed.): Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary Schools, New York, 1964.

Fenton, E.W.: Teaching the New Social Studies in Secondary School, New York, 1966.

Fines, J.: The History Teacher and Other Disciplines, History Association Pamphlet, 1970.

_____ : History: Blond's Teacher's Handbooks, London, 1969.

Gaillie, W.B.: Philosophy and the Historical Understanding, London, 1964.

Gosden, P.H.J.H. and Sylvester, D.W.: History for the Average Child, Oxford, 1969.

Hexter, J.H.: Reappraisals of History, London, 1961.

Hurstfield, J.: History in the Vith Form, Historical Association Pamphlet, 1964.

I.A.A.M.: The Teaching of History, Cambridge, 1960.

Jeffreys, M.V.C.: History in Schools: the study of Development, London, 1939.

Kerr, J.F. (ed.): Changing the Curriculum, London, 1968.

Linscott, M.: The Quiet Revolution, Edinburgh, 1966.

Ministry of Education: Teaching History, London, 1952.

Musgrave, P.W.: The Sociology of Education, London, 1965.

Musgrove, F. and Taylor, P.H.: Society and the Teacher's Role, London, 1969.

Nisbet, S.: Purpose in the Curriculum, London, 1957.

- Oman, C.: On the Writing of History, London, 1939.
- Peters, R.S.: Ethics and Education, London, 1966.
- Plumb, J.H.: Crisis in the Humanities, London, 1964.
- Prothero, G.: Why Should we Learn History?, Edinburgh, 1894.
- Renier, G.J.: History: its Purpose and Method, London, 1961.
- Richmond, K.: The School Curriculum, London, 1971.
- Rickover, H.G.: Education for all Children, New York, 1967.
- Rowse, A.L.: The Use of History, London, 1946.
- Stenhouse, L.: Culture and Education, London, 1967.
- Strong, C.F.: History in the Secondary School, London, 1964.
- Sturley, D.M.: The Study of History, London, 1969.
- Swart, M.J.: The Meaning, Purpose, Nature and Value of History,
Port Elizabeth, 1972.
- Taba, H.: Curriculum Development, New York, 1962.
- Tansey, P.J.: Educational Aspects of Simulation, New York, 1972.
- Thomson, D.: The Aims of History, London, 1969.
- Trevelyan, G.M.: History and the Reader, London, 1945.
- Trevor-Roper, H.: History, Professional and Lay, Oxford, 1964.
- Tyler, R.W.: Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction, Chicago,
1949.
- Venable, T.C.: Philosophical Foundations of the Curriculum, New
York, 1967.
- Waller, W.: The Sociology of Teaching, New York, 1961.
- Watts, D.G.: Environmental Studies, London, 1969.
- Whalley, G.E.: The C.S.E., Leeds, 1969.
- Wheeler, D.K.: Curriculum Process, London, 1967.
- Whitehead, A.N.: Aims of Education, London, 1929.
- Wilson, B.: Youth Culture and the Universities, London, 1970.

Articles

- Beloff, M.: "The Study of Contemporary History", History, March, 1945.
- Bestor, A.: "Education and its Proper Relation to the Forces of American Society", Daedalus, 1959.
- Case, R. and Collinson, J.: "The Development of Formal Thinking in Verbal Comprehension", British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 32, 1962.
- Dale, R.R. and Jones, I.: "The Interest shown by Boys and Girls in the Principal Aspects of History in Grammar Schools", Educational Review, Vol. 10, 1957.
- Field, G.C.: "Some problems of the Philosophy of History", Proceedings of the British Academy, 1938.
- Fines, J.: "Archives in Schools", History, Vol. LIII, 1970.
- Friedman, K.C.: "Time Concepts of Junior and Senior School Pupils and Adults", The School Review, Vol. 52, 1944.
- Hales, E.E.Y.: "History in the Melting Pot", History Today, Vol. XVI, 1965.
- Hallam, R.: "Logical Thinking in History", Educational Review, Vol. 19, 1966-67.
- Hook, S.: "Education in the Age of Science", Daedalus, 1959.
- Jahoda, C.: "Children's Concepts of Time and History", Educational Review, Vol. 15, 1963.
- Lamont, W.: "A Black Paper Reconsidered", Teaching History, Vol. I, No. 2, 1969.
- Oakden, E. and Sturt, M.: "The Development of the Knowledge of Time in Children", British Psychological Journal, Vol. XII, 1922.
- Pistor, F.: "Concepts of Historical Time", Journal of Educational Research, Vol. XXXIII, 1939.
- Pritchard, L.: "The Relative Popularity of Secondary School Subjects", British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. V, 1935.
- Roberts, M.: "Contemporary Problems of With Form History", History, Vol. LIII, 1970.
- Riddle, B.: "Role Conflicts Perceived by Teachers in Four English Speaking Countries", Comparative Education Review, February 1970.
- Spivey, C.: "History and Social Studies Projects in America", Teaching History, Vol. No. 4 (1970).

- Taylor, P.H.: "Children's Evaluation of the Good Teacher", British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 32(3), 1962.
- Thomas, P.D.: "The Teaching of History in the United States in the Era since Sputnik", Teaching History, Vol. I, No. 4, 1970.

Theses

- Booth, M.: A Critical Analysis of the Secondary School Curriculum, unpub. thesis, M.(Ed.)A. Southampton, 1967.
- Cairns, T.: Interest in History shown by Secondary School Pupils, unpub. thesis, M.Ed. Durham, 1953.
- Coultham, J.: Junior School Children's Understanding of some terms commonly used in the Teaching of History, unpub. thesis, Ph.D. Manchester, 1960.
- Dobson, J.L.: A study of attitude among Adolescents towards British History and Institutions, unpub. thesis, M.Ed. Durham, 1950.
- Smith, A.: Some problems in theory and practice of History Teaching in English Secondary Schools, unpub. thesis, M.Ed. Oxford, 1964.
- Sirrett, G.W.: History in the Comprehensive School, unpub. thesis, M.Ed. Leicester, 1966.
- Wood, D.M.: Analysis of the definitions of social relations in Childhood, unpub. thesis, Ph.D. Nottingham, 1964.