

The use of sources in school history

1910-1998: a critical perspective

TONY McALEAVY

is principal inspector, Gloucestershire L.E.A.. He has written numerous school history textbooks, the most recent being *The Arab-Israeli Conflict*, Cambridge University Press, 1998. He has led a number of influential developmental projects in history education, notably in the area of 'interpretations of history' for the National Curriculum Council in the early 1990s.

Keatinge's
suggested
activities
are
almost
always still
worth
using
today

The arrival of sources of evidence into secondary school history classrooms amounted to a small revolution. What began as a radical development is now establishment orthodoxy, with both GCSE and now National Curriculum in England and Wales enshrining its principles. Tony McAleavy pays tribute to some of the thinkers and key lines of thought that made this revolution so enduring. By placing it in a broader historical context he also offers a critical perspective. Using the work of M.W. Keatinge he reminds us that the founding fathers of the SHP movement were not the first to challenge 'traditional' school history and nor were they the first to devise methods that were both rigorous and highly practical. Moreover, the evidence revolution must not stop with the thinking of the 1970s and 1980s that now dominates school textbooks. McAleavy argues that two decades of work with historical sources in schools reveals continuing problems. He alerts us to some distortions of the historical process and to questionable pedagogical practice that can occur when teachers overemphasise notions of 'reliability' at the expense of other types of evidential understanding. He also argues that far from being antithetical to good evidential analysis, links with contextual knowledge are to be encouraged. Finally, he suggests that the processes of synthesis, reasoning and argument need to be taught more directly if pupils are to make full use of their critical understanding of historical sources.

I attended a boys grammar school on Merseyside from 1966 to 1973. I studied history throughout these years and there were many good things about my school history education. I cannot, however, remember a single occasion when we spent a lesson looking at original source material. The textbook the school used for British social and economic history at O Level contained no sources, other than a small number of black and white pictures. Thirty years later the situation has been transformed. The programmes of study for the National Curriculum require the use of sources. At GCSE and A Level all syllabuses involve work on sources and almost all textbooks are littered with pictures and quotations labelled as sources, with accompanying questions and activities. How did this come about? What have we learnt, as history teachers, about how students can use source material in the classroom?

The great breakthrough in the popularisation of source work took place after the establishment of the Schools Council History Project in 1972. While the Project has been hugely influential, teachers had been considering using original documents in school history long before the Project. One man, in particular, wrote a remarkable survey of the possibilities of source work many decades before most us were born. His name was M.W. Keatinge. There is much that we can still learn from this great pioneer of source analysis.

Keatinge was Reader in Education at Oxford University and in 1910 he produced a book of outstanding quality, *Studies in the teaching of history*.¹ He was concerned that history did not seem to have a very secure place within the upper secondary curriculum. He argued that teachers who made extensive use of original sources, particularly documents, would be able to provide a more stimulating experience for their students and would, thereby, be better able to justify history as part of a core curriculum for older students.

It is during the secondary period that the boy's critical faculty is developing and must be made use of. It is only if thought-compelling exercises can be devised that history is worth treating as a serious school subject

Keatinge provided a range of specific source-based activities that he had tried in the classroom, often accompanying his

descriptions with samples of pupils' work. His suggested activities are almost always still worth using today. Here is a selection of some of his case studies in the use of sources.

CASE STUDY 1 - USING INTERNAL EVIDENCE IN A SOURCE

A class had been studying the reign of Richard II and the Peasants' Revolt. Keatinge gave them the account of the revolt written by the famous chronicler, Froissart. He deliberately told them nothing about Froissart but asked them to write down everything that they could work out about the author from the internal evidence within the source. Keatinge provided sample responses that showed pupils exercising genuine inferential skills as they attempted to describe the writer and marshalled supporting quotations:

He seems to be on the side of the upper classes: (He describes the rebels as) "The evil disposed in these districts"

CASE STUDY 2 - USING CONTEXTUAL KNOWLEDGE TO INTERPRET A SOURCE STIMULUS

Keatinge worked with students who were about to consider the reign of Mary Tudor. They already knew something about the Reformation under Henry and Edward. Keatinge gave them a speech by Mary in which she promised to give back land taken from the Church. Pupils were required to write an imaginary reaction to the speech on the part of a member of the nobility. Pupils needed to demonstrate their knowledge of the way nobles had benefited from the attack on the wealth of the Church. The activity obliged pupils to show they understood the context within which Mary made her proposal. Keatinge quotes one pupil's response:

Queen Mary considers her own land, but seems to forget we have land as well. She thinks it right to give it back, but all people do not think alike, and we desire to keep our land. Therefore, let Queen Mary give back only the land which belongs to her.

CASE STUDY 3 - PARAPHRASING SOURCES TO HELP PUPILS TO ACCESS CONTRASTING OPINIONS

Keatinge made it absolutely clear that there were important differences between using sources in the classroom and the work of academic historians. He was, as a consequence, prepared to paraphrase sources for use in the classroom. In one striking example he gave students a paraphrase of two violently different contemporary views of the character of Henry II. He asked the class how such different interpretations could be explained.

CASE STUDY 4 - SHOWING PUPILS HOW DIFFERENT 'KNOWLEDGE' CAN BE THE RESULT OF ACCESS TO DIFFERENT SOURCES

Many of Keatinge's most imaginative activities required pupils to use sources to create some new knowledge about a topic they were already studying. In one example, he asked them to show their new knowledge in graphic form, and he employed a simple but effective technique to enable them to see how different 'knowledge' can be the consequence of access to different sources! Two chronicle accounts of the Battle of Bannockburn were used. Students were asked to produce a sketch plan of the battle. The class was divided in two. Half used one source, and the other half looked at the second source, in order to find evidence for their plans. The whole class then came together to compare the results, to discuss the differences, and to agree a third synthesis that combined elements of both sources. In another dazzling example, Keatinge asked the class to produce, in effect, two flow charts, describing the sequence of significant events in the Battle of Poitiers as described in two conflicting contemporary accounts. The differences between the two versions were then analysed by the whole class.

Keatinge wanted history to contribute to what, today, we might call 'critical thinking' or 'active citizenship'. He insisted that developing critical faculties through problem-solving work would also make a vital contribution to the moral development of young people. He saw the ability to reason and respect for evidence as indicators of moral maturity.³ He also talked about the importance of sources in providing 'atmosphere' or a sense of period.

Keatinge was typically prescient when he recognised that without changes to public examinations, work on sources would never establish itself in the mainstream of school history education. He provided sample exam papers that combined conventional recall questions with questions on sources.

There was a high degree of practicality about Keatinge's proposals. He discussed the importance of the key vocabulary needed to make sense of particular documents. He described how everyday exemplification could be used to introduce difficult concepts:

When introducing a class to the condition of evidence it is frequently desirable to start with a modern instance. 'Who saw the South African football match on Saturday?' A few boys plead guilty. 'Who did not see it but heard of it from

an eye-witness? Who did not see it but read about it in the papers?' Which of the boys who were at the match were close by when there was that dispute, and what opinions did they form as to the rights and wrongs of the matter... Here we have a number of the factors to be considered in estimating evidence.⁴

There is some disagreement about the impact of Keatinge's work.⁵ While he may have had some disciples there seems little doubt that only a small minority of teachers sought to put his ideas into practice. History teaching was dominated instead by what David Sylvester has called 'the great tradition': the role of the school teacher of history was to help pupils to learn a body of established factual information about the past. Working with sources had no significant role to play within the great tradition. Many books about history teaching published 1920-1960 contain no references at all to the use of sources.

There were, however, individuals who kept alive the source-based approach pioneered by Keatinge. In the late 1920s F.C. Happold advocated the use of sources in the classroom.⁶ He called for a new kind of history exam in which candidates would be given a collection of extracts from original sources and asked questions that tested their ability to analyse such sources. In 1927 Happold provided a specimen paper that asked questions on a collection of conflicting contemporary accounts of Napoleon. Happold was not given much support for his ideas. One commentator, A.J. Williams dismissed the proposal with a criticism that was to re-surface decades later when the Schools Council History Project developed a similar examination:

A capable pupil, with little knowledge of history, could gain high marks on intelligence alone ... it would not prove the possession of a body of historical knowledge.⁷

Happold was able to persuade the Oxford Local Examinations Board to introduce an 'O' Level syllabus that included source-based questions. This attracted very few candidates and but it struggled on until it was finally scrapped in 1958.

The dominant mood among school history teachers was revealed at a conference in 1929, which brought together school and university teachers. The two sides tried to achieve a consensus on the nature of history teaching. However, while the university teachers were keen to highlight the use of evidence, the school teachers were concerned only with the transmission of knowledge.

There is a pithy summary of this abortive conference in the Historical Association journal *History*:

In general the discussion never wandered very far away from the weighing relative merits of imparting exact historical knowledge in more or less formidable doses and the training in critical method and a scholarly mental outlook. The University teachers emphasised the desirability of the latter, and this was criticised by almost all the school representatives.⁸

The mood of antipathy towards the use of sources had changed by the late 1960s and there were many teachers who were prepared to consider more extensive use of source level of adolescent thinking about evidence and methodology as one at which young people show 'awareness of the

Keatinge
wanted
history to
contribute to
what, today,
we might call
'critical
thinking' or
'active
citizenship'

Denis
Shemilt
brilliantly
identified
many of the
intellectual
problems
students
encounter
when
working on
sources

material. The document series 'They saw it happen' was popular. CSE examinations for students of average ability began, in some cases, to include document questions. Archive education packs were produced by Jonathan Cape (the famous Jackdaw series) and the University of Newcastle department of education. Some history educators began to call for a greater emphasis in school history on the methodology of the historian and the use of sources. This new mood coincided with an anxiety about the future of the subject and a belief that teaching methods needed to change if history was to remain an important part of the secondary school curriculum.

In 1972 the Schools Council History Project was set up. Like Keatinge and Happold, its first director, David Sylvester, decided that any changes in classroom practice would not be sustained unless there were corresponding changes in public examinations. The Project, with its 'What is history?' unit and its O Level and CSE examinations proved very popular. Not only was there an expectation that sources should be used throughout the course but there was also a specific emphasis on source skills in the Paper II of the public examination. In this paper pupils were given a collection of sources relating to a topic that they had not studied before. They were required in the exam room to make sense of the sources.

The Project was very influential in shaping the direction of school history over the following 20 years. HMI were persuaded of the importance of using sources in the way advocated by the Project. The Project philosophy contributed to the way all public examinations in history evolved in the 1980s. Regulations were introduced requiring all A Level syllabuses to include document questions. When a new examination for all 16 year olds was planned, criteria were established obliging all boards to test work with sources in all the proposed GCSE history syllabuses. The new examinations were accompanied by a new style of textbook that included large amounts of source material.

One of the most valuable outcomes of the early days of the Project was the research of Denis Shemilt into how students following the course, and a control group of candidates studying more traditional syllabuses, thought about history. Shemilt described his findings in the evaluation study published in 1980.⁹

We are often told today that one of the problems with recruiting candidates for GCSE history is the perception that it is a 'difficult subject'. Perhaps there is a link between this view and the style of work on sources that the Project popularised. Shemilt discovered that Project candidates were much more likely to see history as a difficult subject. He was not dismayed by this. Quite the contrary: perception of intellectual challenge was evidence that something worthwhile was taking place in history. His findings in this area were quite stark. Of Project pupils, 75% said that history was more difficult than maths. In the control group only 12% said that history was more difficult than maths.

In a brief article published in 1987 Denis Shemilt returned to his research data and brilliantly identified many of the intellectual problems students encounter when working on sources.¹⁰ Shemilt's analysis remains of practical value today in helping us to understand students' perspectives on source work:

Some students, particularly less able ones, often found it difficult to see that sources had a different status and nature from the information about the past that they were also given in history lessons. The most obvious example of this was an inability to distinguish between information provided in the main text of a book and sources included within the book: both were seen as identical quarries of undisputed facts about the past.

Shemilt made the valuable distinction between unsubstantiated opinions and 'justifiable assertions'. Many students were unable to see that it was necessary to justify their views of what a past situation might have been like.

To many of Shemilt's interviewees the statements of people who were witnesses to past events were seen as being automatically correct. These students were preoccupied with the search for explicit information in sources and found it difficult to see that they should also be making inferences. They fail to appreciate that, 'The historian goes beyond the information given; that is, he may use a source as evidence to support propositions that the source does not purport to assert.'¹¹

Pupils who were capable of inferential use of sources often had a rather mechanistic view of how sources could be used and lacked a sense of the 'historicity' of sources. This inhibited them from seeing that a source was dependent on the wide historical context of the age in which it was produced. 'The importance of immediate situation may be appreciated, but the significance of the wider social and cultural milieu is rarely seen. Thus, when studying emigration from early nineteenth-century Britain, even the most able 15-year-olds will neither use nor regard information on political, religious and industrial developments excepting when exercises are specifically designed to turn attention in these directions.'¹²

Shemilt was broadly optimistic that teacher awareness of these difficulties, together with appropriate methods and resources, could help students to overcome many of their misconceptions. His description of the highest level of student reflection is striking and useful: 'Written history is beginning to be recognized as ... a reconstruction ... which makes visible connections and continuities, moralities and motives, that contemporaries would not have perceived, nor perhaps have understood.'¹³

Curiously, however, given the recognition that the best work on sources depended on a sense of period and the ability to make inter-connections, Shemilt did not feel that the analysis of sources must be based on a detailed knowledge of a topic or period. In his conclusion, he talked instead about the need for 'limited and highly selective' background information so that students do not become swamped with 'background noise'. He points out that 'irrelevant material. . . degrades the pupil's capacity to know what he is doing'.¹⁴ This begs the question, however, of what constitutes relevant background material, such as might aid the analysis of sources, through pertinent contextual information.

Shemilt's analysis of the adolescent thinking about evidence is a *tour de force*. However, he said very little about how students could deploy and organise the information they gained from this evidence. Typically, he describes the highest

historicity of evidence'; in other words, the focus is on the student's perception of source material rather than the use of the same sources.

While many good things arose from the Schools Council History Project, there were some problems associated with the new approach to sources. The Project rightly tried to make its materials accessible to pupils of widely differing abilities. Many poor readers found complete sources, or even long extracts, difficult. The Project team established, in response, the tradition of giving pupils some quotations that were so short as to be questionable as sources. Thus in an effort to obviate 'difficulty' a new (and distracting) difficulty was created. The mini-gobbet was born. Its domination of the next generation of textbooks was to create a wholly new type of boredom and difficulty for lower attainers.

Look for example at these two sources that were provided in one of the Project's specimen exam papers. The paper asks pupils to consider the character of Henry VIII:

Source K

Henry never spared man in his anger, nor woman in his lust. Sir Robert Naunton (17th century)

Source M

In 1527 the armies of the Emperor Charles V attacked Rome and captured the Pope, Clement VII.
From G. R. Elton- *England Under The Tudors* 1955¹⁵

Brutally brief, these sources also illustrate another problem that was linked to the post-Project orthodoxy; namely that often no contextual detail at all was supplied about the background of the authors of particular sources. As a result, students had very little to go on when making a judgement about the status of a source. In the absence of any knowledge about Robert Naunton or Geoffrey Elton pupils inevitably tended to produce 'off the peg', all-purpose answers on the merits and demerits of different types of sources.

I described earlier how Project pupils began to see history as being difficult. Perhaps the sense of difficulty was made worse by a particular emphasis on the problematic nature of sources. Project materials tended to put a marked stress on the need for pupils to hunt for indicators of bias, distortion and gaps in the evidence base. They were often asked to distinguish between primary and secondary sources and asked to make judgements about sources that defied simple categorisation. The preoccupation with bias and the categorisation of sources may have made history seem difficult. It could also, if not handled with great skill on the part of the teacher, detract from pupils' enjoyment of the subject. The last 20 years of classroom history have shown that to be constantly told to spot bias and to comment on the reliability of primary and secondary sources can be just as boring as being told to memorise a particular collection of facts and dates.

Some of these problems are the result of later distortions and dilutions or teaching weaknesses that have occurred in various forms of post-Project practice now that work with sources has become the new orthodoxy. However, some are perhaps traceable to assumptions in Schools History Project philosophy itself. Schools Council History Project methodology was based on an assumption that school pupils

could undertake historical enquiry in a way that was modelled on the work of academic historians. How accurate was this modelling? Do historians in reality spend most of their time agonising over bias, reliability and the provisional nature of their findings?

It is interesting to take a great piece of historical scholarship and to measure the historian's use of sources using criteria laid down by examiners over the last twenty years. Many historians would not be deemed to have reached higher levels because they say little about the problematic nature of their source material. Of course they make judgements about whether they can trust sources but this is only part of a bigger enterprise in which they seek to use evidence derived from original sources, and the work of other historians, in order to create a substantiated and well-argued account of an aspect of the past.

Try this one at home! Take a book off your shelves that you would see as a good piece of academic history. Look at the index for references to the bias, unreliability, distortions and gaps in the source material on which the book is based. More often than not, there are no such references. Look at the book's conclusion: does it sum up by emphasising that the argument of the book has to be seen as highly provisional because of the problematic nature of the evidence base? This epistemological humility is not the most obvious trait displayed by eminent historians. If the book does not display these characteristics, why is it good history? Perhaps it is the skill with which the historian has linked together evidence from different sources in a convincing and reasoned account of the past? If we are right to base school history on historical method surely we should take these skills of reasoning and argument seriously when planning and assessing work on sources.¹⁶

While the Project directors were right to link their innovations to public examinations, the connection brought some difficulties in its wake and these difficulties are still with us today. Within the constraints of an examination there is a very limited number of methods that one can use to test the ability to use sources. Project exams, and subsequently virtually all other history exams, understandably tended to give candidates very brief extracts from written sources and picture sources, and then invited candidates to comment on the sources. One unintentional impact of this was to narrow, for practical purpose, the working definition of sources; clearly film, music and complete works of historical fiction cannot be easily looked at during an exam! Textbook writers, who were very often senior examiners, adopted this same style for the new generation of books. This further reinforced the view that sources were to be largely equated with quotations and pictures.

In the 1980s Her Majesty's Inspectorate were influential in the making of policy on the teaching of history. The extent to which HMI endorsed the Project philosophy on the importance of the use of sources is clear from their 1985 report, 'History in the primary and secondary years'. This document develops the thesis that even the youngest of children would benefit from being introduced, not only to sources, but also to ideas about the problematic nature of sources. The report begins by identifying 'the principal characteristics' of a good historical education. The first of these characteristics is defined as 'an awareness of the nature

Thus in an effort to obviate 'difficulty' a new (and distracting) difficulty was created. The mini-gobbet was born

of evidence'. HMI go on to stress that this awareness involves understanding evidential limitations and the impossibility of absolute certainty. Even teachers of the youngest primary children are encouraged to strive for the development of attitudes of doubt and scepticism:

Historical evidence may be difficult to interpret and is always incomplete... Because of the range and diversity of the evidence, and the possible interpretations of it, historical judgements are always provisional and tentative. Thus a study of the past can begin to encourage a measure of informed doubt ... or responsible scepticism ... There is no reason why an awareness of evidence should not permeate the teaching of history for all pupils, however young.¹⁷

The HMI survey attempted to identify the elements of progression in various aspects of school history. Making deductions from evidence was given as a relatively low level outcome. At the highest level pupils were able to identify gaps in a collection of evidence and were able 'to recognise bias and "propaganda"'.¹⁸

The HMI report of 1985 was both a retrospective celebration of Schools Council History Project methodology and a tentative precursor of a National Curriculum statement for history. The Education Reform Act of 1988 established the statutory framework for a new National Curriculum. Between 1988 and 1991 there was a lively debate about history teaching as the first model of the National Curriculum took shape. Traditionalists and radicals argued over whether history was about skills, such as those of source analysis, or the acquisition of factual knowledge. The resulting statutory orders were a clever compromise that gave a high level of factual detail in the prescribed Study Units and a high level of emphasis on skills in the attainment targets (ATs). One of the most interesting developments was the separating out of work on primary and secondary sources (although these terms were not themselves used). Secondary sources, and other representations of the past, became a focus in their own right and performance in this area was described by AT2. Work on original sources was assessed against the statements of attainment of AT3.

Both AT2 and AT3 continued to encourage the view that sources were profoundly problematic and that using sources to create accounts of the past was a lower order activity than understanding how difficult it was to trust them. The attainment targets were organised on a ten point scale. At Level 2 and 3 (characteristic of average and able 7 year olds) pupils were making deductions and drawing together knowledge from different sources. At the highest levels young historians moved beyond the mere creation and communication of knowledge and entered a mystical cloud of unknowing as they realised that problems with sources render ultimately questionable all assertions about the past:

AT2 Level 10: 'Shows an understanding of the problems and issues involved in trying to make history as objective as possible.'

AT3 Level 10: 'Explain the problematic nature of historical evidence, showing an awareness that conclusions based on historical sources may well be provisional.'¹⁸

The revision of the National Curriculum in 1995 was not intended to alter radically the nature of the subjects taught. The main brief for those who carried out the review was to cut content and simplify assessment arrangements. However, in practice the 1995 review of the history curriculum went beyond this. While work on interpretations and sources remained within the new single attainment target the view of source work underwent an important change. The preoccupation with the problematic nature of sources was significantly reduced. The new emphasis was on how students could use sources in order to construct well-crafted accounts of the past. Compare for example two equivalent, relatively high level descriptors.

Level 7 (AT3) 1991

'(Pupils) make judgements about the reliability and value of historical sources by reference to the circumstances in which they were produced.'¹⁹

Level 7 1995

'Pupils are beginning to show independence in following lines of enquiry, using their knowledge and understanding to identify, evaluate and use sources of information critically. They are beginning to reach substantiated conclusions independently.'²⁰

At the same time as the National Curriculum was being revised, the criteria governing GCSE syllabuses were reconsidered. The result was an increased emphasis on the need to make connections between the evidence one can derive from sources and a wider contextual knowledge of the topic in question. This spelt the end for the 'unseen' Paper II sources paper of the Schools History Project. Perhaps even more importantly, the GCSE syllabuses were given, from 1998 onwards, new grade descriptions that stressed, in line with the revision of the National Curriculum, that sources were to be used to help candidates produce valid interpretations of the past. At the highest level the description places the evaluation of reliability at the beginning of a process that leads to the production of a 'reasoned and substantiated conclusion'.

These are changes that I personally welcome. More work now needs to be done on how pupils can link the evaluation and analysis of sources to the business of reasoning and argument. How can we best help pupils to organise evidential information? Back in 1910, Keatinge realised that pupils needed to evaluate sources for what he called 'sincerity'. He then went beyond this important first step in suggesting ways that students could use sources to enrich their understanding of important topics and to create logical, substantiated accounts of the past. By putting more emphasis on sources as the starting point for the construction of well-argued descriptions of the past we can be true also to the idea, central to the important developmental work of the Schools Council History Project, that school history can develop a methodology that is genuinely modelled on the work of academic historians.

'How can history be made into a real training school for the mind, worthy of no inconsiderable place within the curriculum? For an answer to this question we must turn to the methods of the modern scientific historian.'²¹

More work
now needs
to be done
on how
pupils can
link the
evaluation
and analysis
of sources
to the
business of
reasoning
and
argument

- ¹. M.W. Keatinge, *Studies in the Teaching of History*, (Black 1910)
- ². Keatinge, op.cit., p.110
- ³. Here Keatinge anticipated the work of Matthew Lipman and others who have argued that strong links can be constructed between moral and intellectual development. Lipman was later to make a strong case for the coincidence of moral dispositions and intellectual attributes that would result, for example, from respect for evidence and the rules of argument.
- ⁴. Keatinge, op.cit., p.215
- ⁵. This disagreement is discussed by D. Sylvester in *Teaching History* ed. H. Bourdillon (Routledge, 1994)
- ⁶Happold, F.C., *The Approach to History* (HMSO1928)
- ⁷. Quoted by W. Lamont in Ballard, M., *New movements in the study and teaching of history* , p.193 (1970)
- ⁸. Lamont, op.cit., p.198
- ⁹. Shemilt, D., *History 13-16 Evaluation Study* (Holmes MacDougall 1980)
- ¹⁰. Shemilt, D., 'Adolescent Ideas About Evidence and Methodology in History' in Portal, C., *The History Curriculum for Teachers* (The Falmer Press 1987)
- ¹¹. Shemilt op.cit. p.50
- ¹². Shemilt op.cit. p.59
- ¹³. Shemilt op.cit. p.56
- ¹⁴. Shemilt op.cit. p.60
- ¹⁵. Schools Council History Project *A New Look at History* (1976) p.81
- ¹⁶. In 1975, Elizabeth Kingdom, Lecturer in Philosophy at the Institute of Extension Studies, University of Liverpool, wrote an Occasional Paper entitled, *Key Concepts and Curriculum Content* (London, Schools Councils Publications 1975). She was critical of the Schools' Council team's underlying philosophies, especially their use of the six 'key

concepts' - change and continuity, cause and consequence and similarity and difference. She argued that the theories of knowledge underpinning the discipline of history were more varied and complex than this. Thus, in effect, she predicted some of the problems that have arisen with the assessment of progress in history using criteria drawn from the key concept principles.

Recently, Robert Guyver has drawn history teachers attention to these issues in fascinating articles that encourage us to revisit the philosophies underpinning the 'new history'. See Guyver, R. 'Key Concepts, Causation and the Great Knowledge Debate: Politics, Practice and Philosophy' in Kerr, D., *Current Change and Future Practice; Fresh perspectives on history teacher education, history and history teaching* (Standing Conference of History Teacher Educators /School of Education, University of Leicester 1996) and Guyver R., 'National Curriculum History: Key Concepts and Controversy' in *Teaching History* 88 (1997) pp 16-19. Guyver focusses chiefly upon the problems in using the key concepts, but he also draws our attention to Kingdom's critique of the Project's reliance on empiricist models, which were later to have such a huge impact on the use of sources in the classroom. Kingdom was critical of the work of Hilda Taba that were influential in the work of the Schools' Council Team:

'Within any one discipline different epistemologies produce contradictory accounts of what constitutes proper content and methodology of the discipline in question. . . the dominant epistemology in British and American disciplines (is), namely, empiricism. It is naturally enough shared by Taba, nowhere more clearly than in her brief description of history as characterised "by documentary, doubt-removing methods of verification". . . But no mention is made of the fact that such a conception of history is disputable, even if not normally thought to be controversial.'

¹⁷. Department of Education and Science *History in the Primary and Secondary Years: an HMI view* (HMSO 1985)

¹⁸. DES *History in the National Curriculum (England)* (HMSO 1991)

¹⁹. DES, op.cit.

²⁰. DFE *History in the National Curriculum (England)* (HMSO 1995)

²¹. Keatinge, op.cit., p. 38