

**PERCEPTIONS OF AN IRISH DIMENSION
AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE FOR THE
ENGLISH HISTORY CURRICULUM**

by

PAUL EDWARD BRACEY

A thesis submitted to
The University of Birmingham

For the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

School of Education
The University of Birmingham
December 2007

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

ABSTRACT

This thesis asserts that an Irish dimension reflects approaches towards diversity within the English History Curriculum. An Irish dimension is explored within the context of Multicultural Britain, debates over ways in which the past has been constructed and changes in the history curriculum. A series of ‘fuzzy generalisations’ of an Irish dimension in the curriculum emerge from questionnaire and interview case studies. This approach is based on Bassey’s (2001) premise that case studies can lead to tentative generalisations, which are subject to being challenged by findings drawn from different contexts. This study explores the perceptions of primary and secondary teachers, together with participants in Irish related projects and key ‘movers and shakers’ working outside the classroom. The research findings suggest that a respondent’s perceptions of the importance of an Irish dimension in the curriculum reflect a range of influences including values, pragmatism, subject knowledge and expertise. The researcher accepts that the extent to which an Irish dimension contributes to the history curriculum will vary between different school contexts. However, the thesis argues that the way in which an Irish dimension is developed and how it relates to the teaching of diversity within the history curriculum is of more importance than the amount that is taught.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Professor Ian Grosvenor for his guidance and support. My research also reflects the encouragement and patience provided by friends and family.

Particular thanks are due to Mary, Richard, Laura, Patrick and Jenny, together with Mum and Dad.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

INTRODUCTION 1

An Irish dimension in the English history curriculum: Why it should be explored, how it will be explored and what this will show?

CHAPTER 1 10

An Irish dimension within the context of multicultural Britain, historiography and the school history curriculum: a review of the arguments and literature

The Irish community in Britain: historical overview

The Irish within multicultural Britain

Constructing the past: historiography, Britishness and an Irish dimension

An examination of changes affecting the place of an Irish dimension within the English history curriculum

CHAPTER 2 41

Methodology: approaches used to examine an Irish dimension within the English history curriculum

General considerations

Questionnaires

Case Study 1: Pilot study of 25 Secondary History Mentors

Case Study 2: Birmingham Heads of History

Case Study 3: Delegates at the Schools History Project Conference at Leeds in July 2004

Case Study 4: Delegates at the Primary Historical Association Conference at Duxford in May 2004

Case Study 5: Birmingham Primary History Co-ordinators

Interviews

Documentary evidence

Research into action

Questionnaires

Case Study 1: Pilot study of Secondary History Mentors

Case Study 2: Birmingham Heads of History

Case Study 3: Delegates at the Schools History Project Conference at Leeds
in July 2004.

Case Study 4: Delegates at the Primary Historical Association Conference at Duxford
in May 2004

Case Study 5: Birmingham Primary History Co-ordinators

Interviews

Documentary evidence

CHAPTER 3

73

An Irish dimension within the English history curriculum: teacher perceptions through questionnaires

Stage 1: Secondary school history teacher responses

Stage 2: Primary school responses

CHAPTER 4

99

Three mini-case studies using interviews to explore teacher perceptions of an Irish dimension in the history curriculum

Case Study 1: Responses from seven Birmingham University Mentors

Case Study 2: Secondary School Heads of History

Case Study 3: Primary School History Co-ordinators

CHAPTER 5

140

Project case study I: Perceptions of educators involved with Teachers in Development Education (TIDE)

CHAPTER 6

162

Project case study II: Perceptions of educators involved with the Ireland in Schools project

Case Study 1: The Nottinghamshire Co-ordinator and three Heads of History

Case Study 2: The Blackpool Secondary Foundation Subjects Consultant and
three Heads of History

Case Study 3: Three Primary Teachers

CHAPTER 7	206
Movers' and shakers' perceptions of an Irish dimension in the history curriculum	
CONCLUSION	238
An Irish dimension in the English history curriculum: findings and implications	
APPENDICES	257
BIBLIOGRAPHY	286

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1:	Summary Chart of the Case Study Questionnaires	48
Table 2:	Summary of Interview Case Studies	69
Table 3:	An examination of the relationship between teacher perceptions of Irish and multicultural dimensions at Key Stage 3	80
Table 4:	Reasons for developing an Irish history dimension at Key Stage 3	81
Table 5:	Respondents' reasons for developing a multicultural history dimension at Key Stage 3	83
Table 6:	Perceptions of the importance of an Irish history dimension at Key Stage 3 by respondents teaching an Irish dimension within the Schools History Project	84
Table 7:	Perceptions of the importance of an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 by respondents teaching an Irish dimension at AS/A2	85
Table 8:	A comparison between the perceptions of an Irish dimension in Roman Catholic and Local Education Authority school respondents in Case Study 5	92
Table 9:	An examination of the relationship between primary teacher respondents' perceptions of an Irish dimension and a multicultural dimension	94
Table 10:	A comparison of teacher ratings of an Irish dimension in the questionnaires and interviews in Chapters 3 and 4	101
Table 11:	An Irish dimension in the English History Curriculum: a model for Key Stages 1-3	248

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

- CIDE** Committee for the Irish Dimension in Education
- DEC** Development Education Centre
This Birmingham based development education organisation has been renamed TIDE - Teachers in Development Education
- DfES** Department for Education and Skills
The government department in charge of education has undergone repeated name changes – this abbreviation relates to the most recent reference used in this thesis.
- MEG** Midlands Examination Group
- OCR** Oxford, Cambridge and the Royal Society of Arts Examinations
- QCA** Qualifications and Curriculum Authority
- SCHP** School Council History Project
The examination based on its work since 1988 has been called SHP, which is an abbreviation for School History Project
- TTA** Teacher Training Agency (renamed TDA –Teacher Development Agency in 1990s)
- Trocaire** The Catholic Agency for World Development based in the Republic of Ireland
- WMEB** West Midlands Examination Board
- 80 : 20** The full title is 80:20 Educating and Acting for a Better World
It is an independent charity set up by the former director of Trocaire, which is based in the Republic of Ireland.

INTRODUCTION

AN IRISH DIMENSION IN THE ENGLISH HISTORY CURRICULUM: WHY IT SHOULD BE EXPLORED, HOW IT WILL BE EXPLORED AND WHAT THIS WILL SHOW.

On Friday 13th 2007 *The Guardian* provided the following report on Protestant celebrations in Northern Ireland which had taken place on the previous day:

Orangefest, as the Orange Order's July 12 parades are now being promoted, was launched with a huge fireworks display in east Belfast. What was missing was equally significant: there were no traditional displays by loyalist paramilitaries... Few republicans gathered in the drizzle to protest as the first parades set off yesterday morning. Instead, Sinn Fein's complaint this year has been about pollution caused by the burning of thousands of tyres in communal bonfires. (Bowcott, 2007, p.7)

This commemoration of the 1690 victory of William of Orange over the deposed King James II has been a flash point for sectarian violence, demonstrating where interpretations of the past have collided with more recent animosities affecting Protestant and Catholic communities. This does not mean that differences between Protestants and Catholics have been fully resolved – disputes remain over the Drumcree March in Portadown, for example. However, the current situation would have been unthinkable at the turn of the 21st century let alone at the height of the 'Troubles'. A simple comparison between the 'Troubles' in Northern Ireland and the current conflict between the 'West' and 'Islam' would suggest that they reflect what happens when antipathy degenerates into crisis. An assessment of the extent to which each of these conflicts can be compared and contrasted is relevant in the context of our multicultural society and interdependent world. The Irish community in Britain also represents the largest ethnic minority and as such has a major role in appreciating diversity. Consequently, the following research is based on the premise that an Irish dimension should form part of British

and global history and that this includes issues associated with racism. The study is intended to explore how an Irish dimension has featured within the history curriculum and the implications of this for curriculum development. A recent Ofsted report entitled *History in the Balance* provides a clear justification for teaching topics that link historical topics that are relevant to pupils' lives:

... school history has a triple job: it has to help young people how to become historians, it must help young people to learn about the past; and it must help prepare for their futures. (Ofsted 2007, p.25)

The Ofsted report included references to *Every Child Matters* (2003), Citizenship, Britishness and social cohesion. The report made the case for ensuring that history in schools had contemporary relevance. It also said that the curriculum was dominated by English history at the expense of Irish, Scottish, Welsh and European dimensions and that teachers failed to include the stories of people who had come to Britain.

This research project focuses on the period between 2000–2007 with fieldwork undertaken between 2002–2006. A series of case studies exploring of groups of educational providers is used to produce 'fuzzy generalisations' about their perceptions of an Irish dimension in the history curriculum. Bassey (2001) introduced the term 'fuzzy generalisations' to explain how case studies can provide tentative generalisations. This period has been characterised by relative stability in the history curriculum with respect to the National Curriculum, GCSE and AS/A2 level examinations. However, the study begins with an examination of changes that have taken place since c1970. This is partly because the period since 1970 provides a personal and professional life history of the researcher which led to the focus of this study. However, of greater importance is the fact that the period since 1970 provides a historical background for understanding the significance of an Irish dimension in the history curriculum at the start

of the 21st century. The study also ends with a series of predictions for the period after 2007. This is because the history curriculum in secondary schools will be revised from 2008, and it is anticipated that this will be followed by a review of the primary curriculum (Ward, 2007). Moves towards this became evident towards the end of the research project. At the same time broad educational changes such as *Every Child Matters* (2003) have implications for the history curriculum. It is therefore appropriate to build on data from the recent past and predict if the opportunities for developing an Irish dimension are likely to be greater or less in future.

The long gestation period for researching into an Irish dimension relates to the researcher's personal and professional life history. The researcher came in contact with a number of Catholic and Protestant students from Northern Ireland when undertaking student vacation work in the summer of 1969. At this time the Irish students were dismissive of media reports of violence in Northern Ireland. The researcher continued to work with Irish students during summer vacations from 1970-75 and during this period their reflections about the situation there changed. For example, in 1975 one student, whose family lived in the Falls Road area of Belfast, applied to study at an English University in order to get away from the 'Troubles'. Northern Ireland was not the only cauldron of conflict at this time. The researcher's early political views were also influenced by news coverage of Commonwealth immigration to Britain as well as growing opposition to Apartheid in South Africa. Although each of these developments was distinctive they appeared to show the impact of cultural conflict buffeted by power.

This concern provided a focus for the researcher's historical research for BA and MA dissertations. The plight of refugees in the later 1960s provided the impetus for exploring the

experiences of Huguenot refugees in the late 17th and early 18th centuries (Bracey, 1974). An attempt to understand cultural conflict in Ireland was undertaken two years later in an MA dissertation which focused on the late 16th and early 17th century plantations (Bracey, 1976). During the researcher's work as a teacher from 1976 and Head of History from 1983-97 there were opportunities to relate this research interest to work in the classroom. A Mode 3 History CSE (WMEB, 1984) course taught between 1983-87 provided opportunities to look at people who had come to Britain from earliest times to the present day including immigration from Ireland. A GCSE Social and Economic History Course (MEG, 1988) taught from 1986 included a unit and coursework related to migration. This provided the opportunity to develop course work tasks related to eighteenth century slavery, Irish and Jewish immigration in the nineteenth century and post-war immigration. The Irish Modern World Study component of the School History Project was taught in 1983 (WMEB, 1983) and from 1996 (MEG, 1998). The advent of the National Curriculum also provided opportunities to include an Irish dimension within the context of the Norman invasions, religious and political conflicts in the 16th and 17th centuries and famine/hunger in the nineteenth century (the last topic is extremely contentious and is regarded either as a natural disaster or the result of government policy). A topic on the Normans included an overview lesson which compared and contrasted them with other people who have come to Britain.

Involvement in a series of projects confirmed and developed the researcher's belief that an Irish dimension relates to an anti-racist perspective, which will be considered later. Firstly, the researcher was invited to contribute to two Birmingham LEA multicultural history curriculum groups in the 1980s where curriculum structures and resources were discussed. Within these discussions an Irish dimension featured in the context of the long-term development of

multicultural Britain. Secondly, during the 1980s the researcher attended a series of conferences organised by the Birmingham Committee for the Irish Dimension in Education in conjunction with the Multicultural Support Service in Birmingham, which directly related an Irish dimension to anti-racism¹. These conferences explored issues related to anti-Irish racism, Irish history and the situation in the North of Ireland. Thirdly, the researcher attended workshops provided by the Development Education Centre in Birmingham from the late 1980s. The researcher was given the opportunity to take part in two Development Education Projects which included an Irish dimension. The first project involved working with teachers from Birmingham and Dublin to produce a teacher resource book related to a range of global contexts including Ireland (Bridle & McCarthy, 1993). The second project was hosted by the Development Education Centre for Oxfam and explored the transition from conflict to peace in a range of contexts including Northern Ireland (Garlake & Welshman, 1997). Fourthly, during the early 1990s the researcher had the opportunity to write about the place of an Irish dimension as part of a discussion about the nature of British history (Bracey, 1995b). This was a response to the British history debate which was prevalent during the development and introduction of the 1991 and 1995 versions of the National Curriculum. Fifthly, since 1998 the researcher has contributed to the work of the Ireland in Schools Project, an organisation dedicated to promoting mutual understanding between Britain and Ireland. This has included producing materials and a series of research articles. Particular reference should be made to research undertaken in the period preceding the current study which explored the perceptions which a group of year 7 pupils had of Ireland (Bracey & Gove-Humphries, 2003). The initial

¹ The conferences referred to were: *The Second One-Day Conference. Anti-Racist Education - The Irish Dimension*, Saturday 8th March 1986, Bishop Challoner School, Birmingham Committee for the Irish Dimension in Education, and *The Third Annual One-Day Conference. Teaching about the North of Ireland*, Saturday 4th April 1987, Bishop Challoner School, Birmingham, Committee for the Irish Dimension in Education in conjunction with the Multicultural Support Service.

intention for the current research project was to broaden this research in order to explore the perceptions of different groups of children. However, during the early stages of the project it was decided that it would be more useful to explore the perceptions of teachers and educators because of their central role in determining how the past is constructed within their classrooms.

Clearly, the last thirty years have seen changes with respect to the situation in Northern Ireland and multicultural Britain, although they have remained contentious issues. The focus of the latter has shifted to some extent from the overt racism associated with Powellism towards New Commonwealth Immigration towards Islamophobia and opposition to East European migration. With respect to the study of the past this is particularly evident when people in different parts of the world are stereotyped or defined through Anglo-centric or Euro-centric norms. From the outset the current research was influenced by the findings of a report entitled *The Future of Multi-ethnic Britain* (2000) which set out to define multicultural Britain, its national story and means of tackling racism. In order to appreciate the contribution of different communities it challenged the principle of a single notion of Britain's past or what it means to be British today. This perception of both the past and present has a fundamental impact on the type of society we want to live in today and in the future.

Consequently, the researcher is of the opinion that although historical enquiry requires looking at the past from a range of perspectives, this needs to be developed within a framework which includes the experiences and perceptions of people from a range of ethnic, cultural and religious communities. In the words of Said, late Professor of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University:

Rather than the manufactured clash of civilisations we need to concentrate on the slow working together of cultures that overlap, borrow from one another, and live together in far more interesting ways than any abridged or inauthentic mode of understanding can allow. But for that kind of wider perception we need time and patient and sceptical enquiry, supported by faith in communities of interpretation that are difficult to sustain in a world demanding instant action and reaction. (Said, 2003, xxii)

The following research explores how far an Irish dimension in the history curriculum relates to anti-racism, to ways in which the past has been constructed and the implications of this for curriculum development. Clearly, the situation in Northern Ireland has changed considerably since 1970. However, the research does not assume that most historians or history educators support this perspective but sets out to find how an Irish dimension is perceived and the implications of this for curriculum development. The researcher met most of the research participants for the first time during the course of the research. Where this has not been the case the nature of the relationship between researcher and participant will be specified.

The significance of the period since 1970 goes beyond the personal and professional life history of the researcher to broader changes related to an Irish dimension. The place of the Irish community within multicultural Britain, the place of Ireland in historical debates about the past and its place in the school history curriculum have been debated and subject to change during this period. The first chapter provides a literature review of these developments during the period since c1970. This provides a basis for exploring the place of an Irish dimension at the start of the twenty-first century. The second chapter provides a methodology which sets out to justify the focus of the research on the perceptions of educators, including both teachers and 'movers and shakers' who have a wider role in shaping the work undertaken in schools. The perceptions of these educators are obtained through the use of questionnaire and interview case studies together with supporting documentation. These are used to provide

a series of ‘fuzzy generalisations’ about perceptions of an Irish dimension within the history curriculum. Subsequent chapters analyse the research data.

The third chapter examines responses from five questionnaire case studies drawn from teachers in both primary and secondary schools. Teacher perceptions of an Irish dimension are compared with other dimensions in the history curriculum. The overall purposes of this chapter are to indicate broad trends within the case studies and to provide potential interviewees. The fourth chapter explores the perceptions of these interviewees, which are grouped into three case studies. In all cases the teachers’ perceptions of an Irish dimension are compared with their perceptions of other dimensions.

The fifth and sixth chapters investigate the perceptions of people involved in curriculum projects related to Ireland – Teachers in Development Education (TIDE) and the Ireland in Schools Project. Interviews with project leaders and a document analysis provides an insight into the nature of their involvement with an Irish dimension in the history curriculum. This is followed by an analysis of the impact of each project on the perceptions of teachers involved.

The seventh chapter examines the perceptions of ‘movers and shakers’ including an HMI, the QCA Officer for History, the Director of the School History Project, a textbook writer, a Professor and Lecturer in History Education and an LEA Adviser. The perceptions of this group are analysed and compared with those of the teachers.

The conclusion seeks to draw out general trends from a series of case studies and produce ‘fuzzy generalisations’ about the significance of an Irish dimension in the context of the

whole curriculum during the period 2002–7. This is based on a term developed by Bassey (1999) to support the use of case studies to produce qualified generalisations that can be supported or challenged by studies in other contexts. Although the case studies lack verifiable qualities associated with a large-scale statistically representative surveys, they provide opportunities to get rich data from key educators associated with developing an Irish dimension in the curriculum. The data analysis leads to an attempt to provide a model for including an Irish dimension in the history curriculum that is flexible, critical and balanced in a way that eludes stereotypical and ethnocentric approaches to the past. This is followed by a prediction of how changes emerging towards the end of this period will influence its future development.

CHAPTER 1
AN IRISH DIMENSION WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF MULTICULTURAL
BRITAIN, HISTORIOGRAPHY AND THE SCHOOL HISTORY CURRICULUM:
REVIEW OF THE ARGUMENTS AND LITERATURE

The most obvious question that this title raises is – why should an Irish dimension be developed within the English history curriculum at the start of the 21st century? However, arguments to support teaching an Irish dimension are not difficult to find. The Irish community represents the largest ethnic minority in England. The history of Ireland and the rest of Britain have been deeply intertwined with the result that an Irish dimension impacts on considerations about the nature of Britishness. Issues within Northern Ireland during the last quarter of the 20th century represent the most recent phase in this relationship and have implications for members of the Irish community living within England. The recent changes associated with the ‘Peace Process’ in Northern Ireland suggest that it provides a useful basis for comparison with seemingly intractable issues in other parts of the world. For example, Younge (2007) argued that it is useful to contrast the IRA and al- Qaida in order to appreciate ways of dealing with different forms of terrorism.

The place of an Irish dimension in school history curriculum will be considered within its wider context. This will begin by looking at the history of migration from Ireland and its significance to multicultural Britain. An examination of changing constructions of the past will be followed by a detailed investigation of changes in the school history curriculum. Although the focus of this research project relates to the period since 2002 it is necessary to consider the debates associated with each of these areas over the preceding thirty years in order to appreciate the current significance of an Irish dimension in the curriculum. The

historical context in which an Irish dimension has developed has been explored in a conference presented to the History Teacher Educator Network (Bracey, 2005c) and History of Education Society (Bracey, 2005d) followed by a journal article (Bracey, 2006d). The following analysis draws on aspects of this article but goes beyond it to explore curricular issues in greater detail.

The Irish community in Britain: historical overview

The proximity of Ireland to the rest of Britain has meant that migration has taken place since earliest recorded times. However, there are key periods associated with Irish migration. The mid-19th century and the impact of The Famine [Hunger] were the most significant period of migration. Migration continued in the 20th century with peaks in the mid 1930s, the war years and the 1950s and the 1980s. What can be said about the experiences of the Irish community once it had arrived and settled in mainland Britain? It has been commonly argued that the Irish community faced hostility in the 19th century but that attitudes towards them moved along a linear path towards assimilation in the 20th century. Jackson (1963), one of the few historians to write about the Irish in Britain before the late 1980s, suggested that the black rather than the Irish community bore the brunt of prejudice in the 1960s. O'Connor (1972), who produced a detailed study of Irish migration to Britain, held a similar perception. The view that the post-war Irish migrants assimilated into the host population has remained the perception in a number of books dealing with the development of multicultural Britain.

Walvin, commented:

At the turn of the century [twentieth century] ... they [the Irish] were in effect an old problem which the English had learnt to cope with and which, with time, seemed less obviously troublesome at every level... Throughout the subsequent history of Irish into Britain (there were 1 million born in mainland Britain in 1961) the Irish were

never again to be regarded as the problem they had been in **the early and mid** nineteenth century. (Walvin, 1984, p.59-60)

This perception has been endorsed by some social scientists whose focus is inevitably on more recent issues. For example, Solomos (2003), a sociologist, compared conditions faced by the Irish in the 19th century to those of black people, but did not explore the issues facing Irish communities in the late 20th century. The failure to explore issues facing Irish migrants in the period after World War 2 has also been encouraged in a number of books, which have celebrated the experiences of the Irish community. For example, Chinn (2003) produced a popular history of the Irish in Birmingham. He commented on the existence of anti-Irish racism in the 19th century, together with brief references to prejudice in the 1950s and 60s and the aftermath of the Birmingham Pub Bombings in 1974, but the overwhelming focus of his work was a celebration of the Irish community and its culture.

However, assimilationist and celebratory images of Irish experiences have been challenged by a number of historians. Myers (2006) criticised Chinn (2003) for providing a sanitised account of the Irish experience, which failed to explore class, gender, health or racism and domesticated the community's past without trying to analyse it. Holmes (1988; 1991) produced a study of the experiences of different migrant groups in Britain since the late 19th century, which led him to question the idea that immigrant communities follow a path from hostility to acceptance. The following reference to experiences of Irish people from the 1950s certainly challenges the belief that they were assimilated:

In England in the 1950s an Irish person seeking lodgings remained likely to encounter discriminatory notices carrying the bleak message 'No coloured. No Irish'. Further evidence of discrimination can be detected in the disproportionate number of recommendations made by British courts in the 1950s and 1960s for the deportation of Irish defendants accused of relatively minor offences. These examples of differential

treatment need to be placed against a background of anti-Irish sentiment during these years. (Holmes, 1991, p.50)

Other writers have supported this argument. Greenslade (1992) argued that experiences of prejudice during the 1940s and 1950s led Irish people to retreat into their own communities. Coogan (2000) stressed the existence of anti-Irish prejudice, health problems and social mobility issues confronting Irish migrants. Hickman and Walter argued that it is a mistake to assume that the Irish community has been assimilated into British society simply because they are white and were excluded from Nationality Acts since World War 2, and stress that:

control of Irish people takes a very different form, however, and the fact that it does not mirror strategies adopted by the state towards black people in no way lessens the fact that the Irish are a problematised, targeted and racialised population. (Hickman & Walter, 1995, pp. 6-11)

The outbreak of the 'Troubles' in Northern Ireland inevitably raised the profile of Ireland and the Irish community after 1969. Provisional IRA bombings in Britain in the 1970s sharply increased hostility. The introduction of the Prevention against Terrorism Act made the Irish in other parts of Britain a suspect community. Hickman and Walter provided examples of personal testimonies to claim that, 'Pre-existing prejudices were applied with renewed intensity to all Irish people, the vast majority of whom had no connection or sympathy with the violent incidents' (Hickman & Walter, 1997 p.228). The consequences of anti-terrorist legislation caused both anxiety and resentment when innocent members of the Irish community had their movement restricted or liberty taken away. In 1990 Feketi interviewed Gareth Pierce, a defence solicitor for many people who had been detained as a result of this legislation, including Gerry Conlon, a member of the Guildford Four. Pierce argued that this legislation had a particularly intimidating effect in which, 'The likelihood of being stopped affects the whole of the incoming and outgoing Irish community north and south - it makes an entire community transient and suspect' (Feketi, 2001, pp.81-99). Although it could be

claimed that the experiences of the interviewer were likely to reflect the worst possible scenarios faced by people within the Irish community, its reference to the fact that in 1985 55,000 people were stopped and examined suggests that the scale of this measure was affecting the lives of a large section of the Irish community. By the 1980s there is some evidence that anti-racist supporters drew links between black and Irish experiences. The Greater London Council was a prime mover in applying this policy to the Irish community from 1983. In the following year its *Policy Report on the Irish Community* (GLC, 1984) highlighted areas of discrimination such as housing, unemployment, education and media stereotyping. In the same year Curtis (1984) wrote *Nothing but the same Old Story: The Roots of anti-Irish Racism* with financial support from the Greater London Council.

This examination of the Irish community's experience challenges the argument that a minority community naturally follows a path towards this assimilation. Yet, as the next section makes clear, there continues to be extensive debate about the status and experiences of the Irish within multicultural Britain.

The Irish within multicultural Britain

The Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain (Parekh, 2000), usually referred to as *The Parekh Report*, provides a useful basis for looking at how perceptions of the Irish community have changed since c1970. This report was produced by the Commission on the Future of Multi-ethnic Britain, which was set up in 1998 by the Runnymede Trust, an independent think-tank devoted to the cause of promoting racial justice in Britain. The Commission was given the task of analysing the current state of multi-ethnic Britain in order to make Britain a confident

and vibrant multicultural society. The first part of the report provided a vision for Britain which involved arguing for a new national story. A central place within this vision was its definition of Britain as 'A community of citizens and a community of communities, both a liberal and multicultural society' (Parekh, 2000, p.ix). The second part of the report examined racism, inequalities and institutional factors related to them. The third section considered strategies for change. A checklist of recommendations followed this. Events since the publication of the report, especially 9/11 and 7/7 have resulted in pressures on black minority ethnic communities, most notably seen in anti-terrorist legislation. However, it could be argued that the protection of civil liberties and positive relations between different communities make *The Parekh Report's* (2000) recommendations even more important in 2007. Each section of the report included references to Ireland and/or the Irish community. The report is important in that it placed racism against the Irish community alongside that faced by other minority groups. In particular *The Parekh Report* suggested:

The position of the Irish as insider-outsider is uniquely relevant to the nature of its multicultural society. For generations, Irish experience has been neglected owing to the myth of homogeneity of white Britain, but it illuminates Britishness in much the same way that the experience of black people illuminates whiteness. (Parekh, 2000, p.32)

This argument is extremely important in asserting the place of an Irish dimension within constructions of multicultural Britain. It is interesting to note that *The Parekh Report* (2000) stated that it was inspired by and intended to rethink the seminal report *Colour and Citizenship* (Rose et al, 1969). This earlier report was based on a framework that emphasised the importance of skin colour, and the distinction between the host and 'coloured population' when it stated:

The greater part of our analysis has been concerned with the British reaction to immigration, and the greater part of our prescriptions are for programmes for which British society - still overwhelmingly white - would have the responsibility. (Rose et al, 1969, p.676)

The report made some reference to discrimination faced by Irish migrants in the 19th century but felt that by the post-war period:

... the Irish were duly accommodated within the social structure of twentieth-century England without any drastic modification of that structure ... the Irish by the Second World War were largely accepted. And their full participation in the extension of rights in the Welfare State was unquestioned. (Rose et al, 1969, p.18-19)

The Rose (1969) and *Parekh Report's* (2000) different perceptions of the Irish community within a multicultural paradigm reflect the changing perspectives amongst historians of Irish migration. *The Parekh Report* particularly drew on the work of Hickman and Walter (1995; 1997) who had researched conditions facing the Irish community. However, the argument that the Irish community has faced racism in late 20th century Britain has not received universal support. Howe (2000, p.51) challenged this belief and argued that, '...evidence on anti-Irish discrimination and prejudice in Britain remains highly ambiguous'. Howe accepted that the Irish community faced hostility but felt that Hickman and Walter (1995; 1997) had failed to explain upward social mobility among the Irish community. However, the following reference from their work suggests that this criticism was unjustified:

Irish-born people are clustered in particular occupation and industrial categories reflecting gaps in the British labour market... Northern Irish-born people by contrast have profiles much closer to, or even slightly higher status than, the British average. (Hickman & Walter, 1997, p.50)

He was particularly critical of the way in which they argued that the Irish have been ignored because it is assumed that they have been 'assimilated' into British society. Howe argued that this demonstrated a misunderstanding of the term 'assimilation', presumably because it is commonly used to explain a policy. Nevertheless, it can be argued it is still a perfectly

reasonable way of explaining why so many writers have ignored the experiences of Irish people with issues associated with multiculturalism. Overall, there seems to be sufficient evidence to clearly indicate that hostility against Irish migrants did not end during the 20th century and that the Irish community has encountered racism in post-war Britain. This raises a number of questions about the nature of anti-Irish racism in both the past and the present. *The Parekh Report* (2000) noted that the treatment of the Irish community challenged any idea of a white homogenous society. A more recent argument goes beyond this and places their experiences in the context of racism and exclusion:

The history of Irish relations with England adds an interesting dimension to the study of changing forms of racialism and the historical contingency of whiteness... old racial imaginaries were reworked in the context of Irish immigration to England in the nineteenth century and again in the context of the political conflict in the twentieth century. (Bhattacharyya et al, 2002, pp.13-14)

This theoretical framework provided a useful means of showing that oppression associated with racism has manifested itself in different ways within different historical situations. These writers argue that 18th century religious oppression gave way to jokes and monstrous images of the Irish in the 19th century designed to break up links with the English working class at the time of the Chartists. The media in the wake of the bombing campaigns readily drew upon such images in the 1970s. This clearly demonstrates the hollowness of the assumption that migrant experiences move from hostility to assimilation, or that racism is associated with colour as opposed to structural issues between insiders and outsiders within society.

Furthermore, if the experiences and contemporary status of the Irish in Britain has links with their treatment in the past it is important to consider how historians have treated Irish history. For this reason, the next section explores the importance of 'constructing the past' and how an

Irish dimension has featured in this. Clearly, this also validates how contemporary perceptions about relations with Ireland relate to the development of Britain and its empire.

Constructing the past: historiography, Britishness and an Irish dimension

Changing perceptions of the past and issues such as national identity have proved to be highly contentious, especially since the 1980s. It has been argued that this reflects the way in which all minority communities have been constructed. Consequently an examination of an Irish dimension within these debates provides a useful insight into looking at these wider issues. *The Parekh Report* (2000) provides a useful starting point for looking at ways in which constructions of the past have changed. Chapter 2 of the Report had the title 'Rethinking the National Story'. This suggested that Britain's story reflected the histories of all communities within Britain and its empire. The wrath of the right wing press was reflected in the *Daily Telegraph* of October 10th, 2000 which began with the headline "Jack Straw wants to re-write history" and went on to argue that British national identity was threatened. The paper's reference to an Irish dimension proved particularly interesting in this context. Johnson, the newspaper's Home Affairs correspondent, proves illuminating, '[the] Irish are included among ethnic minorities even though they, for good or ill, share a common history [with the British]' (Johnson, 2000, p.6). This distinguishes the Irish community from black communities and at the same time refuses to accept that people from Ireland may well have particular interpretations of its past associations with Ireland.

The case presented by *The Parekh Report* (2000) was by no means new. The notion of a single national identity was the dominant discourse from the 19th century. Kearney related this to the work of Ranke:

The professionalism of history brought with it the acceptance not only of Leopold Von Ranke's critical methods but also his stress upon the role of 'nations' in history... during the twentieth century, long after the original impulse from Ranke had been lost sight of, the writing of history along 'national' lines came to seem axiomatic... The extent to which the writing of history was so strongly nation based was disguised by the way in which English historians shifted between the use of the term 'British' and 'English' ... history has been taught and written along national lines, and hence tied, often unconsciously, to national ideologies and nation building.
(Kearney, 1989, pp.1-3)

Kearney presented a very different construct of the history of Britain, which considered the development of the four nations of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales. The period preceding Kearney's work was associated with the growth of regional, global approaches to the past related to contemporary concerns such as gender, class, ethnicity and religion. Said (1978), Professor of English at Columbia University and a key proponent of post-colonialism, argued that the perceptions of cultures were constructed by Europeans. Dodd (1986), a lecturer in English at Leicester University, used this hypothesis to explain how the English created identities for themselves and for people in the Celtic fringe during the 18th century. Samuel, Professor of History at the University of East London argued that a 'four nations' history of Britain provided a more natural framework for comparative studies of the past (Samuel, 1998, p.26).

The Parekh Report's (2000) arguments were strongly influenced by the work of Davies (1999) which integrated the histories of England, Ireland Scotland and Wales and related them to a European context. *The Parekh Report* also made use of the work of Colley (1992), an eminent historian of the 18th century. Colley argued that religion and warfare drew the regions

together. The relationship between Scotland and England in particular was seen as a business relationship. With the end of Empire she predicted that it would break up into its constituent parts. What Davies (1999) and Colley (1992) did have in common was their emphasis on the development and expansion of Britain and 'Britishness' over the past 300 years. This provided the basis of Parekh's vision of Britain's national story, which included people from England, Scotland, Wales, Ireland and the Empire.

However, it would be a mistake to assume that this shift in perspective has taken place without resistance or controversy. In the 1980s Elton argued for a grand narrative approach to the past based around studies of British kings and queens, rather than multicultural or Third World History (see Milne, 1986, p.21). Cannadine called for 'a new version of our national past which can regain its place in our general national culture' (Cannadine, 1987, p.188) and lamented the growth of both global and micro studies of the past. Even as the 20th century drew to a close a number of popular historians supported Anglo-centric versions of the past. Davies drew attention to four popular titles - *The Story of Britain* written by Strong (1992), *The Oxford History of Britain* edited by Morgan (1999), *The Lives of Kings and Queens of England* written by Fraser (1997) and *This Sceptred Isle* by Lee (1997), which failed to do justice to the history of the isles of Britain and Ireland. His comment about the last of these succinctly demonstrated its limitations:

Liberally laced with trenchant extracts from Winston Churchill's *History of the English Speaking Peoples* (1954-56)... Both the book and radio series revealed the public appetite for old-fashioned narrative history... the interpretation is Anglo-centric to a fault. It accepts without a word of hesitation that England is the only part of the Isles that counts and that British history is a mere continuation of English history. (Davies, 1997, p.xxxiii)

Even where historians have broadened their study towards British rather than English history, the inclusion of Ireland could remain ambiguous. Some historians acknowledge but choose to

largely exclude an Irish dimension (eg Robbins, 1998; James, 2001). The way in which two historians, Schama (2000; 2001; 2002) and Ferguson (2003) constructed the past is particularly significant. Each of these historians used both books and a television series to promote their ideas. Between 2000-2002 Schama produced his three books entitled *The History of Britain 1300 BC – AD 1603*; *The History of Britain 1603-1776* and *The History of Britain 1776-2000* to support his television series. Volume 1 of his trilogy was the most profitable history book sold in 2000 (Bookseller, 2001). During the first three months of 2003 Schama's three books ranked second, third and fourth, with volume III having sold 16,529 copies, volume II 10,518 and volume I 9,166 respectively (Bookseller, 2003b). Schama's first volume began with an inclusive perception of Britain, which was comparable to that given by *The Parekh Report* (2000):

Imagine... a British history in which alteration, mutation and flux, rather than continuity and bedrock solidity are the norm: that does not lead inexorably to a consummation in the unitary state of Great Britain ... This would be a history in which a national identity - not just Britain, or in England, but in Scotland, Ireland and Wales - was not fixed but a decidedly shifting and fluid quality... (Schama, 2000, p.16-17)

However, the content of this volume proved somewhat different. The first chapter, which covered the period up to the Norman Conquest, set Neolithic settlers within the context of Britain, but the rest of the chapter was Anglo-centric, restricting itself to the area covered by the Romans and conflicts between Saxons and Vikings. References were made to St. Patrick and St. Columba but they were related to England's past. This is supported by Haigh's review of Schama's first volume in *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, which commented:

Like the Blair Project, the new history is modern - not 1950s Churchillian patriotism or 1960s Marxian labour history, but a third way. As with Blairism, it is not clear what the third way might be – something to do with change, multiplicity, heterogeneity, fluidity, contingency, complexity... Despite third way slogans, it is a traditional, a Churchillian agenda... It is a history of England... The Celts get it only when they are a nuisance to the English. (Haigh, 2000, p.27)

Although, the third volume certainly included regions outside England, such as the Irish Potato Famine and the Empire, it is difficult to escape the view that this was a history predominantly viewed from the centre rather than the periphery.

If the balance in Schama's story suffered from 'sins of omission', more serious charges can be placed against Ferguson's (2003) book and television series. *Empire: How Britain made the Modern World* was the most widely purchased hardback history textbook, with sales totalling 17,682 (Bookseller, 2003b). In the week ending 24th January 2003, Ferguson had managed to rank fortieth in the composite list of all paperback and hardback sales (Bookseller, 2003a).

Ferguson acknowledged the ruthlessness of the British Empire but stressed how it demonstrated Britain's overwhelming contribution to the world:

Without the spread of British rule around the world, it is hard to believe that structure of liberal capitalism would have been so successfully established in so many different countries around the world... It spread the rule of law over vast areas. Though it fought many wars, the Empire maintained a global peace unmatched before or since. (Ferguson, 2003 pp.358-59)

His references to Ireland amounted to reasons for 16th century conquest and problems associated with it, together with moves towards home rule and radicalism leading to the Easter Rising. This examination of the imperialism of Ireland was written from an Anglo-centric perspective. Ferguson's references to Ireland were a minor part of a wider global discourse in which he saw America taking over Britain's mantle to uphold a new defensive empire in the 21st century. The alarming implications of this approach were highlighted by Wilson's review in *The Guardian*, 8th February 2003:

With its swashbuckling heroes and glamorous locations, his series *Empire* lends fake historical legitimacy to his new imperial enterprise... by using Britain's imperial past to justify America's imperial future, Ferguson's arguments are misleading. Worst of all they encourage policy based on a version of the history of empire that is simply wrong... Based on a version of history last taught over a century ago, these kinds of arguments are not taken seriously by historians today. Until recently, it seemed that

19th century liberal orthodoxy's about 'progress', 'order' and the benefits of British colonial rule had become the marginal province of the fogyish Tory right... The new liberal imperialists believe the west has the power to remould the rest of world in its own image. (Wilson, 2003, p.22)

Young, a political commentator for *The Guardian*, made an eloquent case for white history by arguing that:

... We do not hear enough about white history, but that which masquerades as history is more akin to mythology. White people, like black people, need access to a past, which is accurate, honest and inclusive. We do not need more white history. We need it better told. (Young, 2002, online)

Arguably, neither Schama nor Ferguson met this requirement. If considerations of Britishness have proved contentious over recent decades, any attempt to include an Irish dimension needs to appreciate how different perceptions of Ireland's past have emerged within Ireland. These have reflected the differences between communities, comprising Catholic and Protestant perspectives. Joyce (1998), a lecturer at Manchester University, argued that postmodernist approaches were fruitful in approaching conflicting discourses about Ireland's past. A similar argument was made by Longley (2001), Professor of English at Queen's University Belfast, to criticise attempts to use inclusive commemorations to support the peace process. Foster (2001), Professor of History at Oxford University, noted the difficulties in developing a story of Ireland which broke away from its role as a victim. He particularly argued against the use of theme park histories - the simplistic use of heritage sites, stories and commemorations for tourists or explicit political purposes. Howe (2000) goes further than this and provides an overview of a range of discourses which relate to Ireland and its wider context. He suggests that a range of discourses of Ireland's past have emerged. The classical nationalist perspective that British colonialism stymied Irish development, and that union between the North and Republic is needed to rectify this problem, clearly predates 1970 and continues to have

resonance. Secondly, within the period since 1970 post-colonialist writers have produced a comparable perspective, which stresses the cultural and psychological impact of imperialism. A third perspective argues that Britain wants to let the North of Ireland go so that both countries can put their energies into joining the bourgeois interests in Europe, Nato and America. A contrasting perspective held by staunch Ulster Unionists holds that the British Empire and its legacies had a progressive and civilising influence. Finally, revisionist academics have increasingly linked Ireland's past within the context of the North Atlantic Archipelago (Britain and Ireland) and a European perspective. The last perspective provides some points of comparison with recent perspectives of Britain this side of the Irish Sea. At the same time several of these perspectives question how far an Irish dimension should be located in constructions of Britain or a wider European and world context.

Finally, debates about the way in which *The Parekh Report* (2000) focused on the place of different communities in Britain go beyond disagreements between 'traditional' and 'progressive' perspectives. The Campaign against Racism and Fascism (2000), which represented the viewpoint of the Institute of Race Relations, claimed that the report was strongly influenced by 'academic preoccupations with postmodernism' at the expense of anti-racism. The report certainly used a postcolonial construct to argue that people from different parts of Britain and its empire should relate to its national story. John McLeod (2000), lecturer in English at Leeds University, argues that postcolonial constructs do not give a full understanding of the past, because they do not provide opportunities to consider the different cultures, such as the achievements of Celtic Ireland, in their own terms.

Clearly, an Irish dimension has formed part of a contentious debate involving both Irish and British historians. This has affected the school history curriculum when academic historians have voiced their opinions during the debates preceding the introduction of the National Curriculum in 1991, for example. History teachers will also have encountered different perceptions of the past during their undergraduate studies, or subsequent reading.

Nevertheless, the translation of historical debates to what happens in history classrooms is by no means immediate or straightforward. In order to understand this issue it is necessary to explore changes within the history curriculum.

An examination of changes affecting the place of an Irish dimension within the English history curriculum

It has been demonstrated that *The Parekh Report* (2000) made a clear case for including an Irish dimension as part of a vision of multicultural Britain. It has also been shown that this was based on an understanding of Britain's diverse past, an issue that has been contested amongst academic historians over the past thirty years. *The Parekh Report* (2000) made no direct reference to school history teaching. However, it can be assumed that its national story was intended to inform everyone, including school children. Clearly, if pupils are to appreciate that they live within a multicultural society and that its past reflects a diversity of experiences, this needs to underpin what is taught. It remains to be seen how far the history curriculum in schools has moved towards this discourse.

Before exploring links between an Irish dimension and education for diversity it is necessary to appreciate that some history educator's challenge the view that history should be linked to moral and social values associated with issues such as racism. McGovern (1994; 2007), founder member of the History Curriculum Association, has criticised changes in history teaching since the 1970s. He has consistently argued that children need to be presented with a body of knowledge about the past. His proposed body of knowledge consisted of people and landmarks to provide a shared sense of the past:

It tells us who we are and how we got here...For newcomers coming into the country it is equally important. Knowledge of a country's past can be an important means of binding together its people (McGovern, 2007, p.61).

He opposed exploring multiple perspectives and social purposes such as

'Britishness', ethnic diversity or gender as political correctness. However, McGovern's justification for teaching landmarks in British history showed an inherent contradiction in his argument:

A new generation of storybooks needs to be published to highlight the excitement of the past and its landmarks for this country and for other countries. If this leads to bias towards pride in our own national identity, so be it. (McGovern, 2007, p.80)

It is also evident that his approach to historical contexts failed to provide opportunities for children to analyse issues underlying the actions undertaken by people in the past:

Through their encounters with stories children will learn what people are like. They will learn that people act bravely or savagely, not because they are British or German or Indian or Nigerian, but because they are people and that is what people do.' (McGovern, 2007, p.81)

Although McGovern criticised using history for social and moral purposes, his approach to the past appears to support a narrowly focussed traditional political and social agenda.

The debate about the relationship between history and social and moral values goes beyond a dichotomy between traditional and progressive teaching approaches. Lee (1991; 1992), Senior

lecturer in History Education at the London Institute of Education, argued against the teaching of history as a means of social engineering by right of left-wing exponents. The central feature of his argument was:

The reason for teaching history in schools is not so that pupils can use it for making something else, or to change or preserve a particular form of society, or even expand the economy. The reason for teaching history is not that it changes the world, but that it changes *pupils*, it changes the way what they see in the world, and how they see it. (Lee, 1991, p.43)

Lee was concerned that focussing on personal and social functions was at odds with providing a wider conception of history as a way of looking at the world that informed best practice:

Other-historical –criteria lie behind this wider conception. Pupils need to understand long- term change, to grasp the differences between short and long run importance, to see how different kinds of significance can be attributed to the same changes in different temporal and spatial contexts. They need to examine radically different ways of life from ours, and to understand alternative individual ideas. Some ideas may be best acquired in passages of the past very clearly not concerned with issues people confront today. The distance allows judgement relatively untrammelled by assimilation to immediate prejudices (Lee, 1992, p.23)

It could be argued that the structure, which Lee provided, was not value free since he specified the need to consider different perspectives and different temporal and spatial contexts.

The relationship between history and social and moral education has proved particularly controversial with respect to teaching about the Holocaust. Russell, Lecturer in History Education at Goldsmiths College, University of London has explored the nature and development of what is an emotional and controversial aspect of the history curriculum (Russell, 2006). The following analysis draws on interviews and publications Russell used to analyse the perspectives of a range of educators. Russell made reference to the views presented by Kinloch (1998; 2001) and Salmons (1999) who challenged the idea of using the Holocaust as a means of teaching social and moral issues. Kinloch, Deputy President of the

Historical Association and former Head of History at Netherhall School, Cambridge, questioned a group of history teachers about how they taught the Holocaust and their replies emphasised moral, social and spiritual lessons to be drawn from studying it. He argued that the problem with these objectives was that they were ‘ a dangerously non-historical set of assumptions’ (Kinloch, 1998, p.44-5). Kinloch said that teaching about the Holocaust should start and end with what happened and why’ (Kinloch, 1998, p.46). His argument explicitly focuses on teaching historical attributes and attempts to exclude a social and moral dimension. This was challenged by Haydn, History Education Lecturer at the University of East Anglia (Haydn, 2000) who considered that teaching social and moral education justified teaching the Holocaust. Nevertheless, he stressed that studying the Holocaust should be underpinned by raising historical questions and human experiences in order to produced a reasoned understanding about what took place.

A similar case was made by Salmons, Holocaust Education Co-ordinator at the Imperial War Museum, who considered that moral issues arise from teaching the Holocaust because it reflects crimes committed by ordinary men and women. In response to correspondence with Russell he argued that ‘ Rather than being a panacea for racism, prejudice and other social skills, studying the Holocaust was likely to show the complexities of these issues and that there are no easy answers’ (Russell, 2006, p.38). He appreciated that history could support student reflection on their own role in society but felt that it was not the role of teachers to shape history in order that they arrived at the same conclusions as themselves (Russell, 2006, p.126).

These arguments have implications about the way in which history is taught- they stress that teaching about the Holocaust should aim to provide an objective understanding of what happened in the past. Nevertheless, with the exception of Kinloch they appreciated the need to include a social and moral dimension in teaching it. The case for developing an Irish dimension also raises moral and social issues associated with prejudice and racism. However, the following analysis is also based on the premise that history should attempt to provide opportunities for pupils to reflect and look objectively at the past.

What structure has prevailed in the school history curriculum? What factors have promoted change? What have been the implications of this for the teaching of Irish history? The period after the Second World War was characterised by a considerable degree of teacher autonomy over the curriculum. How far this encouraged diversity in curriculum design is questionable.

Slater ruefully commented:

Content was largely British, or rather Southern English; Celts looked in to starve, emigrate or rebel... abroad was of interest once it was part of the Empire, foreigners were sensibly allies, or rightly defeated (Slater, 1989, p.1 cited in Phillips, 1998, p.14)

Aldrich and Dean (1991) emphasised that in the 1950s some three-quarters of grammar schools followed an English oriented course. This suggests that, even if it was taught, Irish history merely supported an Anglo-centric perspective. This clearly related to the emphasis on English history amongst academic historians at that time. Phillips (1999) suggested that by the 1960s a number of factors challenged this perspective. Firstly, post-war immigration led some schools to re-evaluate the orientation of their history syllabi. Secondly, the growth of social sciences based on conceptual analysis and social constructivism encouraged ideas associated with relativism. Thirdly, the growth of histories from below challenged grand

narrative histories based on the exploits of famous leaders. Fourthly, the growth of new subjects caused a feeling that history was under attack. This fear was brought to a head in an article by Price (1968) which called for a School Council Research Project. Subsequent debates focused on the development of a rationale for the teaching of history, which was dubbed 'new history'. Ultimately this resulted in the introduction of the Schools Council History Project, which was taught to children between the ages of 13-16, including an examination course for children between 14-16. The approach stressed that history should be viewed as a distinct body of knowledge, requiring the cultivation of precise skills. Ireland was selected as an option by which children could understand a current problem in the context of the past. The limited time allocated for this section of the course, together with an assessment focus on the contemporary context made it likely that it would problematise Ireland and spend little time on its more distant past. A review of *The Irish Question*, the only textbook available for this course in the 1970s and early 1980s, undertaken by teachers in Northern Ireland drew attention to its strengths and weaknesses:

... the Schools Council were to be congratulated on grappling with this sensitive issue and on producing materials which were lively, accessible and, by and large, fair... All the reviewers agreed that 'The Irish Question' suffered from a weakness which to them as Irish people undermined its effectiveness. It is agreed that the historical dimension is crucial to understanding Northern Ireland today. (Development Education Centre/Trocaire, 1986, pp.82-85)

In 2001 the Oxford and Cambridge and Royal Society of Arts Examinations Board (OCR) echoed what the reviewers had said fifteen years earlier:

Candidates' ability to juggle with the intricacies of highly complex political situations continues to impress moderators. The principal difficulty appears to lie in balancing the demands of the past with those of the present so that the assignment is neither a survey of current affairs nor a chronological narrative of past events but shows the extent to which there are links between the two. (OCR, 2001, p.23)

The impact of an Irish dimension within the Schools Council History Project course needs to be set in perspective. Firstly, it was only one option within the Modern World studies component of the examination. Secondly, until the advent of GCSE a very diverse range of syllabi was available for schools. Thirdly, content was chosen to support breadth of knowledge and skills within the project and there was no obligation for a school to look more holistically at Ireland's past or link it to the experiences of other people. As such, it did not necessarily relate perceptions of British history to anti-racist perspectives, which were emerging in the late 1970s and 1980s. An anti-racist approach challenges the perception that immigration is either recent or a problem. This involved looking at the long-term nature of Britain's multicultural society and the contribution made by different immigrants rather than focusing exclusively on New Commonwealth immigration during the period since World War 2. A comparable argument can be made about the Schools History Council Project's focus on contemporary Northern Ireland. This inadequate long term historical perspective problematised Ireland and failed to balance contemporary issues with its significance in the history of Britain.

The introduction of the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) in the 1980s allowed for a choice of subject content. However, the government did set up a working group to establish general criteria for examination boards. It was suggested that boards should offer the opportunity to study British history:

... which helped pupils towards an understanding of the 'intellectual, cultural, technological and political growth of the United Kingdom. In contrast, it suggested that in their deliberations over content, the boards should bear in mind the linguistic and cultural diversity of society', an echo of the Swann Report. (Phillips, 1998, p.19)

This did not make explicit reference to the Irish community but could be taken to include it by implication. However, the introduction of GCSE saw a reduction in the range of syllabus options available to Modern World History, the Schools History Project and British Social and Economic History. Modern World History, the first most popular course did not initially include an Irish dimension, although Edexcel introduced it at a later date. The Schools History Project continued to include Ireland as one of its Modern World Studies. Some Examination Boards, such as the Midlands Examining Group, began to include optional units on the development of multicultural Britain, which included nineteenth century immigration from Ireland. It was also possible for schools to introduce coursework related to this theme.

An Irish dimension was developed as part of an anti-racist approach to the history curriculum by some history educators in the 1980s. A comparison of some of the different approaches towards race relations demonstrates the significance of this development. Approaches towards race relations have been characterised by some analysts (Mullard, 1981; Gillborn, 1995; Grosvenor, 1997) in terms of changing policies from assimilation in the 1960s, multiculturalism in the 1970s, anti-racism in the 1980s and identity politics in the 1990s. In 1969 the *Rose Report* made few references about what should be taught in classrooms beyond a reference to the following:

Any national system of education must aim at producing citizens who can take their place in society properly equipped to exercise rights and perform duties the same as other citizens. If their parents were brought up in another culture and another tradition, children should be encouraged to respect it, but a national system cannot be expected to perpetuate the different values of immigrant groups. (Second Report of the Commonwealth Immigrants Advisory Council, 1964, Circular 7/65, cited in Rose, 1969, p.266)

This reflected an assimilationist approach towards minority groups which assumed that they should become absorbed into the majority culture. Dyer (1982) applied this to the history

curriculum and argued that children should be taught British history because he considered that unfamiliar topics were too demanding for pupils. However, this view failed to address the needs of pupils from different ethnic communities in some schools.

Multiculturalism focused on celebrating diversity. The principle aim of this was to encourage respect and understanding by learning different cultures. This was based on the premise that racism resulted from ignorance. Typically, this encouraged exploring cultural identifiers such as traditional dances, clothes and food. Applied to the Irish community it could include an exploration of Irish saints and music. As a means of addressing racism it has a number of limitations. Firstly, it does not adequately reflect diversity within communities. Secondly, Gaine and George (1999) argued that the impact of multicultural education was limited since it was usually restricted to schools with a multicultural population. Thirdly, it does not consider the structures and beliefs underpinning racism. Indeed, Troyna (1992) believed that multiculturalism rested on the premise that racial hostility was an individual rather than a structural problem.

Anti-racism is based on the premise that racism needs to be addressed at both an individual and institutional level. Brandt (1986) argued that racism is:

... both overt and covert, hidden and blatant, and is practised at the individual and institutional levels, within structure and within systems (Brandt, 1986, p.67)

An anti-racist approach problematised the history curriculum with respect to both what was taught and how it was taught. For example, Gaine and George (1999, p.73) stated that history 'can examine racism (and itself) by not taking 'progress' 'superiority' and 'perspective' as

read'. Anti-racism was concerned with the messages within the curriculum and was deemed both appropriate and necessary for all pupils.

What are the implications of this for teaching an Irish dimension? Arguably a number of history educators provided models which included an Irish dimension within an anti-racist approach towards the past. Edgington (1982) stressed that history did more than inform children about other periods and societies and that the content of a syllabus could change cognitive and affective behaviours. He argued that the history curriculum should include local, national and world dimensions, together with enquiries using primary and secondary sources. This was exemplified by a syllabus developed at Tulse Hill School, whose Head of History, Nigel File (1981), co-authored the first school textbook on black immigration to Britain. File included Irish immigration as part of a course on the long-term development of multicultural Britain undertaken by year 8 children. He also produced a pamphlet for the Schools Council, which evaluated how well public examination courses met the needs of a multicultural society (1983). Within this he included references to Ireland and Irish immigration within the context of multicultural history. Goalen (1988) provided a framework for teaching history, which was intended to meet the needs of a multicultural society. He argued that this should be based on the following criteria – firstly, minority cultures should be supported and strengthened in order to assist their struggle for survival. Secondly, the curriculum should deal with values such as respect for persons since racism trades in stereotypes. Thirdly, an analysis of racism should feature prominently rather than focusing on learning about different cultures. Fourthly, Euro-centric and ethnocentric approaches should be challenged. He identified how this could be developed through anti-racist, world history and black history approaches. Goalen's description of a black history approach. Goalen's

description of a black history approach challenged Anglo-centrism by looking at other migrants who have come to Britain including Roman, Anglo-Saxon, Jewish, Chinese, Irish, Polish, Hungarian, Greek and Turkish immigrants. Arguably, both of these approaches towards Irish migration reflected multicultural perspectives, which focused on the experiences of the Irish community in the 19th century rather in post-war Britain. Swift (1986) focused on making a case for the study of Ireland and the Irish community. He argued that the Irish community represented the largest cultural and ethnic minority in Britain. Consequently, children of Irish ancestry in mainland Britain needed to have an understanding of their history, which went beyond the nostalgia of their parents and occasional references given to the Irish Question in history textbooks. Secondly, he stressed the need for children to understand the situation in Northern Ireland beyond the English perspectives in order to provide an understanding of the complexities of the situation in its broader economic, social and cultural context. Finally, a comparison of the experiences of black immigrants to anti-Irish racism in the 19th century was seen to relate to an anti-racist perspective.

The History National Curriculum was introduced in 1991 and revised in 1995 and 2000. Its introduction and revisions proved to be contentious amongst both historians and teachers. For example, an early comment on National Curriculum History by two multicultural advisers in Hertfordshire concluded 'the narrowly white and English concept of "national" in the National Curriculum is clearly noted in Mr. Baker's emphasis on British history' (Hardy & Vieler-Porter, 1992). Gaine and George (1999) argued that the 'New Right' was determined to challenge critiques of the curriculum based on issues related to 'Race'. Chris McGovern (1994), a supporter of British history and member of the working party which had the task of revising the National Curriculum, gave a contrasting viewpoint. Disenchanted with the

working party's recommendations he produced an alternative report which was published by the 'Campaign for Real Education', a right wing pressure group. He argued for British history that focused on 'great moments' and 'great figures'. In contrast, Haydn (1996) argued that the government had imposed the National Curriculum to bolster national identity and that it was vital that children should learn other ways of interpreting the past. An examination of the emergence of the National Curriculum, and its implications for an Irish dimension, provides an insight into what happened both in principle and in practice. The *National Curriculum Working Group: Final Report* (DES, 1990) included a rationale for the teaching of history, which certainly identified Ireland and Irish migration within the context of Britain and its multicultural society and also included it within its definition of Britishness. As such, members of the working party were taking into account arguments that were being presented by historians such as Kearney (1989) and Samuel (1998). However, the National Curriculum Orders in 1991 focused primarily on English history (DES, 1991). References to Ireland or other parts of Britain only related to their relationship with England. Much depended on the way in which teachers chose to interpret and adapt the Orders. Subsequent revisions to the curriculum in 1995 (DfE, 1995) and 2000 (DfE, 1999) reduced the level of prescription. The implication of this for teaching an Irish dimension could be seen in the 2000 revision which stated that in Key Stages 2 and 3 '... aspects of the histories of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales should be taught where appropriate' (DfEE, 1999, pp.18, 21). The caveat 'where appropriate' manages to be both qualified and vague to say the least. Gaine and George (1999) commented that there was less anti-racist innovation in 1995 than in 1985 as a result of the introduction of the National Curriculum, a perception that continued to be relevant in 2000. Teachers were also expected to include ethnic diversity within their teaching objectives, but much depended on how they interpreted this and the resources available. There is no

reason to assume that it would encourage an anti-racist perspective and its focus on diversity related to multiculturalism.

If it is accepted that an Irish dimension relates to the understanding of anti-racist issues, it is useful to consider a number of developments in the late 1990s. Grosvenor and Myer's (2001) analysis of the Macpherson Report (1999), the Race Relations Amendment Act (2000) and educational documents such as *Excellence in Schools* (1997) provided the impression that the government was committed to tackling racism. Nevertheless, they went on to argue that the reality has been different. There was no commitment to anti-racism in National Curriculum 2000, although its content has been amended to include 'appropriate' figures from ethnic communities. At best this can be seen as 'weak multiculturalism'. This represented the situation at the time when the current research project was undertaken and provides an insight into the context in which teachers have operated. There have been changes during the period of this research project such as *Every Child Matters* (2003), a recent Ofsted Report (2007) and the development for a new Key Stage 3 History Curriculum in 2008 (QCA, 2007), which will be considered towards the end of the research. However, at this stage it is appropriate to consider the general developments and debates which provided a context for the start of this research.

A number of educationalists have considered ways in which the National Curriculum can be adapted and used to support a multicultural curriculum. Counsell, editor of *Teaching History* and a Lecturer in Education at Cambridge University, suggested that the choice of topics 'is hugely sensitive and will always be contested, particularly where a national curriculum is imposed on a multicultural society'. In particular she noted that '... Pupils can feel excluded

and alienated by a diet of history that excludes or derogates what they see as their past' (Counsell, 2000 p.61). However, she opposed attempts to redress this by a culturally balanced curriculum and felt that the teaching of interpretations of the past provided a means of dealing with this dilemma. Consequently, while she explored ways in which pupils could develop their knowledge of the past she avoided specific references to a context or approach that explored issues such as racism and human rights. More explicit attempts to promote an anti-racist dimension to history teaching were supported by educationalists including the researcher (Bracey, 1995a), Claire (1996) and Grosvenor (2000). Phillips (2002) suggested that history is about identity formation and that it ought to contribute to an inclusive view of society and nation together with a view of the world which looked outwards. He persuasively argued that this is achieved by developing a critical perspective of the different ways in which the past is understood.

Why is it important to develop an understanding of Ireland's history? This can be illustrated through a piece of case study research undertaken by the researcher with a year 7 cohort in a large suburban comprehensive school in the Midlands (Bracey & Gove-Humphries, 2003b). The purpose of the study was to ascertain whether pupils' perceptions of Ireland affected their reactions towards an Irish history topic. The study had some alarming implications. Firstly, the pupils had a distinctly Anglo-centric vision of Britain. Secondly, they considered that the television was the main source of their information about the past. Thirdly, although their historical knowledge of Ireland was greater than that for Wales or Scotland, it was dominated by impressions of violence. Although this did not affect perceptions of the distant past, a focus group study suggested that deep-seated family associations may have had some influence on attitudes to a past event. Clearly the results of a small focus group study need to

be treated cautiously. Nevertheless, studies undertaken by Austin, Rae and Hodgkinson (1987), Sexias (1993), Barton, Teacher Education Professor at the University of Cincinnati, and McCully, a lecturer in History Education at the University of Ulster, have undertaken research with pupils in Northern Ireland which suggests that children's backgrounds have a major impact on their perceptions of the past (Barton & McCully, 2001). At the same time studies undertaken by Branchereau (1995) and Goalen (1997) suggest that the media has a powerful impact on children's perceptions. Taken together, these studies suggest that decisions about what is taught are vital if attitudes and prejudices of pupils are to be challenged.

A number of history educators have suggested ways in which an Irish dimension can be developed within the context of a multicultural perspective. Osler, Professor of Education at Leicester University, made a case for including Ireland within the Citizenship curriculum, which can easily be related to history:

In developing a vision of a future multicultural society, which is inclusive of white people, we need to recognise diversity and a range of identities within the white population. The political and institutional developments in various parts of Britain and in Northern Ireland serve to illustrate how, for individuals, the process of identity development is an ongoing project influenced by political context as well as personal circumstances. A new concept of anti-racism needs to be developed, which is founded on principles of human rights, and which recognises and is inclusive of the white population as well as those of black and ethnic minorities. (Osler, 2000, p.35)

Approaches towards teaching controversial issues and diversity within the context in Northern Ireland have been extensively explored in recent years (McCully, 2002; 2004; Pilgrim, Barton & McCully, 2007). Barton and McCully warn against a simple comparison of the situation facing pupils in different contexts but allow for the fact that racism and terrorism may well provoke emotional responses in some parts of England. Claire, a Lecturer in Education at London Metropolitan University, included an Irish dimension within the context of teaching

history for equality and diversity in the Primary School History Curriculum in England (Claire, 1996). The researcher has produced materials for a series of workshops for teachers (Bracey & Gove-Humphries, 2002; 2003c; 2005b; Bracey, Gove-Humphries & Jackson, 2005a; 2006a) conference presentations (Bracey, 2001; 2005c; 2005d; 2006d; 2007) and articles, which consider ways in which Ireland can contribute to the history curriculum and complement the work undertaken within this research study.

The articles set out to provide insights into ways in which an Irish dimension relates to the English history curriculum. Firstly, it was included within a model for teaching British history from multiple perspectives (Bracey, 1995b). A second article included reference to an Irish dimension within work on the Vikings undertaken with Initial Teacher Training students (Bracey, 2001). Thirdly, opportunities for developing an Irish thread in the Primary History Curriculum was demonstrated in an article for *Primary History* (Bracey, 2003a). Fourthly, articles in *Primary History* and *Education 3-13* used an Irish historical fiction dimension to explore issues associated with the experiences of evacuees and refugees (Jackson, Gove-Humphries & Bracey, 2005; Bracey, Gove-Humphries & Jackson 2006a).

Overall, the treatment of Ireland and the Irish community within the school history curriculum is under researched. However, the preceding analysis demonstrates that a consideration of its significance goes to the heart of controversies related to both academic and school history. What actually happens in history classrooms is likely to be affected by a teacher's subject knowledge and values, school priorities, resources and context. The following chapters will focus on the perceptions of educational providers, including teachers and key educationalists

about the role of an Irish dimension in the history curriculum. The reasons for focusing on providers and the approach taken will be the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY:

APPROACHES USED TO EXAMINE AN IRISH DIMENSION WITHIN THE ENGLISH HISTORY CURRICULUM

General considerations

This research project will explore perceptions of an Irish dimension and how this compares with other dimensions in the school history curriculum. The focus of the study will be on educational providers, especially teachers rather than children. Why focus on providers rather than pupils? This may appear surprising, given that the project was prompted by the results of a previous research project, undertaken in 2001 with 100 year 7 pupils in a Birmingham school. This earlier study suggested that most children had an Anglo-centric perception of the past. Pupils' perceptions of Ireland were characterised by references associated with identity, such as St. Patrick, or to images of violence associated with its more recent past. (Bracey & Gove-Humphries, 2003b). Clearly, any conclusions drawn from a small-scale study need to be treated with caution. However, it raised questions about the way in which history is presented to pupils and how far this affects their map of the past. It also raised questions about the underlying assumption of *The Parekh Report* (2000), the catalyst for the current study. *The Parekh Report* (2000) argues that the Irish community have been neglected 'owing to the myth of homogeneity of white Britain', and that Britain's national story should include an Irish dimension. However, our study qualified this assertion and suggested that rather than being ignored, Ireland and its people suffer from negative

stereotypes. The need to challenge negative attitudes towards an Irish community has relevance to all pupils but has particular implications for the esteem of children with Irish heritage. The school history curriculum cannot be blamed as the sole cause of this problem and our study found a range of influences on children including the media, parents, peers as well as what is taught in school. Nevertheless, it could be argued that in order to appreciate the impact of school history it is necessary to focus on the agencies responsible for framing and developing it. Hence, this current research focus is on providers of school history as the people responsible for the way in which history is presented to pupils.

This study will explore the perceptions of a range of providers including inspectors, advisers, teacher trainers, and project leaders and subject leaders in school. However, Heads of History and History Co-ordinators will provide the main research focus. Field, Holden and Lawlor (2000) suggest that the role of subject leaders in both secondary and primary schools has become particularly significant since the introduction of the National Curriculum, Ofsted and the national leadership standards by the Teacher Training Agency in 1998. Given the importance of subject leadership it is hardly surprising that it has been the subject of a number of studies. Some studies look at the issues facing subject leaders from different subject areas. For example, Wise (2001) investigated the difficulties faced by subject leaders in monitoring academic standards in their disciplines. A number of studies have focused on issues associated with specific subjects, of which a number examine teacher perceptions of issues related to planning, teaching and learning. Lambert (1999), Chief Executive of the Geography Association and former lecturer at London Institute of Education, focused on teacher perceptions of teaching and learning approaches through using textbooks in geography lessons. Rayment (2000), an Art Education lecturer at Reading University,

investigated Art teachers' perceptions of the impact of the National Curriculum, which may provide a useful comparison with the distinctions between academic and school history.

Rayment argues that the National Curriculum has seen a move towards formalisation of Art at the expense of open-ended creativity. This has been challenged by a number of academic art educators as a betrayal of the nature of the subject. However, Rayment's findings led to the conclusion that despite some misgivings Art teachers approved of the approach taken in the National Curriculum. The article tentatively suggested that the academic priorities were overshadowed by other concerns such as performance management. He argues that the structured approach, which the National Curriculum provided, made it easier to demonstrate competence for threshold payments. A comparison between history teachers and history educators would provide opportunities to see how far they shared the same priorities.

The research is based on the belief is that an Irish dimension should form part of an anti-racist/multicultural history curriculum which reflects diversity. However, the research does not assume that this will be the perspective of interview and survey respondents. The intention is to investigate the importance attached to an Irish dimension relative to other dimensions. Consequently, where an Irish dimension is deemed important, the focus will be on trying to ascertain why it is taught and how this relates to underlying perspectives of the people concerned.

The focus of the research will be on teacher perceptions of an Irish dimension within the curriculum. Clearly the impact of local context, school organisation, age phase, interests and opportunities may affect teacher perceptions, and for this reason the research will explore the perceptions of a range of teachers. This will be compared with the perceptions with a number

of ‘movers and shakers’, history educators working outside the classroom. Ultimately, the ‘fuzzy generalisations’ generated by this analysis will provide tentative conclusions about the significance of an Irish dimension in the curriculum. Hopefully, models or suggestions for developing an Irish dimension will emerge from this analysis.

The research process will make use of a series of questionnaire and interview case studies. Why not classroom observations of individual teachers? Alternatively, why not go to the other extreme and have a large-scale survey, which could produce statistically significant results? A classroom-based study would certainly provide a natural development from the earlier study of a cohort of children, which prompted the research. This could include an investigation of the influence of resources, teacher subject knowledge, together with classroom interaction triangulated with pupil responses. However, an in depth classroom focus in a limited number of contexts would not provide the breadth of evidence, which can be considered through looking at the responses of a wider range of people. This is particularly important when trying to explore the impact of different contexts - primary and secondary schools as well as the influences of specific projects related to Ireland. This naturally leads to the second question - why not use a large-scale study? Generalisation on the basis of this type of study has a number of advantages if the purpose of the research is to get a general impression about the place of an Irish dimension in the curriculum. However, it will prove less useful in exploring particular groups of teachers or contexts in which an Irish dimension is developed.

The research will be organised into case studies and it is appropriate to justify this. Robson (2002) defines a case study as ‘the situation, individual, group, organisation or whatever we are interested in’. This approach can be illustrated as:

... a group of children in a class in a classroom, doctors and nurses in an accident and emergency ward, workers in a particular machine shop or union branch, or people working in an organisation such as the BBC, most social scientists would think of this as case study, and the use of such a research design requires us to justify the choice of group and locale. (Bechhofer & Paterson, 2000, p.46 cited in May, 2001, p.172)

What are its advantages? May provides a useful indication of the way in which case studies provide insights into particular situations:

... cases may be selected according to the needs driven by the sponsor of research. They may also be argued to be 'typical' in some sense, or even taken as 'critical' in that they are different and that their examination would not only illuminate the dynamics that inform those differences, but also heighten sensitivity towards what is taken to be 'normal' in other circumstances. (May, 2001, p.173)

Robson indicates a range of ways in which the structure, nature and approach to case studies can take different forms. This can be illustrated by looking at different examples. For example, Charlesworth (2000) produced a study of working class life in Rotherham that made use of demographic and manufacturing statistics coupled with ethnographic descriptions of the area. Case studies have been used by a number of educational researchers. Rayment analysed the response of a group of art teachers to the National Curriculum. Osborn et al (2000) used case studies, which involved interviewing staff in three schools to identify how they mediated government directives and external requirements to their teaching styles and approaches towards dealing with change. Lambert (1999) used a relatively small group of geography teachers in order to determine how they used textbooks. The small scale of his survey enabled Lambert to provide the teachers with a choice of new textbooks in order to take part in the study. In all of the above examples the cases studies provided opportunities for researchers to have a very specific focus to their research features of the cases. For this reason, the flexibility of case studies over a large-scale survey is of paramount importance when investigating teacher perceptions of an Irish dimension. The intention is to use this approach as a means of generating 'fuzzy generalisations'. Bassey (2001) suggests that case

studies can be used to provide tentative generalisations, which can of course be questioned and challenged in other contexts. Case studies based on questionnaires and interviews are intended to provide insights into how a range of educational providers, especially teachers, perceives Ireland within the English History Curriculum. It is appreciated that teacher perceptions or comments may not match what they do in practice. However, this research is particularly interested in ascertaining what they believe and why they believe it. At the same time, where possible, the intention will be to triangulate teacher perceptions with other forms of evidence such as planning documentation.

The use of questionnaires and interviews needs to be underpinned by considering a number of ethical issues. Issues associated with questionnaires will be dealt with first. There is a potential conflict between transparency and maximising responses to the questionnaires. A questionnaire related to an Irish dimension in the history curriculum could be ignored by anyone who does not consider it relevant. At the same time it would be unethical not to mention the purpose of the research. BERA (2004, p.6) guidelines state, 'Researchers must ... avoid deception or subterfuge unless their research design specifically requires it to ensure that the appropriate data is collected' Arguably, the research in question does not require these extreme measures. The problem of ensuring maximum responses while remaining clear about the focus of the project will be resolved by indicating the interests of the research while stressing that people's responses to the history curriculum as a whole are relevant to the project.

The second issue relates to confidentiality of respondents. The British Sociological Association code of ethics states: 'Guarantees of confidentiality and anonymity given to

research participants must be honoured, unless there are clear and overriding reasons to do otherwise' (1996, p.3). Postal surveys will be coded to enable reminders to be sent out but names are left as optional for those people prepared to be interviewed. The analysis of questionnaire data will relate to all teachers within a case study rather than any individual person or school.

Interviews with individual people require a particularly clear understanding of ethical considerations. The British Education Research Associations (BERA) provides the following guidance:

Researchers must recognise the participants' entitlement to privacy and accord them rights to confidentiality, unless ... they willingly waive that right ... Conversely researchers must recognise participants' rights to be identified with any publication of their original works or inputs. In some contexts it will be the expectation of participants to be so identified. (BERA, 2004, p.8-9)

The researcher will assume that in most cases interviewees would prefer to remain anonymous. This will be supported by written agreements between the researcher and interviewee in which conditions can be negotiated. Interviewees will not be named when their responses are analysed. However, there are a number of issues which need to be considered. With high profile interviewees such as the HMI or Director of the School History Project reference to the person's conference presentations and publications will make them identifiable. This issue will be discussed with the interviewee and opportunities for them to see transcripts will be particularly important. Should circumstances arise in which the interviewee does not want the transcript to be used then it would not be appropriate to include them in the research. It is anticipated that teachers who provide interviews will remain anonymous and given the opportunity to look at transcripts. This will not be an issue with interviewees associated with the questionnaires. Teachers who have been contributors to

Teachers in Development Education projects could be in the organisation's publications but will not be identified within this research. The situation is slightly more difficult with respect to teachers involved in the Ireland in Schools Project. This organisation puts teacher materials on its web site where they can be identified. In order to deal with this issue a general reference to the Ireland in Schools web site will be made rather than references to the materials produced by individual teachers. This case study includes some teachers who have given conference presentations or published articles. Where interviewees have directly put their work in the public domain it seems appropriate to make reference to it.

Research structure

Questionnaires

The questionnaires will provide data sets located in five case studies of secondary and primary teachers.

Table 1 provides a summary of the size, location and date when each questionnaire is to be undertaken. It is possible that these differences will also influence what can be deduced from each case study, which needs to be taken into account when drawing comparisons between them.

Table 1: Summary of questionnaire case studies

Case studies	Location	Population	Date
1	Pilot study with mentors at Birmingham University	25	October 2003
2	Birmingham Secondary postal questionnaire	62	Autumn 2004
3	School History Conference at Leeds	156	July 2004
4	Historical Primary Conference at Duxford	58	May 2004
5	Birmingham Primary postal survey	75	Spring 2005

Case Study I: Pilot study of 25 Secondary History Mentors

This will consist of mentors attending an INSET at Birmingham University in October 2003. They will be drawn from schools in Birmingham and its surrounding area. Given that all of the mentors are to be given time to complete the questionnaire and it can be collected immediately after completion it is possible to obtain a response rate of 100%. The mentors form a distinct group, as a result of their links with the university training student teachers. This case study will also serve a pilot, as it will provide an opportunity to test and reflect upon the data provided before undertaking subsequent case studies. For this reason it will be referred to as the pilot study.

Case Study 2: Birmingham Heads of History

The second case study will be a postal questionnaire sent to 62 out of 77 secondary school Heads of History in Birmingham schools not present at the mentor meeting at Birmingham University used for Case Study 1. The survey will only be sent to LEA and church schools and, given the broadly comparable geographical context to the pilot study, it is anticipated that the results will provide similar responses. Birmingham has a higher proportion of first, second and third generation Irish migrants than most areas in Britain. The questionnaires will show whether or not this is matched by an Irish dimension being significant within its schools.

Case Study 3: Delegates at the Schools History Project Conference at Leeds in July 2004

This case study will consist of 156 delegates attending a plenary lecture at conference. It is assumed that teachers attending this conference will include a significant number who are

teaching Ireland as part of the School History Project. The fact that they attend the conference over a weekend may indicate enthusiasm for history and School History Project teaching and learning approaches. It is also possible that some people will be attending the conference because they are either ambitious or fearful about getting to grips with aspects of the history curriculum. However, it is unwise to assume that any of these possible characteristics are more prevalent amongst the conference attendees than the population of history teachers in general. The conference is advertised throughout the country and will draw teachers from different areas. Not all of these teachers will serve areas with Irish communities, which suggests that it will provide a useful comparison with the previous case studies. Given that it is sent to a diverse range of schools, it is anticipated that this could include responses from some people working in the private sector as well as LEA and church schools. The structure of the questionnaire given to teachers at the conference will be the same as for Case Study 2.

Case Study 4: Delegates at the Primary Historical Association Conference at Duxford in May 2004

This case study will consist of 58 primary teachers who will be given a questionnaire at the start of the conference. It will mirror the Schools History Conference in that it will draw on a population of teachers from different parts of the country who are sufficiently committed to history to attend an INSET day on a Saturday. It is also anticipated that it would include some people working in the private sector as well as LEA and church schools.

Case Study 5: Birmingham Primary History Co-ordinators

This case study will be a postal questionnaire sent to History Co-ordinators in Birmingham in Spring 2005. Questionnaires will only be sent to teachers working in the 5-11 schools age range so that the provision across key stages can be compared. Out of an aggregate total of

276 primary schools, 197 are LEA schools and 53 are Roman Catholic schools, with most of the remainder run by the Church of England. There are 40 postcodes in Birmingham which have at least one LEA primary school, and 35 postcodes which have at least one Roman Catholic school. This provides a geographical spread comparable to the secondary surveys in Birmingham.

The intention is to send a questionnaire to one LEA school and one Roman Catholic school in each postcode. In all 75 primary schools will be contacted, which represents over 27% of the primary schools in the city. However, the potential responses from Roman Catholic schools will be much larger than their proportion within the total number of schools in the city. Can such a skewed sample be justified? Given that the responses of all Heads of History in Roman Catholic secondary schools will be analysed through questionnaires sent to all secondary school Heads of History, the approach used will provide opportunities to obtain data from an equivalent geographical spread of Roman Catholic primary schools. However, the main justification is the assumption that it provides a purposeful sample. There is a strong likelihood that Roman Catholic schools will serve Irish communities and it will be useful to see if this makes the co-ordinators more likely to consider an Irish dimension important in their work. Given this, it is intended to compare the responses of co-ordinators in Roman Catholic and LEA schools as well as analysing the case study as a whole.

Before undertaking the questionnaires with the five mini-case studies they will be pre-tested by giving them to two primary and two secondary teachers in order to test for ambiguities and structural issues with their design. The principles underpinning the secondary and primary school questionnaires will be broadly comparable. However, some changes will be necessary

to allow for the different contexts in which the two sectors operate, with the former usually organised in subject departments and the latter through History Co-ordinators who are also generalist class teachers. It is assumed that a Head of History in a secondary school will have direct control over the long, medium and short term planning in their department and may well teach across several year groups. Although it may be reasonable to assume that the History Co-ordinator in a primary school will have control over what they teach and will have an overview role across what happens in other classes it is necessary to consider issues associated with their role. Research into the role of subject co-ordinators in the mid 1990s suggested:

The primary Subject Co-ordinator's role was not clearly defined compared with that of the Head of Department role of a secondary teacher. There was not the same access to rooms or resources and no opportunity to recruit a specialist team to work with them. (Osborn et al, 2000, p.117)

Further, government assessment of the role of history co-ordinators in primary schools is not encouraging. The HMI Report for 2001/2 states:

It is often the case that teachers leading history are relatively new in post, and their first concern is with documentation, such as the policy and schemes of work.... These new subject leaders are often enthusiastic, but they sometimes lack the status or subject knowledge to become engaged in a dialogue about teaching. Conversely in several schools where the Head Teacher is the History Co-ordinator, there are no such concerns about authority, but there are many conflicting demands on time that make it difficult to undertake the co-ordinating role or expand it. (Ofsted, 2001/2, p.6)

The Annual Report for the QCA made two years later is no more encouraging. After commenting on the crucial role of the primary history co-ordinator it comments:

... the co-ordinator is often given insufficient time and resources to do the job effectively. Frequently, the history co-ordinator will be a new or inexperienced teacher or will have a further range of responsibilities. (QCA, 2004, p.5)

Consequently, the impact of primary History Co-ordinators is likely be less than that of secondary Heads of History. This indicates that a degree of caution is required when

comparing the primary and secondary case studies. The structure of the questionnaires will appreciate the organisational differences between the two sectors.

The secondary teacher questionnaires will start with a series of questions about the context of the school and respondent. This is followed by a series of questions designed to find out their perception of the importance of an Irish dimension in history and how this compares with their attitude towards other dimensions. The first question will ask teachers to rate their perception of the importance of different dimensions – Local, Multicultural Britain, British, English, Irish, Welsh, Scottish, European and World history at Key Stage 3. The order of dimensions is jumbled up in order to encourage each dimension to be considered independently. The purpose of this is to enable teachers to emphasise what they believe without pre-empting responses related to Ireland. Subsequent questions consider perceptions of multicultural history, Irish history and Irish migration for each area of study. This will be followed by specific questions which either follow up the earlier questions, or find out if Ireland is taught at Key Stage 4 or 5 and the resources used. The penultimate question will ask teachers if they have been involved in any other historically based projects. Finally, they will be given the opportunity to add any further comments.

The primary questionnaires will start with the contextual questions as secondary questionnaires. However, attitudinal questions, which follow this, will take into account the differences between primary and secondary schools. Consequently, the primary survey will begin by asking the History Co-ordinator to evaluate the dimensions in relation to their own teaching. Rather than following the secondary survey and asking them to evaluate particular areas of study for which they may have little or no direct experience, they will be asked to

give their perceptions of dimensions looked at in question 1 for Key Stage 1 and 2 as a whole. The final questions will be similar to those asked of the secondary teachers, and relate to resources and involvement in projects. Direct comparisons between primary and secondary contexts will need to appreciate the differences in survey designs. However, exploring the distinct features of a case study is a strength of case study research. Given these qualifications, nevertheless, the intention is to make cautious comparisons between the case studies of the two sectors.

Interviews

A major purpose of the questionnaire will be to identify potential interviewees who will provide the major focus of the research project as a whole. Interviews can explore perceptions of an Irish dimension in greater depth than is possible with the questionnaires and provide rich data. The intention is to gain in depth insights of particular teacher perspectives beyond what is possible in the questionnaires. The responses of groups of interviewees will form mini-case studies. The first of these will consist of respondents to the pilot questionnaire who indicate that they are willing to be interviewed. As a pilot study it will test the interview schedule. It will also provide data about perceptions of a range of people who do not necessarily have a strong commitment to teaching an Irish dimension. It will also triangulate and extend conclusions drawn from the pilot questionnaire. The second and third case studies of teachers will consist of primary and secondary teachers whose responses to questionnaires 2-5 indicate that an Irish dimension is important in their teaching. The interviewee schedules will start with comparable questions but will take into consideration the different circumstances affecting history teaching in primary and secondary schools. The third and fourth case studies will consist of project leaders and teachers who demonstrate a particular commitment to an Irish dimension through producing materials for either Teachers in

Development Education or the Ireland in Schools Project. Their interviews will also include the opportunity to explore the significance of the project that they have contributed to. The last mini-case study will consist of a range of educational providers, 'Movers and Shakers' who may influence teachers. This will include an HMI for History, the QCA History Officer, two History Education lecturers at Birmingham University and the History Advisers for Birmingham. The perceptions of this group of people towards an Irish dimension within the curriculum are significant because of their role in training, supporting and inspecting teachers. The interviews with people in this case study will include general questions previously asked to teachers but will also seek to find out the nature of their particular role in promoting an Irish dimension.

The main focus of the interviews will be to identify the interviewees' current perceptions of an Irish dimension. However, where appropriate it will be necessary to provide a historical context, and the distinction between past and present could become blurred. Goodson (2003) considers that getting a longitudinal perspective of how teachers' practice is being transformed is central to understanding the ongoing transformation of schooling. Banks, Leach and Moon (2005) argue that teacher subject knowledge consists of subject knowledge related to the academic nature of their subject, school knowledge which transports it to the school context and pedagogic knowledge which interact with each other in order to bring their professional knowledge into being. They consider:

...at the heart of this dynamic process are the personal constructs of the teacher, a complex amalgam of past knowledge, experience of learning, a personal view of what constitutes 'good teaching' and a belief in the purposes of the subject. (Banks, Leach & Moon, 2005)

By implication such factors as experience and values which teachers bring to their work or have been exposed to in the past could affect how they far they support or approach an Irish

dimension in the curriculum. It is anticipated that reference to previous experiences will be particularly important with respect to the co-ordinators of the Teachers in Development Education and Ireland Schools Project in order to appreciate how the projects came about and whether their initial objectives remain the same today. Similarly, where it is found that teachers have been in the profession over a number of years or within different schools, it is likely that past experiences may have a bearing on their perception of an Irish dimension.

Before considering how the interviews are to be conducted it is necessary to consider issues associated with collecting oral data. Firstly, the impact of the interviewer on the interview needs to be taken into account (May 2001). This is dealt with in a number of ways, such as the fact that the researcher will conduct all of the interviews, which provides consistency as far as the interviewer is concerned. At the same time the fact that everyone to be interviewed is a teacher suggests that the differentiation between interviewer and interviewee is less than would be the case if pupils, parents or other groups were to be involved. However, there remain issues of school context, teacher confidence, experience and expertise and whether or not they are strangers. Given this, the background, context and relationship between the researcher and interviews will be indicated during the analysis in order to allow for the impact of these factors.

It is possible that some teachers may feel intimidated or simply want to provide the 'correct' answers. Some interviews will have to be conducted by telephone and others are face to face in a classroom or office, which restricts opportunity to detect factors such as body language or the ease by which an interviewee can relate to the interviewer. These issues will be addressed by emphasising that all answers are valid and that the research is not assuming a particular

response. A common format for the prompts during the early stages will attempt to make it easier to compare responses. However, it will be necessary to adapt specific questions for particular individuals, such as ‘movers and shakers’ and teachers involved in specific projects. Accessibility, cognition and motivation need to be considered when planning interviews (Khan & Cannell, 1983; Moser & Kalton, 1983, cited in May, 2001, p.128). The first of these relates to gaps in interviewee knowledge. This can be a problem when dealing with current perceptions and will almost certainly be an issue when looking at aspects of life histories. This will be resolved by providing interviewees with prompts before and during the interview in order to deal with short-term confusion or memory loss, or changing perceptions over time. Where possible the interviews will be supported by cross-references to documentary evidence. Providing a prompt sheet to the interviewee and ensuring that questions are sufficiently open to allow for a range of responses hopefully obviates cognition or misunderstanding about what is required. In order to provide for comparison a common format of semi-structured questions will be used in interviews, subject to some qualifications. Prompts certainly provide an overall structure for the responses although clearly some teachers will go beyond this. In all interviews asking a mixture of broadly based and specific questions and the opportunity for interviews to go beyond the schedule will encourage motivation. However, specific questions will be required for ‘movers and shakers’ and teachers involved in projects.

The interview analysis is intended to provide evidence of common issues and differences between people within case studies, as well as comparisons between non-teaching educators and teachers. The intention is to identify similarities and differences in responses amongst teachers within and between case studies. At the same time it will be important to appreciate and analyse individual teacher perceptions in order to investigate specific ways

in which an Irish dimension is developed. For some questions the evidence will speak for itself. However, principles associated with grounded theory will be used to build up patterns in some responses, such as reasons for developing an Irish dimension. Is this acceptable? Raleigh comments:

The recorded in depth interview, or oral history, is a specific research method within the general designation of qualitative methodology and is close to the basic principle of grounded theory. The difference lies in the emphasis placed on the formation of questions that guide the research. Also grounded theory references to other kinds of behaviour besides the interview. Proponents of grounded theory research insist on research without perceptions – that is without hypothesis.... For others, there is the acceptance of the researcher starting with articulated problems or interviews that guide the interview process. (Raleigh, 1994, p.8)

Following from this is the decision about whether to use a computer package to facilitate the research. The advantage of technology is that testimony fragments could easily be grouped and quantified as appropriate. However, it will not be used for the following reasons: firstly, the number of transcripts is not unduly large – certainly under 45 which suggests that the benefits of technology would not compensate the time involved with manipulating the software. Secondly, the study is split into smaller case studies, which can readily be analysed manually. Thirdly, the gaps, priorities, tone and emphasis for some answers - especially the question asking teachers to give reasons for developing an Irish dimension – is of equal importance to the texts but would be missed with a computer based analysis which focused exclusively on the text.

All of the questions will begin with reference to the person's context, role and experience. The interview schedule used with Heads of History can be seen in Appendix I. All interviews will include common questions to enable comparisons between case studies to be made, but there will also be questions designed to relate to the specific features of different case studies. In the case of the 'movers and shakers' and some teachers this will include appropriate

references to their life histories. The interviewees will then be asked to indicate the relative importance they attach to skills and content. Although this is not at first an obvious question to ask, it is important in demonstrating the person's perception of their approach to school history. After this they will be asked to identify their perception of the importance of different dimensions in their teaching. In part this triangulates with the surveys with reference to English, Irish, and Scottish, Multicultural and World history but other dimensions such as Black history and Anti-racist history are added on the assumption that they can be explored more effectively through talking than is possible in a survey. Teachers will then be asked how important they consider an Irish dimension to be at each key stage in their school, supported by prompts such as – not important, occasional references, some importance and very important. Where teachers indicate that it is important they will be asked to indicate why. A list of prompts including interest, ethnicity of the children, preparation for Key Stage 4 (in the case of secondary schools), availability of materials, anti-racism and human rights, or any other reasons – provides a framework for this response. This particular question is particularly important in trying to determine the teacher's underlying beliefs. Subsequent questions will provide opportunities to discuss resources, sources of support, attitudes of staff, pupils and parents and finally, opportunities and constraints in developing an Irish dimension as well as issues raised by interviewees. The purpose of this is to gain an insight into how the teacher relates an Irish dimension in practice. Where teachers are involved in either the Ireland in Schools or TIDE projects additional questions explore why they became involved in the project, their role within in it and its impact.

Documentary evidence

Clearly there are a range of influences affecting teacher perceptions. The curriculum is influenced by a number of agencies ranging from the government and examination boards as well resources such as textbooks, websites and projects and visits to museums for example. The literature review has made reference to the impact of government and examination boards and textbooks. During the early stages of this project the intention was to undertake a contents analysis of both examination board documentation and textbooks. Haydn, Arthur and Hunt (2003) claim that textbooks are the main resource used by teachers. Their case is based on an Ofsted survey of 1994 which pre-dates the expansion of web based resources. However, Issitt (2004) persuasively argues that textbooks provide a basis for teachers' work, which ensures that they provide a good indication of what is taught. However, the focus of the current study restricted opportunities to provide a detailed investigation of resources. However, resources used or produced by interviewees, including textbooks and project resources will be analysed where appropriate.

Hence, it can be seen that this research is underpinned by the belief that an Irish dimension should be part of teaching for diversity within a multicultural curriculum. However, it does not assume that questionnaire respondents and interviewees will support this premise. It is possible that by eliciting specific responses and building them up into categories it may be possible to explore different reasons for developing an Irish dimension. The next stage of this chapter will consider the extent to which the above plans and contingencies operated in practice.

Research into action

The issues and opportunities experienced during the research will begin with an examination of the questionnaires, followed by interviews and finally documentary evidence.

Questionnaires

The questionnaires raised a number of issues related to the different contexts and populations of the five case studies.

Case Study I: Pilot study of Secondary History mentors

This achieved a 100% response with all 25 mentors completing the questionnaire. Clearly, providing time in a closed context ensured a maximum response rate whether or not the history teachers were interested in the subject of the research. The remaining surveys were to a greater or lesser extent influenced by organisational weaknesses. The mentors were drawn from a range of schools including 15 from Birmingham schools, 8 from the surrounding conurbation and 2 from a satellite town relatively close to the city. By matching postcodes to schools it was possible to identify 24 LEA schools and one Roman Catholic school.

Case Study 2: Birmingham Heads of History

This consisted of 62 Heads of History in Birmingham who were not Birmingham University mentors. A letter and questionnaire were sent to each Head of History. These were followed by written reminders at two-week intervals and an email reminder from the History Adviser. This produced 38 replies which represented a response of 61%.

It is possible to indicate how well Birmingham secondary school Heads of History / History Departments were represented in the project as a whole by combining contextual data from the 15 secondary schools in Pilot Study with the 38 responses to Case Study 2. Added together they become 53 responses out of 77 schools in the city that represents an aggregate response rate of 69%. This can be broken down to responses from 46 out of 65 LEA schools (71%) and 7 out of 10 Roman Catholic Schools (70%). The results showed that heads of history in Roman Catholic schools, which it could be assumed would have closer links with Irish Communities, were not more disposed to respond than LEA schools where links are less direct. Birmingham also has a Church of England and a Muslim school but their Heads of History did not respond to the questionnaire. The geographical spread of schools represented within the two case studies was encouraging with questionnaires returned from teachers in 31 out of 37 (84%) postcodes which had at least one LEA or Roman Catholic school.

Case Study 3: Delegates at the Schools History Project Conference at Leeds in July 2004

This questionnaire received helpful support from the conference organiser. Time had been given to explain the purpose of the research at a major plenary lecture, the foyer was used as a collection point, and a raffle was used to maximise responses. However, this questionnaire only achieved a response rate of 52 out of 156 teachers (33%). How can this be explained? Weaknesses included the fact that there was no opportunity for follow up reminders. There was no opportunity for questionnaires to be completed and handed in during or immediately after the plenary lecture because teachers had to go to seminars across the campus. Although the conference foyer was a prominent place, the rambling nature of the site may have been problematic. The intense nature of the conference coupled with social networking in the evening may have discouraged people from filling in a questionnaire. The conference

organiser and I discussed the prospect of giving out stamped addressed envelopes but felt that this could prove counter productive in encouraging people to reply at the conference.

However, stamped addressed envelopes were made available at the front of the lecture theatre and later in the foyer if teachers requested them. In retrospect it may have been advisable to give them out to every delegate in the lecture theatre.

Case Study 4: Delegates at the Primary Historical Association Conference at Duxford in May 2004

This questionnaire only achieved a response rate of 13 out of 58 teachers and reflected a number of serious organisational issues. The overwhelming issue was that it was impossible to have any control over the administration of the questionnaires. It was agreed that they would be posted to the organiser of the conference. All surveys were sent in plastic wallets with covering letters and stamped addressed envelopes. Unfortunately, the organiser put them into unidentifiable resource packs for delegates. About five minutes were given to introduce the research but no opportunity was given to have them returned during the one day conference. The researcher was not given access to the delegate list but the organiser did send out a reminder to delegates. In retrospect, it can be said that this proved to be a learning experience! It was clearly a mistake to release control over the distribution of the survey. Secondly, in retrospect it may have been better to have asked the organiser if the questionnaire could have been posted to delegates, possibly before the conference.

Case Study 5: Birmingham Primary History Co-ordinators

Initially this questionnaire proved to have an even lower response than the Historical Association Conference. Only 7 teachers out of a population of 75 (40 LEA and 35 Roman

Catholic) schools replied to the questionnaires. Clearly it was necessary to see if there were problems with the questionnaire. A straw poll telephone contact was made with the first five History Co-ordinators in the list of contacts compiled for the questionnaire. They were assured that the researcher was not contacting them to fill in the survey but to ask for their help in trying to find out why very few people had responded to it. They were then asked the following questions: Did you get the questionnaire? Were there any problems with it? For example, was it too long? Were there any issues with the questions? Two teachers said that they had been ill or had just returned from maternity leave. Three teachers said that due to limited time they had not got round to answering it. In all cases they said that there was not an issue with the form or the questions and two people offered to complete it. Clearly, it is possible that a mixture of pride and politeness may have affected these answers. Indeed, if they had not had time to answer the questionnaire it is possible that they had not looked at it. Given that the pre-pilot survey did not suggest that there were problems with the survey it was decided to keep the questions. However, the presentation of the questionnaire was streamlined with the intention of making it possible to complete it more easily. The straw poll suggested that the questionnaire reached its intended audience. Direct conversations with subject co-ordinators suggested that they would be prepared to do what was required. Consequently, it was decided to directly contact History Subject Co-ordinators before sending out the questionnaires. This proved incredibly time-consuming in practice, often requiring several telephone calls. The nature of this case study was clearly distinctive in that people were responding to direct requests for help. A second written reminder was sent out but it was felt that since this followed a telephone request, it would be inappropriate to send a third request. The results were quite encouraging since replies increased to 46 out of the 75 schools (61%). 26 out of the 40 LEA history co-ordinators (65%) and 22 out of 35 (63%) Roman Catholic

schools replied. Only 6 telephone responses were negative. There was at least one reply from History Co-ordinators from schools representing 32 out of the 40 (80%) postcodes in the city.

What can be said about the five case study questionnaires? Clearly the organisation with which questionnaires were undertaken had a considerable impact on their efficiency. Direct contact and control in the Pilot Case Study provided the most successful organisational approach. Robson (2002) argues that non-response is a very serious issue using postal self-completion questionnaires. He states that we have little basis for assuming that responders and non-responders are similar. He notes that some authors (Gay, 1992. Cited in Robson, 2002, p.251) accept 70% but supports writers (Jones, 1995, cited in Mertens, 1998, p.130) who recommend response rates of 90% in order to avoid bias. Clearly Case Studies 2-5 did not meet the last suggested requirement. May (2001) suggests why responses can be quite low:

Unless people have an incentive, either through an interest in the subject, which the survey is covering, or some other basis, then response rates are likely to be low or the figure of 40% is not uncommon. (May 2001, p.97)

Overall, responses from secondary Heads of History were more easily obtained than from History Co-ordinators in primary schools, which probably reflected the fact that the latter have a generic teaching role across the curriculum. There does not appear to have been a higher response rate from Roman Catholic as opposed to state schools. The secondary and revised primary postal case studies are significantly more efficient than this figure, but clearly both conference case studies only reflect the view of a small number of their respective populations. In both cases there were organisational issues affecting the level of control over the responses. This may well also reflect that the issues raised were less likely to be of general concern to many teachers. Clearly, these issues needed to be taken into account when examining and drawing conclusions from the perspectives of those who actually replied to the

questionnaires. At best it can be tentatively suggested that the people who responded to the survey demonstrated an interest in either an Irish dimension, the history curriculum as a whole or at least had some sympathy with educational research.

Several issues identified in the Pilot Study led to modifications of the questionnaire in subsequent case studies. Firstly, the context section in case studies 2-5 distinguished between church and state schools. Secondly, the headings in some attitudinal questions were modified to make them clearer. Thirdly, a British dimension was included after the pilot study. Initially, this had been excluded because it was felt that it would have different meanings to different people. On reflection it was felt that it would be useful to compare this with Irish and multicultural dimensions. Appendix II shows the questionnaire schedule sent to Heads of History in secondary schools. The schedule sent to History Co-ordinators in primary schools was modified to relate to the anticipated impact of the organisation in primary schools on responses. The questions sent to History Co-ordinators were also streamlined following initial difficulties in getting responses. Finally, questions related to the resources, such as QCA schemes and textbooks were made more specific in Case Studies 2-5.

Interviews

The major organisational consideration with respect to interviews was deciding who to interview, how to group them and how far the same approach was appropriate for different groups (refer to Table 2). It was relatively easy to identify ‘movers and shakers’ as most of them were involved in key curriculum developments or they were linked to teachers in the case studies. All teachers were volunteers on the assumption that they would have more to contribute than a random sample, for example. In the case of the Pilot Study all seven people

who volunteered were interviewed. This proved effective in giving a wide range of responses to an Irish dimension. However, Case Studies 2-5 received many more volunteers than it was possible, or indeed necessary, to interview. The Birmingham postal survey produced 20 volunteers, the School History Project Conference produced 24 volunteers, the Historical Association gave 11 volunteers and the Birmingham Primary questionnaire produced 24 volunteers. However, by focusing on teachers who indicated that it formed an important part in their planning considerably reduced the interview list. In all four Heads of History from the secondary Birmingham questionnaire and three from the School History Project conference fell into this category. A high proportion of teachers completing the primary questionnaires, 11 from the Historical Association questionnaire and 25 from the Birmingham questionnaire, agreed to be interviewed. However, out of the 11 responses to the Historical Association questionnaire only two indicated that an Irish dimension was important. One volunteer worked in a state school and the other in a private school. Only the LEA co-ordinator was interviewed since it was assumed that the private school might not necessarily follow the same curriculum structure as LEA or Roman Catholic schools. The Birmingham questionnaire included four volunteers who indicated that an Irish dimension was important in their planning and one said that an Irish dimension was quite important.

All of the interviewees associated with the projects were involved with developing or implementing materials. With respect to TIDE it was possible to interview the co-ordinators and historians working in Irish related curriculum projects. Out of five historians of who produced materials for Irish related projects three agreed to be interviewed. One person had moved to Portugal, which was overcome by conducting a telephone interview. With respect to the Ireland in Schools Project it was possible to interview the chairperson who suggested key

teachers who had been involved in its work. These included History teachers at secondary level in a range of contexts, and several teachers who were primary teachers, although not necessarily History Co-ordinators. There were no difficulties in getting responses from people involved in this project.

The process of interviewing proved developmental in a number of ways. Everyone allowed the interview to be recorded. With the exception of technical problems on two occasions, which required summaries to be produced immediately after the interview, the use of a tape recorder appeared to be effective in enabling the conversation to flow. In two cases there was a significant discrepancy between the perceptions given in the questionnaire and what was said in the interview but in general interviews extended the data beyond what had been possible with the questionnaires. Indeed, some questions emerged as a result of interview responses. For example the inclusion of an Irish dimension in the sixth form was highlighted during the pilot study with one of the mentors at Birmingham. In other cases the scope of the interview was extended by the previous experience of the interviewee. It was anticipated that a historical dimension would be useful as part of the interviews with 'movers and shakers'. Some interviews with teachers revealed useful information about an Irish dimension by delving into aspects of their life histories.

The context in which interviews took place does not appear to have been an issue. Most interviews took place in schools and through direct personal contact, although in some circumstances it was more convenient to interview the person by telephone. There does not appear to have been a noticeable difference between direct and telephone interviews. In both cases interviewees readily provided positive and negative perspectives related to the key issue

without evident inhibitions. A more significant issue was the relationship between the researcher and the interviewee. Hitchcock and Hughes succinctly indicate this as follows:

Interviewers and respondents have identities. They have perceptions of themselves and each other. This knowledge, of course, varies and changes, as people become more familiar with each other... We might describe this as the ethnographic context of the interview, unstructured interview or conversation. (Hitchcock & Hughes, 1995, p.169-70)

The chart below provides an insight into the relationship between the researcher and the interviewees. This information is intended to provide a transparent way of indicating whether it is possible that this could have affected the interview. The ‘movers and shakers’ were known in a professional capacity, quite closely in a few cases, prior to the interviews. A few teachers were known before the interviews but this was not generally the case. Most interviewees had been Heads of History or in History Co-ordinator role over a number of years and presented themselves in a confident manner. However, two teachers who were relatively new in their role lacked both confidence and precision in their responses.

Table 2: Summary of interview case studies

Interview case studies	Features	No	Relationship with researcher
Movers and shakers	HMI SHP Director Textbook writer QCA Officer Two University Teacher Educators LEA Adviser	7	Professional contact Professional contact Professional contact Professional contact Significant professional contact Significant professional contact

Pilot study	All volunteers from the questionnaire	7	2 professional contact 5 unknown
Birmingham secondary teachers	All volunteers from the questionnaire who indicated that an Irish dimension was important in their planning. The intention was to identify the perceptions of teachers positively disposed to towards an Irish dimension. During the interviews it was found that one interviewee did not teach an Irish dimension and another was not positive towards teaching it. Neither interview was included in the analysis.	4	1 professional contact 3 unknown
School Project History Conference teachers	All volunteers from the questionnaire who indicated that an Irish dimension was important in their planning.	3	Unknown
Birmingham primary teachers	All volunteers from the questionnaire who indicated that an Irish dimension was in their planning. During interviews it was found that one teacher did not teach an Irish dimension and their response was not included in the analysis.	6	Unknown
Historical Association primary teachers	All volunteers from the questionnaire who indicated that an Irish dimension was in their planning.	1	Unknown
Teachers in Development Education Project	Director and Project Facilitator Teachers involved with producing materials for the project related to an Irish dimension.	2 3	2 professional contacts 1 professional contact and 2 unknown

Ireland in Schools (a) Secondary Teachers	Chairperson	1	Significant professional contact
	LEA Consultant	1	Unknown
	Teachers involved with producing/or using materials produced by the project.	6	Unknown
Ireland in Schools (b) Primary Teachers	Teachers involved with producing materials for the project related to an Irish dimension.	3	1 professional contact 2 unknown
TOTAL		44	

Documentary resources

The research initially intended to analyse the way in which a range of documentary resources, including government regulations, public examinations and textbooks constructed an Irish dimension. The scale of data associated with questionnaires and interviews restricted the use of documents to supporting this focus. Documentary evidence related to the Teachers in Development Education and Ireland in Schools, projects including administrative records, websites and teaching resources proved to be particularly valuable. The use of teaching resources raised the issue of teacher anonymity. Teachers in Development Education groups of teachers who produced materials in its resource packs named them and Ireland in Schools usually named the teachers with the resources they produced on its web site. This issue was resolved by not directly naming teachers but indicating where the materials could be found. The only exceptions to this were two teachers who had independently written about their work in the public domain.

The major focus of the research was the interviewee responses that provided rich data related to the attitudes and perceptions of a range of History educators working both within and

outside the classroom. The approach used provides 'fuzzy generalisations' rather than statistically significant conclusions. Certainly the size of the questionnaire case studies would make it unwise to make statistical generalisations from them. Essentially, they provided a crude means of identifying patterns, raising issues and identifying potential interviewees. An examination of mini-case studies of groups of educators both within and outside the classroom will be the focus of the following chapters.

CHAPTER 3

THE IRISH DIMENSION WITHIN THE HISTORY CURRICULUM: TEACHER PERCEPTIONS THROUGH QUESTIONNAIRES

Exploring an Irish dimension in the curriculum raises a number of research questions that can be explored through using questionnaires. For example, what are teachers' perceptions of the importance of an Irish dimension within the history curriculum? How does this compare with other dimensions? Is there any correlation between an Irish dimension and a multicultural dimension? Is an Irish dimension more significant in Roman Catholic schools where there may be direct links with the Irish community? Is there evidence of particular involvement in Irish history related projects? This chapter will explore these questions through five questionnaire case studies.

The context of each case study will be considered before examining the findings. This will indicate the professional role of the teachers who completed the questionnaire. Thereafter they will be referred to as 'respondents' to provide greater clarity in the subsequent analysis. The first part of the chapter will compare responses from three secondary school case studies. The findings from the secondary case studies will then be compared with case studies of teachers working in primary schools. Towards the end of the chapter a series of tentative 'fuzzy generalisations' will be made on the basis of the findings. Finally, data from the questionnaires will be used to establish criteria for selecting interviewees for the next stage of the research.

Stage 1: Secondary school history teacher responses

The three secondary case study questionnaires relate to three different contexts and/or approaches to obtaining data. Case Study 1 consisted of 25 history mentors working with Birmingham University School of Education. 19 mentors were either Heads of History or Humanities Departments, two were second in departments, three were history teachers and one was a head of year. 15 of the mentors worked in Birmingham schools and ten in the surrounding area. 19 of the mentors said that they served in a conurbation or suburban area, three indicated that they taught in a county town and three specified that they taught in the inner city. The mentors were not asked whether they taught in LEA or church schools. However, by checking postcodes it was possible to determine that 22 taught in Local Authority schools and three taught in Roman Catholic schools. 14 mentors taught in 11-18 schools, nine taught in 11-16 schools and two did not indicate whether they taught in 11-16 or 11-18 schools. With respect to the communities served, 11 mentors said that they served multicultural communities and, of these, two said that they had links with the Irish community. 11 teachers described their intake as British or white, one as Roman Catholic and two respondents did not complete this question.

Case Study 2 consisted of 38 Heads of History in Birmingham Local Education or Roman Catholic schools who do not have mentoring links with the School of Education. The schools included 21 establishments teaching 11-16 and 17 educating 11-18 year groups. The heads of department indicated that they taught in urban schools. 20 respondents indicated that they worked in the inner city and five said that they taught in suburban schools. The remainder said that they taught in a city or conurbation. With respect to the communities served 26 indicated that their schools had a multicultural intake, 11 said that they had a British white intake and

one said that they served the Irish community. However, when directly asked if their school had links with the Irish community the latter number rose to four.

Case Studies 1 and 2 were investigated separately. However, between them they accounted for the large proportion of Birmingham secondary schools. The 15 Birmingham secondary schools in the pilot study and 38 in Case Study 2 represent 53 out of 77 (69%) schools in the city. Geographically their combined response accounted for secondary schools in 31 of the 37 (84%) Birmingham postcodes. Heads of History from seven out ten Roman Catholic schools in the city were included within either Case Study 1 or 2.

Case Study 3 consisted of 52 responses from 153 delegates attending a plenary session at the School History Project Conference in July 2004. The teachers were more diverse than Case Studies 1 and 2. Only 25 were Heads of Humanities or Heads of History. 21 responses came from history teachers, while the remainder consisted of four pastoral heads, a history mentor and an Advanced Skills history teacher. With respect to the type of schools represented, 24 of the teachers taught in 11-18 schools, 25 taught in 11-16 schools, while three did not indicate the age range taught. The range of schools was slightly wider than Case Studies 1 and 2 with 46 from Local Education Authority schools, three private schools, two Church of England Schools and one Roman Catholic School. The teachers came from a wide geographical area including 20 from the North of England, eight from the Midlands and East Anglia, one from Wales, two from the Isle of Man, one from Germany and one from the Philippines. They also taught in a range of contexts with six teachers working in rural schools, 17 in county towns and 29 in city conurbations (of which nine indicated that they taught in the inner city). Only 14 respondents indicated that they worked in multicultural communities, with only one of

these responses making reference to the Irish community. Of the rest one teacher identified their intake as Manx/ Irish but the remainder referred to their intake as White or British. However, five teachers responded positively when directly asked if their schools had links with the Irish community.

The first four questions were intended to find out teacher perceptions of an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3 and how this related to the rest of the curriculum. The respondents graded their responses in five categories. The first case study provided a pilot study to test the approach used for subsequent case studies. The means by which this was done is demonstrated in Appendices IV and V. The five categories used for each of the four questions in Case Study 1 can be seen in Appendix IV. When a respondent left a question blank it was rated zero. If a respondent felt that they never mentioned a dimension it was given a rating of one. If they thought that it was mentioned verbally in lessons it was rated as two, whereas three, four and five definitions related to increasing degrees of importance. The five categories in the case study were reduced to three when analysing the data. This can be seen in Appendix V where categories zero, one and two were labelled as 'low importance', category three was labelled as 'some importance' and categories four and five were labelled as 'important'. This approach was then used with Case Studies 2 and 3. The data from the three case studies was brought together in Appendix VI. The different size of the case studies, with 25 in the pilot study, 38 in Case Study Two and 52 in Case Study 3 made it difficult to compare them. In order to deal with this issue the data was converted to percentages in Appendix VII and modes in Appendix VIII.

What does a comparison between the three cases studies suggest about respondents' perceptions of an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3? Appendices VII and VIII show that most respondents felt that an Irish dimension had some importance in their planning. Reference to the percentage figures indicates that over 40% respondents gave this response. This general perception is developed more fully to rate the importance of an Irish dimension and migration from Ireland in different areas of study. Appendix VIII indicates that an Irish dimension had a low mode rating in all areas of study. Case Study 1 provides a marginally higher rating for 1500-1750 but the mode for this was shared between respondents who gave it low and some importance. Nevertheless, the percentage figures in Appendix VII indicate that a sizeable minority of respondents in all three case studies considered an Irish dimension important for the period 1500-1750. A number of respondents to Case Studies 1 and 3 also regarded an Irish dimension important for the period 1750-1900. A small number of teachers considered that links between an Irish dimension and world history were important. Both the mode and percentage figures for all of the case studies suggested that the majority of teachers did not consider immigration from Ireland to be of any importance in their planning. A few teachers considered immigration important especially when teaching 1750-1900.

Were respondents in Roman Catholic schools more likely to develop an Irish dimension than teachers working in Local Education Authority schools? It could be assumed that Roman Catholic schools were more likely to have links with local Irish communities. This data is not shown in the appendices but could easily be obtained from questionnaires. Case Studies 1, 2 and 3 had a very small number of responses from teachers working in Roman Catholic schools. Case Study 1 included three respondents from Roman Catholic schools and Case Study 2 included four; only one respondent from a Roman Catholic school contributed to

Case Study 3. Half of the Roman Catholic respondents said that an Irish dimension was either important or of some importance. Respondents from Roman Catholic schools accounted for all of the teachers who regarded an Irish dimension important for the 1066-1500 area of study and most taught it for the period 1500-1750. However, they did not consider Irish immigration to Britain to be important in their planning. Overall, responses from the respondents in Roman Catholic schools were generally positive towards teaching an Irish dimension but any conclusions drawn from this must be qualified by the small number of responses to which this relates.

How did respondent's perceptions of an Irish dimension compare with other dimensions in the Key Stage 3 curriculum? Reference to Appendices VII and VIII suggests that mode scores and percentage scores for English history, local history, European and world history were considered important by the majority of respondents in all three case studies. It is perhaps hardly surprising that 92% of respondents to Case Study 1 and 100% in Case Studies 2 and 3 regarded English history as very important. British history was included in Case Studies 2 and 3 and virtually all of the respondents considered it important. The importance attached to these dimensions was substantially greater than that given to an Irish dimension. The mode scores for an Irish dimension resembled those for Scottish and Welsh dimensions. In all three regions a sizeable minority felt that they were important, although percentage ratings given to an Irish dimension were higher than those given for the other regions in Case Studies 2 and 3. The higher ratings given to British history than the regional or multicultural history suggests that for most respondents British history was equated with English history.

Can perceptions of an Irish dimension be compared to multicultural history? Responses to a multicultural dimension are of particular interest given that a core stimulus for this research was the *Parekh Report's* (2000) contention that the Irish community is invisible in constructions of multicultural Britain. Appendices VII and VIII show that more respondents in Case Studies 1, 2 and 3 rated a multicultural dimension as being important than was the case for an Irish dimension. Charts B and C in the appendices show that a multicultural dimension was rated more highly than an Irish dimension for all areas of study, except of Britain 1500–1750 in Case Study 3.

Is it possible to find similarities between perceptions respondents held towards Irish and multicultural dimensions? Table 3 attempts to address this question by showing the perceptions of individual respondents. This required going back to the data for individual respondents in the questionnaires rather than appendices that reflect the case studies as a whole. The findings show that over half of the respondents in each case study showed similarities between Irish and multicultural dimensions (16 out of 25 in Case Study 1; 25 out of 38 in Case Study 2 and 31 out of 52 in Case Study 3). This does not of course mean the respondents were aware of this connection.

Tables 4 and 5 attempt to go beyond the similarities suggested in Table 3 by looking at the reasons given for developing Irish and multicultural dimensions. Table 4 shows that less than half of the respondents said that they included an Irish dimension and of these only 27 identified reasons. Over half of reasons for including an Irish dimension were pragmatic, such as fulfilling National Curriculum requirements or preparation for GCSE. However, over

a third of the responses related it to broader issues such as Britishness, contemporary affairs or human rights.

Table 3: An examination of the relationship between teacher perceptions of Irish and Multicultural dimensions at Key Stage 3 based on the responses from History Case Study 1 (History Mentors working with Birmingham University), Case Study 2 (Heads of History in Birmingham Schools) and Case Study 3 (Delegates at the School History Project Conference)

Perceptions of Irish and multicultural dimensions	Case Study 1	Case Study 2	Case Study 3	Combined Totals
Irish and multicultural dimensions important	5	7	7	19
Irish dimension important and multicultural dimension some importance.	0	2	5	7
Irish and multicultural dimensions some importance.	2	4	4	10
Multicultural dimension important and Irish dimension some importance	9	12	15	36
Respondents showing some similarities between Irish and multicultural dimensions	16	25	31	72
Irish dimension some importance but multicultural low importance	2	2	2	6
Multicultural dimension important and Irish dimension low importance	5	5	7	17
Multicultural dimension some importance and Irish dimension low importance	0	5	0	5
Multicultural and Irish dimensions have low importance	2	1	12	15
Not answered	0	0	0	0

Number of respondents	25	38	52	115
------------------------------	-----------	-----------	-----------	------------

Table 4: Reasons for developing an Irish history dimension at Key Stage 3 based on responses from History Case Study 1 (History Mentors working with Birmingham University), Case Study 2 (Heads of History in Birmingham Schools) and Case Study 3 (Delegates at the School History Project Conference)

Reason given	<u>Case Study 1</u> Birmingham University Mentors	<u>Case Study 2</u> Birmingham HoDs who are not mentors	<u>Case Study 3</u> Delegates at School History Project Conference	Total
Part of the National Curriculum	3	0	0	3
Specific topics eg Civil War	0	4	3	7
Local settlement	0	0	1	1
Prepare for GCSE	0	1	2	3
Part of British History	0	0	2	2
Immigration/ Contemporary issues	3	2	0	5
Human rights/equal opportunities	0	0	2	2
Identity of pupils	0	1		1
Personal interest	0	1	1	2
Not relevant	0	1	0	1
Respondents who gave a reason for including an Irish dimension	6	10	11	27
Respondents who said they included an Irish dimension but did not give a reason.	14	15	17	46
Respondents who said they included an Irish dimension	20	25	28	73

Respondents who said they did not include an Irish dimension.	5	13	24	42
Total responses	25	38	52	115

When turning to reasons given for including a multicultural dimension, see Table 5. This question was only included in Case Studies 2 and 3. For Case Study 2, 33 out of 38 (87%) respondents said that they included a multicultural dimension. 34 out of 52 (64%) respondents in Case Study 3 said that they included this dimension.

In Case Study 2, 19 out of the 21 respondents said that they taught a multicultural dimension because of the need to reflect ethnic diversity or the identity of pupils in their school. The figure was slightly lower for Case Study 3, with 14 out of 26 respondents giving these reasons, possibly reflecting the fact that delegates to the School History Project were drawn from a range of contexts, including areas with few people from ethnic minority communities. Ten respondents to Case Study 3 gave pragmatic history related reasons for including a multicultural dimension such as references to the National Curriculum. The data in Tables 4 and 5 indicate that Irish and multicultural dimensions may have been selected for a variety of reasons – historical, pragmatic and ideological. Some of the responses were similar for both dimensions which suggests that it would be useful to explore potential links more fully through interviews.

What do the case studies suggest about the perceptions of an Irish dimension in GCSE, AS and A2 history courses? In Case Study 1 eight out of a total of 25 respondents taught an Irish dimension at Key Stage 4. In Case Study 2, the proportion was higher and accounted for 18

out of 38 responses and in Case Study 3 there were 21 out of a total of 52 respondents teaching an Irish dimension at Key Stage 4. All respondents said that that they taught the Schools History Project. No reference was made to an Irish dimension as a British history

Table 5: Reasons for developing a multicultural history dimension at Key Stage 3 based on responses from Case Study 2 (Heads of History in Birmingham Schools) and Case Study 3 (Delegates at the School History Project Conference)

Reason given	<u>Case Study 2</u> Birmingham Heads of History who are not mentors with the university	<u>Case Study 3</u> Delegates at School History Project Conference.	Total
Part of the National Curriculum	2	2	4
Enhance historical understanding	0	4	4
Prepare for GCSE	0	4	4
Diversity	9	7	16
Identity of pupils	10	7	17
Personal interest	0	2	2
Respondents who gave a reason for including a multicultural dimension	21	26	47
Respondents who said they included a multicultural dimension but did not give a reason	12	8	20
Respondents who said that they included a multicultural dimension	33	34	67

option within GCSE Modern World or the multicultural Britain option within Social and Economic History. Table 6 attempts to demonstrate if respondents who taught Ireland as part of the Modern World Study in the School History Project considered an Irish dimension to be important at Key Stage 3. Just under half of the respondents in each case study who taught an

Irish dimension at Key Stage 4 regarded it as important at Key Stage 3, although almost the same number attached low importance to it. This raises questions about the different reasons why people teach an Irish dimension at GCSE and links between Key Stages 3 and 4 which require more detailed research using interviews.

Table 6: Perceptions of the importance of an Irish history dimension at Key Stage 3

by respondents teaching an Irish dimension within the Schools History Project 3 based on responses from History Case Study 1 (History Mentors working with Birmingham University), Case Study 2 (Heads of History in Birmingham Schools) and Case Study 3 (Delegates at the School History Project Conference)

Rating of respondents who taught an Irish dimension as Modern World Study at KS4	<u>Case Study 1</u> Birmingham University Mentors	<u>Case Study 2</u> Birmingham HoDs who are not mentors	<u>Case Study 3</u> Delegates at School History Project Conference	Totals
Important	3	8	9	20
Some importance	4	5	3	12
Low importance	1	6	9	16
Respondents teaching an Irish dimension at KS4	8	18	21	47
Respondents not teaching an Irish dimension at KS4	17	20	31	68
Respondents in each case study	25	38	52	115

The teaching of an Irish dimension at AS/A2 was added to Cases Studies 2 and 3 after Case Study 1 had been evaluated. A very small number of respondents indicated that they taught an Irish dimension at AS/A2. The responses and correlation with perceptions of the importance of an Irish dimension in Key Stages 3 and 4 can be seen in Table 7. Just over half of the respondents who taught an Irish dimension at AS/A2 also taught it within GCSE. Only one of these respondents regarded it as important at Key Stage 3, although virtually all of the respondents felt that it had some importance. The implication of this is that for most of this group there may be some links between the key stages but it was not strongly developed. Clearly, interviews with teachers within this group would indicate how far this is the case.

Table 7: Perceptions of the importance of an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4 by respondents teaching an Irish dimension at AS/A2 based on responses from History Case Study 1(History Mentors working with Birmingham University), Case Study 2(Heads of History in Birmingham Schools and Cse Study3(Delegates at the Schools History Project Conference).

Respondents who taught an Irish dimension at AS/A2	<u>Case Study 1</u> Birmingham University Mentors	<u>Case Study 2</u> Birmingham HoDs who are not mentors	<u>Case Study 3</u> Delegates at School History Project Conference	Total
Taught as a Modern World Study at KS4	2	4	3	9
Not taught at KS4	1	4	2	7
How far they rated an Irish dimension at KS3				
Important	1	1	1	3
Some importance	2	7	3	12
Low importance	0	0	1	1
Respondents teaching an Irish dimension at AS/A2	3	8	5	16

Respondents not teaching an Irish dimension at AS/A2	22	30	47	99
Total respondents	25	38	52	115

The final stage of the questionnaire was intended to see if any respondents were sufficiently interested in an Irish dimension to become involved in curriculum projects related to it. In order to put this in perspective they were also asked if they contributed to any other projects. Six respondents indicated that they had been involved in projects related to an Irish dimension. In Case Study 1 two respondents indicated that they had been involved in Ireland related projects. In Case Study 2 one teacher indicated that they had been involved in a Teachers in Development Education Citizenship Project linking Birmingham with Derry/Londonderry and another had attended an INSET Course related to the Ireland in Schools Project. In the third case study three teachers said that they had some involvement with the Ireland in Schools Project. A larger number of respondents, nine in Case Study 1, six in Case Study 2 and seven in Case Study 3 said that they were involved in other curriculum projects, most of which related to multicultural issues. Clearly, very few respondents had been involved in Irish history projects. However, of more interest than the numbers involved in projects related to Ireland is the perception of those teachers who have been involved with them. For this reason it will be appropriate to locate teachers involved in the TIDE and Ireland in Schools Projects and analyse their perceptions of an Irish dimension in the history curriculum.

The last question provided respondents with the opportunity to add any observations or comments. No respondents in the first case study made any comment. One respondent in the second case study who taught Ireland as part of their GCSE School History Project course felt that the coursework was too difficult for most schools to undertake it. The third cases provided three responses to this question. Two respondents indicated that they were interested in developing an Irish dimension in their curriculum; of these one indicated that they were Irish and the other had studied Irish history at university. The third respondent taught in an international school and wrote that they were committed to developing diversity within their curriculum.

Stage 2: Primary school responses

Case Studies 4 and 5 provided responses from primary school teachers. Both case studies proved to be problematic. The difficulties associated with getting responses have been considered in the Methodology Chapter. Case Study 4 took place at the Historical Association Conference in May 2004. Only 13 out of 58 (22%) questionnaires were returned and they cannot provide anything approaching a representative sample of the people attending the conference. However, they still provide an insight into the perceptions of a few teachers working in very different contexts. Given the small size of this case study its responses have not been converted to percentages but Appendix IX shows three categories of responses and the mode for each question. Only three respondents indicated that they had responsibility for co-ordinating history, while four indicated that they were class teachers, two co-ordinated English, one co-ordinated Physical Education and Geography, one was a Key Stage 2 leader and one was an Advanced Skills History Teacher. Nine respondents taught in Local Authority schools, one in a Church of England school and three in private schools. The age ranges

taught included two Foundation/Key Stages 1-5 schools (both private), two Foundation/Key Stage 2 schools, seven Key Stage 1 and 2 schools, one Key Stage 2 school and one Key Stage 1 school. With the exception of one respondent from the south-west, all came from the south and east of England. Two respondents indicated that their schools were located in inner cities, five in suburbs, five in county towns and one in a rural context. With respect to ethnic and cultural diversity six respondents said that they taught in multicultural schools and seven in White British contexts. When directly asked if they had links with the Irish community only two gave positive replies.

Case Study 5 focused on History Co-ordinators in Birmingham schools. A questionnaire was sent to 75 out of 276 History Co-ordinators (excluding schools which only catered for Foundation Stage and/or Key Stage 1 pupils) in Birmingham. There are 192 Local Education Authority schools and there are 40 postcodes with a Local Education Authority school and 53 Roman Catholic schools. However, the questionnaires provided a geographical spread of the two types of school. There are Local Education Authority schools located in 40 postcodes and Roman Catholic schools situated in 35 postcodes. One Local Education Authority school and one Roman Catholic school were used to represent each postcode. Case Study 5 ultimately achieved a response of 48 out of 75 (65%). This response rate was comparable to the response rate with Birmingham secondary schools in Case Study 2. As a result of this it was appropriate to convert the raw data shown in Appendix X into percentages and modes in Appendix XI. However, the fact that 41 of these responses came after direct telephone request needs to be appreciated when making comparisons with other case studies. Responses from LEA and Roman Catholic schools were comparable with 26 out of 40 (65%) LEA schools replying and 22 out of 35 (63%) of Roman Catholic schools replying. A response was

obtained from at least one school in 32 out of 40 (80%) postcodes in Birmingham which indicates that they represent a reasonable geographical spread across the city. All of the respondents described the areas served by their schools as urban and 18 specified that they taught in the inner city. 22 respondents said that they served multicultural communities, 19 said that their intake was White or British and five said that it was White British and Irish. When asked if their school served an Irish community the last figure rose to 15 and in all cases this was within Roman Catholic schools.

The questionnaire for the primary case studies had the same focus as the secondary case studies. Nevertheless, a number of differences were made to allow for the context in which primary school co-ordinators operate. The reasons for this are dealt with in the Methodology Chapter but will be briefly reiterated to clarify the approaches used to analyse the findings. The attitudinal questions looked for the same dimensions as the Key Stage 3 questionnaires. However, it was assumed that the primary co-ordinators would have less insight into the range of study areas than secondary respondents. Consequently, the attitudinal questions dealt with the respondents' perceptions of their own teaching, together with history within Key Stages 1 and 2. There were modifications to the dimensions – multicultural history was used rather than multicultural Britain to ensure that it was still relevant even if the respondent did not directly teach British history with their own class. Irish migration was added as a dimension to the charts to provide some basis for comparison with chart D in the secondary case studies. The five ratings were slightly different to those used for the secondary questionnaires in order for them to relate to the way in which primary schools are organised through class teachers rather than subject specialists. For their own teaching this included: 'not relevant for the areas I teach', 'I have not chosen to include it', 'I mention it orally in one

or more lessons', 'it is mentioned in one area' and finally, 'it is important in one or more areas'. When considering their perceptions of Key Stages 1 and 2 they were asked to tick under the following headings: 'I do not know', 'never mentioned', 'mentioned orally in some lessons', 'mentioned in at least one scheme' and finally, 'important in the key stage as a whole'. The five headings are reduced to three designating the first three as 'low importance', the fourth as 'some importance' and the fifth heading as 'important'. The final three headings are intended to be broadly comparable with the secondary responses. There is a risk that by grouping the first three categories as being of 'low importance' the results may have deflated the primary responses. However, the approach used has prioritised looking for realistic comparisons between the responses given by the primary and secondary case studies.

What did the findings from the questionnaires suggest about the primary teacher respondents' perception of an Irish dimension? Appendix IX shows data from Case Study 4. As noted above the data is represented as raw figures and modes but not percentages because of the small number of responses in the case study. Only two teachers indicated that an Irish dimension had some importance and in their teaching. The remaining respondents said that an Irish dimension was of low importance. A similar response was given to the significance of an Irish dimension within Key Stages 1 and 2, although two respondents felt that it was important at Key Stage 2.

Case Study 5 data was converted into percentages and modes in Appendix XI. Modes for an Irish dimension indicate that the respondents did not consider it important. 84% of the respondents considered that an Irish dimension was of low importance. Irish migration was rated as having low importance by 90% of the respondents. 11 % and 8% of the respondents

felt that Irish history and immigration respectively, had some importance. This left only 5% and 2% believing that Irish history and Irish immigration respectively were important in their teaching. Only 4% felt that an Irish dimension was important at Key Stage 2 and 5% at Key Stage 1. However, 16 % said that it had some importance at Key Stage 2 and 9% said that it had some importance at Key Stage 1. Nobody considered that Irish immigration was an important part of their school's planning in either key stage, although 11 % said that it had some importance at Key Stage 2 and 5% at Key Stage 1. Overall, an Irish dimension had a lower profile with primary than secondary respondents. However, all of the case studies, whether they were secondary or primary, indicated that some respondents regarded an Irish dimension as important.

Is it possible that respondents working in Roman Catholic primary schools were more likely to develop an Irish dimension than other schools? Case Study 4 did not receive replies from any Roman Catholic primary schools. Case Study 5 was deliberately constructed to compare responses from people working in Roman Catholic and Local Authority schools. Out of 35 questionnaires sent to Roman Catholic primary schools 22 replied which were comparable to 26 out of 40 Local Authority schools. The results obtained from looking at the data on the questionnaires can be seen in Table 8. The raw figures provide a clear idea of the perceptions of most teachers. The respondents' perceptions of their own teaching shows very little difference between Roman Catholic and Local Authority schools, although the two respondents who indicated that it was an important part of their teaching worked in Roman Catholic schools. Virtually all respondents in Roman Catholic schools gave low priority to Irish history, which was comparable with responses from teachers working in Local Authority schools. A very small number of respondents rated an Irish dimension as important and a few

more credited it with some importance. Within this last group there were slightly more respondents from Roman Catholic than Local Authority schools.

How did respondents' perceptions of an Irish dimension compare with their attitude towards other historical dimensions? Both Case Studies 4 and 5 suggest that primary respondents gave lower ratings for all dimensions than was the case with secondary respondents. This can even be seen in the responses given to English history and British history. Appendix IX indicates that in Case Study 4 only seven out of 13 respondents rated English history and British history as important for their teaching. Ten respondents considered English history as important at Key Stage 2 but only four gave this rating at Key Stage 1. Scottish and Welsh dimensions were given similar ratings to an Irish dimension. Most respondents did not regard them as important, although Scottish history had a more positive mode than Irish history for Key Stage 2.

Table 8: A Comparison between the perceptions of an Irish dimension in Roman Catholic and Local Education Authority school respondents in Case Study 5

Perceptions	Frequency of Mode ratings				
	N/A	Low	Some	Imp	Total
IRISH HISTORY DIMENSION					
Perception of an Irish History dimension in their own teaching					
RC responses	3	14	3	2	22
LEA responses	0	24	2	0	26
All responses	3	38	5	2	48
Perception of an Irish dimension at Key Stage 2					

RC responses	0	17	4	1	22
LEA responses	0	22	3	1	26
All responses	0	39	7	2	48
Perceptions of an Irish dimension at Key Stage 1					
RC responses	1	17	3	1	22
LEA responses	4	20	1	1	26
All responses	5	37	4	2	48
MIGRATION FROM IRELAND					
Perception of migration from Ireland in their own teaching					
RC responses	3	15	3	1	22
LEA responses	0	25	1	0	26
All responses	3	40	4	1	48
Perception of migration from Ireland at Key Stage 2					
RC responses	0	17	4	1	22
LEA responses	0	22	3	1	26
All responses	0	39	7	2	48
Perception of Migration from Ireland at Key Stage 1					
RC responses	2	18	2	0	22
LEA responses	3	23	0	0	26
All responses	5	41	2	0	48

The percentage figures for Case Study 5 (Appendix XI) support the implications of the findings in Case Study 4. Modes for English history and British history were high with respect to respondents' own teaching. However, for most dimensions they were not encouraging. The percentage figures also qualified the impression given by the modes. Less than 50% regarded English history as important in their own teaching or within Key Stage 2.

Only a third of the respondents felt that this English history was important in Key Stage 1. 58% of respondents regarded British history as important in their own teaching. Only 44% regarded it as important at Key Stage 2 and 42 gave this rating for Key Stage 1. Scottish and Welsh history ratings were comparable, if slightly lower than those given for an Irish dimension. However, the main impression given is that most respondents did not regard regional diversity as important. The reasons for the overall differences between primary and secondary responses need some explanation. It can reasonably be speculated that it reflects differences in subject expertise. It could also reflect different approaches to the curriculum between respondents working in primary and secondary contexts.

What were perceptions of multicultural and Irish dimensions in the primary school case studies? Table 9 shows virtually no evidence of links between multicultural and Irish dimensions in Case Study 4. Similarly, in Case Study 5 only nine out of 48 believed that both multicultural and Irish dimensions had at least some importance within Key Stage 2 in their schools. The overwhelming majority felt that a multicultural dimension had some importance but did not consider this to be the case for an Irish dimension. Over half of Case Study 4 and approximately a quarter of Case Study 5 respondents did not consider either multicultural or Irish dimensions important within their own teaching or in either key stage. This suggests that primary respondents felt less strongly about these dimensions than those in the secondary case studies.

Table 9: An examination of the relationship between primary teacher respondents' perceptions of an Irish dimension and a multicultural dimension

Perceptions of Irish and multicultural dimensions	Case Study 4 Own	Case Study 4 KS2	Case Study 4 KS1	Case Study 5 Own	Case Study 5 KS2	Case Study 5 KS1
Irish and multicultural dimensions important	1	0	0	2	2	1
Irish dimension important and multicultural dimension some importance	0	0	0	0	0	1
Irish and Multicultural dimensions some importance	0	1	0	2	3	4
Multicultural dimension is important and Irish dimension some importance	0	1	1	0	4	0
Respondents showing some correlation between Irish and multicultural dimensions	1	2	1	4	9	6
Irish dimension some importance but multicultural low importance	2	1	0	2	0	2
Multicultural dimension important and Irish dimension low importance	2	1	1	9	15	11
Multicultural dimension has some importance and Irish dimension low importance	1	2	1	10	13	10
Multicultural and Irish dimensions have low importance	7	7	8	18	11	14
Not answered	0	0	2	3	0	5
Number of respondents	13	13	13	46	48	48

The final stage of the questionnaire was intended to see if any respondents were sufficiently interested in an Irish dimension to become involved in curriculum projects related to it. In order to put this in perspective they were also asked if they contributed to any other projects. Responses from primary respondents to this aspect of the questionnaire were very different to replies in the secondary case studies. Secondary responses to this question made reference to external projects. However, most primary respondents assumed that this related to their curriculum in school. Three respondents from the primary case studies indicated that they had developed Irish related history projects, with references to work on the famine, navvies, the Vikings at Key Stage 2 and Grace O'Malley and 'Ourselves' at Key Stage 1. Eight respondents in Case Study 4 and ten in Case Study 5 made some reference to multicultural projects. Several respondents included reasons for including a multicultural dimension. Three respondents in Case Study 4 and seven in Case Study 5 said that they wanted to reflect cultures within the local community. Two respondents in each case study included a values based rationale for including multicultural history such as understanding contemporary society, migration or racism. These comments provide some comparison with reasons given

by some secondary respondents. A number of primary respondents indicated that they had been involved in other curriculum developments such as cross-curricular planning, which was noted by five replies to Case Study 5. Hence, both primary and secondary respondents made some reference to Irish projects, although these formed part of a wider range of interests. A notable difference between them is that a few secondary respondents made reference to Irish based curriculum projects but primary respondents made no reference to this. It will be appropriate to explore how far this reflects the limitations of the primary case studies and whether these opportunities are available across both sectors.

The questionnaire ended with an opportunity for respondents to make additional comments. Four out of 13 respondents to Case Study 4 and 15 respondents out of 48 in Case Study 5 did this. Most responses related to earlier questions but the following are worthy of particular consideration:

I can see how Irish history can be linked to QCA units. However, (1) There is so much English history to cover; choices have to be made as to what to include/exclude in the history curriculum, and (2) Resources are often geared up to QCA topics, and teachers have limited time to tackle a new subject. I can see potential for teaching some Irish history through PSHE. (Response 1: Case Study 4)

[I] feel our history scheme is closely linked to government requirements in QCA and these do not lend themselves easily to broader inclusion of Welsh/ Irish/ Scottish history. (Response 2: Case Study 5)

We only have to cover what is required in the National Curriculum. (Response 3: Case Study 5)

Just because we do not teach certain things it does not mean we do not believe they should be taught - QCA is too narrow! (Response 4: Case Study 5)

I have never seen any information books on Irish history or migration simple enough to make a big part of any of our primary history topics ... I have looked! (Response 5: Case Study 5)

Clearly, these views may not be typical of the views of most respondents but they raise a number of issues. The first four responses certainly relate to research which suggests that primary teachers have taken QCA schemes to be prescribed syllabi (Bracey 2001). This suggests that an evaluation opportunity to develop an Irish dimension with the schemes is appropriate. The last response indicates that there are issues with respect to available resources and/or possible awareness of curriculum projects related to an Irish dimension.

What 'fuzzy generalisations' emerge from comparing the five case studies?

The scale and nature of the case studies means that the conclusions drawn from them must be related to the context in which they were located. At the same time there could still be a difference between what teachers said they did and what actually took place in their classrooms. Nevertheless, the diversity of contexts and the comparison made between them hopefully provides a reasonable basis for making a series of 'fuzzy generalisations'. The data from the case studies suggest that an Irish dimension has some importance at Key Stage 3, although this varies between areas of study. It is significant in some School History Project Modern World Studies, and in some cases forms part of AS/A2 work. However, the case studies suggest that its importance is limited in most of the primary schools. However, in both sectors there are some respondents who regard it as important.

The questionnaires provided some insights as to why respondents developed an Irish dimension. It will be particularly interesting to develop this more fully and explore whether particular teachers relate it to pragmatic considerations or values such as anti-racism. Only a limited number of respondents regarded an Irish dimension as important and it appears to have had a higher profile with secondary respondents. However, in both primary and

secondary schools there are respondents who have indicated that an Irish history dimension was important. Some respondents also indicated that they had been involved in curriculum projects related to Irish history. Overall, the questionnaire case studies raised issues that need to be explored in more detail. This will be the focus of the next chapter that analyses interviews undertaken with respondents drawn from each of the case studies.

CHAPTER 4

THREE MINI CASE STUDIES USING INTERVIEWS TO EXPLORE TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF AN IRISH DIMENSION

The questionnaire case studies in Chapter 3 indicated that a significant number of secondary respondents felt that an Irish dimension had some importance in their history curriculum, although this was less evident amongst primary teachers. This chapter will examine rich data about teacher perceptions of an Irish dimension provided from three mini case studies based on interviews. All of the interviewees had previously completed the questionnaires used in Chapter 3. Each case study provided a number of 'fuzzy generalisations'. Comparisons between the three mini case studies produced more broadly based 'fuzzy generalisations'. If the research were to be undertaken again, greater emphasis would also be placed on exploring life histories as well as current perceptions from interviewees. This became more significant with later interviews, especially with project co-ordinators and 'movers and shakers' and some teachers. The impact of previous experiences and training on developing individual teacher values and approaches towards constructing the past could have provided useful insights into the extent that teacher perceptions are affected by influences during early stages of their careers compared with current imperatives for example. Interviews for the first mini case study were undertaken during the period from January to July 2004 and consisted of anyone from the pilot study who volunteered to be interviewed. The second case study included volunteers from the Birmingham Secondary Heads of History and School History Project Conference questionnaires who had indicated that an Irish dimension was important in their Key Stage 3 history curriculum and most interviews were undertaken between January to March 2005. The third case study included volunteers from the Birmingham Primary School

and Primary Historical Association Conference questionnaires who had indicated that history was either important or of some importance in their history curriculum. Interviews were undertaken between March and September 2005. The use of volunteers rather than a random sample was intended to maximise opportunities for positive or at least well-considered responses related to an Irish dimension. The first case study included anyone who was prepared to be interviewed regardless of whether they regarded an Irish dimension as important, in order to provide a basis for comparison with the second and third case studies. The latter were intended to explore the perceptions of people who had a commitment to teaching Irish history. The difficulty in finding primary interviewees who regarded an Irish dimension as important was dealt with by including teachers who said that it had some importance.

Table 10 compares the ratings which the volunteers gave to an Irish dimension in the questionnaire and interview. This basic triangulation tested the validity of the questionnaire data. Six out of seven interviewees in the first case study gave the same responses in both the questionnaire and interview. The people who volunteered for the second case study did not show the same degree of consistency. Certainly two interviewees continued to say that an Irish dimension was important in their teaching while others became more cautious when interviewed. Two interviewees said that they did not teach an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3, despite having said that it was important in the questionnaire. Most of the primary history co-ordinators in the third mini case study were consistent in their responses to both the questionnaire and interview, although one interviewee said that they did not teach any Irish history despite having said that it was important in the questionnaire. This indicates that

results based on questionnaire data needs to be treated cautiously. For the purposes of Case Studies 2 and 3, which were intended to explore the perceptions of teachers committed to teaching Irish history, the three interviewees who were found not to teach it have been excluded from the analysis.

Table 10: A comparison of teacher ratings (low importance, some importance and important) of an Irish dimension in the questionnaires and interviews

Interviewees	Questionnaire	Interview	Consistency
Case Study 1: Secondary History Mentors			
1	Low	Low	Yes
2	Some	Some	Yes
3	Some	Some	Yes
4	Low	Low/some	Yes
5	Low	Low	Yes
6	Some	Low	No – less
7	Some	Low/some	Yes
Case Study 2: Secondary Heads of History who rated an Irish dimension as important			
1	Important	Important	Yes
2	Important	Important	Yes
3	Important	Some	No
4	Important	Some	No
5	Important	Some	No
6	Important	Low/not at all	Not at all
7	Important	Low/not at all	Not at all
Case Study 3: Primary History Co-ordinators who rated an Irish dimension as important/of some importance			

1	Some	Low	No - less
2	Some	Low/some	Yes
3	Important	Important	Yes
4	Important	Important	Yes
5	Some	Some	Yes
6	Some	Not taught!	Not at all

The mini case studies focused on interviewee perceptions of an Irish dimension and proceeded to explore how this reflected their approach to the curriculum as a whole. Consequently, this was followed by an analysis of how far interviewees distinguished between British and English history, multicultural and anti-racist history, as well as skills and content.

Case Study 1: Responses from seven Birmingham University Mentors

Seven secondary history mentors agreed to be interviewed. Six of the interviewees worked in Local Authority schools and one worked in a Roman Catholic school. Four mentors taught in Birmingham schools and three within neighbouring counties. Five of the mentors taught in schools with sixth forms. All of the interviewees taught in urban comprehensive schools. Two interviewees worked in schools serving multicultural communities and five served largely white communities. One school had strong links with a local Irish Catholic community. Four of the interviewees were Heads of Humanities and the remaining three were Heads of History. The length of teaching experience varied and at one extreme two of the mentors had over twenty years teaching experience while three had been in their current role for less than three years. The perceptions of each interviewee will be considered in turn before attempting to draw out common features and differences reflecting the case study as a whole.

The first interviewee worked in a co-educational 11-16 inner ring comprehensive school serving a multicultural community and had been a Head of History for 22 years. They said that an Irish dimension had low importance in their Key Stage 3 course in both their responses to the questionnaire and interview even though it was taught as the Modern World Study in the School History Project at Key Stage 4. What did the interviewee say about other aspects of Key Stage 3 history? The interviewee said that skills were more important than content in their teaching at both Key Stages 3 and 4. They said that local and English history were important. In particular, they felt that local events were considered to be particularly important in engaging the interest of the children. Although the interviewee said that Welsh and Scottish dimensions had some importance in their work, this was qualified at a later stage of the interview:

I suppose it's a matter of prioritising but Ireland, Wales and Scotland ... it's difficult enough for our pupils to know about England ... and to try and do two or three things at a time does confuse them.

The first interviewee's perceptions of black, multicultural and anti-racist history were somewhat unclear. The interviewee considered that black history was important at Key Stage 3 but had reservations about multicultural and anti-racist dimensions because they felt focusing on them distorted the way in which historians should study the past. This perception was contradicted when they said that slavery was part of black history because it reflected the school's multicultural population.

The interviewee showed further inconsistency by stating that one of their reasons for teaching Ireland as a Modern World Study at Key Stage 4 was because it reflected the fact that

Birmingham had an Irish community. Other reasons given for teaching the Modern World Study at Key Stage 4 included personal interest, the fact that it could draw on local memories of the Birmingham pub bombings and because it was considered more accessible for pupils than China or the Arab-Israeli conflict.

When teaching this unit they provided a brief overview of the history of Ireland in order to provide a background to the current situation. This was followed by a range of teaching and learning approaches which made use of newspapers, films, songs and a three dimensional model to help pupils to understand the context of 'Bloody Sunday'. The effectiveness of the course may be reflected by the fact that GCSE evaluations undertaken by the department with pupils over a number of years indicated that the Ireland study is its most popular component. However, the assignment developed by the interviewee for the examination reflects their approach to both history and an Irish dimension. The assignment explores a Catholic interpretation of 'Bloody Sunday' which they supported by the following comment:

... we are doing it from one point of view ... not giving anything from the other side because we are looking at the way it is tackled... so long as we know that it's slanted.

This supports earlier comments in which they said that skills were more important than content. Priority was given to the understanding of conceptual skills rather than providing a holistic appreciation of the context in which the assignments were set. When explicitly asked if they felt that the study should help pupils to understand a problem or culture, their reply was even more revealing:

It's like juggling a few balls in the air - at basics it's to get them [the pupils] a GCSE because that's the most essential thing, that's what they're coming here for, that's what they've got a right to. They've got a right to pass an exam ... and that's a very important first thing.

The interviewee's response suggests that they were primarily driven by pragmatic considerations rather than a desire to fully explore values associated with the study of Ireland's past.

The second interviewee taught in an 11-18 co-educational comprehensive school serving a predominantly white population in an urban area. The interviewee had been a Head of History in the school for nine years and Head of Humanities for two years. The interviewee said that an Irish dimension had some importance at Key Stage 3 in their response to both the questionnaire and interview. The interviewee's course included the Irish history from the time of the Normans, which provided some insight into the long-term relations between Britain and Ireland. They said that this was facilitated by the availability of resources, notably textbooks. The interviewee taught Ireland as a Modern World Study in the School History Project at Key Stage 4 and Irish Home Rule was taught within their AS/A2 British History course.

How did this relate to their perception of the curriculum as a whole? Unlike the first interviewee they said that skills and content were of equal importance. When discussing other strands they regarded English history as important while Welsh and Scottish history had some importance. They said that black history had some importance at Key Stage 3. Both multicultural and anti-racist histories were considered important. The impression given was that this interviewee was moving towards an appreciation of British history, although it was difficult to determine how far this was developed. When asked what factors supported or constrained their work this interviewee was alarmed at the prospect of having to focus on cross-curricular skills. The following comment is quite revealing:

When the National Curriculum was first introduced the pressure was - blimey all that content! Now I think it's [important] to make sure there is some ... we do need to

concentrate on ... literacy and numeracy and so on [but] if we try to educate children with no content we might produce a generation of children that can do everything but who know nothing.

They clearly felt that these pressures could affect the quality of history teaching in general. They also indicated that it could affect the viability of teaching an Irish dimension. The interviewee's reasons for teaching Ireland as the Modern World Study within the School History Project at Key Stage 4 were:

I think it's the one that has got the most relevance to young people ... it's a difficult one but the choices that are suggested to you are all complex, such as the Arab-Israeli thing. But it [Ireland] has some resonance in Birmingham because of the bombings and because sometimes a lot of ... some of ... the children have Irish antecedents.

Overall this decision appears to have been influenced by pragmatics and some awareness of British and multicultural history. However, they said that it was not selected in order to support anti-racism.

The third interviewee was the Head of Humanities in an 11-18 urban co-educational Roman Catholic school serving a predominantly white population with significant links with the local Irish community. The interviewee said that an Irish dimension had some importance at Key Stage 3 in both their responses to questionnaire and interview. They taught aspects of Irish history from the time of the Normans. The interviewee said Irish history was taught because it related to the background of pupils in the school. The interviewee had been at the school for 22 years of which the previous four and a half years had been as Head of Faculty and six and a half as Head of History. During this period the department had developed a substantial unit of work related to the history of Ireland. Consequently, they had significant experience in teaching an Irish dimension in the school under the leadership of the previous Head of Humanities. During the 1980s the department had occasionally received complaints from parents who were sensitive to their children being taught about Republicanism and the IRA

but the topic was generally well received. Indeed, the teaching of an Irish dimension was praised in the *Times Educational Supplement* following a positive OFSTED report:

More than 80 percent of pupils have parents or grandparents who are Irish or were born in Ireland ... They also live with Irish politics on the streets. "IRA scum out" has appeared on walls and bus stops over the past few weeks ... Given this cultural background, the school's history department took the decision 10 years ago to spend optional time at Key Stage 3 with 14-15 year olds teaching Irish history around the topic of the potato famine, an initiative that has recently been praised by inspectors from the Office for Standards in Education... the school's head of humanities said, "We felt it was our duty to introduce some historical background to their cultural identity." (Williams, 1997)

Nevertheless, the attention given to Irish history had declined since 1997. This was partly influenced by the Ofsted report, which criticised the fact that it was undertaken as the department's European area of study. The department planned to deal with this issue by integrating an Irish dimension within British history. Although Irish topics had been developed within aspects of Key Stage 3 there were several key aspects including Famine/Hunger which had still not been included within their revised course. There were a number of reasons why this did not take place. Firstly, the interviewee said that the Irish intake in the school was beginning to decline. Secondly, it is possible that the interviewee was less committed to an Irish dimension because they were English. However, this is unlikely to have been particularly significant because of the fact that they raised it as an issue at yearly reviews, while over half of the department was Irish. It is possible that broader curriculum issues may have provided more serious constraints. The interviewee was aware of the flexibility provided by National Curriculum 2000 but still found it difficult to find space within their curriculum because there were so many topics they considered to be important. An even greater constraint was the recent emphasis on developing ICT and English across the curriculum. They supported this development but noted that it had been undertaken within

more traditional topics which could make it more difficult to develop themes such as an Irish dimension in future.

How did the interviewee's treatment of an Irish dimension compare with their treatment of other aspects of the curriculum? This interviewee supported a balance between skills and content. They regarded English history as important, but their approach to Welsh and Scottish history can be seen in the following comment:

In Key Stage 3 English History without a doubt is the big focus of the National Curriculum. I think it is very English dominated. Within this there are certain tokenisms particularly in a year 7 lesson on Scotland and a lesson on Wales and in years 8 and 9 we have tried. With Ireland we have tried with a more overt, if you like, approach in the scheme of work.

It appears from this that English history was equated with British history. Black and anti-racist history and multicultural history were considered important. This was taught through the 'Black Peoples of the Americas' unit, which the interviewee said provided opportunities to consider issues such as prejudice. The interviewee did not include an Irish dimension within their work at GCSE or AS/A2. Overall, it appears that this interviewee regarded an Irish dimension as an aspect of multicultural history. It also seems likely that as a result of this its role within the school is likely to decline as the school intake changes. Some reference is made to anti-racism but this does not appear to have been fully developed across the curriculum. Occasionally they compared Irish migration to more recent migrant groups in discussions but it is unclear how far the interviewee related an Irish dimension was related to anti racism.

The fourth interviewee was a Head of Humanities in a co-educational 11-18 comprehensive school serving a multicultural community in an urban context. They considered that an Irish

dimension had limited importance in their Key Stage 3 course. However, they included it as part of a unit on 'Identity' related to the development of Britain in the 16th and 17th centuries and Irish migration at the time of the Famine/Hunger within a unit on the development of multicultural Britain. They did not include an Irish dimension at Key Stage 4 but it was included in AS/A2 courses related to Home Rule in the context of 19th century Britain and the American Frontier. Another member of the department was involved in Teachers in Development Education (TIDE) projects related to Ireland. One of the projects called 'Let's talk' involved taking sixth form students to Ireland for cross-cultural discussions. However, the interviewee stressed that these projects encouraged generic skills and attitudes amongst pupils rather than an Irish dimension within the curriculum. The interviewee said a major reason for not developing an Irish dimension was the fact that the majority of the pupils came from black communities.

How did an Irish dimension relate to other dimensions? The interviewee supported a balance between skills and content. They rated English history as important but considered Scottish and Welsh to have limited importance, although they were included as part of the unit exploring Identity which has been mentioned above. Local and global studies ranging from pre-colonial Africa, challenges to slavery and the development of multicultural Britain were important features of the history course. Overall, this suggests a commitment to anti-racist values. Despite, the fact that the interviewee did not claim that an Irish dimension was an important part of their course, it was certainly playing a significant part in supporting its overall commitment.

The fifth interviewee had been Head of Humanities for three years in an 11-18 co-educational comprehensive school serving a predominantly white community in a town. The interviewee said that an Irish dimension was of limited importance in their Key Stage 3 history curriculum. However, they included references to Ireland when teaching a topic entitled 'Cromwell: Hero or Villain?' The interviewee also provided the opportunity for pupils to explore the presence of Irish migrants in the 19th century as part of a skill-based study based using local census records. The Elizabethan Plantations had been taught in the past but had been removed in response to a reduction of time allocated to history. How did an Irish dimension relate their perception of other dimensions? This interviewee supported a balance between skills and content, with a slight preference for skills. When considering Key Stage 3 they regarded English history as important, but gave low ratings to both Scottish and Welsh history. They indicated that black, multicultural and anti-racist dimensions were important and taught them through topic a topic on slavery and prejudice.

An Irish dimension was not taught at Key Stage 4 but did form part of an AS/A2 course related to 17th century Britain. Irish and British dimensions were important when teaching sixth form students:

The British side [of the course] goes back to Cromwell and the Civil War ... so Ireland and Scotland become a much bigger issue because there it is taught as one of the causes of the Civil War. If one area in the school where Ireland is not a tag on, it is here.... It is one of the areas integral to what is going on ... [in a] British Civil War rather than an English Civil War.

When the interviewee was asked why this topic was taught from an Anglo-centric focus at Key Stage 3 but a British focus at Key Stage 5 they replied:

Progression... lots of things... it's time... a bit more to play with. Depth... I think

its possibly a philosophical thing... at Key Stage 3 ...[it is] simplified for their needs but at A level [you need to consider] historiographic debate which can come up in the exam.

This suggests that pragmatic considerations rather than underlying values drove the interviewee's approach to the curriculum.

The sixth interviewee had been Head of History for two years in an 11-18 co-educational comprehensive school serving a white working class community in a town. In their response to the questionnaire they said that an Irish dimension had some importance in their planning at Key Stage 3 but during their interview said that it was of limited importance. It was taught as part of the topic 'The Making of the United Kingdom'. Ireland had been taught as the

Modern World Study within the School History Project prior to the arrival of the interviewee at the school. However, the department moved towards the Edexcel Examination Board syllabus, which provided the opportunity to avoid teaching a Modern World Study which staff regarded as too difficult for most of their pupils. Although the interviewee had not been at the school when this decision was made they had not considered re-introducing the Modern World Study. They taught the Civil War at AS/A2 but the following extract suggests that they approached it from an Anglo-centric perspective:

Interviewee Six: We are looking at the causes of the Civil War, the Civil War itself and immediate after effects, and of the Civil War and execution.... and the Irish, obviously Irish rebellion and Stafford come in there as well as Cromwell and Drogheda.

Interviewer: Is it an analysis of Cromwell or do you get an Irish perspective?

Interviewee Six: No... it's very much the concept of the rebellion and how the English rulers, leaders are controlling Ireland.

The impression given was that at both Key Stage 3 and at AS/A2 this interviewee's approach towards Ireland reflects an Anglo-centric approach to the history curriculum. Was this reflected in their approach to other aspects of the curriculum? with their approach towards other dimensions? The interviewee said that they prioritised skills over content. They rated English history as important and considered that it was a major requirement of the National Curriculum. Scottish and Welsh history were said to have limited importance. The following comment suggests a distinct Anglo-centric perspective: 'Irish, Scottish, Welsh [history] ... I would not rate as important in this school, that is not to dismiss the part of English History where they come in.' This interviewee said that they hoped to develop black, multicultural and anti-racist dimensions. They taught Mughal India, which they did not like but hoped to purchase textbooks related to Empire in the future. The overall impression given was that this interviewee's perceptions were distinctly Anglo-centric.

The seventh interviewee taught in an 11-16 co-educational comprehensive school located in a conurbation serving mainly white pupils with children from ethnic minority communities. They had been Head of History for a year but had taught in the school for nine years. They considered that an Irish dimension had low importance at Key Stage 3 and it was not included in their GCSE course at Key Stage 4. Nevertheless, when Irish history was taught they ensured that it was related to contemporary issues:

... we don't spend a huge amount of time looking at anything particularly to do with Ireland ... basically [we consider] Cromwell the man: Was he a hero or villain? Why are there different opinions of him? People then had different opinions of him as we have different opinions of people today. Why are there issues in Northern Ireland? Why are there issues between Britain and Northern Ireland? Why are these issues here today? Let's turn the clock back and ask why.

The interviewee related Irish history to anti-racism by using their study of the past to challenge the use of derogatory Irish jokes. They also indicated that Ireland was briefly included within their study of Empire:

I think it's important that students have an understanding of Ireland and Irish history ... we touch on it when we look at ideas of empire ... you know - was Ireland seen as part of the Empire?

However, the fact that Ireland was only mentioned in passing whereas Black Peoples of the Americas formed the main focus in this topic suggests that it's overall significance was limited. How did an Irish dimension relate to other dimensions? When the interviewee was asked about how they rated skills and content in history teaching they avoided directly answering this question and said that they wanted 'children to become critical human beings'. They rated English history as important. Scottish and Welsh history were rated as having low importance, although they were included within the study of the development of Britain in the 16th and 17th centuries. This interviewee rated black history and multicultural history as important and during their interview demonstrated a commitment to making comparisons between topics associated with anti-racist or human rights issues:

We look at the slave trade and we look at the effect of that on Africa ... that's interesting because it also links to the Holocaust and one of the things I have shown [is] a brief extract of genocide in Rwanda [which] makes links with colonialism and slavery as well.

Overall, despite the limited time and emphasis given to an Irish dimension, it does appear to have been related to an anti-racist perception of the past.

What 'fuzzy generalisations' emerge from the seven Birmingham University perceptions of an Irish dimension? Several interviewees had developed an Irish dimension despite the fact that none of them had indicated that it was important in their questionnaires. The way in which the different interviewees approached an Irish dimension reflected the different ways in

which they constructed the past. For example, the first interviewee was predominantly concerned with skills rather than content. This was reflected in their attitude towards multiculturalism and anti-racism as well as their approach towards the examination assignment at Key Stage 4. In the latter they appeared to be interested in developing pupils' ability to detect bias without fully appreciating different perspectives or values. Three interviewees gave little or no time to an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3, which compared with their approach to Scottish and Welsh dimensions. Approaches towards anti-racism or multicultural history were largely restricted to slavery. This suggests that the map of the past provided to their pupils had a distinctly Anglo-centric focus. One interviewee provided a multicultural approach to the past based on the Irish ethnicity of pupils in the school but most of their teaching was restricted to English and Irish history. One interviewee went some way towards relating an Irish dimension to British history and but only one, or possibly two interviewees went some way towards relating it to an anti-racist history curriculum.

Secondly, several of the interviewees taught an Irish dimension in more than one key stage. The first and second interviewees taught an Irish dimension at Key Stage 4 as the Modern World Study within the School History Project. Neither of them developed links between teaching at Irish dimension at Key Stages 3 and 4. However, they were pragmatic in their approach towards teaching Ireland at GCSE. The first interviewee's assignment appeared to be primarily concerned with mastering historical skills rather than a holistic appreciation of the context in Northern Ireland. Perceptions of accessibility also affected the choice of Modern World topic. Both the first and second interviewees also indicated that this was a factor encouraging them to select Ireland rather than the Arab-Israeli conflict at Key Stage 4. Four out of the five interviewees who taught in 11-18 schools included an Irish dimension

within their AS/A2 courses. There were no clear reasons given for this apart from the fact that it formed part of the syllabus. It is interesting to note that one interviewee developed an Irish dimension within British history at this stage when teaching about the Civil War in the 17th century whereas another interviewee continued to approach the same topic from an Anglo-centric perspective.

Thirdly, the interviewees indicated a number of constraints, which affected an Irish dimension in the curriculum. Negative perceptions of the pupils' ability appear to explain why the first interviewee did not include an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3. Another interviewee's school no longer taught an Irish dimension at GCSE because it was thought that the topic was too difficult. Some interviewees felt that the National Curriculum affected their choice of content. Two interviewees considered that teaching English history fulfilled the National Curriculum requirement to teach British history. It is possible that Ofsted's interpretation of the National Curriculum may have restricted Irish history in one school. Nevertheless, concern about the emphasis on cross-curricular core skills on the history curriculum appears to have been considered as a more serious constraint. Nevertheless, a number of interviews indicated that resources were available, especially at Key Stage 4 while the overall presence of an Irish dimension within this case study was greater than expected from its initial ratings.

Case Study 2: Secondary School Heads of History

The second case study investigated the perceptions of secondary school history teachers who had indicated a strong commitment to teaching an Irish dimension in their response to the questionnaire. Appendix I shows the interview schedule used for interviewees in this case study. All of the interviewees taught in urban schools. Two interviewees worked in

Birmingham, and the remaining three taught in the north, south and east of England. All of the interviewees were Heads of History. One interviewee had been Head of History for 19 years, one had taught for 30 years but had been Head of History for seven years. The remaining interviewees had been Heads of History for between four and seven years.

The first interviewee had taught in a co-educational 11-16 urban comprehensive school, which served a predominantly white community of which 30-40% received free school meals. They had taught in the school for 31 years and had been Head of History for the previous seven years. They considered that an Irish dimension was important in their Key Stage 3 curriculum. The department had recently used the flexibility in National Curriculum 2000 to restructure their course into a series of themes. This led to teaching Ireland through a unit of study with year 9 pupils called “Why has it been difficult to achieve peace in Northern Ireland?” The reason for developing this topic was to support teaching Ireland as the Modern World Study in the School History Project at Key Stage 4:

We have studied it [Ireland] as part of Key Stage 4 ... when the kids came to do this they had no concept of what had been going on in Ireland and therefore we decided at Key Stage 3: wouldn't it be a good idea to introduce the basis of the problem of Ireland at a much younger age.

The pupils studied the Plantations, The Famine/Hunger, World War 1 and Partition, which it was felt would provide a basis for Key Stage 4 with its focus on more recent events.

What was their perception of other historical dimensions at Key Stage 3? This interviewee supported a balance between the teaching of skills and content. English History was rated as important while Scottish and Welsh dimensions were credited with some importance. Their approach to black history related to a thematic approach to curriculum planning. A theme related to the Olympic Games included studies of what happened at particular Games and

drew out the significance of events associated with Black Power or Terrorism, for example. They had worked with the Religious Education and English departments to develop an anti-racist policy, although their approach to diversity was influenced by the intake of the school:

... we actually spend time on it, although having a low proportion of ethnic minority pupils here we do spend less time on it than if I was say perhaps in an inner city school.

On the evidence available it is unlikely that this interviewee considered anti-racism or multiculturalism as particularly significant at Key Stage 3. Until recently more able pupils had undertaken a Modern World GCSE and the less able the School History Project. However, they had recently decided to enter all of their pupils for the School History Project course because they felt that it was easier to achieve higher examination grades in the latter course. This decision was made in response to senior management pressure to increase examination results. They selected Ireland as the Modern World Study because they were interested in it and also because the Irish community were part of Birmingham's history. They used the anniversary of the Birmingham pub bombings as a basis for the examination assignment. This replaced earlier assignments related to the Good Friday Agreement, which the interviewee considered to have become dated and dry. The interviewee argued that the topic was related to local memories and provided opportunities to consider anti-racist issues:

I know where I was at that time; I know what the local Longbridge reaction was at the time, where you couldn't walk down if you were Irish. So it is this sort of thing that I am trying to get over to them about stereotyping as well.

Interviewer: Do you think there are wider issues?

Yes it has got a lot of wider issues – and by wider issues we come up to prejudices, we come onto wider stereotyping as I have said of certain people, that everybody that is Irish is a terrorist at that time. It also leads to the formation of Irish political parties, terror groups, it leads to peace movements, and it can lead to a number of areas that we can discuss.

The interviewee said that at a recent examination meeting they had been asked why they studied Ireland as their Modern World Study. They suggested that Roman Catholic schools selected it because of links with Ireland but for many teachers like themselves it was because they were traditionalists who had taught the same topic for many years and that they were familiar with it. They also noted that one teacher from a multicultural school had started teaching the Arab-Israeli conflict and they felt that in similar circumstances they would do the same. Overall, this goes some way towards suggesting that they were influenced by multicultural and, possibly, anti-racist considerations more explicitly at Key Stage 4 than Key Stage 3. However, pragmatism and pressure to increase examination results appear to have been a major influence on the teaching of an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3 and their wider adoption of the School History Project.

The second interviewee taught in an urban 11-16 girls' school serving a predominantly white working class community. This interviewee had been Head of History in the school for seven years and had recently become an Assistant Head Teacher. They regarded an Irish dimension as important at Key Stage 3 and developed it alongside work related to medicine as preparation for work at Key Stage 4. The idea for developing themes came about after the interviewee had attended a School History Project Conference and its implementation was facilitated by financial support from the Head of School. The interviewee said that reasons for developing an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3 included:

Children's backgrounds, and I would say background to Key Stage 4 was the real push. It's been the push for everything that we do ... over the past few years. We just threw everything out and wrote specifically linking Key Stage 3 and Key Stage 4.

This suggests that multicultural and pragmatic considerations were particularly important. When asked about the history curriculum in general this interviewee felt that a balance between skills and content was important. When asked about their perceptions of other dimensions they said that English history was important and that Scottish and Welsh history had some importance. Black history was considered important but only within slavery and Empire topics studied during Black History Month. Multicultural history was regarded as important and an anti-racist policy had been developed through working with other subject departments. Nevertheless, on the basis of the interview it would appear that multicultural and anti-racist themes were not extensively developed within the interviewee's course.

The interviewee introduced the School History Project at Key Stage 4 when they became Head of History. They gave the following reason for selecting Ireland as the Modern World Study:

I think it is the best of the available alternatives ... there is a wealth of material and it is the part that is most up to date ... I think the fact that it is in the news can tap into their [the pupils'] interest.

They noted that Walsh's (2000) textbook provided an up to date textbook but stressed resources were readily available on the Internet. The identity of some of the pupils is also seen as significant:

... doing the GCSE piece of coursework they [some pupils] suddenly said, "Well my Dad's Irish, my family's this or I'm spending the summer in Ireland with my relatives". I realised that we could suddenly start picking bits and pieces up.

This may imply that the ethnic identity of some of the pupils was regarded as a resource. This factor rather than a commitment to teaching diversity in principle may possibly explain their

decision to focus on teaching Irish history. The interviewee's approach towards teaching the Modern World Study indicated a positive attitude towards teaching this challenging course to pupils:

Some of the students do it remarkably well and then other pupils ... say when they are nearly at the end of it, 'I still don't understand.' But I would say, 'That is natural for some people. Finish your homework and then read it back' ... and then the penny drops. It needs going through the process; it's almost learning by doing.

It is interesting to note that the interviewee considered that in the past they had used coursework that had been too demanding. In recent years coursework had been made more manageable. The main constraint, which this interviewee faced, was the fact that the history department did not have anyone with sole responsibilities in this area while they had wider school responsibilities. This affected opportunities for curriculum development but did not appear to have influenced the current organisation of the department. The overall impression provided was of a highly efficient but pragmatic approach towards teaching an Irish dimension.

The third interviewee taught in 11-16 urban girls' school, located in a large northern city. They indicated that the school had a multicultural intake including pupils from the local Irish community. Although they indicated that an Irish dimension was important at Key Stage 3, when answering the questionnaire during the interview they said that it had some importance. The interviewee did not give particularly strong reasons for teaching an Irish dimension. They said that the background of the pupils was also important and that it also supported anti-racism. Nevertheless the way in which they supported the last assertion was somewhat vague:

I would say that part of the reason why we teach it is that it enables us to teach about the news so that we can relate it to modern times.

An Irish dimension was the specialist interest of two members of the department, although the interviewee did not have a personal interest in it. In contrast to the first and second interviewees no reference was made to links between Key Stages 3 and 4. The Key Stage 3 course included studies of Ireland in the Middle Ages and Grace O'Malley in the Tudor period followed by the Cromwellian Plantations and the Battle of the Boyne. Pressures of time had meant that the medieval part of the course had not been undertaken during the past two years, which suggests that it was not given a high priority compared to other topics. Nevertheless, events in the 17th century appear to have been considered more fully:

We do William of Orange and the Battle of the Boyne [by considering] – how is the Battle of the Boyne remembered by different communities? So we look at a Protestant and a Catholic interpretation of the same event. We do Cromwell in quite a similar way.

When the interviewee was asked about their perceptions of other aspects of their history course they said that both skills and content were important but that priority was given to the former. With respect to historical dimensions at Key Stage 3 they said that an English dimension was considered important but Scottish and Welsh dimensions were not rated as important. Multicultural and anti-racist history were regarded as important but world history was not considered as important. This last point may have underestimated their approach to world history, which included a study of African states such as Mali as a prelude to studying Black Peoples of the Americas. Within British history topics they included reference to black people at the Tudor Court. Overall, this suggests that some multicultural and anti-racist perspectives were being developed. However, although aspects of Irish history loosely related to this, the regional dimension of the course was almost certainly focused on English rather than British history.

The interviewee taught Ireland as the Modern World Study within the GCSE School History Project course. However, its selection was primarily for pragmatic reasons - it was regarded as easier to teach than other options. The interviewee particularly noted the fact that they would not know how to begin teaching about the Arab-Israeli conflict with the Muslim pupils in the school. They felt that the availability of resources, especially websites, was an important reason for teaching the course. They noted that if something significant happened in Ireland at the time they were teaching the course, this proved helpful for their teaching. However, they did not refer to the background of the pupils as a reason for undertaking this particular course. In retrospect it is difficult to determine whether this was because they had already mentioned it with respect to Key Stage 3 or if different considerations operated at Key Stage 4. When asked about additional factors supporting or inhibiting the development of an Irish dimension, the interviewee cited time and quality of resources at Key Stage 3 were constraints. They felt that pupils at Key Stage 3 were neither particularly interested nor hostile to it. This may be an issue given that the presence of Irish community presence in the school was a reason for including it. The interviewee noted that some parents felt that their pupils had become very interested in the course when they studied it at Key Stage 4 and it encouraged them to watch the news. Nevertheless, for many pupils they felt that the response was less enthusiastic:

They find it difficult. The concepts and the religion, and they are politically literate and they find it unbelievably difficult, but I think when we evaluate it at the end, it's not the thing they like the least.

This related to wider issues related to both Citizenship and History with respect to teaching Political Literacy. Overall, an Irish dimension related to broad multicultural considerations at Key Stage 3, although the significance of this must not be overemphasised. At Key Stage 4 the only thing that can be said for certain was that it was regarded as an easier option than

alternative Modern World Studies, especially where the emotional and controversial issues were regarded as more challenging for their pupils than recent events in Northern Ireland.

The fourth interviewee was Head of History in an 11-18 urban school in south-east England where they had worked for 19 years. They had expanded their professional role through becoming a Key Stage 3 history textbook writer and an Advanced Skills Teacher. The interviewee said that the school served a white middle class community with a small proportion of pupils from ethnic minority communities. In their response to the questionnaire they said that an Irish dimension was important in their teaching but during the interview they modified this to say that it had some importance. Ireland also served as an option alongside the Arab-Israeli conflict as part of the School History Project at Key Stage 4 and within their teaching about the Civil War at AS/A2.

The interviewee provided the following reasons for teaching an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3:

I think that human rights and multicultural elements are important. I think the contribution to helping students understand why the country in which we live today is a United Kingdom encompassing the different peoples of Britain ... is quite important.

The comment below made at the end of their interview returned to this thread and developed it more fully, drawing out a range of positive threads:

I just think that history is such a rich tapestry and there are so many threads that make up that tapestry and so many competing interests and I think that Ireland...not just when Ireland becomes an issue with English history but culture and contribution of the different people of the British Isles of the sort of country that we live in today. I think it is very definitely one of those threads.

The interviewee did not regard it as important for work related to Ireland at Key Stage 3 to support Key Stage 4 as they felt that there was a clear break between the two key stages.

Examples of topics where an Irish dimension was developed included Henry II, the Irish Rebellion and Cromwell. The interviewee stressed that they attempted to look at these events from an Irish and English point of view, although the term 'Irish Rebellion' may warrant caution in fully accepting this assertion.

When asked about their perception of the whole curriculum they said that over the past twenty years they had moved from a strong skill emphasis towards supporting a balance between skills and content. When asked about English, Scottish, and Welsh as well as Irish strands they said that they were all important. The interviewee admitted that English history dominated much of their course. Nevertheless, they were aware of the broader implications of the National Curriculum with respect to British history:

The National Curriculum ... has made teachers think more about the various strands that need to be present within their teaching and I think certainly from my point of view I pay more attention to teaching British history as opposed to English history as a result of that ... many pupils do find the concept of the United Kingdom quite a difficult one and I think it is an important job for history teachers ... not to think that England and Britain are the same thing.

When asked about black, multicultural and anti-racist dimensions their reply was much less expansive. They said that black history was probably under represented. The idea of a clash of cultures theme to reflect conflicts between the Saxons and Normans, the Incas and Spaniards and the Jews in Nazi Germany was used to support the principles underlying multicultural and anti-racist history. Overall, the impression given is that the fourth interviewee had a conceptual impression of multicultural Britain, which included an Irish dimension. Having said this, there is nothing to suggest that this interviewee had really developed issues related to the nature of multicultural Britain beyond a few broadly based conceptual statements.

The interviewee said that one of the reasons that they chose to teach about Ireland as the Modern World Study at GCSE was because they had studied it at university. They also felt that a lot of materials and conferences had been introduced to support teaching the topic. In recent years the availability of BBC videos, CD ROMS and websites had also proved useful. Pupils and parents were generally positive and some parents had commented that they would have liked to attend their children's lessons in order to understand what was happening in the news. Nevertheless, this interviewee admitted that if they were introducing the School History Project course into their school they would focus on 'Terrorism' because of its greater contemporary relevance. Within this they noted that it would be appropriate to make comparisons between the Irish Republican Army and current terrorist organisations, although the focus of the study would clearly be elsewhere. An Irish dimension was taught when studying the Civil War within the AS/A2 course where reference was made to historians who promoted British as opposed to English history:

... partly due to the work of Conrad Russell [an eminent historian] in emphasising the British nature of the civil wars of the 17th century and the inter-relationship between events in England and events in Scotland and events in Ireland.

Overall, the only issue at Key Stage 3 raised by the interviewee was time, and they said that the amount allocated to history was about to be reduced. They were unable to specify whether or not this would impact upon their treatment of an Irish dimension.

The fifth interviewee had been Head of History for four years in an 11-18 urban multicultural school in eastern England. The school was operating a two-year Key Stage 3 curriculum.

During the interview they said that an Irish dimension had some importance at Key Stage 3 whereas they had said that it was important when answering the questionnaire. When asked why they developed an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3 they cited personal interests and anti-racist or human rights issues as having some importance. However, the interviewee

emphasised pragmatic motives for developing an Irish dimension in order to support work at Key Stage 4. In year 7 pupils looked at how Cromwell has been interpreted at different times in the past. In year 8 pupils examined Michael Collins. As a result the interviewee felt that:

When we start GCSEs the children have got some understanding of Irish history and we need to do a brief recap on work they already know and understand - appreciate that they could do more.

When asked about their perceptions of other aspects of the history curriculum they said that they supported both skills and content but gave priority to the view that children should learn about their past and put the world into this framework. When asked about different dimensions at Key Stage 3 the interviewee indicated that English history was important, Scottish history was given low priority and Welsh history was not mentioned. World history was considered important and multicultural history was considered important but no reference was made to black history or anti-racism. Overall, it is difficult to ascertain how far their overall curriculum had moved away from an overall Anglo-centric focus, although their treatment of Irish history helped to challenge it. The interviewee noted that their main constraint was having to teach Key Stage 3 in two years and it seems probable that this may have restricted their curriculum choices. An Irish dimension was taught as the Modern World Study within the School History Project at Key Stage 4. The interviewee did not provide specific reasons for teaching an Irish dimension at this Key Stage. They used texts by Walsh (2000) and MacAleavy (1997) and people in the locality from Nationalist or Loyalist communities. Pupils also collected newspaper portfolios during the course in order to support their course. When asked about responses to the course they said that pupils never complained about it while a number of parents indicated interest during parents' evenings. Pupils had some opportunity to pursue an Irish dimension at the end of year 12 when it featured within a series of specialist interest activities, which were not directly related to their examination

course. Overall, the impression given was that this interviewee had some broader values but that these were overshadowed by pragmatic considerations associated with curriculum pressures within the school.

What 'fuzzy generalisations' emerge from the perceptions of the secondary school Heads of History in the second mini case study? All of the five interviewees taught Ireland as their Modern World Study within the School History Project at Key Stage 4. The overwhelming consideration of four out of five of the interviewees was the intention to develop an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3 in order to support work at Key Stage 4. Although league tables and examination results were not explicitly mentioned it seems reasonable to assume that this had some impact. The second interviewee for example replaced a Modern World GCSE course for more able pupils with the School History course on the assumption that this would help them to meet senior management targets. One interviewee also considered that Ireland provided an easier Modern World Study for their pupils than the Arab-Israeli conflict. It is interesting to note that several interviewees considered that the GCSE Modern World Study related to Ireland was challenging and that two of them addressed this issue in their coursework. Overall, most of the interviewees in this case study were influenced by pragmatic considerations when they developed an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3.

There was some variation in the way in which different interviewees constructed the past. Although all of the schools indicated that they taught multicultural history and some referred to anti-racist history, these dimensions were not always strong features of their history courses. At the same time links between an Irish dimension and multicultural and anti-racist history were not very clear.

Two interviewees indicated that they served multicultural communities and two made some links between their history curriculum and the local Irish community. One interviewee developed African and British black history which indicated some appreciation of anti-racist approaches. It was not evident that they fully applied this appreciation towards their teaching of Irish history. The way in which they challenged Irish stereotypes could be regarded as anti-racist but there was little evidence to suggest that they applied this understanding to issues facing people within other ethnic minority communities. One interviewee related an Irish dimension to a wider vision of Britain comprised of different communities and nations. They were aware of academic work, which challenged an Anglo-centric vision of the past. Nevertheless, their Key Stage 3 course did not appear to fully develop multicultural or anti-racist dimensions in practice.

The interviewees referred to factors that supported the development of an Irish dimension such as parental interest and, in the case of one interviewee, financial support from the Head of School. However, a number of issues such as time allocation and staffing responsibilities may have restricted curriculum development in general within some schools.

Case Study 3: Primary School History Co-ordinators

This case study examined the perceptions of five primary school interviewees who rated an Irish dimension as either important or of some importance in their history curriculum. All of the interviewees had been teaching for a number of years with the most experienced in their thirtieth year of teaching. The least experienced teacher had been teaching in their current

school for three years but had experience in two other schools. All of the interviewees were history co-ordinators and one was also a member of the senior management team and an Advanced Skills Teacher.

The first interviewee had taught for 30 years including work as a language support and classroom teacher. They had returned to the classroom for the last 13 years and had taught a range of Key Stage 2 classes. At the time of the interview they were responsible for co-ordinating history and the library, as well as teaching year 6. Their school was on the outskirts of Birmingham and their intake was predominantly white with a few pupils from ethnic minority communities. The curriculum was organised in discrete subjects. What was the significance of an Irish dimension in their history curriculum? During the interview the interviewee rated an Irish dimension as having limited importance even though they had said it had some importance when they completed the questionnaire. Nevertheless, they said that it was developed as part of their work on the Tudors:

When we have done the Tudors we bring in the problems with Catholics and Protestants and we have discussed the problems that continued from that period in Irish history today.

How did this compare with their perception of other aspects of their history teaching? When asked about the importance of skills and content they evaded the question by complaining that although pupils remembered content they were less good at remembering skills since the introduction of Standard Assessment Tasks (SATs). English history was regarded as important within both Key Stage 1 and 2. Scottish and Welsh history had limited importance at Key Stage 1 but some importance at Key Stage 2. Overall, they said:

We obviously do English history; we do history of the British Isles but mainly it would be English and Irish with a little bit of Scottish and Welsh.

It is possible that the interviewee's reference to Ireland was influenced by the fact that it was the focus of the interview. However, their comment does at least indicate an awareness that English and British history are not interchangeable. It was evident that they attached some importance to black multicultural and anti-racist history, although their approach was somewhat general. For example, they used experiences of pupils who had visited the Caribbean or Ireland as a starting point in their work. They said that stereotypes were challenged within their teaching. They noted resource issues as a key constraint affecting an Irish dimension:

I buy for history, I buy for geography and I don't come across stuff [Irish materials] and I would buy it if it were there because I do think we should be looking at issues across cultures and races.

It appears that this interviewee had some appreciation of British, multicultural and anti-racist history and that an Irish dimension may have been related to this. Nevertheless, how far these dimensions had been developed remained somewhat vague.

The second interviewee taught in an urban multicultural school. They had trained as an historian and taught for 12 years in their current school. Irish history was taught at Key Stage 1 but was included within some topics at Key Stage 2:

We only really approach it when it comes into other aspects of topics we are doing. For instance the way the Irish were used during the Wars of the Roses ... as cannon fodder really.

Elsewhere an Irish dimension was taught as an aspect of migration within the unit 'Britain since 1930'. However, no clear reasons were given for including an Irish dimension apart from an understanding that it was part of the National Curriculum. When asked about their perceptions of the history curriculum this interview supported a balance between skills and content but stressed that enquiry was of central importance. English, Welsh and Scottish

dimensions were related to topics as they arose. Black, multicultural and anti-racist history were related to within topics or Black History Month, although the interviewee was somewhat disparaging about the latter as being superficial. When asked about opportunities and constraints to their teaching they cited the National Curriculum and the tendency to focus on teaching history through the Literacy Strategy. This interviewee said that they would like to select their own topics related to Roman, Scottish and medieval history using archaeology and living history approaches. The overall impression given was that Irish and multicultural dimensions were included but the interviewee was not really committed to anti-racist approaches or an Irish dimension.

The third interviewee taught in an urban Roman Catholic school, which had a large proportion of children from the local Irish community. The interviewee had taught in the school for 20 years and had worked in both Key Stages 1 and 2. They had responsibility for co-ordinating History and Technology. The curriculum was organised into separate subjects, together with thematic weeks such as an 'International Week'. The interviewee regarded an Irish dimension as an important aspect of the history curriculum because of the background of the pupils. It was developed through occasional references and specific events at Key Stage 1 such as St. Patrick's Day or within themes such as a topic on 'Journeys'. The interviewee said that it featured within topics at Key Stage 2. They also promoted an Irish dimension with children in both Key Stages, when it was the focus of an International Week. An Irish dimension has also been linked to Citizenship when the children debated the 'Troubles' in the Young People's Parliament. When asked about other aspects of the history curriculum the interviewee supported a balance between skills and content. When asked about other dimensions they

commented, 'We obviously do English history. We do history of the British Isles but mainly it would be English and Irish, with a little bit of Scottish and Welsh.'

The interviewee indicated that multicultural history was important in their planning and made reference to Mary Seacole as a starting point for one of their international weeks. They regarded the National Curriculum as a constraint to curriculum and felt that their international weeks helped to deal with the restrictions which it imposed. They noted that the QCA schemes did not have an Irish dimension and needed to adjust in order to include it within their planning. This interviewee appeared to relate an Irish dimension within the context of a multicultural and global curriculum. At the same time they were aware of the distinction between British and English history. They had gone some way towards developing a British dimension, although from their comments this was primarily related to including an Irish dimension as a reflection of the children's background.

The fourth interviewee taught in an urban Roman Catholic school. They estimated that 40-45% of the school's pupils came from the Irish community. Approximately 15% of the school population came from other ethnic minority communities. The interviewee had taught in the school for three years but had previous experience working in two other schools of which one was in the inner city and the other was situated in a white working class estate. When teaching in a previous school they had taught an Irish dimension within a topic on immigration and related it to the experiences of other migrant groups. The interviewee said that an Irish dimension was taught within a range of contexts in their current school. Firstly, Grace O'Malley featured within studies of heroes from different cultures. Secondly, the

Famine/Hunger was an important feature in their curriculum. In addition, the interviewee said that they briefly looked at the Civil War (it is assumed that this reference was the Irish Civil War) as well as the current situation in Northern Ireland with year 4 pupils. The fact that the latter topics were taught 'briefly' suggests that they may have emerged from topics which were more explicitly grounded in the National Curriculum. The interviewee said that they considered an Irish dimension important because they wanted to set it in a wider context:

I am aware, certainly working within an Irish Catholic context [that] there is very much an Irish feeling in schools and as I have an Irish background myself I don't want to just switch from it being English orientated; that would be too negative ... I just try as far as possible with my own limited knowledge and experience to bring in as much influences as I can and look at the global.

This was developed more fully when the interviewee gave their reasons for developing an Irish dimension:

I feel as a person I have a huge commitment to justice ... I feel very committed to justice and anti-racist education. It is very important that we teach anti-racist education and I think history is one of the best ways to do that ... so there are all those reasons in order to help children to develop an alternative mindset to what they might be exposed to, either in the media or their social background or social upbringing. I am not trying to replace one dogma with another; I guess I am just trying to encourage them to think a little bit.

This implies that the interviewee related their work to the background of the pupils but used it to explore wider issues. They felt that an Irish dimension provided an opportunity to consider colonialism and a revisionist [rather than an Anglo-centric] approach to Britain's past. At the same time they felt that teaching about their background had a positive impact on the pupils:

I think it is a self-esteem thing as well. I really feel that so many children who are from minority background can't hook into a lot of aspects in the curriculum and I think it is absolutely essential that children see themselves within their learning and recognise their own people, their own names and that they have a sense of who they are and value that culture.

What did this interviewee have to say about other dimensions? They considered that both skills and content were important and valued opportunities to develop cross subject links. When asked about specific dimensions within the curriculum the interviewee made a distinction between their own teaching and that undertaken by other teachers in the school. Although they emphasised a global dimension they felt that other teachers in the school gave greater priority to English history. They did not refer to a Scottish dimension but said that Welsh heroes were taught alongside significant people from other cultures such as Mary Seacole. The interviewee supported anti-racism and the teaching of black history in schools, regardless of their ethnic population. They included black history within topics but criticised what they perceived as tokenistic activities such as singing and dancing undertaken during black history month. The interviewee felt that pupils and parents provided positive support towards developing an Irish dimension. Although they said that resources were limited it had been possible to obtain relevant materials during visits to Ireland and America. The interviewee considered that the QCA schemes of work were restrictive because teachers attached too much importance to them. They felt that the structure of the National Curriculum restricted opportunities for cross-curricular work. Nevertheless, a more serious problem was the fact that in their role as a history co-ordinator they seemed to have limited influence on the way in which other teachers in the school approached the history curriculum.

The fifth interviewee attended the Primary History Conference in May 2004. They had taught for 17 years and currently worked as a member of their school management team as an Advanced Skills Teacher. They worked in an urban school in southwest England. The interviewee said that their school intake included pupils drawn from a wide social spectrum. Some pupils did not stay in the region for a long period of time as a result of the fact that

parents had decided to stay there over the winter rather than returning home after their summer holiday. The school supported an integrated curriculum, which the interviewee believed to suit a subject like history. As a member of the school management team they ensured that everyone taught a history topic and that when this was done 75% of the skills were specific to history. The interviewee gave priority to skills over content. Their reason for including an Irish dimension was interesting in that they considered ways that Cornwall was linked with other Celtic societies:

I think it would be very wrong of the children to think ... Cornwall sits on its own ... I want them to realise that you have Brittany, Wales, Ireland and Scotland, and how these counties have a similar background and why they should be ruled by the development of England. So I think it is incredibly important not to think that 'We are special on our own' and there is that multicultural aspect [to this in there].

It was difficult to determine how fully the ideas within this statement were developed.

Nevertheless, the examples which they provided, suggest that their approach towards an Irish dimension was distinctive to say the least. When teaching about 'Invaders and Settlers' they said that since England [Romans, Saxons and Vikings] did not have a great impact on Cornwall they focused on its Celtic identity. Consequently it drew links with other Celtic areas such as Brittany, Wales and Ireland. The school promoted this by having had a Celtic Day, which included identity-enhancing activities such as craftwork and dancing. When teaching about the Tudor Rebellion they compared Cornish rebellions with the impact of Cromwell in Ireland. It is interesting to note that they made no reference to Ireland in the Tudor period, where figures such as Hugh O'Neil and Grace O'Malley may have provided more direct comparisons with events in Cornwall. Finally, when teaching the Victorians, links were made between people emigrating from Ireland as a result of the famine with people leaving the mines in Cornwall.

When asked about other aspects of the history curriculum it was clear that a Cornish focus was evident in their whole approach to the curriculum and the interviewee said that this had been praised by Ofsted. The interviewee had been involved in developing a local project entitled 'A Sense of Place' which was supported by the local education authority and was used to challenge the narrow focus of the QCA schemes. English history was still regarded as important. Anti-racist and multicultural dimensions were also considered, especially given the isolated nature of the region. However, the overall impression given was that this interviewee was primarily concerned with multicultural features of the local community and that an Irish dimension was used to support this rather than consider wider issues.

What 'fuzzy generalisations' emerge from the primary teacher interviewees? There was some variation within the responses, which reflected the way in which the interviewees constructed the past. The third and fourth interviewees provided the strongest links with local Irish communities and were the most committed towards developing an Irish dimension. However, they also related the dimension to a wider global and anti-racist perspective that went beyond a pre-occupation with the identity of their school population. The first interviewee went some way towards this perspective but an Irish dimension does not appear to have featured very strongly in their history curriculum. The fifth interviewee said that anti-racism was important but was more concerned with using an Irish dimension to highlight the Cornish identity. The second interviewee certainly made reference to an Irish dimension through the context of the War of the Roses and recent migration but does not appear to have had a clearly defined rationale for doing this beyond the National Curriculum. Most interviewees showed some awareness of the distinction between English and British history, but there was limited evidence to suggest that these distinctions were explored in practice. Most of the interviewees

felt that the National Curriculum and QCA schemes either directly or indirectly acted as constraints on the development of an Irish dimension, although it does not appear to have impacted upon their own perceptions. One interviewee also indicated that they had limited opportunities to influence the work undertaken by other teachers in the school. This raises issues about their opportunities to develop Irish and anti-racist dimensions together with wider issues about the role of a subject co-ordinator.

How far is it possible to identify common trends between the three case studies? Clearly the context and composition of the Birmingham History Mentor Case Study, the Head of History Case Study and the Primary History Co-ordinator Case Study made each of them distinctive from the rest. Can they provide a basis for making ‘fuzzy generalisations’ about the significance and nature of an Irish dimension in the history curriculum? What did the case studies suggest about an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3? The first case study included an eclectic range of responses to an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3. However, most interviewees indicated that it formed part of their history curriculum. In several cases the focus of the curriculum remained Anglo-centric but some interviewees went some way towards including it within British, multicultural or anti-racist constructs. The responses to Case Study 2 differed in that most interviewees developed an Irish dimension in order to support their work at Key Stage 4. Although some interviewees drew out British, multicultural or anti-racist features to their study of Ireland none of them exceeded what had been achieved by some interviewees in the first case study. The primary responses to Case Study 3 provided evidence of an Irish dimension although with possibly one or two exceptions responses compared more with Case Study 1 than Case Study 2. Overall, there was evidence of links between an Irish

dimension and multicultural and anti-racist history but its development was either limited, or the exception to the rule.

What did the case studies suggest about other dimensions? Virtually all responses said that skills and content were of equal importance with only a small minority stressing one at the expense of the other. Interviewees from all case studies emphasised the teaching of English history, although each case study included some teachers who set out to develop a British dimension. Welsh and Scottish dimensions had limited importance except within topics related to identity. Several interviewees taught Ireland at Key Stage 3 as preparation for Key Stage 4. Most interviewees made reference to multicultural and anti-racist dimensions although rhetoric was often stronger than reference to detail. Certainly multicultural dimensions featured more strongly than anti-racist dimensions, although each case study included at least one interviewee who had developed the latter.

What do the first and second case studies indicate about an Irish dimension at Key Stage 4? Whereas only two of the interviewees in the first case study who taught an Irish dimension taught Irish history at Key Stage 4, all of those in the second case study taught it at Key Stage 4. Everyone who taught an Irish dimension at this key stage did it as the Modern World Study within the School History Project, rather than as part of a Modern World Studies or Social and Economic History syllabus. Although interviewees in the second case study taught it at Key Stage 3 primarily for pragmatic reasons, strategic considerations affected interviewees from both case studies at Key Stage 4, in particular, the assumption that Ireland was easier to teach than the Arab-Israeli conflict. Several teachers considered the topic challenging for their pupils and two of them resolved this by structuring their assignments and/or approach to deal

with this issue. Some interviewees selected the Ireland Study because of their own knowledge or interest in the topic. There were also instances where interviewees drawn from both case studies related the topic to the multicultural nature of their local community. In a few cases the course was related to anti-racist issues, but this was not a significant feature within the case studies as a whole. Several interviewees who taught an Irish dimension in the first and second case studies taught an Irish dimension within their AS/A2 courses. Courses which included an Irish dimension related to the Civil War in the 17th century, Home Rule in the 19th century, the American Frontier, a two week optional study at the end of year 12, and as part of a Teacher in Development Education Project called 'Let's Talk'. Some interviewees from both case studies related an Irish dimension to British history within their sixth form teaching, although all teachers within the surveys did not adopt this approach.

The interviewees from all three case studies indicated a number of opportunities and constraints affecting the development of an Irish dimension. Links with local communities or their histories supported the development of an Irish dimension and some teachers used Irish people from the locality to support their teaching. Several interviewees in the first and second case studies raised concerns about the way in which senior management had reduced time allocated for history. In one case this had led to Irish history topics being removed from their course. The primary interviewees did not raise the issue of time allocation. Several interviewees from all three cases regarded the National Curriculum as a constraint on curriculum development. Several primary responses in the third case study also felt that QCA schemes were restrictive, although this was not an issue for the secondary interviewees. Two interviews within the first case study indicated the pressure to focus on cross-curricular skills reduced opportunities to develop an Irish dimension, but other teachers in their case study or

the other case studies did not replicate this concern. One primary co-ordinator interviewee indicated that in their role as history co-ordinator they had limited influence how other staff approached the history curriculum, which limited the extent that they were able to develop an Irish dimension. However, this issue was not raised by any of the other interviewees from either primary or secondary schools.

Overall, it appears that an Irish dimension was by no means invisible. However, the form it took depended on both the values and expertise of the interviewee as well as their general curriculum pressures, which affected their role. Several of the interviewees had used a range of resources and developed creative approaches to teaching an Irish dimension. A small number of primary and secondary teachers indicated that teaching an Irish dimension related to anti-racist values. In some cases it was linked to their perceptions of Britishness or links with the local Irish community. However, several of the teachers gave pragmatic reasons – either to prepare for work at Key Stage 4 or because it was considered less challenging than alternative Modern World Studies. These different political and practical stances have significance for the way in which the past is presented to pupils. The next chapter will explore two Irish related curriculum projects and explore both the rationale behind them and the values of the teachers involved in them in order to see how far they differed from those in the current chapter.

CHAPTER 5

PROJECT CASE STUDY I: PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATORS INVOLVED WITH TEACHERS IN DEVELOPMENT EDUCATION (TIDE)

'Teachers in Development Education' (TIDE) promotes development education in primary and secondary schools. The organisation was established in Birmingham in the mid 1970s and was called the Development Education Centre (DEC) until the late 1990s (in order to avoid confusion the organisation will be referred to as TIDE). The organisation's aims are:

to further development education practice and policy by enabling teachers, schools and organisations to adopt global dimensions and development perspectives as part of their own agenda. (TIDE [n.d.], p.1)

The organisation's projects have typically explored how social, political and environmental issues can be addressed as a means of resolving conflicts in a range of contexts. The organisation has changed from being primarily funded by Oxfam towards relying on grants from sponsors or the government. Given the political sensitivity associated with these issues it is important to consider how far they have been influenced by the agencies financing their work. From the outset it must be said that there was no evidence within the interviews or documentation to suggest that the organisation's policies were inhibited by its sponsors. This perception was confirmed by a conversation with a member of staff at Birmingham University who has worked with TIDE for many years. Since the early 1980s it has supported five projects which have included an Irish dimension. The projects explored general global themes and were cross-curricular in approach. Nevertheless, they included references to Ireland's past. Consequently, this chapter will investigate the implications of TIDE's work by examining the perceptions of the Director, Project Facilitator and three teachers who have been involved in its most recent projects.

The Project Facilitator was interviewed in April 2005 and the Director in the following August. The Director had been involved with the organisation since it was established in the mid-1970s and the Project Facilitator had been in role since 1997.

The researcher had known both interviewees for a number of years and had been involved in two projects related to an Irish dimension at the end of the 1980s and early 1990s. The Director provided the following rationale to explain how they worked with teachers:

I think an operational principle [in our work] is that our objective has been to engage teachers in the process of curriculum change, not to be on the outside.

This partly reflected the small size of the organisation as well as the nature of its work with local teachers. The implication of this was that the teachers were fully involved in the planning and the production of resources related to Ireland. The Project Facilitator said that the objectives of their work were encapsulated in a pamphlet written in 1999 called *Essential Learning for Everyone: Civil Society, World Citizenship and the Role of Education*. The Director was involved in editing and writing this pamphlet which set out to explore development education issues within partners in Scotland, Wales, England and Ireland (North and Republic) within the Development Education Commission. The Project Facilitator said that the booklet summarised the key areas of their work. This was presented as a spider diagram with the title 'The adjectival educations' above it. In the middle of the page was the caption 'A core essential for everyone'. This caption was linked to other captions showing the scope of their work which included Development Education, Environmental Education, Peace Education, Gender Education, Multicultural Education, Anti-Racist Education and Human Rights Education. These cross-curricular 'adjectival educations' overlaid the subjects in the National Curriculum.

The Director and Project Facilitator explained how their work included a historical dimension. The Director made a case for understanding the past in a global context:

One of the problems historically is that we tend to see the global thing as if it is somewhere else ... not because it is part of what we are, and that is a historical attitude and problem. We are back to Empire and superiority ... and being an island.

The Project Facilitator related this to pupil needs:

If you want to equip young people to be active participants in the world that we are living in today then one of the ways that you do that is that you need to give them an understanding of what has happened in the past, to learn from that in order to think about changes needed [now]. So ... we would argue and underline the global ... you might be looking at Birmingham's history but it is in terms of how Birmingham is connected to the wider world - so global isn't always looking at somewhere else, global can be about looking at your own place.

These comments provide a useful starting point for understanding how TIDE came to include an Irish dimension within their exploration of global issues. The Director explained that their interest in Ireland grew out of work related to Ethiopia in the 1980s:

What we recognised was that when we were talking about our personal histories here and Ireland ... there was a commonality ... and not least the whole idea of stereotypes; the idea that how we saw Ethiopia depended on how you saw Ethiopians and if you saw them as being useless and helpless this was racist and didn't help you to understand their situation, but that was also true [of stereotypes] between England and Ireland and we began to explore that.

The Irish Famine/Hunger was regarded as the most obvious comparison with issues in Ethiopia, although the specific nature of each event was appreciated:

... you could draw on case studies that were from different disciplines historically and contemporary and recognise that there were things to learn about famines in Africa now based on the Famine in Ireland. It wasn't the same but these were the things we were thinking.

When considering the current situation in Ireland the Director felt that it was often glossed over in England as if it was not part of the conflict. They compared the way in which people saw images of famine in Africa and argued that it was important to encourage children to discuss the background to these issues.

The Director worked closely with colleagues in both the Republic and Northern Ireland from the early 1980s and these links have had a major impact on its work. From the outset they had a strong partnership with the Director of Trocaire, a development education organisation in Dublin. Trocaire was established in 1973 as the overseas development agency of the Catholic Church in Ireland and in this sense it differed from TIDE, which was a secular organisation. The Bishops of Ireland expressed concern about the suffering of the world's poorest and most oppressed people. Its mission has been to promote:

a just world where people's dignity is ensured, rights are respected and basic needs are met; where there is equity in the sharing of resources and people are free to be the authors of their own development. (Trocaire, 2006)

Trocaire was given a dual mandate to support the poor and inform the Irish public about the root causes of poverty and injustice and mobilise the public to bring about global change. The first meeting between the DEC and Trocaire was held in Greystones, County Wicklow in the Republic of Ireland in 1984. Discussions from this ultimately led to a publication in 1985 entitled *Half the Lies are true...Ireland Britain: a microcosm of international misunderstanding?* Specific chapters looked at issues related to Irish identity, colonialism, and the way in which the School History Project textbook dealt with Northern Ireland, together with experiential exercises exploring solutions to the conflict. The project led to a second project located in Birmingham and Dublin, which led to a publication entitled *Colonialism, Conflict and Community* (Bridle & McCarthy, 1993). This explored environmental as well social, political and historical issues associated with development education in England, Ireland and South America. This included examples from Ireland

including references to the Belfast Peace Line as part of a thematic study of conflict and the Siege of Drogheda within a study of colonialism.

During the early 1990s TIDE hosted a project for Oxfam which was intended to explore the peace-process and the issues facing people in a range of contexts including Northern Ireland. Local teachers developed teaching materials using resources such as transcripts of the experiences of people living through the transition from war to peace. The publication which resulted from this project, entitled *Making Peace: Teaching about Conflict and Reconciliation at Key Stages 3 and 4* (Garlake & Welshman, 1997) did not include materials related to Northern Ireland. The Director suggested that this was because senior management at Oxfam were concerned about producing a pack related to Ireland at a time when people like Gerry Adams were still not allowed to be directly heard in the media. The irony of this is that a chapter related to Bosnia, where the level of conflict was considerably greater, replaced the study of Northern Ireland.

During the late 1990s TIDE became involved in a particularly innovative project which focused on a series of conferences involving sixth form students from Birmingham, Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. The project was called *Let's Talk* and it took place between 1998-2003. The project was initiated by an organisation called 80:20 Educating and Acting for a Better World (its title reflects the uneven distribution of wealth in the world). The organisation was set up in 1996 by the Director of Trocaire as an independent charity and was based at Brayes in the Republic of Ireland. This organisation focused on young people and the following introduction to its work suggests that it used an experiential approach towards engaging them in equality issues:

In practical terms 80:20 is about working with young people throughout Ireland, North and South, to explore and debate these issues. It is also about promoting human rights ... our job is to work with people to face a series of complex and challenging questions which are, at first sight, about the situation of others but, upon reflection, about ourselves and about what we stand for. (Regan, 1996, p.2)

In addition to 80:20 the conferences were supported by a range of organisations including the 'Speak your Peace Project' based at the University of Ulster, 'The World Education Project' based in Sligo in the Republic of Ireland, 'Australians for Native Title and Reconciliation', 'Development Education for Youth' as well as TIDE. The conferences provided opportunities for young people to be given a central role in working with adults, including politicians as well as each other. The Director stressed the importance of this:

The idea was that there should be an opportunity for dialogue ... The young people took a lead role in those conferences and they involved engaging politicians or engaging community leaders and indeed other people from other places.

Conferences were held in Sligo and Birmingham in 1998 and Bray, Belfast and Birmingham in 1999 and involved over 2000 young people (80: 20 *Let's Talk*, n.d.). Over 1,900 of the young people involved took part in a referendum on the Good Friday Agreement in May 1998. The fact that the project took place during a critical stage of the peace process had a particular resonance for 6th form students in Ireland. Each of the conferences included students from six or seven Birmingham schools. The Director provided a succinct reason why issues related to the current situation in Ireland were relevant in England in their contribution to *Let's Talk: A Review*:

We in Birmingham have a particular interest in such a project. There are many families from Ireland who have made Birmingham their home. The Birmingham pub bombing which was nearly 25 years ago had a considerable impact on local community relations but we, like most of England, continue to see conflict in Ireland as a purely local issue. The reasons for this are sometimes difficult to figure. This is 'the English Question'. It deserves an airing not because it will make an interesting history debate but because it has to be part of the reconciliation process, part of the lessons we should learn. (80: 20, 2000, p.15)

The Project Facilitator suggested three specific ways in which the conferences enhanced the students' level of understanding. They said that the conferences provided an opportunity for young people and teachers to become engaged in discussion and debate about issues of conflict and particularly what was happening in Northern Ireland. Secondly, they considered that it was important to have this opportunity because the school curriculum provided little opportunity to access information or to debate such issues. It was felt that this was particularly important at the time given the political significance of the Peace Process. Thirdly, they had observed that many young people and their teachers said they did not understand what was happening in Northern Ireland. They argued that this lack of awareness of the history and background of the current political situation affected people's confidence to enter into any discussion about it.

Events in Northern Ireland were an important feature of student discussions. Indeed, a booklet entitled *Let's Talk: Northern Ireland: A Briefing Paper* (80:20, n.d.) which emerged from the conferences was produced by young people involved in the project. This booklet provided an annotated timeline of events in Ireland since 1916, together with information about current issues in the area. The review demonstrated ways in which participants drew on Ireland's history. However the Project Facilitator emphasised that the project had broader objectives than this:

The idea of the project was to support or give young people, 6th form aged students, an opportunity to engage with and discuss and debate issues of conflict, peace and reconciliation. There was part of the project that focused on Northern Ireland and the 'Troubles', but that wasn't the dominant thing; it was about looking at some of these issues in a global context. So for example ... when we had one of the conferences in Ireland it focused on travellers ... looked at in terms of travelling communities in different parts of the world, and similarly some of the youngsters from Birmingham, you know, they might run a workshop looking at some of the issues [of] living in a multicultural city ... So what was very interesting was that when you did have a look

at what was happening in Belfast and Northern Ireland, there were lots of common issues drawn out.

The debates went beyond Ireland and provided opportunities to look at a range of issues with examples drawn from different parts of the world. For example, discussions related to reconciliation in Northern Ireland also considered issues facing Aborigines in Australia. The conferences also considered conflict and reconciliation in other contexts such as Rwanda, Sudan, Mozambique and the Middle East. It remains to be seen how far the teachers who supported the project related this to their history curriculum but it is worth noting the qualified comment made by the Project Facilitator:

I have to be honest, in some schools they didn't particularly relate it to the curriculum, it was something they saw as being an extra curricular opportunity - it was about enriching [pupil experiences].

Nevertheless, they felt that the project did have a direct impact on the teachers:

I think it inspired them in terms of what you can do in terms of stimulating debate. Getting discussion from young people, gave them lots of ideas for approaches, techniques and methodology for really stimulating discussion.

Perhaps of more significance with respect to an Irish dimension was the fact that some teachers became involved in a second project from 2000-2005. Their work was to lead to the publication of a pack call *Building New Citizenship: Learning from change in Derry/Londonderry* (TIDE, 2001) to build on their experiences (the reference to Derry and Londonderry relates to Nationalist and Loyalist definitions of the city). The Project facilitator explained the importance of being able to build on the teacher involvement in the *Let's Talk Project*:

If we were trying to do the Derry project from cold we would have really struggled to have got a group together initially and you would have had to do a lot of work with that cold teacher group to get them from up to speed on some issues about Northern Ireland. Because of *Let's Talk* we had a whole body of teachers who were suddenly

buzzing ... they were saying to us 'We as teachers are interested in some of this stuff now. Where do we start? ... the Derry Project mainly involved people who had been involved with the *Let's Talk* project because they were crying out for opportunities to get stuck into the stuff themselves. So the *Let's Talk* Project was the format for it if you like.

The new project was intended to support the introduction of Citizenship into the National Curriculum. A short visit to Northern Ireland was undertaken to enable the participants to produce teaching materials, which explicitly related to Northern Ireland. The Project Facilitator provided some insight into the experiential nature of the visit and the role of the teachers from the start of the project:

Initially we hadn't decided to focus on Derry ... we had a hunch that Derry might be the place so we went and stayed there for about five days and we also did spend some time in Belfast. It was a weeklong study visit. We came back here and then there was a whole series of meetings ... We were thinking about the curriculum and then the group ... began to develop some teaching materials for classrooms.

The Director felt that the decision to focus on Derry/Londonderry had a number of advantages:

Derry is not a very big city but everything ... is there including a very difficult history ... there is a phenomenal interest in citizenship [in Derry/Londonderry]; they don't always use that name but the idea that you are building a vision for the future, you are getting investment, you are getting jobs ... so the notion of community projects and all those things, they are reconciliation.

However, they also stressed the fact that this served the purpose of exploring issues, which could be related to the context in which the pupils lived:

The argument was that by looking at citizenship somewhere else you can say, 'What kind of citizenship are we trying to build or how do things connect here or what is our vision of citizenship?'

The resource pack consisted of a series of photographs and a supporting booklet, which contained information pages and decision-making tasks. A brief examination of the pack's contents indicates the significance of a historical dimension. The photographs include a series

of pictures related to current development issues, although some contain explicit historical references such as the city walls or coat of arms. The first part of the booklet comprised a series of contextual overviews including a time line of key events between the establishment of the Londonderry Company in 1558 and the Belfast Agreement of 1998, a brief diagrammatic overview of Northern Ireland politics and current contemporary issues such as policing reform and the community marches. Some attempt was made to link developments in Northern Ireland with related developments in Britain as a whole. This was clearly seen in the way that the writers of the pack compared the way in which the Patten Report on policing in Northern Ireland with the McPherson Report called for the police force to reflect the communities which it served.

The second part of the booklet consisted of a series of decision-making exercises. The first exercise required pupils to explore identity issues by analysing flags and logos from different parts of Britain, Ireland and the world. Pupils then deconstructed images of murals and discussed the citizenship issues associated with them. Pupils were asked to consider images, which could be used to represent Derry/Londonderry in the future. Other tasks required pupils to explore economic development issues and solutions, as well as the case for and against and community marches. The tasks were followed by an account of two projects related to the following theme: 'The need for greater understanding about the different perspectives and views about our past, if we are to support greater cross-community participation in future' (TIDE, 2001, p.45). One of these projects involved producing an animated film of the Battle of the Somme and the Easter Rising - two events which were central features of their different community histories. The final exercise involved linking Derry/Londonderry to its wider

context. Throughout the project pupils were given tasks which encouraged them to relate the issue raised in Derry/Londonderry to their own locality.

How far did the five projects support an Irish dimension in the history curriculum? It is important to appreciate a number of constraints affecting this question in addition to the fact that the primary focus of the projects was not to develop knowledge and understanding of Irish history. The focus of much of the work related to recent problems and contemporary issues. Some projects were also affected by external constraints. The reluctance of Oxfam to include an Irish section in its Making Peace publications is particularly alarming in this respect. *The Let's Talk* Project had to overcome the fact that whereas financial (presumably government) resources were readily available to support reconciliation within Ireland it was not felt appropriate to provide this for English participants. Finally, both the Director and the Project Facilitator considered that the project had not proved popular with teachers. The Project Facilitator commented:

I would say if you are looking at sales of materials, it is one indicator that you could look at in a tangible way – I would say ‘very disappointing’. It is one of the resources that hasn’t attracted a lot of people to come and buy it. We have had to work really hard; we have used it in workshops and [when] people have come across it in a session, they have got really excited [but] we have advertised it in our catalogue and web site and all those sorts of things and it just hasn’t really grabbed people at all.

The Director and Project Facilitator argued that the theme might have been ahead of its time. The Project Facilitator also suggested that the publication’s title and packaging might have been an issue. It is interesting to note that they were about to undertake another project in Northern Ireland but suggested that publications, which arise from it, would refer to citizenship rather than its location in Northern Ireland. Finally, although not specifically

related to an Irish dimension, the Project Facilitator suggested that curriculum development could be restricted by conservative attitudes in schools:

I think that there has been a lot of rigidity in the curriculum and teachers have not had a lot of flexibility ... There has been a sense of it all being laid down in advance ... I think that where teachers have been encouraged a little bit by senior staff in the school to just be a little more flexible about it there is absolutely no problem with it either through history, literacy or science. Looking at a whole range of issues [in a] global context there is just not really a problem at all. It is about how you see the opportunity. It is about how you make these connections and it is about teacher confidence.

Nevertheless, there are a number of positive comments which can be made about TIDE's contribution to an Irish dimension. Firstly, a significant number of Birmingham sixth form pupils experienced opportunities to discuss the situation in Northern Ireland through the *Let's Talk* project. Secondly, the projects and publications produced since the early 1980s included an Irish historical dimension. The project materials based on Derry/Londonderry (TIDE, 2001) certainly provided material which could be used to teach current events there in a historical context at either Key Stage 3 or the Modern World Study at Key Stage 4.

The two projects discussed above included a number of history teachers. This has provided an opportunity to investigate how they reacted to the projects and whether it can be reflected in their perception of an Irish dimension in the history curriculum. Seven teachers, of whom five were historians, wrote the *Derry/Londonderry Project*. All five were contacted and three agreed to be interviewed. The following analysis will analyse the reasons why each of these history teachers became involved with TIDE and with their role in developing projects. This will be followed by an analysis of their perceptions of an Irish dimension within the history curriculum and the extent to which they made links between their work with TIDE and the history curriculum.

The first teacher interviewee was of Irish nationality. They were interviewed by telephone in August 2005. At the time of the interview the teacher had recently taken up the post of Head of Humanities in an international school in Portugal. However, they had previously taught in several schools in the West Midlands including two Roman Catholic schools and one local authority school. The two Roman Catholic schools in which they had worked had links with the Irish community. The local education authority school was described as having a White British population. The interviewee had originally become involved with TIDE in 1997 as part of a curriculum group which produced a pack called *Water for a City – an issue for debate in Victorian Birmingham* (TIDE, 1999) which related to development issues associated with providing water for Birmingham in the mid 19th century. After this they took part in the *Let's Talk* project. The interviewee felt that the central feature of this project was the way in which it provided opportunities for student involvement and participation. They also emphasised the way anti-racist issues in the pack provided opportunities to compare issues in Northern Ireland with other contexts:

Some of the resources we used in an international context ... do have anti-racist connotations because when you start comparing situations vis à vis Northern Ireland or Israel or South Africa in a general way, you can make connections.

The interviewee's explanation of how the project based on Derry/Londonderry emerged:

Let's Talk raised a number of questions, and a number of teachers involved with TIDE said that they would like to have the opportunity to find out more and develop their knowledge of Northern Ireland and what was taking place there so that they could feel more confident about doing things in the classroom.

This supported the views of the Director and Project Facilitator although it emphasised the Irish context more explicitly. This perception was supported by further comments, which indicated how aspects of the resource were intended to help history teachers:

We didn't feel that they needed to be history teachers to use it but the truth would be that history teachers would be more likely to use it ... It [the pack] was first intended to enable teachers to be more confident and second to give them resources that would allow them to teach aspects of Irish history reasonably well, specifically Northern Ireland.

The interviewee felt that materials related to Derry/Londonderry could be used for teaching the Modern World Study within the School History Project at Key Stage 4 as well as Personal, Social and Health Education within their school. However, they did not provide specific details about its implementation.

What was their perception of an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3? The interviewee said that an Irish dimension featured in their curriculum when they taught in Roman Catholic schools where teachers and the community supported it. When asked about other aspects of the curriculum they supported both skills and content. When they taught in the local education authority school they focused on traditional English and World History themes and Black Peoples of the Americas. They did not teach Welsh and Scottish dimensions in any of their schools and felt inhibited in developing an Irish dimension when they taught in the local authority school. This was partly because they felt a non-specialist teacher in their department would have found difficulty in teaching it. However, a more significant factor was the interviewee's reaction to racism directed towards their identity:

The racist element was very important and it was the first time that I received racist comments as an Irish teacher that I had to deal with myself, and I found that quite alien ... it was very important that we brought in subjects that were going to raise those issues ... in that context you had to be able not to jump and bite all the time when students said something you mightn't like.

It is interesting to note that they felt that the students liked studying about Ireland at Key Stage 4. Here they provided a broad history of the situation in Northern Ireland and an

assignment based on 'Bloody Sunday'. They had found TIDE materials related to Ireland were useful but felt that in general shortages of resources were a problem for teachers trying to develop an Irish dimension. It appears that despite the fact that this interviewee appears to have been committed to exploring an Irish historical dimension in their work with TIDE, it is difficult to see how fully this was implemented in their own Key Stage 3 history curriculum, which must have left considerable work to be undertaken at Key Stage 4.

The second interviewee was also Irish and had taught in a Roman Catholic girls' school for eight years, five of which had been as Head of History. The interview took place in January 2006. The interviewee said that most members of the history department were of Irish descent. A large proportion of the girls in the school were either the second or third generation Irish, although in recent years the multicultural communities served by the school had diversified. The interviewee had initially been invited to join the *Water for a City Project* (TIDE, 1999) by their PGCE mentor. They had been invited to join the project based on Derry/Londonderry (TIDE, 2001) by the first interviewee who taught in her PGCE placement school.

We went to Ireland for five days, which was excellent, such an eye opener really. I got to talk with people who had been in prison and had been reformed and there was the Provisional Irish Republican Army, which was quite frightening.

The interviewee helped to produce resources for the pack and went on to use it in school.

However, they said that it did not fit into their history curriculum and was used within

Citizenship/Personal, Social and Health Education. However, the interviewee felt that taking part in the project had influenced their teaching:

It [TIDE] has given me [a] global understanding which I didn't have when I started teaching at all. I think we always try to refer back to what is going on in the world today. Even more recent wars and the anti-racist thing comes through there an awful lot more than I would have done.

The fact that the interviewee did not explicitly relate their work with TIDE to their history curriculum is surprising given both the nature of their school intake and the specific focus of the materials based on Derry/Londonderry. It is of course possible that these attributes were still evident in their treatment of an Irish dimension. The interviewee said that they taught some Irish history within their curriculum but that there was scope for them to do more. They said that Cromwell was covered briefly in year 8 but and gave much greater emphasis on teaching the Famine/Hunger in year 9:

We teach the Irish Famine at the start of year 9. So in the context of industrialising Britain we talk about Ireland where industrialisation didn't happen and then the effects on the Irish people. In fact we did a big study there and obviously our aim is to try and teach the girls a little about their history because we have lots of Irish girls. So that's probably a good ten weeks we spend on the Famine.

The fact that the interviewee did not use the term 'Hunger' suggested that they were not including controversial aspects of the subject. However, the following comment suggests that different interpretations were a central feature of their approach:

As you know, as far as anti-racist education goes it [the Famine/Hunger] leaves a lot for discussion because our key focus 'God created the potato blight and he created the famine so that is how it started' [is down to] all sorts of interpretation. So it leads to masses of discussion, and it affects the rest of the world through immigration.

Some reference was also made to famines in general, although the interviewee said that the focus was on its impact in Britain. It is difficult to claim that this approach was encouraged through the interviewee's work with TIDE as they indicated that the topic was based on the subject knowledge of a department member who had undertaken an Irish study as part of their degree. The school did not teach about Ireland within their Key Stage 4 History course, although it did feature within the context of Gladstone and Home Rule within their AS/A2

course. Some pupils with Irish backgrounds chose to undertake personal studies related to Ireland.

There were a number of constraints, which the interviewee said affected the development of an Irish dimension in the history curriculum. They considered that National Curriculum 2000 and QCA schemes were restrictive and felt that it would be useful to have an enquiry which focused on Ireland. This comment was surprising given that unit 17 of the QCA schemes is entitled 'Divided Ireland - why has it been so hard to achieve peace in Ireland?' (QCA, 2000). The interviewee also felt constrained because they felt that there were not enough resources related to Ireland. The interviewee said that they had had conversations with the Ireland in Schools Project and would like to get involved with its work at a later date.

The interviewee's comments about their history curriculum as a whole began with the following comment:

I think it is very much a mixture. At the moment the whole work is [concerned with] work related learning and enterprise. It is where you have to look at what you are and the skills you are delivering as much as the content. The skills that we teach are very important, how to balance, how to make decisions, how to work together as a group. But what I think makes it [History] special and why we love it is because the context is important as well ... that's what motivates and enthuses and engages the pupils.

This statement suggests that primarily pragmatism and the desire to select topics which would interest the pupils drove the interviewee. The interviewee said that English History dominated their course. No mention was made of Welsh and Scottish dimensions. Multicultural and anti-racist history were considered important but were not regarded as a key focus of the course. Nevertheless, the following comment suggests that they were explored through different topics:

We can draw out influences of the world, such as the First World War and the role that the Empire played in that, and that brings in your black history and anti-racist history ... I was thinking about anti-racist history, particularly, certainly through the treatment of Jews and we really do make a big thing of it with year 7 with the treatment of the Jews in Medieval England and we trace it in year 9 and again in year 11 and then we do make links with the Stephen Lawrence Enquiry and try and introduce some current affairs when we can.

The interviewee felt that there was a good case for building more black history into their curriculum in future as a means of motivating growing numbers of African-Caribbean girls in the school. The overall impression given from this interviewee is that they considered that their approach towards history teaching was enhanced through involvement with TIDE. Their history curriculum, including their treatment of Ireland, reflects sympathies with both development education issues and looking at different interpretations of the past, although in some respects it was traditional in approach. It is not really possible to state that this involvement directly affected their treatment of an Irish dimension but certainly there are similar dispositions evident in their work in school and their involvement with TIDE.

The third interviewee was a history teacher and an Advanced Skills Teacher for Citizenship. The interview took place in September 2005. The interviewee taught in a multicultural school, which included pupils from both middle class and socially deprived backgrounds. By coincidence the Head of History was the fourth interviewee within the pilot study in Chapter 4. The interviewee initially became involved with the *Water for a City Project* (TIDE, 1999) before supporting the *Let's Talk* and Derry/Londonderry (TIDE, 2001) projects. Like the other interviewees involved with the *Let's Talk* project they commented on the central role which sixth form pupils played in the project. However, they also stressed the significance of the project in challenging the sixth formers' pre-conceptions:

Lots of kids in Ireland said, This is the first time I have seen different types of people from me [a reference to the multicultural intake of the group from Birmingham] in the

same room and the whole issue of having to deal with people from elsewhere who are coming to Ireland. But it's not just that it was the whole dimension of 'The Troubles' and the dimension of the differences between Loyalist and Nationalist and Unionist and Sinn Fein ... which our kids found very confusing, but they were prepared to have a go at it.

This demonstrated the value of providing opportunities for young people from different communities to meet and discuss issues related to their different contexts. The interviewee stressed that the conferences had a skills focus but looked at a range of international conflicts such as Rwanda and Iraq. The effect of the project was to develop pupils' debating skills, which enhanced the quality of their AS/A2 studies, as well as developing their political awareness. The interviewee then became involved in the project based on Derry/Londonderry. They gave more detailed comments than the other interviewees about the people they met and places were visited. They talked with the Ballymena Flower Festival where contacts between the two communities were beginning again. The group also went to the Bogside and the site of 'Bloody Sunday in Derry/Londonderry, together with the Shankill and Falls Roads in Belfast. As a result of this they developed materials related to identity, including the significance of murals and issues associated with policing, community divisions within the council and local geography. The interviewee argued that the project was essentially about communities and that issues associated with the polarisation of communities in Derry/Londonderry were equally relevant in Leeds and Bradford where divisions were emerging.

What was the impact of TIDE on the interviewee's work in school? Clearly the interviewee was not a Head of History and their role was related to Citizenship Education. However, they considered that Citizenship and History could not be separated. At the same time the Head of History was always willing to trial materials which had been developed by TIDE. It is also possible to identify their perceptions of what was taught even if they did not have ultimate

responsibility for the history curriculum. The interviewee felt that occasional references were made to Ireland in their course. They made no reference to the Development of Multicultural Britain unit, which had been discussed by the Head of Department and included references to Irish immigration. However, they indicated that the Derry/Londonderry materials had proved useful in developing a unit about Identities with year 8 pupils:

Things like the murals [can be used] as an example of what some people think Britishness is ... because we still have debates sometimes about whether kids think themselves to be English or British or British Asian ... a lot of that has come from my understanding of identities through the pack that we wrote.

The interviewee appears to have selected an aspect of their work with TIDE to support an Irish dimension in the history curriculum in school. They said that it was unlikely an Irish dimension would be developed more fully because the school had an explicit focus on world issues. Nevertheless, the interviewee appreciated that Ireland was linked to both British history and the development of Empire.

What did the interviewee have to say about other aspects of the history curriculum? They felt that skills rather than content were important in history teaching. When dealing with other dimensions they regarded English history as important provided that it was related to local and global contexts. Welsh and Scottish dimensions were considered to be of limited importance apart from the study of national identity. Black, multicultural and anti-racist dimensions were regarded as important. The interviewee supported the stance of the Head of History analysed in Chapter 4, which stressed the importance of teaching pre-colonial Africa, slavery and resistance to it, which related to anti-racist approaches. They also made reference to using TIDE materials, such as pictures of Africa in order to challenge stereotypical images. Overall, this interviewee may have been selective in the Irish materials, which they used in school and only taught limited amounts of Irish history, but the approach used suggests that it

closely related to their work with TIDE. The link between an Irish dimension in the history curriculum and anti-racist and global issues appears to have been a significant feature of their work.

How far can links be made between TIDE projects and an Irish dimension in the history curriculum? It is appropriate to restate the fact that the underlying rationale for TIDE's work was to promote development education and it did not specifically set out to establish this development within the history curriculum. Nevertheless, it drew links between aspects of Irish history and other global issues through a succession of projects related to Ireland from the early 1980s. The focus of most work related to the emergence of the recent conflict in the north rather than a broadly based approach towards understanding Ireland's past. It has also attempted to explore different attitudes towards the conflict. In this sense it has much in common with the overall focus of the School History Project. However, whereas the latter certainly required pupils to compare the situation in Northern Ireland with different contexts, the comments from the interviewees indicate that TIDE focused on global issues and used recent events in Ireland to exemplify ideas such as conflict and resolution and compare them with other contexts. Its also commonly related the situation in Northern Ireland to issues within multicultural Britain.

It is difficult to gauge the impact of the various projects with teachers in the region, although disappointing sales for the pack based on Derry/Londonderry suggest that some caution is needed when considering the pack's wider impact. Nevertheless, the substantial numbers of sixth formers attending the *Let's Talk* project reflects an innovative teaching and learning approach, whether or not work related to Ireland was embedded into the school history

curriculum. The analysis of the three teachers committed to recent work in Ireland provides some indication of the impact of the projects and whether they affected the teaching of an Irish dimension. In all three cases the main impact of involvement with TIDE related to their understanding and teaching of global issues, anti-racism and human rights issues. Although the impact of this on the whole curriculum varied between the three interviewees it certainly affected their perceptions of the past. The first interviewee taught an Irish dimension in school, certainly at Key Stage 4, but it was difficult to gauge how far they developed an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3. It was also difficult to suggest how TIDE had a direct influence on their course. Overall, the impact of the school intake affected the priority given to an Irish dimension. The second interviewee was more specific about their treatment of an Irish dimension, which certainly related to development education approaches. However, it could equally reflect simply a well-informed approach to historical interpretations of 19th century Ireland. Some attempt was made to relate Irish experiences more widely but this was limited. Their overall history curriculum was quite traditional but it was evident that they used opportunities to draw out anti-racist and human rights issues. The third interviewee did not develop an Irish dimension within many aspects of the curriculum but had directly incorporated Irish based materials from TIDE into their teaching. This interviewee clearly appreciated links between Irish history and global and anti-racist dimensions within their work.

Overall, it appears that working with TIDE certainly influenced teacher perceptions of an Irish dimension and this may have had some impact on their approach to the curriculum. However, it would be unwise to assume that involvement in the TIDE project had a substantial impact on the teaching of an Irish dimension in the history curriculum.

CHAPTER 6

PROJECT CASE STUDY 2: PERCEPTIONS OF EDUCATORS INVOLVED WITH THE IRELAND IN SCHOOLS PROJECT

The 'Ireland in Schools' project is a voluntary organisation that has been supported by private donations rather than government grants. The original programme was started in September 1989 at the Institute of Irish Studies in Liverpool and was closely linked with the Warrington Project in 1993. However, since March 2000 the organisation has been totally independent and the chairperson has worked directly with teachers, advisers and teacher educators. The organisation's website indicates that it wants to make an Irish dimension part of the mainstream curriculum:

Aim

The aim of IiS is to make Ireland a part of the normal curriculum in Britain, from primary schools to sixth forms, by making it easy for teachers to draw upon Ireland in their teaching.

Inspiration

The original inspiration was to underpin the peace process in Ireland by fostering better understanding of Ireland in Britain through young people.

Educational life of its own

However, the programme has taken on an educational life of its own by

- addressing key curriculum issues
- enriching the teaching and learning experience for teachers and pupils alike and
- making learning fun as well as challenging.

(<http://www.iisresource.org>)

The site indicates how Ireland in Schools has shifted from having a specific political focus on facilitating the peace process in Ireland towards relating this to wider issues. The following statement indicates how this was linked to diversity issues as well as more broadly based changes in the school curriculum:

- *Contributes* towards the teaching of citizenship, mutual understanding, ethnic and cultural diversity and British history by helping to extend the curriculum beyond the Anglo-centric focus of most published resources.
- *Promotes* current developments in the curriculum including the primary and secondary National Strategies and the needs of the child.
- *Enhances* potential by developing thinking skills, links with English, including historical fiction, and a range of creative approaches from drama to dance.

This suggests that despite its independence the organisation seeks to work within the initiatives set by government as a means of integrating an Irish dimension into the school curriculum. Ireland in Schools supports both primary and secondary schools by producing curriculum materials such as booklets, CD ROMS and, more recently, through its website.

The chairperson, an academic historian and former Director of Irish Studies at Liverpool University, is the driving force behind the organisation's work. Given their role they could be easily identified and permission was given to name them that dealt with ethical issues highlighted within the BERA (2004) guidelines. However, this is an issue which appears in several chapters, and in order to provide at least partial privacy to interviewees and also to focus on their perceptions rather than their identities it has been decided to avoid naming interviewees. Although the work produced by the interviewees is available on the Ireland in Schools website it will not be cited directly within this research. The only exceptions will be two interviewees who independently made reference to their work in the public domain through their publications.

This chapter will investigate the Ireland in Schools project's work by examining the perceptions of its chairperson together with mini case studies of clusters of teachers and curriculum advisers who have supported its work. It is appropriate to state that the researcher has known the chairperson since 1998 and developed materials for Ireland in Schools. This

issue will be dealt with by investigating projects which did not involve the researcher. Most interviewees were not known to the researcher before their interview. The nature of any prior professional contact will be indicated when the data from each interviewee is analysed.

The work of Ireland in Schools has been the subject of three newspaper articles. The first two articles appeared in the *Times Educational Supplement* and the third in the *Daily Mail*, a British tabloid newspaper renowned for its conservative views. The first article in *The Times Educational Supplement* in 1999 was entitled 'Spell of Celtic Magic'. The article began with a poignant reference to a plaque commemorating the death of two children after an IRA bomb exploded in Warrington in 1993 (Brennan, 1999). The uncle of one of the children had taken on the task of replying to thousands of letters of condolence and noted that many of them had been sent by school children. He decided to go into some local Warrington schools and ask children to write to their peers in Ireland, but was surprised by their responses:

It struck me how little was known about Ireland - about the history that had led to this [the bomb blast in Warrington which killed his nephew] and about the everyday lives of the Irish people who were as shocked as we were. Teachers had children asking 'What's the IRA?' and 'Why did they bomb us?' and didn't know what to say to them. (Brennan, 1999, p.8)

This experience led the Warrington Project, which was established to promote better understanding amongst young people in Britain and Ireland. In Britain the project concentrated on introducing Irish Studies into the National Curriculum. Ireland in Schools combined with the Warrington Project in 1993 and the chairperson of Ireland in Schools led the Education sub-committee of the Warrington Project. The newspaper article outlined the approach by which the project brought an Irish dimension into the curriculum:

... a low-key "back-burner" approach, producing course outlines and in-service training materials that slot seamlessly into the curriculum. "The idea is not that

studying Ireland is a chore, but that it is interesting and stimulating and will help get good results'. (Brennan, p.8)

The article noted that the work had focused mainly on history and that the project was in the process of developing materials for teaching citizenship, drama and literature.

A second article in the *TES* related to Ireland in Schools appeared in July 2003. By this time the Warrington and Ireland in Schools projects had separated and the latter continued to focus on teaching and learning about Ireland within the National Curriculum. The *TES* included a magazine and each issue focused on specific theme. The issue, which made reference to the Ireland in Schools project, was called *Respect: Teaching about cultural diversity. Common ground. How schools bring people together*. The magazine included articles about riots in Oldham and Bradford, Islamophobia and countering racism, African art, refugee children and attempts in Jerusalem to develop links between Arab and Israeli children. Ireland was dealt with in two separate articles – one of these related to an Education for Reconciliation Project with teenagers in Northern Ireland. A second article entitled *Gaelforce* focused on the work of the Ireland in Schools project (O' Sullivan, 2003). The chairperson was again interviewed in an article about the project in which he said that schools with few Irish pupils were won over to using its materials as a means of addressing multiculturalism. The journalist drew attention to the way in which the project provided a broad range of curricular opportunities:

If focusing on Irishness is an excellent way of approaching multiculturalism, as the *Parekh Report* implies, it can go much further than that. Irish Studies can cover history, literacy, music and citizenship education. Sophisticated, colourful teaching materials including CD-ROMs, music and videos covering these areas are available from a programme called Ireland in Schools. (O'Sullivan, 2003, p.8)

The article indicated that Irish history could, for example, be taught through looking at the Famine/Hunger, the background to the 'Troubles' or the Tudors. A brief contextual background to these topics was supported by examining a song called 'Fields of Athenry'

which focused on the life of a young man who was transported because he had stolen corn in order to avoid starvation. The use of historical fiction and drama were also advocated as valuable approaches in teaching about Ireland's past. The article selected the case of Grace O'Malley, also known as Granuaile, as a fascinating study for primary children given that she was both a pirate and a politician who ruled in Ireland and resisted the English. Such was her power that Elizabeth I agreed to meet her in order to consider Grace's complaints against the English governor of Connacht. With older pupils the theme 'Ireland, Elizabeth's Vietnam' provided an opportunity to explore the controversial nature of events in the 16th century. The article clearly supported to the work of the Ireland in Schools project.

The education correspondent of the *Daily Mail* (Harris, 2004) wrote the third article which began with the headline 'Move over Florence: Schools are told to ditch 'jaded' heroine Nightingale and give history lessons about a female Irish pirate'. This was followed by a stinging attack on the QCA for including a scheme of work, which had the title 'Who needs Florence Nightingale? for its *Innovating History*. Although no reference was made to the Ireland in Schools project, a teacher working with the project had produced the materials. The teacher and their school were named in the article but had not been contacted by the newspaper. The article implied that the QCA was recommending that 'teachers look at an obscure 16th century Irish pirate Grace O'Malley - who has been lionised by feminists'. The attributes of Grace and Florence were listed beside captions which read 'Hospital Angel: Florence Nightingale' and 'Sea Devil: Grace'. Reference was made to Florence Nightingale walking the wards with her lamp, reducing death rates and establishing St Thomas' Hospital and the fact that she remained a spinster and died in bed aged 90. In contrast the article said that Grace stormed castles, directed murderers and slaughtered hundreds of Spaniards. The

article concluded by noting that historians were divided as to whether she died in bed or in battle. The article made no attempt to question the validity of key aspects of their stories such as images of Florence Nightingale's lamp, or the reasons for Grace's death in poverty. On the contrary the article claimed that it had the support of academic historians:

... the [government] watchdog [QCA] was yesterday attacked by historians for downgrading Miss Nightingale in favour of politically correct Left-wing fashion ... historians reacted angrily to the material which had been posted on the QCA web site. Dr. David Starkey said that there is 'no contest between Miss Nightingale and Grace O'Malley - whom he had never heard of. (Harris, 2004, p.25)

Given the prominence of Starkey in the media and the fact that he had written a book (Starkey, 2001) and television series about Elizabeth, his view would have presumably had credence with *Daily Mail* readers. More recently, Starkey's strongly Anglo-centric and elitist perception has been highlighted in the *Guardian*:

Looking at power from the top down and from the centre outwards, the Starkey view is thoroughly reactionary and insular. English history is therefore seen not just as royal centric, it's also a series of plots at court. The consequences may be enormous and the stakes are high - but it's the passions and intrigues, the hatreds and rivalries of a few key individuals that matter. (Williams, 2006 [online])

This critique helps to explain why Starkey explored Elizabeth I but not Grace O'Malley. The article cited further support from Alex Attewell, director of the Florence Nightingale Museum and Nick Seaton, of the Campaign for Real Education. The first of these was likely to be concerned at the prospect of schools replacing Florence Nightingale. The Campaign for Real Education was established in 1987 in order to promote for traditional approaches towards teaching. The organisation tried to promote national history which included facts about 'great moments' and 'great figures' such as Florence Nightingale in the National Curriculum in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Seaton, 2007 [online]).

An examination of the rationale related to Grace O'Malley on the QCA website certainly began with reference to teachers being jaded with teaching Florence Nightingale but did not challenge her importance. At the same time the National Curriculum at Key Stage 1 does not require teachers to teach Florence Nightingale. She appeared as one of the optional QCA schemes of work in 1998 and as such the *Daily Mail's* attack was totally misconceived.

What do these three articles suggest about Ireland in Schools since the late 1990s? The first two articles that appeared in the educational press in 1999 and 2003 respectively were sympathetic to the project and promoted its work. The first article related to links between England and Ireland whereas the second article related the work of the project to multiculturalism, which may suggest some change in emphasis within the project itself, although it is possible that it may have been influenced by the theme of the magazine. However, the third article, written in 2004, was aimed at a conservative audience and was cavalier in its approach towards examining National Curriculum requirements. The opportunity to attack a government body and limited availability of political news while Parliament was in recess immediately after Christmas is perhaps the most likely explanation for the article. It did not attack the Ireland in Schools project directly but certainly challenged and named a teacher who was working with the organisation.

The articles collectively promote a series of research questions emerging from the newspaper articles, which will be explored through interviews with people associated with the Ireland in Schools project. Firstly, how far was involvement with the project prompted by a desire to develop mutual understanding between Britain and Ireland? Secondly, how far was this

related to a multicultural or anti-racist perspective? Thirdly, how far do the perceptions of the Ireland in Schools project supporters compare with the radical image presented by the *Daily Mail* article? The following analysis will attempt to explore these questions through interviews with the chairperson and mini group case studies.

The chairperson had considerable expertise in Irish History. The interviewee had been the first Director of Institute Irish Studies at the University of Liverpool, which was set up in 1988. The Institute established undergraduate and postgraduate courses and research in Irish history. The university website states:

From the outset, the Institute has been held in the highest regard in Ireland itself, in Britain and further afield, for its role in teaching and researching Irish culture, history and politics, promoting understanding between the people of Britain and Ireland and for contributing positively to today's improved perceptions of Ireland.
(<http://www.liv.ac.uk/irish/about/index.htm>)

The following comment helps to explain why the chairperson decided to establish Ireland in Schools:

What disillusioned me is that academic output made no impact on events in Northern Ireland and emphasised even more to me the need for more general education.

When the interviewee retired from the University of Liverpool they removed the Ireland in Schools project away from the Institute. They worked through the Warrington Project initially but eventually separated from them in order to focus more explicitly on the organisation's educational objectives. Since that time the interviewee continued to work with a wide range of schools and educational organisations. Their intention was to:

Make Ireland a normal part of the curriculum in schools in Britain so that people begin to get a broader understanding of it and don't have these prejudices and stereotypes [of Ireland and Irish people] which abound.

The interviewee worked with individual teachers or groups of teachers and provided contextual knowledge to support their needs. The interviewee saw their role as providing support with respect to contextual knowledge, resources and printing materials and that the teachers should determine the teaching and learning approaches:

Our project is to instigate Ireland in the curriculum and you just have to do it whatever way you can, and then once you have introduced people then you can get them to see the benefits.

How did the Ireland in Schools project's perception of an Irish dimension relate to the history curriculum as a whole? The interviewee said that they were primarily interested in historical content but accepted that skills needed to be developed. When asked about different dimensions in the curriculum they provided the following holistic response:

I think that one needs a balanced curriculum, but I do think that people first and foremost need a context of their lives, and therefore a history of these islands I think should come first, and therefore I wouldn't make such a clear distinction between English and Irish history ... I suppose I have a great difficulty with this notion of multiculturalism as separate, and in history I think it pervades the whole thing ... it's just like gender equality.

The implication of this perception was that the Ireland in Schools project was intended to contribute to the history curriculum as a whole. Given the breadth of vision shown by this statement it is interesting to note the interviewees' response to the *Daily Mail* article, which attacked the teaching of Grace O'Malley.

The comment by David Starkey explains why our programme is needed. You would have thought after all these years there would be some appreciation that perhaps Ireland might be important ... the same thing [which is] happening now is that we'll continue to revile Islam, without understanding it. The trouble with papers like the *Daily Mail* is that they do articulate what many people think ... The fact that a leading academic should say, 'I've never heard of her' [Grace O'Malley] is a sad reflection on the state of English History.

The interviewee also felt that their work went beyond the history curriculum since it enabled teachers to integrate cross-curricular developments such as thinking skills and literacy into their planning.

In order to meet its objectives the Ireland in Schools project produced a range of resources. The interviewee noted that this was important because, apart from two textbook series aimed at the Northern Ireland market, history textbooks produced in England rarely mentioned Ireland. The exception to this were texts produced for the School History Project Modern World Study but these focused on problems associated with the conflict rather than the history of Ireland as a whole. The project had worked with primary and secondary teachers to redress this issue. Usually this involved small groups of between two and eight teachers, although in Manchester 30 schools participated in the scheme. The project had engaged with teachers serving in LEA and church schools in different parts of the country including Blackpool, Bury, Northamptonshire, Nottinghamshire, Sefton and Staffordshire. The chairperson was unable to give a precise date of when they began working with each cluster but noted that contacts were ongoing. In response to a recent email request for statistical information the chairperson provided a list of 101 people who had contributed resources (kha200@aol.com, 31/05/2007). Clearly the level of involvement has varied, and the perceptions of some of the main contributors to the project will be considered later in this chapter.

Ireland in Schools has also used its website to promote its work and provide resources for teachers and this has received an average of 209 visitors per month. During the past seven years secondary teachers in Nottinghamshire and Blackpool serving LEA, Catholic and

Church of England schools developed resources related to the Normans, Cromwell, the Famine/Hunger and Easter Rising for Key Stage 3, as well as materials directly related to the School History Project Modern World Study at Key Stage 4. The interviewee was disappointed that many teachers were not very adventurous and had been reluctant to develop resources related to Tudor Ireland given its crucial importance:

Without understanding what is happening in the Tudor period you can't really understand the sense of loss Ireland felt, because in the 17th century it is all a question of land really, and religion ... whereas what you have got in Tudor time was this big collapse of Gaelic Ireland and [this] memory persists.

They observed that there was no interest from teachers for AS/A2 materials. Primary school teachers were interested in materials related to Grace O'Malley, the Famine/ Hunger and World War 2. However, materials related to earlier periods such as St. Brendan or the Vikings had proved less popular. The implication of this is that pupils studied the problems confronting Ireland rather than its achievements and pre-colonial experiences.

What did the chairperson consider helped or hindered their work? It is hardly surprising to find that the interviewee regarded the enthusiasm of individual teachers as the most important factor in supporting their work. In secondary schools they felt that many teachers were driven by the need to help pupils come to grips with the Modern World Study unit within the School History Project. The need to teach this project in six to eight weeks at Key Stage 4 increasingly led teachers to look towards ways of introducing an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3. They felt that primary teachers were more likely to become involved in the project out of general interest and the desire to innovate. These teachers were more likely to consider cross subject links and often made links with literacy. In primary schools support from the Head Teacher also proved crucial. This was less important in secondary schools where the Head of School had less influence on developments within particular departments.

Beyond individual schools they felt that the project's impact was influenced more by word of mouth than anything else, including media coverage. However, local education advisers and university lecturers provided a critical role in developing local projects. The interviewee also acknowledged support given by the History Officer within QCA and direct contacts made at history conferences. Nevertheless, the interviewee felt that there were a number of factors that hindered their work. Firstly, they felt that the number of government initiatives coupled with the demise of history advisers made it difficult to promote their work in some areas. Secondly, with both secondary schools and Local Education Authorities it was often difficult to bring subject specialists from different subject areas together in order to support cross subject initiatives.

How did the perceptions of the chairperson compare with those of people involved in the Ireland in Schools project? This will be examined through looking at three mini case studies – Case Study 1: The Nottinghamshire Secondary Phase Group; Case Study 2: The Blackpool Secondary Phase Group 3; and Case Study 3: The Primary Phase Group. The people who were interviewed were considered by the chairperson to be particularly active supporters of Ireland in Schools work. However, before examining the perceptions of each of the groups it is necessary to explain why the approach differs from the teachers in the TIDE chapter. When examining the perceptions of teachers associated with TIDE, the intention was to explore how far teacher perceptions in their schools compared to work they had produced for TIDE. It was therefore felt appropriate to analyse each teacher's contribution to TIDE and then consider how this related to his or her perceptions of the curriculum undertaken within their school. When considering work undertaken through Ireland in Schools it was found that the materials

produced by the school related to their curriculum. For this reason the following analysis will consider perceptions each teacher held about the history curriculum before looking at how interviewees worked with Ireland in Schools.

Case Study 1: The Nottinghamshire Co-ordinator and three Heads of History

This group consisted of a cluster co-ordinator and three teachers from different schools. The group included another teacher, but since they did not produce any materials their perceptions have not been included. All of the interviews took place during March 2004. The perceptions of the co-ordinator will be considered before considering the perceptions of individual teachers, given their pivotal role in establishing the group.

The co-ordinator established the group during the time that they had been seconded to teach PGCE History students in the School of Education at Nottingham University. Although they had returned to teach in school, the group continued to meet at the university. The interviewee had the role of Training Co-ordinator in their school which served a predominantly white community in an urban context. Although the interviewee taught history, they were not in charge of the history department in their school. Ireland was taught as the Modern World Study at Key Stage 4, and the interviewee had been able to enhance it by introducing materials from the Ireland in Schools Group. However, an Irish dimension was not taught at Key Stage 3. The interviewee said that the Key Stage 3 curriculum was dominated by English history. They felt that some reference was made to black, multicultural history and anti-racism through teaching about the Slave Trade, Martin Luther King and the Holocaust.

Clearly, the co-ordinator's interest in promoting an Irish dimension was more closely linked with their role at the university than their own school. Their initial interest was aroused when they had read information about the Warrington Project. The interviewee invited the chairperson to the university during the autumn of 1998 with the intention of using Irish materials as a focus for teaching A level in a seminar with PGCE students. In order to maximise responses they decided to change the focus of the group's activities to developing materials for the School History Project Modern World Study at Key Stage 4. Four people agreed to form a curriculum development group. The following comment suggests that the purpose of this curriculum group appears to have been to provide mutual support and develop university-tutor links:

I think people were keen; they liked being able to be together to talk about it [the Modern World Study] because dealing with Ireland was a difficult thing ... and from the university point of view, it meant a close link with mentors. The mentors liked it because there was an outside agency that was involved who might have some expertise that they could draw upon. And so we began to meet regularly once a term and to share the resources that we used in the Modern World Study and develop new ones.

The interviewee was particularly excited about materials which had been developed by one member of the group, based on the chance discovery that the PGCE student they were mentoring had experienced a bomb attack when they lived in Northern Ireland. With the student's support and agreement it had been possible to develop a resource pack which compared their experiences with interpretations of the event in the local and national press.

The following year saw the group's work become more structured and they not only developed resources but also produced a quiz to ascertain base line pupil subject knowledge at the start of their Modern World Study topic. The group found that the subject knowledge of pupils varied depending on what they had been taught at Key Stage 3 and decided to develop materials for this earlier key stage. It was also felt that curriculum development could

incorporate broader curriculum initiatives such as thinking skills. Some attempt had been made to involve other curriculum areas, although the interviewee felt that the impact of this varied. The interviewee felt that the chairperson provided crucial support for the group:

[The chairperson's] expertise has been wonderful because he knows where to find things ... he was able to engender tremendous enthusiasm in us because we thought 'Wow, there is so much there which we didn't know ... I didn't know about people like Grace O'Malley.'

The effectiveness of the group was helped by the way that they worked well as a team and shared resources. It was facilitated by support from their Heads of School who had given them half a day each term for meetings. The co-ordinator and one of the teachers had also been able to promote their Key Stage 4 material through a workshop at a School History Project Conference. Overall, this interviewee's involvement appears to have been pragmatic rather than values driven, although their continued support for the group was most important.

The first teacher interviewee within the Nottinghamshire case study was an Irish Catholic who had married a Protestant. They had taught for six years as Head of Department in a Roman Catholic school and had recently taken up the post of Head of Humanities in a multicultural Church of England school. Their new school only taught years 7 and 8 at the time of the interview but would eventually become an 11-18 comprehensive school. The interviewee considered that an Irish dimension was important in their history curriculum. They had developed work related to it in their previous school where a lot of children had Irish backgrounds. Although their new school had a different intake, the interviewee still intended to include an Irish dimension in their course. They started by studying Strongbow and the Norman Conquest with year 7, the Famine/Hunger in year 8 and planned to teach about 1916 in year 9 with the intention of developing a discrete Irish strand throughout Key Stage 3 as a foundation for studying it as a Modern World Study within the School History Project at Key

Stage 4. They also considered that it was important to make appropriate links between developments in Ireland and other parts of Britain. In the case of Strongbow it was felt that the impact of the Normans only made sense if it was linked to the Battle of Hastings in England. Although the interviewee felt that this was more difficult when studying the Famine/Hunger they said that this could be done by comparing the impact of the government laissez-faire policies on the lives of the rural poor in Ireland and the industrial working conditions faced by the working class in England.

What was the interviewee's perception of the range of dimensions which could be developed in the history curriculum? This teacher regarded English history as important because they felt that the National Curriculum and a lot of textbooks were based on it. They felt that Scottish and Welsh dimensions had some importance and wanted to develop them more fully, subject to time constraints, following on from their commitment to an Irish dimension. Black, multicultural and anti-racist dimensions were considered important, and the interviewee felt that it was important to explore a range of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds when challenging stereotypes. The interviewee was particularly concerned about the negative images provided when studying slavery. Consequently they considered that it was important to teach about civil rights and world civilisations.

Although the interviewee appears to have related their interest in an Irish dimension to wider values, their initial reason for becoming involved with Ireland in Schools was pragmatic. They felt that the Modern World Studies textbooks were outdated, and the opportunity to meet with the chairperson and other mentors provided an opportunity to obtain and quickly develop resources to support their needs. The interviewee said development of materials for

Key Stage 4 was followed by an assessment of pupil knowledge at the start of the Modern World Study. The results of this led to them developing work for Key Stage 3 during the second year of their involvement with the project.

The first piece of work which the interviewee produced was called 'Behind the Headlines in Northern Ireland: The Market Hill Bombing'. This exercise compared the experiences of a PGCE student from Northern Ireland whose house had been devastated, and the way in which the event had been reported in local and national newspapers. The interviewee described how the story, which her PGCE student told of her experience in Northern Ireland, provided a stimulus for producing the unit:

As she [the student] was talking I felt the hair on the back of my neck. I just felt it rising and thought that young girl shouldn't be here by rights because of what she was involved in. She was so lucky ... and the kids [pupils in the class] were gripped completely. They couldn't believe it. It was out of their experience.

The second unit examined the Famine/Hunger and was entitled 'Why was the Famine important in British and Irish History?' This unit explored life in Ireland in the early 19th century, events in the 1840s and their effect on the relationship between England and Ireland. The pack involved freeze framing and source based activities, together with thinking skills to explore the consequences of the potato blight. Although the unit did not make direct links with other parts of the world blighted by famine, it effectively integrated a range of generic and historical skills with the study of Irish history.

The interviewee felt that a number of factors had helped to support the project. They felt that the Ireland in Schools meetings were uplifting and provided opportunities for mutual support between local teachers. This was enhanced by academic and presentational support provided by the chairperson and opportunities to share work produced by other members of the group.

For example they had already used materials related to the Normans produced by another member of the group and intended to make use of materials which this member had produced on the Tudors. They felt that it had enabled them to provide up to date materials for their Key Stage 4 pupils. The interviewee had provided a workshop at a School History Project Conference to promote the work of Ireland in Schools:

[We were trying] to get people interested in developing a pathway to Key Stage 4 through introducing it to Key Stage 3 ... a lot of it was looking at what we did in Key Stage 4 to hook the kids in, and we talked about the quiz, the Market Hill Bombings, the murals, portraits and songs.

They noted that the chairperson gave out cards to people who attended the workshop and followed this up to promote their work more widely.

The only constraints which the interviewee encountered were related to their attempts to work with teachers outside the group. They had tried to encourage other departments in the school to become involved in the project, but this had not been successful. A more ambitious idea developing email links and possibly visits between her pupils and a school in Northern Ireland also failed. The chairperson had set up this link and some materials had been sent to the partner school but the interviewee had received no response. Overall, this interviewee appears to have produced high quality resources and linked an Irish dimension to aspects of anti-racist education.

The second teacher interviewee had taught for six years and had been Head of History until two years before the interview, after which they had given up their post of responsibility in order to teach part time. At the time of the interview they were undertaking maternity leave. The interviewee taught in a rural comprehensive school serving a white community. The interviewee regarded an Irish dimension as important in their teaching at Key Stage 3 and

taught it as the Modern World Study within the School History Project at Key Stage 4. When the interviewee was Head of History they also taught the Irish Question at A level. However, they said that their decision to teach it at Key Stage 3 was because they were struggling to support pupils at Key Stage 4 rather than from anti-racist or human rights considerations. When asked about other dimensions the interviewee said that they were aware of the importance of content as well as skills. They regarded English history as important but only gave tokenistic regard for Scottish and Welsh dimensions. Nevertheless they felt that these dimensions needed to be considered more fully given that a number of pupils had asked them why they were learning about Ireland rather than Wales or Scotland. The interviewee attached some importance to black and multicultural history but felt that anti-racist history was important given that the isolated nature of their school led to a lot of inherent racism. However, when asked to exemplify where anti-racist education was taught they only referred to the Holocaust. This suggests that they had not as yet developed a holistic approach to anti-racism within their history curriculum that related it to a series of topics.

The interviewee became involved with Ireland in Schools in response to the co-ordinator's invitation for mentors to form a curriculum group to support work at Key Stage 4. At the time of the interview in March 2004 they had been involved with the Ireland in Schools project for four or five years and regarded the support that it provided as first rate. Initially they joined the project as an opportunity to discuss Key Stage 4 issues with teachers from other schools and went on to develop an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3:

Ireland in Schools sort of broadened everything for the whole of the history department and it became much more than that. It became a real mission to develop an Irish theme ... I got students from the university to come and help me to put an Irish pathway through my Key Stage 3.

The interviewee developed materials related to the Normans in Ireland and Cromwell. They also trialled the work on the Famine/Hunger which the first teacher interviewee had produced. The interviewee noted that senior management had been supportive in allowing them to attend Ireland in Schools project meetings. They had also had the opportunity to develop an Ireland in Schools Day in the school. However, the new Head of Department did not share their enthusiasm for an Irish dimension and had reduced its significance, including replacing it at A level with a study of Chartism. The overall impression given by this interviewee was that they were primarily motivated by pragmatism and had not explicitly linked an Irish dimension to issues associated with diversity.

The third teacher interviewee taught in a rural comprehensive school that served a middle class white community, although its multicultural intake had increased in recent years. The interviewee had taught in the school for 26 years and had been Head of History for 11 years. They said that an Irish dimension had some importance in their curriculum at Key Stage 3 and was taught as Modern World Study within the Schools History Project at Key Stage 4. Their interest in developing an Irish dimension at Key Stage 4 was primarily because they felt that the children ought to understand the issues involved with the current situation at an area which was close to home. They particularly wanted to challenge stereotypical perceptions held by pupils such as assumptions that all Catholics supported the IRA. When asked about other dimensions at Key Stage 3 the interviewee indicated that English history was important but Welsh and Scottish dimensions were of limited importance. Anti-racist and world history were considered important but black and multicultural history was only rated as having some importance. The interviewee regarded anti-racism as important because racist issues had

arisen in the school. They noted that pupils did not think of themselves as racist and would argue that Irish jokes were not racist. However, there was little to suggest that the interviewee developed an anti-racist dimension within their history curriculum.

The interviewee indicated that their involvement with the Ireland in Schools project was strongly driven by pragmatic motives:

I got a leaflet in my tray - it was then called the Warrington Project because it was mainly related to the Warrington Bombing. I made it clear to the group and to [the chairperson] that my initial interest was resources ... We had just started the Schools History Project and I thought this would be an ideal way of supporting it.

The group had agreed to split up tasks and share resources. Initially, this supported the Modern World Study at Key Stage 4 and the interviewee used a thinking skills booklet related to 'Bloody Sunday'. However, the interviewee said that this was followed by the decision to produce materials at Key Stage 3 and they had taken responsibility for developing activities related to the 'Making of the United Kingdom', with particular reference to Henry VIII, Cromwell and the Glorious Revolution. These materials had also been developed in order to promote thinking skills. The interviewee considered that the links, which the group had with Nottingham University, together with the way in which the chairperson supported them and produced high quality resources from their work, contributed to the success of the project.

The interviewee noted a number of issues, which they had faced in promoting an Irish dimension. With respect to the project they felt that the only problem in the group was that some people did not produce resources. The project had also tried to help them to develop links with a school in Ireland but unfortunately the school had not replied to them. Within their school a former Head Teacher had prevented them from getting two perspectives of the conflict in Northern Ireland by using Protestant and Catholic Irish people in the local

community because they feared that it would upset parents. Nevertheless, the interviewee had used Irish members of staff in the past and did not consider that it would be an issue with the current Head Teacher. Overall, they felt that curriculum time restrictions were the most serious issue that they faced when trying to promote an Irish dimension in their history curriculum:

The only problem we have got is time ... I don't want to make it [Irish History] a bolt on thing. I don't think that would be very helpful and it would be difficult for the kids to appreciate the links. We have tried to assimilate it as smoothly as possible but I must say that time is a problem and, with this [National Curriculum] emphasis on British i.e. English History, makes it difficult.

The interviewee dealt with this by selecting aspects of Ireland in Schools project resources and integrating them into their Programme of Study. The overall impression from the third interviewee was that they were committed to developing an Irish dimension. This was particularly influenced by pragmatic considerations such as developing the Modern World Study course at Key Stage 4, links with the university and opportunities to develop materials to support thinking skills. However, they also believed that it was important to challenge stereotypical perceptions of the situation in Ireland. They were aware of racism within the context of this of Irish history.

What underlying threads indicate the way in which this cluster related to the Ireland in Schools project and the development of an Irish dimension? The role of the co-ordinator was important in making the initial link and organising the group, but the impetus for curriculum development appears to have been the support provided by the chairperson together with the requirements of schools within the group. The primary reason for involvement appears to have been instrumental in providing a focus for meetings on the part of the co-ordinator or supporting the School History Project Modern World Study related to Ireland. Their decision

to produce materials at Key Stage 3 developed at a later date in order to help prepare pupils for Key Stage 4. In this way the group was driven by pragmatic considerations associated with raising attainment. However, the group appears to have become genuinely enthusiastic about the topics and materials that they produced and committed to introducing an Irish strand throughout Key Stage 3. The teachers also introduced wider curriculum initiatives such as thinking skills into their units of work so that they related to general educational developments within their schools. Although all of the interviewees made references to other dimensions, only the first teacher appears to have developed anti-racism within different parts of their curriculum. In this way they provided a more holistic approach to anti-racism which provided opportunities to compare its impact in different historical contexts. The group had received support from senior management in their schools that had enabled them to meet. Nevertheless, organisational changes in one school and resistance from a former Head Teacher of one school indicated that senior management could obstruct as well as promote innovation.

Case Study 2: The Blackpool Secondary Foundation Subjects Consultant and three Heads of History

This case study consisted of the perceptions of a LEA Foundation Subjects Consultant and three teachers they identified as being most closely involved in developing materials related to Ireland in Schools. Most interviews took place during March 2005, although one teacher who joined the group at a later stage was interviewed in December 2006. The Consultant was invited to make a presentation to the History Teacher Educator Conference at Edgehill University in July 2006 (McQueen, Duckworth, Wright, 2006a) and Midlands History Forum in November 2006 (McQueen, Duckworth, Wright, 2006b). On both occasions two teacher interviewees accompanied them. The perceptions of the Consultant

will be considered before considering the thoughts of individual teachers, given their pivotal role in establishing the group.

The Foundation Subjects' Consultant had seen materials produced by Ireland in Schools when they were teaching in school but had decided to work with the project after attending a workshop provided by the Chairperson and Researcher at the Humanities Conference in November 2003. The interviewee had experience as Head of History in a Catholic secondary school and had been in their current post for two and a half years at the time of the interview. Their current job focused on the development of thinking skills across different subject areas in the eight secondary schools within Blackpool LEA.

The interviewee supported a combination of skills and content in history teaching. Their perceptions of the history curriculum indicated that they felt that an Irish dimension should be related to other dimensions in the history curriculum:

Traditionally most history taught in school under the banner of British history would have been English history, but now I think British history, other than English history, Irish, Scottish and Welsh. I would say that British history is very important and personally anti-racist history would be a key issue for me. I always was a World, European history rather than British history [enthusiast when I taught] in school.

The interviewee said that they had a longstanding interest in Irish history, which had been encouraged by their Liverpool Catholic background, visits to Ireland, and previous work in a Catholic secondary school where they taught about the diaspora and issues related to the 'Troubles'. Nevertheless, the interviewee felt that communities served by Blackpool schools were different to their previous experiences in that there was not a noticeable Irish presence, with the possible exception of the Catholic school. The transient nature of the local population

meant that it was difficult to identify a typical Blackpool person. Consequently, the interviewee did not use this as a case for developing either an Irish or multicultural dimension in local schools. For the interviewee development of transferable learning skills was seen as a particular priority given that Blackpool had to address the issue of low attainment in its schools. This issue is supported by comparing the LEA Year 9 SATs and GCSE results with national standards (DfES, 2006). The interviewee used the Ireland in Schools project as a means of getting Heads of History in schools to collaborate as a team in developing thinking skills materials. The interviewee had been able to enlist support from seven out of the eight Heads of History in the project and was currently working with four of them. The materials, which Ireland in Schools provided were a catalyst for their work:

My job is to get teachers working and developing strategies, and if you have got ready made resources you can tap into, then we can look at the pedagogical side. So the teachers don't have to go and research. Although a lot of teachers like to do that, it is very time consuming. It has helped me; it has given me a focus for developing [my work] with teachers.

Teachers identified specific topics and focused on agreed thinking skill approaches.

The interviewee planned to get teachers to produce nine packs, each focusing on a different thinking skill and aspect of Irish history. The organisation of this reflected the following strengths and weaknesses:

What we found was the difficulty of getting them together, which is invariably a problem with teachers, and so we found that the most practical way for us to work would be if I were to work with each teacher individually on planning a piece of work and then at regular stages they would come together and they would share with each other what they had done. Now, real life inevitably takes over and out of these four teachers I have only got one piece of work up and running.

The last point was a short-term problem rather than a long term issue, given that one of the teachers was newly promoted and still in the early stages of their career, and two teachers had

been delayed by personal or school difficulties. The interviewee was about to start work with one of these teachers. Although conflicting demands on teachers' time restricted progress, it was encouraging to see that significant developments had been made by the time that some of them presented evidence of their work at History Teacher Educator (McQueen, Duckworth, Wright, 2006a) and Midlands History Forum conferences in 2006 (McQueen, Duckworth, Wright, 2006b). By this time the first of these teachers had completed their pack and presented it as part of a workshop. At the same time another teacher who had become involved in the project in the period since March 2005 joined them.

The Foundation Stage Consultant said that work had been undertaken in seven areas of Irish history and been used to exemplify seven different approaches to thinking skills. However, they stressed the ways in which their materials impacted on the history curriculum when they addressed the two conferences. They told the audience that one of their reasons for developing Irish history was to challenge Anglo-centric notions of the past. This point was made before any reference was made to thinking skills. Secondly, they said that they had limited the range of thinking skills exemplified so that priority was given to the requirements of the topic. This emphasis on history as opposed to generic skills may of course have reflected the nature of the conferences. However, the fact that the interviewee had been commissioned by the QCA to develop materials to support the 2008 revision to Key Stage 3 History may have encouraged them to emphasise the way in which the history curriculum is structured. Nevertheless, the overall impression given by this interview was that their primary concern was developing thinking skills and that teaching an Irish dimension supported this.

The first teacher interviewee involved in the Blackpool case study had taught for 23 years. They had been in their current school for 20 years and been Head of History for five years. The school served a predominantly white Roman Catholic community but included some pupils from the Philippines and China. The teacher felt that even if pupils did not have direct links with Ireland a significant number were likely to have Irish ancestry. Indeed, the interviewee felt that they did not give sufficient curriculum time to an Irish dimension, given the background of the pupils.

The interviewee taught an Irish dimension within the context of Medieval Realms and Making of the United Kingdom at Key Stage 3 because they considered that, '[Ireland] is still a big issue, and it is still not settled. There are still outstanding issues and I think that these are really important to anti- racism'. With the exception of work undertaken for the Ireland in Schools project, the interviewee did not indicate how they related to this within their teaching. An Irish dimension was briefly mentioned at Key Stage 4 with reference to the Ulster Division at the Battle of the Somme in the Modern World Syllabus. The interviewee felt that it was of greater significance when Home Rule was taught as part of the AQA syllabus at Key Stage 5. When asked about the curriculum as a whole they said that both skills and content were important. With respect to different historical dimensions at Key Stage 3 the interviewee indicated that while English history was regarded as important they also considered other areas. They felt that Scottish and Welsh history should not be ignored but did not need as much emphasis as English history.

The interviewee indicated more about their perception of diversity when they said that half a year of their teaching was devoted to black history. They were also aware of the implications of developing an anti-racist perspective across their course when they said:

In year 8 we start with slavery and go right up to civil rights and so [we cover] anti-racist history. [When looking at this] we cover the Holocaust as well [and it is a thread] probably right through Key Stage 3. I could probably find other examples ... I suppose when you are doing the Romans there are aspects there with what it is like to be conquered. [It is there when looking at] Britain 1750-1900 when we look at Empire.

The first teacher interviewee became involved with the Ireland in Schools project when the Foundation Consultant promoted it at a Key Stage 3 strategy meeting and set up Head of History Network meetings. They said that from the start four teachers became involved with the project with the intention of developing materials separately and sharing them with the group. The interviewee was interested in developing materials related to both 1916 and Grace O'Malley. They had developed the 'fortune-line' activity related to Grace, Elizabeth I and Hugh O'Neill. They said that the activity worked well with pupils. However, in future they felt that staff needed more background information before undertaking the activity. The interviewee was a teaching and learning coach within the school and hoped to use Irish materials to support working with teachings in other curriculum areas, such as English, Music or Religious Education. Nevertheless, there were some issues and constraints. As the first member of the cluster to complete the materials they were frustrated by having to wait for other people to produce materials which could be shared. They also felt that time and curriculum space inhibited curriculum development. Their work on Irish history had been undertaken in year 8 because they felt that Black People of the Americas could be squeezed because it was not one of the core areas of the course. This indicates that the interviewee did not fully appreciate the flexibility provided by National Curriculum 2000. It is interesting to

note that, despite their alleged support for ant-racist approaches in history teaching, work developed on Ireland was at the expense of black history.

The second teacher interviewee had only taught for two years and had recently become Head of History. They said that their school was located in a deprived area and served a white population, of which a few pupils came from Irish backgrounds. The interviewee was interested in Irish history and had undertaken it within their degree. They also felt that it contributed to understanding civil rights issues and had relevance to what pupils could see in the news. The interviewee said that Irish history only had some importance in their overall planning at Key Stage 3. It did not form part of Key Stage 4 where they taught the Modern World Syllabus. At Key Stage 3 an Irish dimension was included within their work on 16th and 17th century Britain. They particularly focused on the Battle of the Boyne and used it to explore events up to the present day including the Good Friday Agreement. They made use of some textbooks but relied mainly on their own resources to support teaching about Ireland. When asked about the balance between skills and content they said that content was quite important, but they emphasised the importance of thinking skills rather than historical skills which presumably reflected the nature of their involvement with the Foundation Stage Consultant's local network. When asked about other dimensions the interviewee indicated that English history was important. Scottish history only featured when they taught about the 16th century and Welsh history did not feature in their course. They considered that black, multicultural and anti-racist history formed quite an important part of their work with year 8 pupils:

We do a very big study on riots in America, slavery and how Europe got involved and a bit further on the civil rights and Martin Luther King. That is definitely anti-racist history; they get black, multicultural and anti-racist history.

Work related to Black History at Key Stage 3 was followed up at Key Stage 4 which included a project related to the experiences of Black people in America. Nevertheless, given that no reference was made to Africa it appears that the interviewee's references to slavery were still quite narrowly defined. The interviewee also made reference to human rights issues with respect to both Ireland and America but did not make explicit links between them.

The second teacher interviewee had been encouraged to become involved with the Ireland in School project by the Foundation Subjects' Consultant. At the time of the interview they were only in the early stages of working with the project and were looking at the prospect of introducing materials related to Grace O'Malley into their topic on the Tudors as well as developing a unit of work on the Famine/Hunger. This material was subsequently developed through a 'Mystery' activity which involved sorting and categorising cards showing different reasons why the people left Ireland in the 19th century. This was followed by a thinking skills task in which pupils explained how they had formed their decisions. The activity was presented as a small group activity, as part of the presentations given to the History Teacher Educator (McQueen, Duckworth, Wright, 2006a) and Midland History Forum Conferences (McQueen, Duckworth, Wright, 2006b). The interviewee's perceptions were not fully developed when speaking to them in 2005, which may reflect the fact that they had only recently taken on the role of Head of Department. The overall impression given was that involvement in the project helped with their professional development, although it is difficult to determine how far this impacted on their perceptions of an Irish dimension and its links with other dimensions in the history curriculum.

The third teacher interviewee was interviewed in December 2006. They had taught in their current school for 20 years and had become Head of History in 1992 and, finally, an Advanced Skills Teacher in 2005. Their school had a 97% British white intake with a very small percentage of Black and Asian pupils. They had been invited by the Foundation Subject Consultant to become involved with Ireland in Schools in 2005, subsequent to the researcher's visit to Blackpool. The interviewee had developed materials which contributed to presentations at the History Teacher Educator Network Conferences (McQueen, Duckworth, Wright, 2006a) and Midland History Forum Conferences (McQueen, Duckworth, Wright, 2006b). It was decided to interview this teacher because their perspectives reflected some significant differences from the teacher interviews, which had taken place in 2005. The interviewee felt that cross-curricular skills such as thinking skills were more important than content. However, when they focused on the connection between specific historical skills and content the interviewee said that they were of equal importance and should be blended together.

When considering specific dimensions in the history curriculum the interviewee said that an Irish dimension was important in their teaching. However, they said that they did not have strong political views about the situation in Ireland and that their interest was primarily driven by the availability of resources. This was surprising given the ratings which they gave to other dimensions. English history was given the same rating as an Irish dimension while Scottish and Irish history was given less importance. The interviewee rated multicultural, anti-racist and world history as being very important. They related the importance of the last dimensions to cross curricular issues, related to the fact that they taught in a Language College which highlighted the need to draw links with Europe and the need to appreciate that pupils were

growing up in an ever smaller world. They felt that in a predominantly white town such as Blackpool it was important for pupils to understand different cultures and that it would be tragic if they followed an Anglo-centric course.

The third interviewee had been invited to join the Ireland in Schools project in order to develop links between thinking skills and Irish history. They said that they decided to become involved with Ireland in Schools out of personal interest, which they regarded as an important incentive for teachers. The interviewee had developed exercises that supported different thinking skills activities around the theme 'Why has it been difficult to achieve peace in Ireland?' The first activity involved analysing the way in which five popular songs related to the period associated with 'The Troubles'. Three songs: 'Give Ireland back to the Irish' by Paul McCartney (1972), 'Sunday Bloody Sunday' by U2 (1983) and 'Young Ned of the Hill' by The Pogues (1989) supported a Republican perspective. Two songs: 'I'll tell Me Ma' by Van Morrison and Paddy Maloney (1988) and 'Coney Island' (1989) by Van Morrison made no reference to the political situation in Northern Ireland, which may have been influenced by the singer's Protestant background. Pupils were expected to listen to the music and use a 'graphic organiser' to analyse them. This consisted of four concentric squares in which pupils name the song in the first square, its story in the second square, its message and the help it gave them in understanding Irish history in the third square, and finally problems such as its reliability in the fourth square. The interviewee also produced an exercise, which explored why people fought for British forces on the Somme or against Britain in the Easter Rising.

They had also worked with the second interviewee to produce their Irish migration unit. The activities provided opportunities to explore diversity through using Irish history. Their

contribution to the Midlands History Forum Conference workshop and interview indicated how they used materials related to Irish migration to support anti-racism by comparing experiences of migration from different parts of the world including the African and Irish Diaspora. In addition to developing materials the interviewee had organised a visit for their pupils to visit a school in Belfast which had involved a citizenship and history focus. They felt that staff and pupils had responded positively to using the materials produced through Ireland in Schools. They felt that the local network led by the Foundation Subjects Consultant was effective in encouraging teachers to develop and share materials. Without this support they thought that it would have been difficult for the project to develop. The only hindrance, which they commented upon, was time. This interviewee appears to have been committed to developing generic skills and global links. It seems reasonable to suggest that they were developing an Irish dimension, partly because resources and a local support network were available, but also as a means of developing the wider curricular objectives.

The main impression which emerges from this case study was the strong influence of the Foundation Subject Consultant. All of the interviewees expressed an interest in Irish history and also made reference to aspects of anti-racist history. However, only the third teacher interviewee really indicated a broader perception of global issues such as diaspora, which encompassed their work on Ireland. It may be significant that this teacher was interviewed in November 2006 whereas the researcher met the other teachers in March 2005. The Foundation Subject Consultant was also more explicit about using an Irish dimension at this time than had been the case during their first interview in 2005. It seems reasonable to suggest that this reflected curriculum changes during this period, such as QCA proposals to revise Key Stage 3 which certainly encouraged approaching wider themes associated with diversity

within British history. It is interesting to note that all of the schools followed a Twentieth Century World History Syllabus and consequently did not develop an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3 in order to provide pupils with contextual background for work at Key Stage 4. However, the overriding focus of this cluster's work related to the development of thinking skills which reflected the professional role of the consultant, a driving force for their links with the Advanced Skills and a justification for setting up the local teacher network.

Case Study 3: Three Primary Teachers

Although Ireland in Schools did form links with clusters of primary teachers it was impossible to identify a tightly knit group which could be compared with Case Studies 1 and 2.

Consequently, three teachers drawn from different parts of the country will provide a focus for this section. The first teacher taught in Northamptonshire, the second teacher taught in Staffordshire and the third in Liverpool. Each study provides a very distinctive approach towards developing an Irish dimension. Each of the interviewees indicated that they had been given some support from their Local Education Authority Advisers but they appear to have developed their materials more independently than the teachers in Case Studies 1 and 2. For this reason the following analysis will only focus on the perceptions of the three teachers.

The first interviewee produced the Grace O'Malley materials that aroused the response from an article in the *Daily Mail* which has been discussed earlier in this chapter. The interview took place in September 2004 and the researcher knew the teacher in a professional capacity prior to the interview. The interviewee was a history specialist who had taught year 1 pupils in a small rural school in Northamptonshire for nine years, which served a white middle class community. They were the Key Stage 1 Co-ordinator and Initial Teacher Training Mentor.

History was taught as separate subject rather than as part of an integrated curriculum. The small size of the school meant that the interviewee taught all of Key Stage 1 in the same class, which necessitated using a rolling programme of topics over successive years. Nevertheless, the interviewee said that they liked to experiment with new topics and rarely taught the same theme more than once. The interviewee considered that skills and content were important in history teaching. English history was regarded as important in their teaching but they did not attach particular importance to an Irish dimension. They made no reference to Scottish history. When the interviewee taught about Grace O'Malley a parent had complained about the absence Welsh history in their course and they said that they intended to include this dimension in the future. The interviewee said that black history was important and that they had taught about Mary Seacole, for example. They stressed that their choice of topics was primarily influenced by events which could arouse the interest of the children. For example, they had commemorated events such as the moon landings and the Battle of Naseby.

Women's history was also a strong personal interest:

One area that we haven't got down here [on the interviewee question prompts] that is really close to my heart is 'Women's History', looking at women and the role of women and things like that.

It was interesting to note that the interviewee was about to develop a topic related to Beatrix Potter. The overall impression given from this was that women's history and an eclectic approach to stimulating pupil interest was of more interest to the interviewee than a commitment to teaching about ethnic diversity.

The interviewee became interested in developing work on Grace O'Malley when they attended a workshop at a conference run by the Local Humanities Adviser. The Adviser had developed a unit on Grace O'Malley for the Ireland in Schools project and promoted it

through a workshop. They provided the interviewee with a CD-ROM and pictures and helped them to make contact with the Ireland in Schools chairperson who went to the school to provide advice. The interviewee adapted the Adviser's plan. The Adviser's role appears to have been supportive but not directive compared to the Blackpool case study. Nevertheless, the Adviser and interviewee produced a joint article for *Primary History* which promoted teaching Grace O'Malley (Kirkland & Wykes, 2003). The interviewee identified a central difficulty with the topic affecting the approach they used:

It was very difficult for me on a personal and professional level to recognise what life was like for Grace and her family, and so to try and get it over to the children was very, very difficult ... whether it was a real story or not, about cutting her hair so that she could go on a ship. Getting children to recognise that women haven't always had the choices, which they have [today], is the really important one.

This was achieved by getting children to imagine what a pirate was like and then challenging the male stereotype images, which they produced by looking at Grace O'Malley. The topic explored specific historical issues, such as the fact that portraits of Grace were made in the 18th century, two hundred years after she had died. The interviewee felt that the children were intrigued by the fact that there is little available evidence to indicate what Grace O'Malley looked like. Events in her life were brought out through the use of drama and role-play:

I would tell the story for a bit then they [the children] would act a bit and then we would freeze frame. Then I would ask them how they felt ... I still don't think that all of the children really understood what life was like ... so it was trying really. I chose all the best bits [of her life such as] the dimmer when she wasn't let in and the kidnapping and then when she met Queen Elizabeth ... even when she was in prison. I got the children to draw a picture of what they thought she looked like and [they began by drawing] cowboy jails and [we refined this by asking] what actually would it have been like to be in a castle ... she wouldn't have light, she wouldn't have heat ... and really got them to try and think about her experiences.

This demonstrates how the interviewee grappled with trying to develop a sense of empathy with young pupils. They also noted the way in which Grace inherited her title and how the use

of stories could be associated with Irish tradition. However, they felt that Grace's ethnicity and where she lived was of limited significance to the children:

We did obviously look at the fact that she was Irish; whilst to me that was interesting, to the children it was neither here nor there. We had a look on a map ... I think that from their point of view it wouldn't have mattered even if she had come from the moon, because she was a 'Pirate' and she did things.

The approach demonstrated a well-developed appreciation of historical skills supported by creative teaching and learning approaches. Nevertheless, it is interesting that they challenged stereotype male images of pirates but not the fact that Grace was regarded as a pirate because she opposed the English conquest of Ireland. This suggests that the interviewee was more interested in gender rather than either multicultural or anti-racist perspectives.

The interviewee said that they would like to develop Irish history topics in future. However, they felt that a number of issues inhibited its development in schools. Curriculum time and government priorities on core subjects were regarded as restrictions but do not appear to have inhibited the interviewee. Possibly a more serious issue was their perception of QCA schemes which they believed to have inhibited the curriculum. The interviewee refused to use the schemes at Key Stage 1 but admitted that they provided useful support for a part time teacher in their school who was responsible for teaching history at Key Stage 2. The researcher contacted the interviewee following the publication of the *Daily Mail* article. They were understandably annoyed because the newspaper had named them and their school without having the courtesy to make any contact whatsoever. Clearly, references to left wing and politically correct sympathies implied in the article were at variance with the interviewee's perceptions of their work.

The second teacher was interviewed in March 2005. They taught in an urban school in Staffordshire, which served a white middle class community. The interviewee had taught for thirty years, of which fifteen had been in their current school. They taught a year 5 class, co-ordinated Environmental Studies and ICT and had recently become an Advanced Skills Teacher for ICT. The school was organised in sets for literacy and numeracy and mixed ability groups for other subject areas. The curriculum was taught through separate subjects, although cross-curricular links were made between different areas of the curriculum. The teacher's experience was in Key Stage 2 and they asked if the interview could focus on this key stage. The interviewee said that an Irish dimension was important in their teaching. When teaching about Ireland they began by looking at the nature of Ireland and the divisions between North and South in PSHE, an issue which is perhaps more readily associated with the secondary school curriculum. They linked it to work in literacy but also used it to draw links across different times in the past:

In year 5 we [make links from the] the famine ... with the Tudors (which we relate to the introduction of] potatoes [and] we can make the link [from this period] with the conflict between the Catholic and Protestant population of Ireland.

When asked about other aspects of history teaching the interviewee said that they supported teaching a combination of content and skills, although they did not elaborate on how the latter was developed. The interviewee considered that English history was important but said that they only made references to Scotland and Wales in literacy. They said that they did not include black or anti-racist history but explored multicultural history by looking at people in different parts of the world.

The summer term [includes] a focus week to look at a country in the world in terms of cultural work. I mean in year 5 we look at Aboriginal culture and that is multicultural history because we look at Aboriginal people and how they evolved into the culture that we see in Australia today.

This clearly went beyond the requirements of the breadth of study in the National Curriculum. They had also established ICT links with schools in Ireland, Germany, Gambia and were developing them with a school in Australia. However, they did not indicate that this was used to promote aspects of history or not.

The interviewee's reasons for developing an Irish dimension in schools appear to have been characterised by an attempt to promote mutual understanding:

We became involved in the Warrington Project, as it was known then, to actually build bridges and make a greater understanding [between Britain and Ireland]; we actually got involved with an exchange scheme, 'The East-West Link Project', where we linked with a school in Limerick.

In some ways this provided a natural development with the ICT links, which they established with schools in other parts of the world. However, it also came as something of a surprise given their indifference to anti-racist history. The project was undertaken by ten schools in Staffordshire and other areas and was supported by a Local Education Adviser at the time of the Good Friday Agreement in Northern Ireland. The adviser put the schools in touch with the chairperson of the Ireland in Schools project, who provided the interviewee with support in developing curriculum materials and links with a school in Belfast. The importance of this link, together with the school's work related to an Irish dimension was publicised on the school's web site (www.gorsemoor.staffs.sch.uk/ireland).

The interviewee emphasised the impact of the enthusiasm and support provided by the chairman of the Ireland in Schools project in their work, which included a curriculum development week related to Ireland as well as the promotion of Irish literature in the school. This involved purchasing Irish historical literature and developing history topics related to Grace O'Malley when teaching the Tudors and the Famine/Hunger for example. The

interviewee had undertaken fund raising activities to enable the school to purchase Irish reading books. The Local Education Authority supported the work of the Ireland in Schools project by providing two conferences in which both the chairperson and two Irish historical fiction authors gave presentations to local teachers. The interviewee appears to have developed an Irish dimension within their curriculum primarily as a result of their own enthusiasm and support from their school and Ireland in Schools. The role of the Local Education Adviser appears to have been generally supportive although it does not appear to have provided curriculum leadership. There was an Irish dimension within their history teaching, but the interviewee's main interests related to developing it through ICT and literacy. The interviewee's commitment to an Irish dimension clearly evident although it was not possible to determine how far they considered diversity issues within other aspects of their teaching.

The third teacher was interviewed in February 2005. The interviewee had been teaching for six years, all of which had been in their current school, which served a predominantly white community in an economically deprived area of Liverpool. During their teaching career they had taught years 2 and 6 and at the time of the interview they were teaching year 3. The interviewee had responsibility for Creative Arts in the school, which included art, drama and music. They had studied History to A level but their degree had been in English. The school operated an integrated curriculum, which meant that the focus of the interview was to ascertain how both history and an Irish dimension related to both history and other areas of the curriculum.

When asked about their perception of the relative importance between skills and content in history the interviewee said that they did not give sufficient attention to historical skills but tried to develop them by using artefacts and resources. Overall, there was a focus on generic rather than subject specific skills. The interviewee developed an Irish dimension through personal interest and availability of resources. They had developed an Irish dimension related to aspects of the school history curriculum. English history was regarded as important but Scottish and Welsh dimensions were never mentioned. They had become involved in a scheme called 'The Green House Project' which had received funding to support black history but also provided opportunities to explore Irish links. They described this as follows:

We went down to the slavery exhibition and we looked at a thing we did with the Irish project where we looked at our names and it was obviously Liverpool and [we explored their origins] and we ... really did get back to where we come from in this multicultural area. The interviewee said that a Local Authority Adviser and their Head of School had encouraged their involvement with the Ireland in Schools project:

The first meeting when they set up the Sefton Pilot [was significant for me in that] I think our Head was invited to it and she came back with various resources and she said, 'This is fabulous' and in my role as Creative Manager, she said, 'Oh, you must have a look at this creative stuff. We will have to do something like this.' She gave me time to think about it and I thought that I wanted to be involved.

The interviewee promoted the use of Irish literature throughout the school. However, they had also developed a dance scheme of work based on the novel *Under the Hawthorn Tree* (Conlon-McKenna, 1990). This identified key aspects of the story such as the death of 'Baby Bridget' as a result of the Famine/Hunger, relations between peasants and landowners and finally the journey, which the children made in order to survive. The approach used video recordings based on the story, together with popular examples of dancing such as extracts from *River Dance* (1996), and drama techniques such as 'hot-seating' to help the children

interpret the story. Clearly, the story, film extracts and the dance related to fiction rather than historical evidence. However, the interviewee prepared for this by teaching the Famine through British and Irish perspectives as part of their study of Victorian Britain. This involved encouraging pupils to make comparisons between the rural conditions in 19th century Ireland with factory conditions in urban parts of Britain. Their examination of conditions in Ireland was supported by sources, including paintings of 19th century Ireland provided by the Ireland in Schools chairperson.

At the time of the interview the teacher was planning to develop another dance activity which focused on the experience of World War 2 evacuees. This unit made particular use of a novel called *Safe Harbour* written by Conlon-McKenna (1995) and a range of resources including pictures, photographs and wartime music. Arguably the pupils had produced a form of historical fiction, which could be compared with written stories using the past as a catalyst for developing the writer's creativity. Nevertheless, was it less clear how far the children critically analysed the fictional materials against historical evidence? The overall impression provided by this interviewee was that an Irish dimension was developed within a range of curriculum areas and that history contributed to this. In addition, an Irish dimension provided a catalyst for a number of community activities, which included talks provided by parents, musical events and links with a local Roman Catholic school. The interviewee had clearly enriched their curriculum by using the expertise and support of the Ireland in Schools project and had been encouraged by their Head Teacher. Nevertheless, the interviewee felt that some issues restricted their work, notably the way in which history had been squeezed within the curriculum. They also noted that the Local Authority Adviser who had helped to establish this

link had been made redundant as result of financial cutbacks and feared that this would affect future creative projects.

What underlying threads indicate the way in which this case study related to the Ireland in Schools project and the development of an Irish dimension? In all three cases Local Authority Advisers were important in providing links with Ireland in Schools, together with some support. There was also some evidence of encouragement from the Head Teacher in two of the schools. However, the enthusiasm of individual teachers and direct links with the Ireland in Schools chairperson appear to have been the overriding influences. The first interviewee was a historian and both the first and second interviewees taught history as a separate subject, but all three interviewees supported linked learning. The use of the internet or people from the local community appeared to provide rich educational opportunities for pupils. Limited references were made to historical skills and dimensions although some reference was made to a multicultural perspective, especially by the third interviewee. Only the second interviewee made significant reference to the initial purpose of the project as a means of promoting British and Irish understanding. It is ironic that the first interviewee, whose work provided the basis for the *Daily Mail's* concerns, was not strongly committed to developing an Irish dimension.

What 'fuzzy generalisations' emerge from the perceptions of the chairperson and the three case studies? The chairperson was committed to developing an Irish dimension in schools but clearly adapted to meeting interviewee needs. In most cases this led to the strategic concerns or interests of the interviewees taking precedence over other considerations. This was particularly evident where interviewees wanted to enhance preparation for their School

History Project GCSE courses or as a vehicle for promoting thinking skills. Two secondary teachers closely related an Irish dimension to an anti-racist curriculum but this was less significant with the other interviewees. One primary teacher interviewee related an Irish dimension to the initial purposes of the project, and another linked Irish and multicultural dimensions. However, the main consideration appears to have been in promoting a focus for cross subject and/or community links. It provided expertise and enthusiasm, which has stimulated grass roots classroom based projects to flourish in a way that is both flexible and relevant for teacher needs. On the other hand it has relied on the perceptions and values of teachers in determining how far pragmatic needs are matched by a commitment to developing an Irish dimension linked to an anti-racist curriculum. Certainly there is no evidence to suggest that any of the interviewees were following the radical left wing agenda depicted in the *Daily Mail* article.

CHAPTER 7

'MOVERS AND SHAKERS' PERCEPTIONS OF AN IRISH DIMENSION IN THE HISTORY CURRICULUM

The purpose of this chapter is to identify the perceptions of seven people whose role has enabled them to influence the work of history teachers and/or student teachers. The first four interviewees included the lead HMI for history, the QCA officer for History, the Director of the School History Project together with a prominent history textbook writer and INSET provider. All four interviews were undertaken by telephone. The remaining three interviewees, included a Professor and Lecturer in History Education who worked at Birmingham University and the Birmingham LEA Adviser with responsibility for History. They were selected because they were particularly significant in Birmingham, the location for three case studies undertaken in previous chapters.

BERA (2004) ethical guidelines are intended to ensure that interviewees remain anonymous if they wished this to be the case. However, the role of most of the interviewees and the fact that several of them have published seminal teacher textbooks has meant that it has not been realistic to disguise their identity. This issue was shared with the interviewees and they understood and appreciated the situation. In order to ensure at least partial anonymity, which some interviewees preferred, they have not been named, although in some cases they can be identified by reference to their publications. Hopefully, this approach also has the advantage of encouraging the reader to focus on the views of the interviewees rather than their identity. It was possible to meet all three of the interviewees who worked in Birmingham.

The intention is to explore the specific perspectives and issues indicated by each of the educators and draw out major threads, which can be compared with the perceptions provided by the case studies analysed in previous case studies. The interviews took place between January and March 2006 after the teacher case studies. This reflects the decision to interview key educators with the intention of comparing their perceptions with those that emerged from the earlier case studies. The researcher knew each interviewee in a professional capacity. The researcher has been the secretary of Midlands History Forum since 1992 and has invited the HMI, QCA Officer for History, Director of the School History Project and INSET provider to give keynote presentations at conferences. The interviewer had worked more closely with the remaining three interviewees over a number of years and the nature of this relationship will be specified when their interviews are analysed. The interviewees were selected because their position in the educational sector which provided them with particular insights into the nature of school history.

The HMI for History was interviewed in March 2006. The interviewee also provided a keynote presentation to the Midlands History Forum Conference (Armitage, 2006) which supplemented information provided during their interview. Most of the following analysis is based on the interview. However, reference will also be made to a key note presentation which the interviewee made at the Midlands History Forum on 11th November 2006 and a report of their address to the Royal Institute of Historical Research Conference in *The Times Education Supplement* on February 23rd 2007 (TES, 2007). The interviewee had been an HMI for 18 years and said that they had undertaken a range of different roles in the past, including the provision of guidance on school evaluation and the development of training materials for citizenship, social, moral, spiritual and cultural education. As an interviewee

they provided a unique insight into both the state of history in schools and the direction in which it was expected to develop within the context of the whole curriculum.

From the beginning of the interview it was evident that the interviewee's overriding concern was *Every Child Matters* (DfES, 2004). The interviewee's reply to an introductory question about the relative importance of skills and content in history teaching called for flexibility in the approach used if this met the needs of the child:

It is difficult to put these in any order of importance because all are important. [We need to] go back to the needs of the child and let that dictate what is the most important ... You could say that the most able are able to deal with content and skills in equal measure but with less able children I think that the story is very important.

The implications of this were related to the needs of pupils across all key stages. For example, the interviewee felt that there might be circumstances where it is necessary to focus on literacy rather than higher order history skills with a Key Stage 2 pupil if this met their particular needs. However, it was evident from the keynote presentation, which the interviewee made to the Midlands History Forum Conference, that this did not mean that they wanted to dilute the significance of history. Here the interviewee warned that the development of the creative curriculum in primary schools still required that topics should be sufficiently focused for progression in history to be possible.

The interviewee returned to the argument of meeting every child's needs when they were asked to evaluate the importance of an Irish dimension alongside other dimensions:

In view of what I have just said about responding to pupils' needs, all are as important as the other. What do young people need? It may vary. There will be elements of history that everyone should do and there should be opportunities to respond to need. In terms of the compulsory core, my opinion is that English, Irish, Welsh and Scottish dimensions should be there, but they are not there at the moment. The focus could be a big question about the development of Britain, which should bring in some or all of these [dimensions]. It is odd to me that we do not see how the country has built up or fallen apart. People teach the

Romans, Tudors, World War 2 in a vacuum, whereas I would much prefer to see themes offering coherence and continuity up to the present day – for example, looking at who has come to Britain and why ... You should bring everything in the class up to the present and explain why it is important that we know about the past – that's school history, which is different to just history.

The interviewee felt that an Irish dimension related to this general framework of the past as an intrinsic part of British history. The interviewee's support for teaching diverse histories was highlighted in a TES report of a conference address that they gave in 2007:

He warned the Institute of Historical Research Conference that pupils were being taught English rather than British history and that the stories of immigrant communities were being neglected ... "If somebody is going to be a plumber going out and working in different communities it might help if they had some understanding of their history." (TES, 2007, pp.4-5)

The interviewee believed that teachers could be flexible in the way in which they taught the National Curriculum but felt that Key Stage 3, GCSE and AS and A2 history needed to be opened up and include a vocational element to make it relevant to the modern world. The above quotation was also related to the interviewee's support for the development of vocational history within the GCSE pilot, which they hoped to see carried through to changes at AS/A2 level. This theme had also been addressed in their presentation to Midlands History Forum in November 2006. The overall impression provided from this interviewee was that they wanted to promote what they considered to be a relevant history curriculum, which would meet a wide range of pupil needs, and that their perception of the place of an Irish dimension must be seen within this wider perspective.

The second interviewee was the QCA adviser for history and they were interviewed in February 2006. The interviewee had responsibility to the government for history provision throughout the 3-19 age range. This involved extensive contacts with the history education community including HMI, examination boards, advisers, subject organisations and teachers.

The interviewee had undertaken this role for six years, having previously been a history teacher, LEA adviser and inspector. During their time as an LEA adviser they had undertaken projects with teachers on both Irish history and black history, which related to the identity of local communities. The interviewee was able to provide insights into both the current policies and procedures affecting the history curriculum and their application. Consequently, their perceptions provided a useful means of complementing the insights provided by the History HMI. The interviewee's perceptions of an Irish dimension were firmly embedded within the context of teaching for diversity, the flexible nature of the curriculum and opportunities and constraints affecting curriculum development. Consequently, it is useful to relate their perceptions of teaching for diversity to the history curriculum and then relating an Irish dimension to this. The interviewee considered that the debate over skills and content had been polarised in the 1970s and 1980s but had moved on as a result of the National Curriculum, which had shown teachers how to blend them. Consequently, they felt that it was no longer an issue for specialist history teachers.

The interviewee considered that National Curriculum in 2000 provided the opportunity for teachers to plan for all dimensions with sufficient flexibility to tailor the curriculum to their own specific needs and circumstances. Although it focused on British history they felt that this ought to be interpreted in its widest sense:

The National Curriculum, I suppose by its very nature, will place greatest emphasis on British history than some of the other dimensions, but it is British history in its broadest sense, that is, in its world wide context, and a recognition I think of the differing histories within British history.

The interviewee felt that the specifications for GCSE provided opportunities to develop different dimensions within the history curriculum through the Modern World Study in the School History Project or within the Twentieth Century World History courses. The

interviewee noted that a significant minority of more adventurous teachers had used the advent of modules at AS and A2 to introduce modules related to different periods.

Nevertheless, the interviewee suggested that a number of factors inhibited the realisation of these opportunities by some teachers. An important consideration was the issue of teacher attitudes and understanding:

I think that there are some teachers who seem to be not that confident about teaching, particularly multi-ethnic history. And the other thing I think is attitudes where I have had some teachers say to me 'Well this is nothing to do with my school, our school is largely white ... and that's clearly a worry. If anything it is certainly as relevant to those schools but even more so. I think that schools in inner cities are forced to address this and I have had teachers in inner London say to me, 'Well, I've changed my curriculum ... what I was doing before wasn't resonating with them [pupils from different ethnic and cultural communities] and at GCSE and A level I was losing students ... So they addressed it in the light of that and probably, if you work in an inner city, you have got that commitment anyway.

The interviewee considered that this was not helped by limited INSET opportunities available for continued professional development in history for both primary and secondary teachers. A second issue was the decision by some teachers not to develop diversity options within the Modern World History GCSE course in their schools. The assumption was that teaching about Nazi Germany would increase the number of children opting for history and GCSE and AS/A2. Thirdly, the interviewee felt that many published resources were often inadequate with respect to teaching for diversity:

If you look at the resources that exist, you can see that a lot of them don't address that; so you might see textbooks purportedly on British history [but] they are not, they are on English history and very mainstream: they don't recognise the gender issues, the multi-ethnic issues ... Not all textbooks, but quite a lot.

The interviewee was optimistic about the scope to develop a more diverse history curriculum in the future. They said that a history lecturer at the University of the West of England had suggested that it would be useful to have a bibliography for primary and secondary teachers to

include both published and local resources related to ethnic and cultural diversity. The lecturer was in the process of creating the bibliography for the QCA and it was intended that it would be able to expand this to meet future needs. The interviewee said that the QCA were in the process of reviewing Key Stage 3, GCSE and A level and that, certainly at A level, this would lead to a much greater emphasis on diversity and inclusion within its aims. This principle was already evident in the development of specifications for a pilot GCSE, which was intended to bridge the academic and vocational divide. The core units for the pilot GCSE included medieval history and either local and or international study. The course also included a number of optional units related to themes such as migration and presenting the past. The interviewee stressed the importance of teaching for diversity within this course:

We wanted ways of holding the different components of the pilot together so that the whole experience made sense to the young person taking it. And if you look at that, the key strands that hold it together are citizenship, interpretation and diversity and inclusion and they run through. They are the strands that every unit has to address ... For example, in the medieval unit, which is one of the compulsory units, one of the themes is diversity within the medieval periods. If you ignore that you are going to do a disservice to the candidates so they are going to struggle to get through the exam.

How did the interviewee's perception of an Irish dimension in the curriculum relate to their ideas about the diversity within the history curriculum as a whole? The interviewee felt that an Irish dimension had a significant part to play as a dimension within the National Curriculum:

We recognise it (an Irish dimension) as important, as a key part of understanding British history and where we have got to today particularly [giving consideration to developments from the] 17th, 19th and 20th centuries ... We haven't gone as far as specifying specific events in the National Curriculum; we have moved away from that but, nevertheless, within that structure it would be possible to cover these.

What this meant in the history classroom depended on the expertise, attitudes of teachers and the resources available to them. The interviewee felt that this was more likely to be an issue in primary schools:

[In primary schools] it's quite possible to do topics that cover and address the Irish dimension, and I think it would be desirable. But I think, again, if they are non-specialists, unless they get advice in addition to the National Curriculum, they are not necessarily going to make these links, maybe not even necessarily see that they should

begin to do that. That's the key, because the National Curriculum doesn't, the message isn't so strong ... I think a secondary teacher interested in, say, British history in the 19th century ... know that you can't address political history in the 19th century without addressing the Irish Question, and the same I think is true for British history for a lot of the twentieth century.

However, they felt that primary teachers were very receptive to change when it was possible to work directly with them. The interviewee felt that this approach was reflected by the work the Ireland in Schools project had undertaken with primary school teachers. Work related to Grace O'Malley, which was based on a teacher's collaboration with the Ireland in Schools project, had been put on the QCA's *Innovating History* website. The criticism, which this topic aroused from the *Daily Mail* (Harris, 2004), has been considered in Chapter 6. The support provided by QCA, and the fact that the Grace O'Malley material remained on their site despite having received criticism in the national press, suggests that the interviewee and the organisation were both willing and able to promote curriculum initiatives in the face of overt attacks from the media.

The interviewee felt that at secondary level teachers had more confidence than primary teachers in developing their schemes of work and were more likely to have the expertise to develop an Irish dimension. However, they said that in order to help them QCA had developed a Key Stage 3 scheme of work called 'Divided Ireland: why has it been so hard to achieve peace in Ireland?' The unit was split into three key issues – 'Why is the past so important to some people in Ireland?' 'Why was Ireland partitioned?' 'Why were there violent protests in Northern Ireland in 1968-9?' The interviewee saw it as an adaptation to the needs of Key Stage 3 of the approach used in the Modern World Study unit in the School History Project. This naturally led to a discussion of the merits of the School History Project course related to Modern Ireland at Key Stage 4. The interviewee considered that the way that

this course required young people to set current issues in their historical context by looking at developments over the past 400 years of Irish history, provided useful skills which they could apply to other contexts. However, they said that whether Ireland was used to exemplify a current issue depended on whether history teachers chose to select it.

Finally, the interviewee identified how an Irish dimension contributed to the pilot History GCSE (OCR, 2006) that was due to be implemented in September 2006. Although teachers had to address issues such as diversity, the syllabus was intended to be more flexible than existing examination courses. The interviewee indicated that this had the following implications for an Irish dimension:

In terms of the Irish dimension they [the history teacher] could choose not to do that. That is certainly a possibility. Or equally on the positive side they could choose to do that and they could do it through a number of different units.

They said that the medieval unit content had been reviewed on a number of occasions to ensure that it included the histories of England, Scotland, Wales and Ireland. Teachers would have the opportunities to choose whether to include an Irish dimension within other units of the course. The overall impression given from interviewee perceptions was that they were sympathetic towards teaching an Irish dimension within the context of a flexible approach to the curriculum that gave due consideration to diversity. Within this framework they allowed for a significant degree of teacher choice, which would affect the extent to which they chose to develop Irish history.

The third interviewee was the Director of the School History Project, and the interview took place in February 2006. The breadth of their role and influence meant that their perspective on the place of an Irish dimension provided a strong justification for interviewing them. The

interviewee had also contributed to the History Working Party, which had led to the introduction of the History National Curriculum in 1991, provided INSET, written textbooks and developed school history programmes for the BBC since the 1980s. The interviewee worked with the Edexcel GCSE Examination Board, and was a regional cluster leader for the GCSE History pilot due to be introduced by the OCR Examination Board in September 2006. They had previously taught history over a period of 18 years in three secondary schools. The breadth of this interviewee's role within secondary school history with respect to planning, publications and INSET provision meant that it was important to analyse their perceptions of an Irish dimension.

The interviewee indicated both their sympathies for teaching a diverse history curriculum and how they used their position to promote it:

I have great opportunities to make things ... through books first of all - all that the School History Project produces and I am connected with. We try to ensure that a cultural balance and a gender balance is achieved. I try, as you know, to give platform at the conference to wider multicultural and a Four Nations View of history as far as I can.

This included providing the researcher with the opportunity to give questionnaires to delegates at the 2004 School History Project in July 2004. When asked about their perceptions of the history curriculum, the interviewee said that in the 1980s they had supported skills over content but had come to realise that content was significant. The interviewee felt that the National Curriculum debate had led to an appreciation that both skills and content were important. They found it difficult to rate the importance of different dimensions in the history curriculum but considered that English and Irish history were important and that Scottish and Welsh dimensions had some importance. The interviewee regarded anti-racist, black and multicultural history as important but did not draw any distinction between them. However, they said that the National Curriculum Working Party

had included sufficient support for a Four Nations approach to Britain's past to ensure that they were not restricted to a narrow focus on English history. The interviewee felt that British history had not been effectively developed in practice. However, they still felt that the National Curriculum has had a positive impact on both British and world history:

If you look at what the curriculum was like before the National Curriculum ... prior to 1991 it was pretty well 100% British equals English history. And now people love to slag off the National Curriculum, but still people are doing, maybe not giving enough weight, but they are doing a non-British unit.

However, the interviewee felt that several issues had reduced opportunities for developing a multicultural perspective in history since the 1980s. A combination of teacher and publisher expectations was considered to be one of the major issues:

You get a cycle of [the publishers saying], 'Who does this? Not many people; we won't include a chapter in our textbooks,' and the poor old teachers say, 'Well, I haven't got any resources for this, I going to find it hard to teach.' You get locked into a cycle. I think the same applies to some Modern World syllabuses from the 80s and 90s - there would have been South American and Caribbean history ... but they disappeared.

In part they felt that the problem lay in the pressure on teachers with respect to results, which encouraged them to stick cautiously to well-resourced and well-known areas and discouraged innovation. They felt that while a minority of teachers might be concerned about teaching black history or immigration, their voice was not loud enough to be heard by the examination boards. At the same time the interviewee felt that the business orientation of examination boards and publishers had restricted the range of topics within both examinations and textbooks.

Did the interviewee consider that these issues affected an Irish dimension? In one sense they felt that the Ireland as a Modern Study was declining as a result of the Peace Process:

It is a good thing for Ireland but a bad thing for the study of Irish history, which is that fewer people are doing [the Modern World Study] and, in a way, as SHP Director, I can't

argue with that really because there are huge issues which are at the forefront of teenager's minds which the course ought to handle, and the most recent work I have done is to devise some work on terrorism ... It is an unfortunate feature that violence is what the Modern World Study tends to focus on ... the drift from Irish history towards Middle East studies is because Ireland is less violent and the Middle East is more violent.

The interviewee also considered that a reduction in the weighting given to coursework in the GCSE forced teachers to focus on the assignment rather than exploring the context of Ireland more fully:

I do think the reduction to twelve and a half percent per assignment is a weak link. Inevitably it is a little bit of background and then wack into the assignment ... I think people probably spend less than a term - probably eight weeks would be normal, on a coursework assignment of which three maybe four would be taken up writing the assignment.

This could reduce opportunities to explore adequately the historical context of the Ireland Modern World Study. The interviewee moved on to argue that time constraints affected opportunities to develop an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3:

I think the good intentions of the National Curriculum to have more non-British history and more Four Nations [which included an Irish dimension] history hasn't been as great as it could be, is probably [due to] time ... In the National Curriculum Working Party we were talking about two hours per week for history, and the fact of the situation is that the majority are on 60 or even 50 minutes per week.

Nevertheless, the interviewee countered these gloomy perceptions with examples of positive developments which were taking place. Firstly, they indicated a growing interest in the theme of Empire and indicated that the BBC would be producing a programme related to it within their 'Time-Lines' series. Secondly, they demonstrated how it was possible to integrate a multicultural dimension into mainstream history by reference to a textbook that they were writing:

At the moment I am doing a year 8 book, and one of the topics is about wars in the period 1500-1900, so I am going to do something on Trafalgar and I want to pick out diversity of the crew of the *Victory* because we know that there were some Caribbeans and some Indians and that there were people from about 20 nationalities on the *Victory*

alone. So there are opportunities to free up some traditional treatment, which I will try and take.

The interviewee appears to have supported an ethnically diverse curriculum both in principle and practice. Although they did not distinguish between multicultural and anti-racist history, covert support for the latter may be implied by their references to a Four Nations perspective, tackling xenophobia, and exploring issues related to Empire. At the same time their commentary provided an insight into the issues and opportunities affecting curriculum development.

What were their perceptions of an Irish dimension? The interviewee said that they had a personal interest in Irish history but felt that had little to do with developing it. Nevertheless, this perception may well underplay their role. In their role as Director of the School History Project they had provided the researcher with the opportunity to undertake a questionnaire to support an earlier chapter for this thesis. The interviewee provided opportunities for the Ireland in Schools project to have workshops at three conferences. They also directly supported the project by co-writing a unit called 'Reputations. Sources: Cromwell at Drogheda' which examined Irish and English interpretations of Cromwell's actions at Drogheda (Bailey & Culpin, 2002). The interviewee had also written a GCSE British Social and Economic History textbook (Culpin & Turner, 1987) in which the experiences of 19th century Irish migrants were compared with other migrants to Britain in the 19th and 20th centuries. Arguably, this related to the needs of newly developed examination courses but it is worth noting that some textbook writers (eg Unwin 1986) did not include this topic. The interviewee explained the significance of including an Irish dimension as a means of demonstrating that:

People have come and gone through England and Britain over quite a long period ... That xenophobia is not new. I wanted to put in those quotes ... those really anti-Irish quotes to kind of illustrate a theme about multiculturalism today. The Irish do actually disappear from the story when I get into the 20th century, but I suppose what I was trying to say is a sort of mini version of 'Invaders and Settlers' and how people have been tramping across this land for a long time.

This perception clearly sets Irish migration in the context of anti-racist history, although it is unfortunate that it failed to explore more issues faced by the Irish community. The interviewee said that the Key Stage 3 textbooks which they had produced, had all included some Irish history. The interviewee also noted that their work for the BBC had helped to develop an Irish dimension as part of an attempt to promote Four Nations History:

In our initial efforts to cover British history we did make an effort to cover Wales, Scotland and Ireland. Have we made an Irish history series? We have done something certainly on Cromwell and Drogheda.

The interviewee said that an Irish dimension could provide an interesting dimension as part of the developing interest in teaching about the story of Empire. Indeed, the BBC schools' programme, which they were planning around the theme of Empire, was going to start with looking at Wales, then Ireland, before looking at developments in the 18th and 19th centuries.

Finally, the interviewee was a regional cluster leader for the GCSE pilot. They were optimistic about this curriculum development in that it demonstrated that some teachers were prepared to experiment in areas where resources were not readily available within an educational climate that discourages innovation. However, the interviewee was in the early stages of developing the course, and when asked about whether the medieval core unit would focus on British as opposed to English history, they replied that they had not considered resources for it as yet.

I don't think there was consciously a feeling that it would give opportunities to deal with Britain as an island through which people passed. But I have no doubt that

teachers will take on that. I don't think we have time to have particularly lengthy debates about that.

When asked specifically about opportunities in which to develop an Irish dimension, they related this more to the local and international core units, which were to be taught at the start of the pilot in the autumn term of 2006.

There hasn't been an expressed wish [from teachers] to do any Irish history. There are some Irish schools - we will see what they do as a local study perhaps ... I do think it is perfectly okay as a Modern World Study. It will be interesting to know what we decided ... Ireland hasn't come up yet. There is no reason why it might not.

This suggested that the development of an Irish dimension within their cluster group was by no means certain. The interviewee was clearly in the early stages of developing the new course but did not appear to share the second interviewee's reference to diversity as a fundamental feature of the medieval unit. These comments were surprising given the interviewee's active support for an Irish dimension within the context of teaching for diversity and Four Nations throughout the interview. Can it be assumed that immediate pressures to get the new course started led to compromises over content? The medieval unit was not the first unit which schools would be developing, and it is possible that it had not been given the same degree of consideration as some of the other units, such as the international and local studies. Overall, the interviewee had certainly promoted teaching for diversity including an Irish dimension in a range of contexts, although they were aware of a range of issues, which held back their development in schools.

The fourth interviewee was selected because they were engaged in a range of activities, which had a major impact on the work of history teachers, and the interview took place in February 2006. Their work included writing textbooks, providing ICT based INSET for history teachers, producing web-based materials with the National Archives and their role as a cluster

leader for the GCSE History pilot. They had previously been Head of History in a secondary school and currently taught GCSE and AS/A2 History as a part time lecturer in a Further Education College. The interviewee said that they had a personal interest in Irish history as a result of their family background. At a later stage of the interview they indicated that their family history was significant in their personal and professional life:

I personally have a big interest in Empire, the British Empire, and it is partly from my roots as a Liverpool lad with Irish parents. I often struggle with being English to be honest, and I can't sit down and deconstruct that, and it throws me sometimes when I go to Northern Ireland and I am regarded as that English bloke in the corner. Whereas over here, of course, like many first and second-generation sort of people, you don't feel English either do you?

Given the range of activities which the interviewee was involved in, it was particularly important to see how far this personal interest influenced their perceptions of the past and its impact on their work. Their response to the introductory question about the relative importance of skills, concepts and historical knowledge provided a useful starting point for examining their perceptions:

I like the idea of skills, concepts and historical context of being of equal importance ... I think sometimes it is a bit like saying, 'What would you rather have - arms or legs?' It becomes artificial when you have to distinguish them ... if you are talking about the portrayal of a particular group, it might be the Irish in 19th century Britain or it might be the abolition of slavery. It is just as important to see the methodology used in propaganda as it is to know the propaganda existed and there was an Irish question or a slavery question.

This indicated clear links between process and content and used examples related to both diversity and Ireland. The interviewee's perceptions about historical dimensions focused on broad issues. They were critical of definitions such as multicultural or black history because they felt that they ghettoised aspects of history and argued that the concept of empire was a more effective mechanism for looking at the past. The interviewee was critical of the way in which these dimensions often featured as an afterthought when looking at topics like Tudor seafaring or were restricted to studies of slavery, and argued that they needed to be an

underlining thread in courses through a series of case studies based around the theme of Empire. This was exemplified by the approach taken with writing a Key Stage 3 textbook (Walsh, 2003), which explored the Roman Empire, Medieval Britain and African Empires.

When discussing the section dealing with African Empires they argued:

There were some Empires like Mali, and I also wanted this concept of Empire to become better understood. So, for instance, I pitched the Norman Conquest not so much as the Norman Conquest but as the middle of an imperial process with the Normans and Angevins ... I wanted kids to see ... African emperors as proper politicians and real kings who scratched their heads over problems and sometimes did terrible things, just as complex and human and real as medieval kings [in Britain].

The underlying structure enabled pupils to explore the Roman Empire by looking at how Rome became an empire, what it was like and why it declined. The medieval empire focused on why the Normans built up an empire, how people were ruled and how they lived. Empires within Africa were explored before looking at the impact of Europeans, slavery, the scramble for Africa and the impact of independence. However, there were very few references to Ireland, Scotland and Wales within the section of the book dealing with the Normans. This was certainly at odds with both comments made by the interviewee and features in other aspects of their work. The interviewee argued that Irish history should be taught, and that while British history and English history were often regarded as interchangeable for English people this was not acceptable to Irish, Scottish or Welsh people. Consequently they felt that there was a case for getting to know about the union between England, Wales and Scotland. They felt Irish history needed to be prioritised where time constraints were an issue because of the issues involved:

I think there is an obvious incentive to prioritise Irish history for the simple reason of its legacy. Although 'The Troubles' are notionally over... I think Ireland does have a claim in that respect. In much the same way as other troubled spots, there is logic to examining their history as well, if just to find the roots of some of these problems.

Towards the end of the interview the discussion returned to perceptions of anti-racism and Empire and they said that their interest in both arose from attempts to identify how Ireland fitted into this. However, they felt that it was necessary to avoid assumptions that the degree of racism was the same in different historical contexts. For example they felt that the abuses in Northern Ireland did not equate with the abuses which have taken place against black people in the United States or South Africa. At the same time they felt that events could be reduced to slogans, or claims of victim-hood, such as blaming the English for the Famine whereas the reality was more complex.

The interviewee provided a range of contexts in which they had developed an Irish dimension. The most significant example of this was a textbook which they produced for the School History Project Modern World Study (Walsh, 2000). The textbook consisted of eight chapters. Given the focus of the examination requirements, the textbook emphasised recent and contemporary events. However, a strong thread throughout the book was the link between past and present, together with an attempt to show two sides to the conflict. The interviewee said that their publisher provided them with a great deal of freedom when writing textbooks. They used this freedom to identify what teachers required:

The initial thinking was to address the main problem in school reporting back which was essentially ... tension that in order to assess an issue in any meaningful way you need a certain depth of knowledge. On the other hand, if you haven't got time, how can you do that? And I think the other problem is, how do you stop it becoming one damn thing after another? And so we combined a pedagogical and content type approach ... For many of them league tables and results and OFSTED are the driving forces ... and so I don't blame the school for trying to get through the thing in six weeks if that is the way their course is set up.

However, the approach, which they used to write the textbook went beyond a pragmatic response to the needs of the examination. When writing texts they explored recent revisionist

interpretations and provided an appreciation of historical contexts. This led to an attempt to provide two perspectives on the conflict in the textbook in order to:

Challenge to a degree the orthodoxy of nationalist left-wing perspectives that have dominated views. I think one of the difficulties that often appears is the people who choose to do an Ireland unit are very often passionately interested in it in the first place and want to communicate all this to the kids and struggle to do so in the time available ... I think the resource of this dimension of the Nationalist, slightly left-wing interpretation is very dominant ... I hope that by challenging it in a balanced way, hopefully I did not challenge in a way that could be dismissed.

The challenges of this undertaking involved spending a significant amount of time in Northern Ireland schools, working with children, teachers and advisers. Successive drafts of the texts resulted from people challenging the interviewee's implicit prejudices, such as when they referred to the 'IRA assassinations' and 'Loyalist murders'. However, given their attempts to provide balance, it is interesting to note that the interviewee felt that this preoccupation could go too far and that certain events such as the Unionists' objection to the Civil Rights marches in the late 1960s was not justified. When dealing with this issue they said that they tried to explain why people acted in a certain way, which did not mean that they thought it was right.

The interviewee saw opportunities to develop an Irish dimension through their work with the GCSE pilot by using it as an international study. They noted that an important feature of this study was to make it distinctive from the School History Project by requiring schools to focus on a significant, rather than necessarily a recent event. They said that one school in their cluster had selected Ireland as an international event, while other teachers explored issues related to Vietnam or World War I. The interviewee said that at first the international events had been regarded as non-British, but during discussions it had been decided to allow anything which was not English, which meant that Ireland could be included. Some teachers

in their cluster group still had difficulty accepting Ireland as an international study, but this issue had been resolved by exploring the diaspora associated with the Famine as a significant event. Despite the fact that the interviewee saw opportunities to explore issues such as Britishness and identity in an optional unit on migration, like the third interviewee, they had not related these dimensions to the core medieval unit.

The interviewee had developed several projects related to an Irish dimension through ICT, which was exemplified through the following example:

I've got the data file which shows the passenger lists coming to Quebec port in 1847 and so I get students to look at the data that is coming out of this and compare it with accounts on websites of how dreadful the coffin ships were and that sort of thing. And so they are able to correlate by calculating percentages of deaths on ships ... They are able to draw patterns of - does the picture in the website reflect the actual hard data that we have got here?

Their work on coffin ships was subsequently developed into a unit of work for the Ireland in Schools project to use with Key Stage 3 pupils, entitled 'The truth about coffin ships? An investigation: The Irish Famine and the flight to America' (Walsh, 2007). The unit began by getting pupils to explore the way that the event was interpreted and represented at the Irish National Famine Memorial in County Mayo and a fictional diary of the passage across the Atlantic. Pupils were then given a series of internet tasks using written and qualitative data in order to evaluate these representations.

Clearly the interviewee had demonstrated both an interest in promoting an Irish dimension and recognised the way in which it related to wider issues associated with diversity.

Nevertheless, they were aware of a number of factors that hindered its development within the curriculum. Although it was specified in Key Stages 2 and 3 and was an option at Key Stage 4, the interviewee felt that much depended on teacher interest. Most schools undertook the

Modern World Syllabus at GCSE and it was still only an option within the School History Project course. They felt that this issue was exacerbated by time restrictions:

I am reasonably confident in history teachers ... It's not that they [teachers] don't regard the Famine as important; they recognise that if you are going to study the Famine you can't just drop in the Famine, you have got to cover a wider dimension. Now if you are going to cover a wider dimension, something has got to go.

However, even if the issue of time were resolved, they felt that teachers faced difficult decisions about what to include in their teaching:

Even if the precious space became available there is a lot of competition to fill that. Lots of schools for instance don't study the Russian Revolution and even as an enthusiast for Irish history I would be pushed to sort of say, 'Yes, Ireland is more important than 1917.

Overall, this interviewee had developed a range of materials which included an Irish dimension, and this reflected their personal interests and values. However, given the nature of their work they understandably exercised a degree of pragmatism to ensure that their products would appeal to practising teachers.

The remaining interviewees were selected because they provided support to teachers and/or student teachers in Birmingham. Their views were particularly important in that they provided a direct basis for comparison with responses from the three questionnaires and interview case studies drawn from teachers in this area, which have been considered in previous chapters. Interviewees five and six lectured in the School of Education at Birmingham University and their interview took place in January 2006. They worked directly with the secondary history mentors who contributed to the first questionnaire and interview case study. Consequently, the interview provided opportunities to explore both their perceptions of history teaching and their impact on mentors and developing teachers. Interviewees five and six were interviewed together because the latter had replaced interviewee five as a PGCE History lecturer eighteen

months before the time of the interview. The perceptions of each of them will be considered in turn in order to analyse their perceptions more effectively. However, it is appreciated that the context of the interview may have influenced the interviewee responses.

The fifth interviewee was a Professor of Education, who had extensive experience in teaching PGCE history students, although they had relinquished this role for the past two and a half years. The interviewee was sympathetic towards equal opportunities issues and had particular expertise in women's education history. The researcher had previously worked with the interviewee and had known them for fifteen years. When asked about their general perceptions about the nature of history the interviewee said that both skills and content were important. They said that during their own schooling content had been the focus of teaching, but during their teaching career skills had been seen at the cutting edge of learning.

Nevertheless, they felt that it was necessary to have contextual knowledge in which skills could be understood. The interviewee's perception of an Irish dimension was set within their broader perception of the past. They felt that all historical dimensions were important and it was important to draw links between them. The interviewee particularly emphasised the importance of multicultural, black and anti-racist perspectives throughout the programme of study. At the same time they felt that it was necessary to make links between different dimensions by setting Medieval Britain in its European context and including Imperialism in any study of the 19th century. At the same time they felt that British history needed to include Irish, Welsh and Scottish perspectives. The interviewee accepted the need to cover topics in breadth but also that depth made it difficult to cover these historical dimensions, and suggested that it could be achieved by using different dimensions as a focus in exploring different periods in the past. The interviewee was aware that this was not fully developed by

teachers in schools. They noted common excuses such as time and also the argument that some teachers gave, that English children should be taught about English history, given that the curriculum in other parts of Britain allowed for their national identities to be taught. They countered the argument by noting that the National Curriculum required British history to be taught and emphasised that 'England needs to know as Wales, Ireland and Scotland will never forget, that they are part of Britain'. A natural progression from this was the interviewee's argument that Irish history needed to be taught outside Roman Catholic schools, its natural constituency, in the same way that black and women's history needed to be taught outside black and girls' schools, as these dimensions were universally relevant. These views have been partly influenced by the interviewee's Welsh identity. However, they also indicated a strongly established awareness of anti-racist issues within the history curriculum.

The interviewee suggested a number of factors affecting the extent that they were able to develop issues related to diversity, including an Irish dimension, with their students. They had been able to support diversity issues in general through their teaching, assignments and local contacts with organisations such as TIDE, which emphasised an equal opportunities dimension within the curriculum. However, the interviewee felt that the preoccupation of student teachers and mentors with basic issues such as classroom management, the overwhelming influence of mentors over what was actually taught in schools limited the extent to which they influenced students' practice during the course. Although they had made contact with the Ireland in Schools project they had not really found opportunities to promote an Irish dimension within general sessions. Nevertheless, they identified two positive ways in which students and former students explored diversity issues. Firstly, for a number of years PGCE students had undertaken whole group activities with some partnership schools where

the interests of particular mentors had encouraged them to explore diversity issues. An Irish dimension had been developed through one mentor, while others had looked at ethnic diversity in general and gender. Secondly, the interviewee had attended a TIDE meeting and was pleased to find that most attendees were their ex-students, which suggests that the links established during the PGCE course may need to be seen as having an impact once the students were working in school. The overall impression provided by this interviewee was that they saw an Irish dimension as relevant in the context of their holistic perception of the past, which was influenced by wider issues associated with balance and human rights. Although they felt that there were limitations on how far they directly influenced students, it appears that they helped to provide a basis for its development with newly qualified teachers in the city.

At the time of the interview the sixth interviewee had been an education lecturer for two and a half years and had taken the role of teaching PGCE students previously undertaken by the fifth interviewee. The researcher had known the interviewee for approximately two years at the time of the interview. Their current role included lecturing citizenship and history education to training secondary teachers as well as the history component in a PGCE Primary Education course. They had a research interest in diversity issues with a particular focus on Holocaust Education. The interviewee had previously taught history for 19 years, of which 11 had been as a Head of History. They had begun their teaching career in the 1980s and had been in schools firmly wedded to teaching concepts and skills. However, they had become disillusioned with what they felt to be an exclusive focus on skills based teaching and with the advent of the National Curriculum had become committed to attaching equal importance to both skills and content. At the time of the interview the researcher had known the interviewee

in a professional capacity for about eighteen months. However, this had involved work related to an Irish dimension, which needs to be appreciated with respect to both the interview and analysis. They had been encouraged to become involved with the Ireland in Schools Project by the local History Adviser (the seventh interviewee). The interviewee had developed materials with the adviser and the researcher, which had served as a basis for a teacher workshop (Bracey, Gove-Humphries & Jackson, 2005) and two articles (Jackson, Gove-Humphries & Bracey, 2005; Bracey, Gove-Humphries & Jackson, 2006a). Clearly, this working relationship with the researcher needs to be appreciated when considering the data. However, during the interview every attempt was made to set an Irish dimension in its widest context during the interview in order to draw out the interview perceptions using the same approach that had been undertaken with other interviewees. Although the Ireland in Schools project was mentioned within the interview, no specific reference was made to work which had been undertaken with the researcher.

What was this interviewee's perception of the history curriculum? How did this relate to an Irish dimension? The interviewee supported the fifth interviewee's support for teaching different historical dimensions, such as English, Irish, Welsh, Scottish and world history and said that they favoured a holistic approach, which drew them together wherever this was appropriate. They also added that it was important to use concepts such as empire and conquest to explore issues related to diversity and made these a focus of one of their assignments. However, they felt that a number of factors adversely affected the development of an Irish dimension in the curriculum. They argued that the National Curriculum encouraged teachers to focus on events taking place in south-east England in which:

... the further that you get from the centre of power, the more peripheral you are to the nation's narrative. If somebody is brought up in Wales [this is more peripheral than other parts of England] and the Irish even further.

They also felt that this distorted perception helped create a national myth that regarded Britain as being isolated. The interviewee exemplified by reference to the way in which the Key Stage 2 area of study constructed the idea that the Romans came to England rather than the fact that England became absorbed into a European Empire. The interviewee was also critical of changes at Key Stage 4 where coursework marks allocated to the Irish component of the School History Project coursework had been reduced to 12.5%, which they felt led to teaching focusing on it as a problem without providing time to adequately set this into a more holistic appreciation of its past.

The interviewee supported teaching diversity and an Irish dimension through their work with both TIDE and the Ireland in Schools project. The interviewee had taken part in a three-day TIDE visit to Derry/Londonderry and would be taking on major responsibilities for co-ordinating a new teacher project. They had become involved with the project in order to explore diversity issues as well as incorporating an Irish dimension into British history. The interviewee said that they had become involved with the Ireland in Schools project as a result of their own family links with Ireland, interest and enthusiasm and the prospect of producing materials with students.

The interviewee said very little about general factors supporting or inhibiting their work with students, although felt that younger mentors were more receptive to change than older mentors but said little about the constraints affecting their impact on schools. At the time of the interview they had used Ireland in Schools materials with primary students but not

secondary students. They used TIDE'S teaching resource, *Building New Citizenship: Learning from change in Derry/Londonderry - a case study supporting citizenship education at KS3* in seminars when teaching about using photographs to draw out issues associated with conflict and diversity. Some students teaching Ireland with the School History Project used the pack during teaching placements. The overall impression is that the interviewee actively supported the development an Irish dimension as part of a wider commitment to diversity together with anti-racist sympathies.

The seventh interviewee was the Adviser for History in Birmingham. They were interviewed in March 2006 and had been in their current post for eight years; the researcher had known them in a professional capacity throughout this time. The interviewee's current role as a member of the Equalities Team was more broadly based than their former area of responsibility as a History Adviser. However, they still had a role in supporting both primary and secondary history teachers. Their work with primary schools included going into schools to help teachers write schemes of work, together with some monitoring and evaluation. They also provided some INSET and networking opportunities for primary teachers. Their work with secondary focused on reviewing secondary departments because teachers tended to buy INSET from other providers such as the School History Project or examination boards. The interviewee had been Head of Humanities in a secondary school in the city before taking up their current post. The researcher had known the interviewee for eight years, both as fellow members of the Midlands History Forum Committee and also through undertaking work with the Ireland in Schools project. This had involved producing materials related to Irish history, four conference presentations and three publications (Bracey & Gove-Humphries 2003b; Jackson, Gove-Humphries & Bracey 2005; Bracey, Gove-Humphries & Jackson, 2006a).

Clearly, the issues of the relationship between the researcher and the sixth interviewee also need to be appreciated with the seventh interviewee. The approach towards dealing with this issue will remain the same as that used for the sixth interviewee.

What were the interviewee's perceptions of the history curriculum? How did this relate to an Irish dimension? When asked about their perceptions of history in the curriculum, the interviewee said that they supported a combination of skills and content but felt that history content requirements needed to be more flexible. They felt that all dimensions in the history curriculum were important, but the following comment suggests that they were particularly driven by issues associated with equality and their role in the Equalities Team:

I think that you need all of them, but with my current hat on being in the Equalities Team, realising the difference that multicultural history does make to the achievement of children, I am coming to the belief that world history is really important I would probably at the moment with Islamophobia etc even put anti-racist history at the top So, I guess I would probably go for anti-racist history, world history, multicultural history and being in the Ireland in Schools group, Irish history. But, I think certainly a much wider dimension than just English history.

The interviewee particularly stressed their commitment to raising the achievement of black pupils through teaching black history and always bringing a multicultural dimension into their courses. They exemplified this by describing how they had responded to school requests for help with Black History Month by developing a Heritage Lottery funded project with 12 local teachers, which they had just completed and which was used to develop resources and INSET. At the same time they noted that a rationale for teaching black history is promoted through the authority's 'Achievement for All' website.

The interviewee considered that an Irish dimension formed part of their overall support for a diverse curriculum:

I think it links to anti-racist education and global human rights ... the fact that we have got a large Irish population in Birmingham, and if we are not valuing their historical background what are we doing? And I was asked at courses when I used to do about cultural diversity, there would always be someone who would put up their hand and say, 'Well what about Irish history?'

This statement implied a mixture of pragmatism and principle towards an Irish dimension.

However, the latter was evident within their work. The interviewee had supported the Ireland in Schools project for approximately seven years. They encouraged teachers to use them by taking them into schools, but noted that they had more opportunities to do this in primary than secondary schools. In addition to their own work the interviewee noted the work of TIDE in taking local teachers to Ireland as a means of promoting curriculum developments.

The interviewee felt that there was a number of factors which inhibited the development of history teaching and which directly or indirectly affected the teaching of an Irish dimension.

They felt that many teachers had not taken advantage of the flexibility provided by National Curriculum 2000 and that some Heads of History had not heard of the QCA website

Innovations in History. The result of this meant that many teachers did not take opportunities to adapt and develop their curriculum. At primary level they felt that while diversity issues were more easily developed than in the more rigid structure of secondary schools, teachers were often dominated by QCA schemes. At secondary level they felt that that the balance of teaching remained Anglo-centric at Key Stage 3, and that for some teachers there was a mindset which emphasised English history:

I think ... some teachers fail to see that it [Ireland] is relevant. They think Ireland is over there and [think] 'Why do we need to learn about it? We have so much English history to get through, how are we going to fit in Irish history?'

The interviewee felt that failure to teach an Irish dimension at KS3 could make it more difficult to teach it as part of School History Project at Key Stage 4 and suggested that

‘schools quite often find that that [Ireland] is too difficult for the children when they have not been taught it at Key Stage 3’. Finally, they felt that teachers were no longer getting adequate training opportunities in history, which affected the health of the subject, which had implications for an Irish dimension. The interviewee considered that the emphasis that primary schools placed on broadly based and generic initiatives had not made use of what history had to offer:

I think that the literacy strategy, history linked into that very well and we ran courses around history and literacy, but with all of the other initiatives - creativity, primary national strategy, they seem to be marginalising history, and I don't know why because history is one of the best subjects I know to link in creativity ... *Every Child Matters* - what better subject could you have than history for children staying safe, being healthy? How can you get children to make a positive contribution if you don't value their backgrounds?

Although the interviewee found local networks such as Midlands History Forum, Ireland in Schools and the Black History Project supported their work, these were often undertaken voluntarily and were not central to their post. At the same time a number of external bodies, such as Examination Boards School History Project, undermined local INSET provision for secondary schools. Although these factors were not directly related to an Irish dimension, they certainly limited potential opportunities for local advisers to promote curriculum development. Overall, despite operating within these constraints, the perceptions of this interviewee suggest that they supported an Irish dimension as part of an anti-racist history.

A number of common threads can be identified in all seven interviewee responses, although their different roles and priorities also demonstrated differences within the group as a whole. All of the interviewees considered that both skills and content should be seen as important. However, it is significant that the first interviewee related this together with their other responses to the *Every Child Matters* (2003) agenda. All of the interviewees supported the

teaching of a range of dimensions with particular reference to teaching for ethnic and cultural diversity and British as opposed to English history. The first four interviewees related this to constructing a more balanced and appropriate history curriculum. The last three interviewees related this to anti-racism, which may have reflected their particular research interests or role in the context of a large multicultural city. All of the interviewees supported the inclusion of an Irish dimension within a broad framework of the past. The first interviewee related it to the development of Britain. This was also evident in the responses from other interviewees. The third and fourth interviewees related this more explicitly to the development of Empire. The fifth, sixth and particularly the seventh interviewee linked an Irish dimension to an anti-racist perspective. The seventh interviewee provided a pragmatic case for teaching Ireland at Key Stage 3 as a means of supporting pupils studying Ireland as part of the School History Project at Key Stage 4. Most of the interviewees had actively promoted an Irish dimension either through producing materials or providing a platform for their dissemination. Most interviewees had supported the Irish related projects. The sixth and seventh interviewees had provided workshops and articles that promoted the teaching of an Irish dimension in the curriculum.

The interviewees indicated a number of factors which limited the development of an Irish dimension, some of which related to history in general. The decisions made by individual teachers about what to teach were a significant influence on what was covered. Confidence, expertise and insufficient INSET opportunities were regarded as significant by several interviewees. The seventh interviewee stressed the way that current whole school initiatives such as creativity were bypassing history and opportunities, which it provided for developing them. In addition, issues such as perceptions of popular topics for options, pressures on

examination results and league tables were credited with encouraging a conservative approach towards the curriculum.

Nevertheless, several of the interviewees provided evidence of recent developments which could enhance the teaching of an Irish dimension in the future. The first interviewee's emphasis on the *Every Child Matters* (2003) agenda required a more broadly based approach to the past, which should include an Irish dimension within the context of Britain's past. The second interviewee drew particular attention to reviews of the Key Stage 3, GCSE and AS/A2 curriculum. The second, third and fourth interviewees provided insights into the way in which the pilot GCSE provided opportunities to develop both diversity and an Irish dimension. Although there was some difference in their perception about the extent to which this influenced the core medieval unit in the course, it is possible that this reflected the fact that they were focusing their attention on the local and international units, which were to be developed before the core unit.

These observations raise a number of questions which need to be clarified and addressed in the concluding chapter. Firstly, how far are the 'mover and shaker' perceptions of an Irish dimension comparable with the teachers in the earlier case studies? Secondly, what general issues and opportunities emerge from making a comparison between them? An attempt will be made to address these questions in the concluding chapter.

CONCLUSION

AN IRISH DIMENSION IN THE ENGLISH HISTORY CURRICULUM: FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

In some respects this research has taken place during a period of relative stability having been established shortly after changes associated with National Curriculum 2000, minor changes to GCSE and the introduction of AS/A2 examinations. This perception needs to be qualified by the fact that this period has seen a move towards a more holistic educational agenda reflected in the Primary and Secondary (2002) Strategies and *Every Child Matters* (2003). Moreover, the research ends at a time when changes are anticipated in the political landscape in Northern Ireland and the History Curriculum in England. This year is also a critical time in the English educational system, with final consultation and planning taking place for reviews of Key Stage 3, GCSE, AS and A2 to be implemented in September 2008. A review of the Primary Curriculum is expected in 2008 (Ward 2007). The year 2007 has also seen the introduction of the *Curriculum Review on Diversity and Citizenship* (2007), which set out to support mutual understanding and used an Irish dimension to support its proposals. Finally, a recent OFSTED survey (2007) has challenged history teachers to consider ways of making history more relevant to meeting pupil needs. This concluding chapter will, therefore, consider three questions – What does the data indicate about perceptions of an Irish dimension? What are the implications of this for curriculum planning? What are its implications for future curriculum planning and research?

An appreciation of an Irish dimension in the history curriculum during the period 2002-2007 has been related to its wider social, academic and educational context. In the literature review it was argued that perceptions of an Irish dimension relate to the place of the Irish community

in Britain's multicultural society, the way in which historians construct the past, history educators define the purposes of school history and developments in the school curriculum since the early 1970s. All three areas proved to be highly controversial as well as providing a context for analysing the perceptions of history educators during the period 2002-7.

the way in which historians construct the past and developments in the school curriculum since the early 1970s. Developments in all three areas provide a context for analysing the perceptions of history educators during the period 2002-7. Fieldwork based on questionnaires and interviews was undertaken during the period 2003-6. The data provided through this approach does not give statistically representative data of teachers throughout English schools but it does provide detailed and meaningful insights about the perceptions of particular groups of educators. The teacher interviewees either volunteered to be interviewed or, in the case of teachers involved in either TIDE or Ireland in Schools, were contacted following advice from project leaders. Interview requests were made directly to other educators, including project leaders, the HMI, the QCA History Officer, the SHP Director, the textbook writer, university educators and the curriculum adviser, all of whom responded positively. The case studies are consequently skewed towards more positive responses more than would be expected from either a random or representative sample. The 'fuzzy generalisations' which emerged from the research are therefore taken to reflect a best case scenario with respect to the place of an Irish dimension in the school history curriculum.

Two issues that were not apparent at the start of the thesis have affected the organisation and scope of the research. Firstly, the initial intention was to explore the perception of an Irish dimension in textbooks and public examinations and compare this with teacher perceptions. However, the range and depth of data provided from questionnaires and especially interviews

proved to be greater than expected and it was decided to undertake a large-scale document analysis after the current thesis had been completed. Secondly, the decision to place the ‘movers and shakers’ to the last stage of the research related to the order in which the interviews were undertaken. At the start of the research this chapter was due to appear before the teacher perception chapters. The decision to place it last arose from the information which some ‘movers and shakers’ provided about curriculum developments, such as *Every Child Matters* (2003) and the GCSE History Pilot which emerged during the course of the research. In retrospect it was naive to assume that the time at which different case studies were undertaken would not impact on the responses provided. The response rates from the different questionnaires also provides useful lessons for the future. The questionnaires, which were immediately returned to the researcher, had a 100% response rate. Postal survey response rates increased when permission was granted by respondents beforehand. The response rate at conferences was lower than that obtained through postal questionnaires. Negotiating an opportunity to collect in the questionnaires more effectively during the conference would possibly increase the response rate.

A number of ‘fuzzy generalisations’ emerge from drawing together perceptions from all of the case studies involving teachers, including those involved in projects. The values and priorities of different teachers varied both within and between the different case studies, but it is possible to identify some underlying threads from the responses as a whole. A high proportion of the teachers who contributed to either the questionnaire or interviews indicated that they included an Irish dimension in their teaching. In a number of cases it appears probable that an Irish dimension was taught within an Anglo-centric vision of the past. Even where an Irish dimension was considered important, this could reflect a range of different values and

priorities. For some interviewees it was developed for pragmatic reasons in order to support examination work or as a context for developing other curriculum initiatives such as thinking skills or literacy. Some teachers certainly related teaching an Irish dimension to local issues or an Irish presence in their local community. There is evidence to suggest that some teachers related an Irish dimension to an anti-racist perspective. Some interviewees also related Irish history to its wider global context. Some teachers combined pragmatic motives with these wider values in curriculum planning. Involvement in Irish related projects could provide opportunities to develop teacher priorities and anti-racist values. However, this was not always the case, while similar values were evident amongst teachers not involved in Irish related projects. Overall, only a few teachers clearly linked an Irish dimension to anti-racism or global values.

The 'movers and shakers' interviews provided an opportunity to compare the perceptions of key educators with teachers. The timing of this last case study in 2006 provided insights about the implications of *Every Child Matters* (2003) and the GCSE History Pilot. The distinctive roles of interviewees within this case study meant that they provided a range of insights. Nevertheless, it was possible to draw out a range of 'fuzzy generalisations' to reflect the case study as a whole. All of the interviewees considered that both skills and content should be seen as important. The HMI particularly related their response to *Every Child Matters* (2003) and emphasised the need for a flexible approach to the curriculum to meet the needs of all children. All of the interviewees supported the teaching of a range of dimensions with particular reference to teaching for ethnic and cultural diversity and British as opposed to English history. All of the interviewees supported the inclusion of an Irish dimension within a broad framework of the past. The reasons given ranged from its place in the development of

Britain, as part of Four Nations History, more specifically in the development of empire, and to its contribution to anti-racist history. One interviewee noted the pragmatic advantage of teaching an Irish dimension at Key Stage 3 as a means of supporting its study at Key Stage 4. Most of the interviewees had actively promoted an Irish dimension either through producing materials or supporting it as part of their work with teachers. Several of the interviewees had actively supported and helped to promote Irish related projects. This group provided clearer support for developing an Irish dimension as part of a more broadly based history curriculum than was the case within teacher case studies. The interviewees supported a broadly based approach towards British history, although some interviewees were more explicitly committed to anti-racism than others. The overall impression given from the ‘movers and shakers’ was that they had a more clearly defined approach towards the place of history in the curriculum than was the case in the teacher case studies.

What did the responses suggest about support or constraints affecting the development of an Irish dimension? Responses to this question were quite focused and it is possible to draw together the responses from the different teacher case studies together and then compare them with the ‘movers and shakers’. The responses from teachers suggested that a number of factors helped the development of an Irish dimension. Several interviewees in each of the teacher case studies made reference to links with local communities. Some interviewees used Irish people from the locality to support their teaching. It was also clear that interviewees involved with the two projects felt that they provided them with ideas, encouragement and resources. The level of support from senior management could prove particularly important in encouraging curriculum developments and projects. However, the interviewees felt constricted by government requirements. Several interviewees felt constrained by National

Curriculum 2000 and primary interviewees felt restricted by QCA schemes; although it could be argued that these perceptions failed to appreciate the flexibility implicit within this last version of the National Curriculum and the advisory nature of QCA schemes, if this is what teachers believed it would restrict what they taught. A small number of secondary interviewees felt that whole school cross-curricular developments associate with the Primary and Secondary Strategies, together with timetable pressures had an adverse impact on history teaching. The overall impression given here was that most of the issues and opportunities raised were not specifically related to an Irish dimension but could affect opportunities to develop it.

The perceptions of ‘movers and shakers’ provided an interesting contrast with the teachers. The responses from these interviewees was considerably more positive about what ought to be taught and ways of teaching it. An Irish dimension was related to these broader opportunities related to the history curriculum. For example the HMI suggested that the *Every Child Matters* (2003) agenda required a more broadly based approach to Britain’s past. The QCA History Officer drew particular attention to opportunities which could become available as a result of reviews of the Key Stage 3, GCSE and AS/A2 curriculum, all of which are due to be implemented in September 2008. The interviewees provided insights into the opportunities provided by the pilot History GCSE. Specific insights into ways that the curriculum could be enhanced were explored by a Professor, Lecturer and History Adviser. These perceptions provide a contrast with the more negative comments made by some teachers. However, ‘movers and shakers’ indicated that there were issues related to teacher confidence, expertise and INSET opportunities. Several secondary interviewees suggested that perceptions of the popularity of particular topics, examination results and league table pressure encouraged a

conservative approach towards the curriculum. At primary level one interviewee argued that whole school initiatives such as creativity were by-passing history and opportunities, which it provided for developing them. The overall impression given here was that the ‘movers and shakers’ demonstrated greater awareness of opportunities for curriculum development but were aware of the constraints which affected the perceptions of the mindset of teachers.

What are the implications of the above ‘fuzzy generalisations’? Any generalisation based on case studies needs to be treated with caution. Nevertheless, a number of issues and potential solutions emerge from this study. Firstly, teachers need to determine how an Irish dimension should feature within a broad understanding of the past. The literature review chapter demonstrated the complex and contentious nature of an Irish dimension within British society, ways in which historians construct the past, as well as developments in the history curriculum. Given this it is hardly surprising that the research findings indicate that teachers have constructed an Irish dimension in different ways. Some teachers have been influenced by a commitment to developing a holistic approach to British History, the ethnicity of their local population or anti-racist values. However, a number of factors adversely affect the development of the history curriculum and by implication an Irish dimension. Several interviewees felt that opportunities to innovate the history curriculum were restricted by government policies. Several teacher interviewees said that they felt contained by an emphasis on core subjects, examination pressures and the National Curriculum. Even where an Irish dimension was included some interviewees indicated that they taught it from an Anglo-centric perspective or though a focus on events during the last quarter of the 20th century. These approaches risk creating negative stereotype perceptions of Ireland, which can be compared to restricting the study of black history to slavery and post-war immigration. This has

implications for both pupils' understanding of the past and their role as citizens in a pluralistic society. Davies argues that:

... the history teacher can take a strong lead in the development of education for citizenship. The most obvious step is perhaps merely to ensure that appropriate content is offered and (very important) that pupils are made aware, in an appropriate manner, of the purpose of this content (Davies, 2000).

This can be applied to decisions about how an Irish dimension, or indeed any other dimension, should be developed within the curriculum. The 'movers and shakers' case study included calls for INSET opportunities. These opportunities need to make reference to debates amongst academic historians as well as professionals directly concerned with the school curriculum. Clearly within this framework it is essential that procedural considerations such as key issues, concepts and skills in history and appropriate cross-curricular skills can be developed.

Secondly, teachers need flexibility to select what is taught if they are to relate to National Curriculum 2000 or Every Child Matters (2003) to meet the needs of particular pupils in their school. How can the case for an Irish dimension in the history curriculum address these issues? A useful starting point is the work of Rogers (1987) and Counsell (2000) who both argued that pupils refine their understanding of the past as they acquire new knowledge. However, the following attempts to go beyond this and provide criteria for developing a chronological and spatial map of an Irish dimension that allows different perceptions of the past to be explored:

- (1) An Irish dimension should be related to its links and comparisons with mainland Britain, Europe and world context.
- (2) An Irish dimension should provide opportunity to understand regional diversities and similarities.

- (3) Irish immigration should be seen as an integral part of Britain's long established ethnically diverse society.
- (4) Different interpretations and versions of Ireland's past should be explored.
- (5) Significant themes and events should be seen within broader spatial and chronological overviews, 'hinterlands' (to be considered below).

Arguably, the above criteria challenge an Anglo-centric past and contribute to a more holistic approach to the past. A more broadly based approach towards the past should provide the opportunity to examine attitudes and values related to communities, cultures and nations (Slater, 1989, cited in Haydn, Arthur, & Hunt, 2001). The criteria for including an Irish dimension are exemplified for Key Stages 1- 3 in Table 11.

This model is intended to provide the basis for a flexible rather than a prescriptive approach towards curriculum planning. Some teachers may focus on an Irish dimension while others would want to focus on people in other parts of the world. At a minimal level it is important that an Irish dimension is included within overviews of topics so that it forms part of children's historical map of the world. For example, at Key Stage 2 or 3 maps and examples drawn from the history of Ireland could relate to broader topics such as migration to Britain, or topics such as the Vikings and Normans. At the other extreme are teachers whose courses include a significant Irish dimension. Here it is particularly important to consider the historical hinterland in which the study of Ireland is placed. This hinterland should relate events to their long-term impact and compare them with other situations. For example, Cromwell's onslaught at Drogheda could be related to the Reformation, Tudor Plantations and Civil War, together with its immediate and long-term impact. Equally, it could provide a

focus for looking at events such as the impact of the Normans during the ‘Wasting of the North’ in eleventh century England, the impact of events at Wounded Knee on Native Americans in the nineteenth century and/or the Amritsar massacre during the period of the British Raj in India in the early 20th century. Where history departments teach Ireland as the School History Project Modern World Study, there is a particular need to consider recent events in a broadly based historical hinterland at Key Stage 3. Arguably, if a balanced perception of Ireland is to be provided, this needs not only to look at the distant origins of the ‘Troubles’ from the last quarter of the 20th century but also wider aspects of Ireland’s history.

This could include a more broadly based appreciation of Ireland’s past within the context of British, European and world history. For example, themes such as the development of towns and agriculture could be set within a British context, while invasion, famine/hunger and empire could be related to a British, European and world context. Clearly many teachers could develop courses which fall between these two extremes, but the central feature of all programmes of study would be the way in which they make use of a topic’s hinterland to support the way in which pupils develop their map of the past. Haydn (1992) argued that in order to engage pupils, content needs to be interesting, relevant and accessible. Hopefully, the hinterland model provides opportunities for teachers to select topics they can make interesting and use links between topics to make them more accessible and relevant. The model, which has been produced for an Irish dimension, could also be related to other dimensions such as Black history or Scottish history, depending on the interests and values of the teacher and the needs their pupils.

Table 11: An Irish dimension in the English History Curriculum: a model for

Key Stages 1-3

Criteria	Exemplification
<p>An Irish dimension should be related to its links and comparisons with mainland Britain, Europe and world context.</p>	<p>Key Stage 1 – Include significant people and their achievements (eg Grace O’Malley or St Brendan) or Irish examples in themes (eg homes) together with references drawn from Britain, Europe and the world.</p> <p>Key Stage 2 – Include an Irish dimension within wider topics eg Within a study of the Vikings pupils could study their origins, scope of their voyages and encounters and focus on their impact in Britain with comparative studies of Yorvik and Dublin; Alfred and Brian Boru.</p> <p>Key Stage 3 – Link an Irish dimension to wider topics and issues eg conquest and empire from the Normans or compare and contrast with events elsewhere eg Drogheda and the ‘Wasting of the North’, Wounded Knee or Amritsar.</p>
<p>An Irish dimension should provide opportunity to understand regional diversities and similarities.</p>	<p>Key Stage 1 – Include significant people and features from Ireland alongside examples drawn from England, Scotland and Wales.</p> <p>Key Stage 2 – Ensure that topics explore diverse experiences within Britain and Ireland rather than just England through maps and examples eg the extent and impact of the Romans, Anglo-Saxons and Vikings; conditions facing the poor in urban Ireland and urban Britain in Victorian times.</p> <p>Key Stage 3 – Ensure that diverse experiences within Britain and Ireland as a whole are explored and analysed eg the impact of the Normans, religious and political conflicts.</p>
<p>Irish immigration should be seen as an integral part of Britain’s long established ethnically diverse society</p>	<p>Key Stage 1 – Within topics such as Journeys or Families or Who am I? Relate to examples of people in the local community, who have come there from different parts of the world, including Ireland, where appropriate.</p> <p>Key Stage 2 – Relate Irish migration to the long term development of multicultural Britain including Romans, Saxons, Vikings, Huguenots and Black settlers, Kinder transport, Empire and Commonwealth immigration etc.</p> <p>Key Stage 3 – Relate Irish migration to the long-term development of Britain including Normans, Jews, Huguenots Black settlers, and Commonwealth immigration and explore issues, opportunities and contributions of different communities.</p>

<p>Different interpretations and versions of Ireland's past should be understood rather than relying on Anglo-centric notions of the past.</p>	<p>Key Stage 1 – Include images related to Ireland and topics, which go beyond stereotypes. Key Stage 2 – Explore different representations/ interpretations of people and events (eg Brian Boru, the Famine/Hunger) Key Stage 3 – Explore different interpretations of events, reasons for them and their wider significance (eg Cromwell, the Famine/Hunger).</p>
<p>Significant themes and events should be seen within broader spatial and chronological overviews and hinterlands.</p>	<p>Key Stage 1 – Explore appropriate historical and spatial contexts, eg the life histories of Irish migrants including early life before they left Ireland, journey to their new home and experiences there. Key Stage 2 – Explore events and developments in a wider context, eg compare the impact of the Romans, Saxons and Vikings in Ireland with other parts of Britain and beyond; look at the long and short-term causes of the Irish Hunger/Famine and compare it with conditions in urban Britain. Key Stage 3 – Explore controversial events in historical, spatial and comparative context, eg Cromwell and Drogheda in the context of the Reformation, Tudor Plantations and the Civil War, subsequent impact.</p>

The above considerations are based on the history curriculum in operation between 2002-7.

What may change the situation after 2007? David Sharrock, the Ireland Correspondent for *The Times*, has encapsulated the changing political situation in Northern Ireland that coincides with the period of this research project, on the day that devolved government was returned to Stormont:

Northern Ireland is awash with strange coincidences. It was six years ago to the day that Peter Robinson, the deputy leader of Mr Paisley's Democratic Unionists, his likeliest political heir ... used parliamentary privilege in the House of Commons to name Mr Keenan and Mr Gillen as members of the Provisional IRA's seven-man ruling army. Mr Adams and Mr McGuinness were also on the list, as was Pat Doherty, who was sitting on the Sinn Fein benches yesterday ... It was Mr Keenan who said in 2001, 'Those who say the war is over: I don't know what they are talking about. The revolution can never be over until we have our country, until we have British imperialism where it belongs. Yet here he was sitting seven seats away from Tony Blair. (Sharrock, 2007, p.30)

Clearly this was an aspiration of the peace process in the late 1990s. However, the way in which the Democratic Unionist Party and Sinn Fein, representing polarised perspectives in Northern Ireland, came to share power over the region from May 8th 2007 would have been impossible to predict in 2001. In many ways the forum which this provides for dialogue between the two communities could be compared to the dialogue between communities envisaged by the *Parekh Report* (2000). Does it suggest that the Irish may become assimilated into British society? The novelty of the current situation may well improve community relations both within Ireland and for the Irish community in Britain. However, this does not necessarily mean that attitudes towards immigrant communities always follow a linear path from hostility to assimilation. Arguably if anti-Irish racism declines, this will be a response to the changing situation in Northern Ireland. This does not reflect a natural move towards acceptance by the majority population – much will depend on future political developments in Northern Ireland and issues affecting community relations in Britain.

Could the peace process lead to the demise of the Ireland Modern World Study within the School History Project? This is possible given the focus of this part of the course on current issues. Indeed, the Project Director was aware that some schools were abandoning the Ireland Modern World Study in 2006. Nevertheless, it can be argued that Irish history and Irish immigration are still relevant for history teachers. For example, a comparison between the recent history of Ireland and the Middle East is instructive in demonstrating both similarities and differences. For example, Gary Young, a political columnist in the *Guardian*, demonstrated this when he criticised attempts by Iain Duncan Smith, a former leader of the Conservative Party, and David Trimble, former leader of the Ulster Unionist Party, to compare the IRA with al- Qaida:

... if comparing the IRA to al-Qaida is disingenuous, contrasting them is instructive. It highlights a distinction between the terrorism of individuals and the armed struggle of movements. For, in certain circumstances, political violence can achieve real progress. Northern Ireland is one such example. Britain did not occupy Ulster by consent but by force. It stands to reason that resistance to its occupation included force ... What it does suggest is that a more sophisticated understanding of political violence than currently offered by the "war on terror" is both necessary and available - a critique that recognises the bankruptcy of individual terrorism, the potency of social movements and the legitimacy of armed struggle. (Younge, 2007, p.27)

This article was not supporting violence but argued that it was necessary to understand the causes of conflict, which were necessarily associated with human rights issues. Where history teachers focus on the Middle East for their Modern World Study it would be appropriate to relate its long term historical background and also explore similarities and differences to the situation which developed in Northern Ireland. At the same time the experiences of Irish migrants in Britain have a significant place in any study of the long-term development of Britain's multicultural society.

Four curriculum developments affecting the teaching of history in English schools are worthy of consideration with respect to the future development of an Irish dimension. Firstly, the *Curriculum Review on Diversity and Citizenship* (2007), an independent report led by Sir Keith Ajegbo, has made a series of recommendations aimed at diversity across the secondary school curriculum and the content of the curriculum for Citizenship Education. It recommended that history could:

... provide opportunities to study 'how movement of diverse people to, from and within the British Isles have shaped the UK through time'. It also provides opportunities to study the ways in which the past has helped shape identities, shared cultures, values and attitudes today (Ajegbo, 2007, p.53)

The report recommended that Citizenship should have a fourth strand entitled *Identity and Diversity: Living together in the UK*. It stated that this should include the development of Britain as a multinational state made up of England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales, as

well as the significance of immigration, commonwealth and the legacy of empire, the European Union and extending the franchise. The report makes reference to an Irish dimension and includes examples of recent and more distant aspects of Irish history amongst its recommended topics.

Secondly, the DfES sponsored the Historical Association to produce a report entitled *Teaching Emotive and Controversial History 3-19* (2007). The authors said that their report was prompted by the following concern:

The study of history can be emotive and controversial where there is actual or perceived unfairness to people by another individual or group in the past. This may also be the case where there are disparities between what is taught in school history, family/community histories and other histories. Such issues and disparities create a strong resonance with students in particular educational settings. (Wrenn et al, 2007, p.3)

The report considered opportunities and constraints affecting the teaching of emotional and controversial issues and went on to identify good practice and recommendations for putting this into practice. It regarded good practice as involving the right blend of content and 'hard thinking' appropriate to the ages and ability of the children. A strong emphasis was placed on planning which included exploring multiple narratives and different perspectives of the past as a means of ensuring that emotional and controversial issues are not compromised. The report made use of recent historical thinking related to Muslim history, the Holocaust, the Russian Civil War and the slave trade. For example, it considered controversies over the impact of the slave trade in Africa, Britain, racism and its abolition, although no reference was made to pre-colonial Africa. Unfortunately, references to an Irish dimension were limited. The report acknowledged the work of the Ireland in Schools project and made reference to teaching Grace O'Malley at Key Stage 1. It also briefly indicated opportunities to

teach about Ireland at Key Stage 3 as well as research related to emotional and controversial issues undertaken in Northern Ireland schools.

Thirdly, the QCA is currently undertaking *The Secondary Curriculum Review. Programme of Study: History Key Stage 3* (2007), which is expected to be introduced in September 2008.

The stated purpose of this review has been to make the curriculum more flexible and increase opportunities for pupils. Particular reference has been made to *Every Child Matters*, diversity and a global perspective in the curriculum. Given that the proposed changes at Key Stage 3 have implications for all children it is appropriate to give particular consideration to their implications for an Irish dimension. The review in each subject is expected to emphasise key concepts, process and breadth rather than specific content details.

The proposed programme for history consisted of a series of broad threads that include local, British, European and World themes since the Middle Ages. One of its threads relates to ‘The changing relationships through time of the peoples of England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales’. The rubric supporting this theme states that this includes the histories of the different parts of the British Isles and their impact on each other and developing an understanding of the origins of the United Kingdom. Furthermore, this requirement should help develop an awareness of multiple rather than Anglo-centric versions of Britain’s past. Nevertheless, the extent that this is done could be restricted by the fact that the proposals do not require the histories of Ireland, Scotland and Wales to be studied before their encounters with England. Although an Irish dimension is not specified elsewhere, themes including the impact of migration and settlement from the middle ages to the twentieth century would be inconceivable without reference to Irish migration in the context of the long-term development of multicultural

Britain. The way in which the Key Stage 3 History proposals link both threads to Citizenship Education demonstrates an implicit link with Ajegbo's recommendations, even though the latter linked regional, ethnic and cultural diversity more closely than the Review. Fourthly, the HMI report *History in the Balance* (2007) has identified strengths and issues which need to be addressed by history teachers. For the purposes of this research the way in which the report challenged teachers to consider 'big issues' in history, its relevance and the need to go beyond teaching English history and make reference to regional and multicultural diversity can be related to the teaching of an Irish dimension.

The above changes suggest that the potential opportunities for developing an Irish dimension may be greater after 2007 than has been the case during the period of the current research project. Clearly, how far this is the case will depend on a range of factors including teacher perceptions, resources, and pragmatic considerations. For example, a recent article in the *Times Educational Supplement* has drawn attention to the fact that the success of the Secondary Review will depend on issues such as how well teachers cope with the flexibility provided, whether Head Teachers use the increased flexibility to reduce curriculum time for subjects like history in response to assessment pressures on core subjects. The article's conclusion provided muted optimism for the future:

Training for teachers in developing new approaches, all agree, is crucial ... Will teachers leap at the opportunities or feel so ground down by initiatives and testing that they will not have the energy to come up with much that is creative? It is a commentary on the state of the profession that a reform that seems so welcome in concept might yet prove tricky to implement. (Mansell, 2007, p.22-23)

This last consideration naturally leads to considering ways in which the current research can be developed. A comparative study between the perceptions of secondary teachers working before and after the curriculum changes in 2008 is the most obvious development on the

current study. An exploration of the perceptions of teachers undertaking the GCSE History pilot would also be particularly appropriate. A detailed comparative study of teacher and pupil perceptions of an Irish dimension in particular school contexts would provide a natural progression from the current study's focus on providers. Much will depend on the resources available for teachers and it would be appropriate to analyse how an Irish dimension is constructed in textbooks, web resources and museums for example. This investigation could build on the interviews with textbook writers undertaken within the 'movers and shakers' chapter and find out how they respond to the new requirements. Comparing any new resources with those available before 2008 would provide an insight into the opportunities provided by the curriculum changes. The approach used for exploring teacher perceptions of an Irish dimension could also be used as a model for examining other dimensions. For example, the Northampton Black History Association is producing teaching materials for its 'Shaping the Future Project', a large scale Heritage Lottery funded project being undertaken from September 2006–8.

What can be said about an Irish dimension in the history curriculum? The overall conclusion to be drawn from this research is that the opportunities to develop an Irish dimension have been influenced by a range of factors both within the education system and beyond.

Responses have varied both within and between case studies. Some teachers have related an Irish dimension to the multicultural nature of their locality and some have related it to anti-racism. The reasons for this reflect differences in values, pragmatism in response to pressures, interest and almost certainly differences in subject knowledge and expertise. The prospects for an Irish dimension for the period after 2008 may prove more promising than during the period of this study. The researcher's belief is that there is a strong case for including an Irish

dimension in both the present and future curriculum. The extent to which an Irish dimension is taught will vary between different contexts, but the rationale and way in which it is brought into the curriculum is of more importance than the amount that is taught. At this point it is appropriate to conclude by repeating the following reference made at the start of this thesis:

... Rather than the manufactured clash of civilisations we need to concentrate on the slow working together of cultures that overlap, borrow from one another, and live together in far more interesting ways than any abridged or inauthentic mode of understanding can allow. (Said, 2003, xxii).

APPENDICES

- Appendix I: Example of an Interview Schedule: interview prompts for secondary teachers
- Appendix II: Secondary Head of History Questionnaire (revised version)
- Appendix III: Primary History Co-ordinator Questionnaire
- Appendix IV: Perceptions of historical dimensions by secondary History respondents in Case Study 1 (pilot study with History Mentors at Birmingham University) with ratings 1-5
- Appendix V: Perceptions of historical dimensions by secondary History respondents in Case Study 1 (pilot study with History Mentors at Birmingham University) modified to three categories (low importance, some importance, important)
- Appendix VI: Perceptions of historical dimensions by secondary History respondents in Case Studies, 1, 2 and 3 comparing three categories (low importance, some importance, important)
- Appendix VII: Perceptions of historical dimensions by secondary History respondents in Case Studies 1, 2 and 3 comparing three categories (low importance, some importance, important) represented as percentages
- Appendix VIII: Perceptions of historical dimensions by secondary History respondents in Case Studies 1, 2 and 3 comparing modes for three categories (low importance, some importance and important)
- Appendix IX: Perceptions of historical dimensions by primary teacher respondents in Case Study 4 with three categories (low importance, some importance, important)
- Appendix X: Perceptions of historical dimensions by primary teacher respondents in Case Study 5 with three categories (low importance, some importance, important)
- Appendix XI: Perceptions of historical dimensions by primary teacher respondents in Case Study 5 with three categories represented as percentages and modes

APPENDIX I: Example of an interview schedule
Interview prompts for secondary teachers

School context

How long have you been in your current job?

Where else have you taught and when?

How would you describe the identity (ethnicity, religion, class etc) of the community served by your school?

General Context

What do you consider the most important purposes in the teaching of history?

1. Which of the following do you agree with?

- Skills, concepts and historical context are of equal importance.
- Content is of primary importance.
- Skills and concepts are of primary importance.
- Anything else?

Explain your answer.

2. Historical dimensions

Rate the importance which you attach to the following in your planning at KS3 from 1 (not important) to 4 (very important)

- English history
- Irish history
- Scottish history
- Welsh history
- Multicultural history
- Black History
- Anti-racist history
- World history.

Explain any 1 or 2 ratings.

Explain any 3 or 4 ratings

3. The place of an Irish dimension in the history curriculum (general questions)

a. How far do you consider that your current school addresses an Irish dimension within your history course at KS3 (if at all)?

b. Why do you teach it? Rate each of the following between 1 (not important) and 4 (very important)

- interest
- personal views/values related to this area
- links to the background of children in the school
- links to anti-racism
- links to global human rights issues
- background for work at KS4
- Any other reason?

Explain reasons for anything you have given a 1 or 2 rating.
Explain reasons for anything you have given a 3 or 4 rating.

4. Do you teach Ireland at Key Stage 4? Yes/No

How far are any of the above points significant? If so, why?

5. Do you teach Ireland at KS5? Yes/No

How far are any of the above factors significant? If so, why?

6. Resources and curriculum projects

a. What resources do you use to support an Irish dimension?

- textbooks
- ICT
- museums
- community
- other

b. What support do you get from your LEA/other agencies in developing an Irish dimension?

c. Are you involved in any projects related to an Irish dimension? If so explain what they are and how far have they impacted on your teaching.

7. Responses

Match the following response for each group towards an Irish dimension and give reasons for this:

Very positive Positive Indifferent Hostile Unknown/Other

- Other teachers
- Pupils
- Parents

8. The bigger picture

- a. Are there any factors which help or hinder the development of an Irish dimension in your curriculum. If so, explain what they are?
- b. Are you involved in any other history projects? If so, please indicate reasons for involvement, support, impact etc.
- b. Are there any points which you want to add/raise?

**APPENDIX II: Secondary Head of History questionnaire (revised version used with
Case Studies 2 and 3)**

Context

How long have you been teaching?

How long at your current school?

What is your position/role?

School/community context

School location (please circle) rural country town city/conurbation

inner city suburb other

Town/County.....

Postcode..... Age range of pupils

Type of school: LEA Catholic C of E Private Other

Name if LEA (if applicable).....

Main community/communities served by school (eg Irish, British Asian, White British, multicultural)
.....

Does your school have significant links with the Irish community? Yes/No

PLANNING AND TEACHING HISTORY

1. QCA schemes of work

a. Please TICK the statement which shows how you use QCA history schemes.

We rarely or never use them	
We have our own topics but use them for ideas.	
We modify them and use them for our courses	
We use them without modifying them at all.	

b. Have you used any other QCA history support? If so, what have you used?

Please put a tick in the appropriate column for all sections of questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

Question 1. How important is each of the following in your Key Stage 3 course?	Never mentioned	Sometimes mentioned in class	Sometimes in plans/schemes	Important in some topics	Important strand throughout KS 3
a. Britain's multicultural history					
b. English history					
c. Irish history					
d. Scottish history					
e. Welsh history					
f. Local history					
g. British history					
h. European history					
i. World history					

Question 2. How important is multicultural history in the following Key Stage 3 areas of study?	Never mentioned	Sometimes mentioned verbally in lessons	Sometimes in plans/schemes	Important in some topics	Import strand throughout KS 3
Britain 1066-1500					
Britain 1500-1750					
Britain 1750-1900					
European history					
Pre 1900 World history					
Post 1900 World history					
Any comments?					

Question 3. How important is Irish history in the following Key Stage 3 areas of study?	Never mentioned	Sometimes mentioned verbally in lessons	Sometimes in plans/schemes	Important in some topics	Important strand throughout KS 3
a. Britain 1066-1500					
b. Britain 1500 –1750					
c. Britain 1750-1900					
d. European history					
e. Pre 1900 World history					
f. Post 1900 World history					
<p>Any comments:</p>					

Question 4. How important is immigration from Ireland in the following Key Stage 3 areas of study?	Never mentioned	Sometimes mentioned verbally in lessons	Sometimes in plans/schemes	Important in some topics	Important strand throughout KS 3
a. Britain 1066-1500					
b. Britain 1500-1750					
c. Britain 1750-1900					
d. European history					
f. Pre 1900 World history					
g. Post 1900 World history					
Any comments:					

5. DO YOU INCLUDE MULTICULTURAL HISTORY?

Reasons for teaching it:

The topic(s) / year group(s) involved:

Resources: eg textbooks, community ...

6. DO YOU TEACH ABOUT IRELAND / OR IRISH IMMIGRATION AT KEY STAGE 3? YES/NO

If yes, please indicate:

Topics / year group(s):

Reasons:

Main resources: (name textbooks used, films ...)

7. DO YOU TEACH ABOUT IRELAND IN EXAMINATION COURSES AT KEY STAGE 4? (eg SHP Modern World Study, Multicultural Britain within Social and Economic History) YES/NO

If yes, please indicate:

Examination board, course and topic:

Reasons:

Main resources: (name textbooks used, films ...)

8. DO YOU TEACH IRISH HISTORY/OR IRISH IMMIGRATION WITHIN AS/A2? YES/NO

If yes, please indicate:

Examination board, course and topic:

Reasons:

Main resources: (name textbooks used, films ...)

9. HAVE YOU BEEN INVOLVED IN ANY IRISH HISTORY RELATED CURRICULUM PROJECTS? (eg Ireland in Schools project, Development Education projects which include an Irish dimension) YES/NO

If yes please indicate the following:

- the name of the project/organisation.
- why you become involved with it
- its impact on your history course (e.g. topics and year groups)
- the main resources used (eg names of textbooks, films, visiting speakers **from the community, songs**)

10. HAVE YOU BEEN INVOLVED IN ANY OTHER HISTORY PROJECTS? (eg Black History) YES/NO

If yes, please indicate:

- the name of the project/organisation
- why you become involved with it
- its impact on your history course (eg topics and year groups)

11. History textbooks at KS3

Please **TICK** the statement which ‘best fits’ what happens in your school:

- a. History topic books are never used
- b. History topic books are occasionally used
- c. We use a range of individual books
- d. We use part sets
- e. We use half class/single class sets of history books
- f. We use more than one class history text

If your school uses history topic books for KS3 please indicate the names (and if possible publisher) of the main texts you use. (If you use depth study texts please locate where most appropriate.)

Area of study

Main Books

Britain 1066-1500

Britain 1500-1750

Britain 1750-1900

Europe

World before 1900

World after 1900

12. History textbooks at KS4

Please **TICK** the statement which 'best fits' what happens in your school:

- d. History topic books are never used
- e. History topic books are occasionally used.
- c. We use a range of individual books.
- f. We use part sets
- g. We use half class/single class sets of history books.
- h. We use more than one class history text.

If your school uses history topic books for KS3 please indicate the names (and if possible publisher) of the main texts which you use. (If you use depth study texts please locate where most appropriate.)

13. History textbooks at AS/A2

Please **TICK** the statement which ‘best fits’ what happens in your school.

- a. History topic books are never used
- b. History topic books are occasionally used.
- c. We use a range of individual books.
- d. We use part sets
- e. We use half class/single class sets of history books.
- f. We use more than one class history text.

If your school uses history topic books for KS3 please indicate the names (and if possible publisher) of the main texts which you use. (If you use depth study texts please locate where most appropriate.)

14. Any further comments about an Irish dimension in the history curriculum?

Once again, I would like to thank you for your help. I would be most grateful if I you would be prepared to be interviewed. This would take place in the Spring or Summer term and last about 30- 45 minutes. I guarantee that all information you give (in the survey or interview) will be treated confidentially. If you can help, please write your contact details below:

Name.....School.....

Address.....

..... Postcode.....

Telephone..... Email (optional).....

APPENDIX III: Primary History Co-ordinator questionnaire (used with Case Study 5)

Context

How long you have been teaching?
How long at your current school?
What is your position/role?

School/Community Context

School location (please circle) inner city suburb other

Type of school (please circle): LEA Catholic C of E Private

Other

Postcode..... Age range of pupils

Main communities served by school (eg British Asian, British White, British Black, Irish etc)

Does your school have significant links with the Irish community? Yes/ No

PLANNING AND TEACHING HISTORY:

1. Which year group(s) do you currently teach?
2. Which History units/areas of study do you teach with your own class?
3. QCA schemes of work

a. Please TICK the statement which shows how you use QCA history schemes.

We rarely or never use them	
We have our own topics but use them for ideas.	
We modify them and use them for our courses	
We use them without modifying them at all.	

b. Have you used any other QCA history support? If so, what have you used?

For questions 4, 5 and 6 please tick against each of the following, giving your immediate thoughts.

4. How important is each of the following when you teach YOUR OWN CLASS?	Not relevant for units/areas I teach with my class	I have not chosen to include it	I mention it orally in one or more lessons	Mentioned in at least one unit/area	Important in at least one unit/area
a. Multicultural history					
b. Local history					
c. British history					
d. Irish history					
e. English history					
f. Welsh history					
g. Migration to Britain from Ireland					
h. Scottish history					
i. European history					
j. World history					

5. Tick the comment which shows the importance of each of the following for KS2 as a whole in your school.	I do not know	Never mentioned	Mentioned orally in some lessons	Mentioned in at least one scheme	Important in KS 2 as a whole
a. Multicultural history					
b. Local history					
c. British history					
d. Irish history					
e. English history					
f. Welsh history					
g. Migration to Britain from Ireland					
h. Scottish history					
i. European history					
j. World history					

6. Tick the comment which shows the importance of each of the following in history themes or topics at KS1 as a whole in your school.	I do not know	Never mentioned	Mentioned orally in some lessons	Mentioned in at least one scheme	Important in KS 1 as a whole
a. Multicultural history					
b. Local history					
c. British history					
d. Irish history					
e. English history					
f. Welsh history					
g. Migration to Britain from Ireland					
h. Scottish history					
i. European history					
j. World history					

7. HISTORY TEXTBOOKS AT KS2

Please **TICK** the statement which 'best fits' what happens in your school:

- a. History topic books are never used
- b. History topic books are occasionally used.
- c. We use a range of individual books.
- d. We use part sets
- e. We use half class/class sets of history books
- f. We use Big Books for History

If your school uses history topic books for the following KS2 areas please indicate the names (and if possible publisher) of the main ones you use.

Area Of Study

Main Books

Romans/Saxons/Vikings

Tudor world

Victorian Britain/
Britain since 1930

8. History textbooks at KS1

Please **TICK** the statement which ‘best fits’ what happens in your school:

- a. History topic books are never used
- b. History topic books are occasionally used.
- c. We use a range of individual books.
- c. We use part sets
- e. We use half class/class sets of history books.
- g. We use Big Books for history

If your school uses history topic books at KS1 please indicate the names (and if possible publisher) of what you consider the most important

9. If any of the following form part of your history teaching at KS1 or KS2, please indicate how and why this is done:

* Multicultural history

* Irish history, or Irish migration

* Any curriculum projects related to history

10. ANY OTHER COMMENTS?

I really appreciate your help in completing this survey, which supports work towards my PhD. If you would be prepared to be interviewed for about 30 minutes please indicate your contact details below. I guarantee that all information you give will be treated confidentially.

Name..... School.....

Address.....

..... Postcode

Telephone..... Email (optional)

APPENDIX IV: Perceptions of historical dimensions by secondary history respondents in Case Study I (pilot study with History Mentors at Birmingham University) with raw data ratings 1-5 (0 indicates no response)

CHART A **Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions at Key Stage 3**

	No rating	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
British mult hist	0	0	4	2	13	6	25
English history	0	0	1	1	4	19	25
Irish history	0	2	5	12	6	0	25
Scottish history	0	1	10	11	3	0	25
Welsh history	0	5	5	12	2	1	25
European history	0	1	1	1	14	8	25
World history	0	2	2	2	13	6	25

CHART B **Teacher perceptions of a multicultural dimension in Key Stage 3 Areas of Study**

	No rating	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1066-1500	0	1	9	4	8	3	25
1500-1750	0	2	9	7	5	2	25
1750-1900	1	2	6	3	12	1	25
Europe	1	2	5	5	11	1	25
Pre 1900W	0	2	3	8	10	2	25
Post 1900W	0	1	2	7	8	7	25

CHART C **Teacher perceptions of the importance of Irish history in Key Stage 3 Areas of Study**

	No rating	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1066-1500	0	14	9	2	0	0	25
1500-1750	0	3	7	10	5	0	25
1750-1900	0	2	12	9	2	0	25
Europe	2	10	13	0	0	0	25
Pre 1900W	0	11	10	2	2	0	25
Post 1900W	0	8	10	3	4	0	25

CHART D **Teacher perceptions of the importance of immigration from Ireland in Key Stage 3 Areas of Study**

	No rating	1	2	3	4	5	TOTAL
1066-1500	0	23	2	0	0	0	25
1500-1750	0	15	8	2	0	0	25
1750-1900	0	6	9	8	2	0	25
Europe	0	15	6	3	1	0	25
Pre 1900W	0	16	7	2	0	0	25
Post 1900W	0	14	8	1	2	0	25

Key for chart A

- 1 Never mentioned
- 2 Mentioned orally in some lessons
- 3 Sometimes mentioned in plans/schemes
- 4 Important in some plans/ schemes
- 5 Important strand throughout KS3

Key for charts B, C and D

- 1 Never mentioned
- 2 Sometimes mentioned verbally in lessons
- 3 Part of some topics in plan/scheme
- 4 Important in some topics in plan/scheme
- 5 Important throughout this area of study

APPENDIX V: Perceptions of historical dimensions by secondary respondents in Case Study I (pilot study with History Mentors at Birmingham University) with raw data modified to three categories (low importance, some importance, important)

CHART A Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions at Key Stage 3

	Low	Some	Important	TOTAL
British mult. hist	4	2	19	25
English history	1	1	23	25
Irish history	7	12	6	25
Scottish history	11	11	3	25
Welsh history	10	12	3	25
European history	2	1	22	25
World history	4	2	19	25

CHART B Teacher perceptions of a multicultural dimension in Key Stage 3 Areas of Study

	Low	Some	Important	TOTAL
1066-1500	10	4	11	25
1500-1750	11	7	7	25
1750-1900	9	3	13	25
Europe	8	5	12	25
Pre 1900W	5	8	12	25
Post 1900W	3	7	15	25

CHART C Teacher perceptions of the importance of Irish history in Key Stage 3 Areas of Study

	Low	Some	Important	TOTAL
1066-1500	23	2	0	25
1500-1750	10	10	5	25
1750-1900	14	9	2	25
Europe	25	0	0	25
Pre1900W	21	2	2	25
Post 1900W	18	3	4	25

CHART D Teacher perceptions of the importance of immigration from Ireland in Key Stage 3 Areas of Study

	Low	Some	Important	TOTAL
1066-1500	25	0	0	25
1500-1750	23	2	0	25
1750-1900	15	8	2	25
Europe	21	3	1	25
Pre1900W	23	2	0	25
Post 1900W	22	1	2	25

APPENDIX VI: Perceptions of historical dimensions by secondary history respondents in Case Studies 1, 2 and 3 (25 History Mentors at Birmingham University, 38 Heads of History and 52 delegates at the School History Conference in July 2004) comparing three categories (low importance, some importance and important)

CHART A **Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions at Key Stage 3**

Case studies	1			2			3		
	Ment	Birm	SHP	Ment	Birm	SHP	Ment	Birm	SHP
Dimensions	Low	Low	Low	Some	Some	Some	Impt	Impt	Impt
British mult. hist	4	3	16	2	11	5	19	24	31
English history	1	0	0	1	0	0	23	38	52
Irish history	7	12	19	12	17	23	6	9	10
Scottish history	11	15	22	11	19	24	3	4	6
Welsh history	10	18	24	12	18	21	3	2	7
Local history	N/A	3	5	N/A	13	10	N/A	22	37
British history	N/A	0	0	N/A	4	2	N/A	34	50
European history	2	3	6	1	7	3	22	28	43
World history	4	2	4	2	5	4	19	31	44

CHART B **Teacher perceptions of the importance of a multicultural dimension in Key Stage 3**

Areas of Study

Areas of Study	Low	Low	Low	Some	Some	Some	Impt	Impt	Impt
1066-1500	10	13	16	4	15	13	11	10	23
1500-1750	11	14	19	7	12	15	7	12	18
1750-1900	9	5	11	3	8	12	13	25	29
Europe	8	7	18	5	14	10	12	17	24
Pre 1900W	5	9	13	8	7	6	12	22	33
Post 1900 W	3	3	8	7	11	8	15	24	36

CHART C **Teacher perceptions of the importance of Irish history in Key Stage 3 Areas of Study**

Areas of Study

Areas of Study	Low	Low	Low	Some	Some	Some	Impt	Impt	Impt
1066-1500	23	32	43	2	5	7	0	1	2
1500-1750	10	19	22	10	12	14	5	7	16
1750-1900	14	25	33	9	6	15	2	7	4
Europe	25	30	46	0	7	4	0	1	2
Pre 1900W	21	32	47	2	3	3	2	3	2
Post 1900 W	18	27	40	3	7	6	4	4	6

CHART D **Teacher perceptions of the importance of immigration from Ireland in Key Stage 3**

Areas of Study

Areas of Study	Low	Low	Low	Some	Some	Some	Impt	Impt	Impt
1066-1500	25	38	47	0	0	2	0	0	3
1500-1750	23	34	43	2	2	6	0	2	3
1750-1900	15	23	34	8	11	8	2	4	10
Europe	21	36	50	3	2	0	1	0	2
Pre 1900W	23	34	49	2	4	2	0	0	1
Post 1900 W	22	31	46	1	7	2	2	0	4

Key for Charts A, B, C and D

Low importance = not recorded, not mentioned or only mentioned orally in class

Some importance = sometimes mentioned in plans

Important = an important strand in A and important in some topics or plans in B, C or D

APPENDIX VII: Perceptions of historical dimensions by secondary history respondents in Case Studies 1, 2 and 3 (25 History Mentors at Birmingham University, 38 Heads of History in Birmingham schools and 52 delegates at the Schools History Conference 2004, with three categories (low importance, some importance and important) represented as percentages)

CHART A Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions at Key Stage 3

Case studies	1			2			3		
	Ment	Birm	SHP	Ment	Birm	SHP	Ment	Birm	SHP
Dimensions	Low	Low	Low	Some	Some	Some	Impt	Impt	Impt
Britishmult hist	16	8	31	8	29	10	76	63	60
English history	4	0	0	4	0	0	92	100	100
Irish history	28	31	37	48	45	44	24	24	19
Scottish.history	44	39	42	44	50	46	12	11	12
Welsh.history	40	47	46	48	47	41	12	6	13
Local.history	N/A	8	9	N/A	34	10	N/A	58	71
British history	N/A	0	0	N/A	11	4	N/A	89	96
European history	8	8	12	4	18	5	88	74	83
World.history	16	6	8	8	13	8	76	81	84

CHART B Teacher perceptions of the importance of a multicultural dimension in Key Stage 3 Areas of Study

Areas of Study	Low	Low	Low	Some	Some	Some	Impt	Impt	Impt
1066-1500	40	34	31	16	40	25	44	26	44
1500-1750	44	36	37	28	32	30	28	32	23
1750-1900	36	13	21	12	21	23	52	66	56
Europe	32	18	35	20	37	19	48	45	46
Pre 1900W	20	24	25	32	18	12	48	58	64
Post 1900 W	12	8	15	28	29	15	60	63	70

CHART C Teacher perceptions of the importance of Irish history in Key Stage 3 Areas of Study

Areas of Study	Low	Low	Low	Some	Some	Some	Impt	Impt	Impt
1066-1500	92	84	83	8	13	13	0	3	4
1500-1750	40	50	42	40	32	27	20	18	31
1750-1900	56	66	63	36	16	29	8	18	8
Europe	100	79	88	0	18	8	0	3	4
Pre 1900W	84	84	90	8	8	6	8	8	4
Post 1900 W	72	71	76	12	18	12	12	11	12

CHART D Teacher perceptions of the importance of immigration from Ireland in Key Stage 3 Areas of Study

Areas of Study	Low	Low	Low	Some	Some	Some	Impt	Impt	Impt
1066-1500	100	100	90	0	0	4	0	0	6
1500-1750	92	90	83	8	5	11	0	5	6
1750-1900	60	60	65	32	30	16	8	11	19
Europe	84	95	96	12	5	0	4	0	4
Pre 1900W	92	89	95	8	11	4	0	0	2
Post 1900 W	88	82	80	4	18	4	8	0	8

Key for Charts A, B, C and D

Low importance = either not recorded, not mentioned or only mentioned orally in class

Some importance = sometimes mentioned in plans

Important = an important strand in A or important in some topics or plans on B, C or D

APPENDIX VIII: Perceptions of historical dimensions by secondary respondents in Case Studies 1, 2 and 3 (25 History Mentors at Birmingham University, 38 Heads of History in Birmingham schools and 52 delegates at the School History Project Conference comparing modes for three categories (low importance, some importance, important))

Case Studies	Case Study 1 Mentors	Case Study 2 Birm. Heads of History	Case Study 3 SHP Delegates
CHART A	Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions at Key Stage 3		
Dimension	What most respondents said about its importance		
British mult history	Important	Important	Important
English history	Important	Important	Important
Irish history	Some	Some	Some
Scottish history	Low/Some	Some	Some
Welsh history	Some	Low/Some	Low
Local history	Not done	Important	Important
Brit history	Not done	Important	Important
European history	Important	Important	Important
World history	Important	Important	Important
CHART B	Teacher perceptions of the importance of a multicultural dimension in Key Stage 3		
	Areas of Study		
Areas of Study	What most respondents said about its importance		
1066-1500	Important	Some	Important
1500-1750	Low	Low	Low
1750-1900	Important	Important	Important
Europe	Important	Important	Important
Pre 1900W	Important	Important	Important
Post 1900 W	Important	Important	Important
CHART C	Teacher perceptions of the importance of Irish history in Key Stage 3 Areas of Study		
Areas of Study	What most respondents said about its importance		
1066-1500	Low	Low	Low
1500-1750	Low/Some	Low	Low
1750-1900	Low	Low	Low
Europe	Low	Low	Low
Pre 1900W	Low	Low	Low
Post 1900 W	Low	Low	Low
CHART D	Teacher perceptions of the importance of immigration from Ireland in Key Stage 3		
	Areas of Study		
Areas of Study	What most respondents said about its importance		
1066-1500	Low	Low	Low
1500-1750	Low	Low	Low
1750-1900	Low	Low	Low
Europe	Low	Low	Low
Pre 1900W	Low	Low	Low
Post 1900 W	Low	Low	Low

Key for Charts A, B, C and D

Low importance = most respondents did not record or mention it, or only mentioned it orally

Some importance = most respondents sometimes mentioned it in class

Important = most respondents said that it was important in strand A, or important in some topics or plans in B,C or D

APPENDIX IX: Perceptions of historical dimensions by primary teacher respondents in Case Study 4 (delegates at the Historical Association Primary Conference in May 2004) using three categories (low importance; some importance, important)

CHART A **Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions in their own teaching**

Dimensions	Responses			Total Responses	Mode
	Low	Some	Important		
Mult. history	8	3	2	13	Low
English history	1	5	7	13	Important
Irish history	11	2	0	13	Low
Scottish history	11	2	0	13	Low
Welsh history	12	1	0	13	Low
Local history	3	6	4	13	Some
British history	1	5	7	13	Important
European history	5	7	1	13	Some
World history	5	6	2	13	Some
Irish immigration	12	1	0	13	Low

CHART B **Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions at Key Stage 2 in their school**

Dimensions	Responses			Total responses	Mode
	Low	Some	Important		
Mult. history	6	2	4	12	Low
English history	1	1	10	12	Important
Irish history	9	1	2	12	Low
Scottish history	5	5	2	12	Low/Some
Welsh history	8	3	1	12	Low
Local history	0	6	6	12	Some/Impt
British history	1	2	9	12	Important
European history	4	7	1	12	Some
World history	3	5	4	12	Some
Irish immigration	8	2	0	12	Low

CHART C **Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions at Key Stage 1 in their school**

Dimensions	Responses			Total responses	Mode
	Low	Some	Important		
Mult. history	8	1	2	11	Low
English history	3	4	4	11	Some/Impt
Irish history	10	1	0	11	Low
Scottish history	10	1	0	11	Low
Welsh history	9	2	0	11	Low
Local history	1	5	5	11	Some/Impt
British history	4	3	4	11	Low/Impt
European history	10	0	1	11	Low
World history	10	0	1	11	Low
Irish immigration	10	1	0	11	Low

Note: The difference response totals reflects the fact that out of 13 responses 11 teachers taught in schools with KS1 and 12 with Key Stage 2.

APPENDIX X: Case Study 5 (48 History Co-ordinators in Birmingham schools) using three categories (low importance, some importance and important)

CHART A **Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions in their own teaching**

Dimensions	Responses			Total responses
	Low	Some	Important	
Mult. history	22	12	11	45
English history	14	12	19	45
Irish history	38	5	2	45
Scottish history	43	2	0	45
Welsh history	42	3	0	45
Local history	15	16	14	45
British history	9	10	26	45
European history	27	8	10	45
World history	20	10	15	45
Irish immigration	40	4	1	45

CHART B **Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions at Key Stage 2 in their school**

Dimensions	Responses			Total responses
	Low	Some	Important	
Mult. history	12	15	21	48
English history	8	17	23	48
Irish history	39	7	2	48
Scottish history	42	6	0	48
Welsh history	42	5	1	48
Local history	12	14	22	48
British history	4	23	21	48
European history	14	23	11	48
World history	5	19	24	48
Irish immigration	43	5	0	48

CHART C **Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions at Key Stage 1 in their school**

Dimensions	Responses			Total responses
	Low	Some	Important	
Mult. history	19	12	12	43
English history	9	20	14	43
Irish history	37	4	2	43
Scottish history	41	1	1	43
Welsh history	42	1	0	43
Local history	11	20	12	43
British history	9	16	18	43
European history	30	10	3	43
World history	25	12	6	43
Irish immigration	41	2	0	43

Note: Out of 48 responses, 43 taught in KS1 and KS2 schools, five only taught KS2 and three did not teach history with their own class.

APPENDIX XI: Perceptions of historical dimensions by primary history respondents in Case Study 5 (48 History Co-ordinators in Birmingham) using three categories (low importance, some importance and important) represented as percentages and modes.

CHART A Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions in their own teaching

Dimensions	Responses			Total %	Mode
	Low	Some	Important		
Mult. history	49	29	22	100	Low
English history	31	27	42	100	Important
Irish history	84	11	5	100	Low
Scottish history	96	4	0	100	Low
Welsh history	93	7	0	100	Low
Local history	33	36	31	100	Some
British history	20	22	58	100	Important
European history	60	18	22	100	Low
World history	44	22	34	100	Low
Irish immigration	90	8	2	100	Low

CHART B Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions at Key Stage 2 in their school

Dimensions	Responses			Total %	Mode
	Low	Some	Important		
Mult. history	25	31	44	100	Important
English history	16	35	49	100	Important
Irish history	80	16	4	100	Low
Scottish history	93	7	0	100	Low
Welsh history	87	11	2	100	Low
Local history	25	29	46	100	Important
British history	8	48	44	100	Some
European history	29	48	23	100	Some
World history	11	39	50	100	Important
Irish immigration	89	11	0	100	Low

CHART C Teacher perceptions of the importance of historical dimensions at Key Stage 1 in their school

Dimensions	Responses			Total %	Mode
	Low	Some	Important		
Mult. history	44	28	28	100	Low
English history	21	46	33	100	Some
Irish history	86	9	5	100	Low
Scottish history	96	2	2	100	Low
Welsh history	98	2	0	100	Low
Local history	26	46	28	100	Some
British history	20	38	42	100	Important
European history	70	23	7	100	Low
World history	58	28	14	100	Low
Irish immigration	95	5	0	100	Low

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ajagbo, K; Kuwan, D; Sharma S. (2007) *Curriculum Review. Diversity and Citizenship*. Nottingham: Department for Education and Skills.

Aldrich, R. & Dean, D. (1991) The Historical Dimension. In Aldrich, R. (ed.) *History in the National Curriculum*. London: Kogan Page.

Armitage, P. (2006) 'The Changing Face of School History. How schools could respond. An HMI View.' Keynote presentation. In: Midlands History Forum Conference *History Matters for Every Child: Raising the Profile of History in Schools*, 11th November 2006. University of Central England: Midlands History Forum, unpublished conference paper.

Austin, R; Rae G; Hodgkinson K. (1987) 'Children's evaluation on neutral and sensitive topics.' *Teaching History*. Vol. 49, pp.8-10.

Bailey, R. & Culpin, C. (2002) 'Reputations. Source: Cromwell and Drogheda. *Ireland in Schools*. Available from <http://www.iisresource.org.htm> [accessed 5th March 2007]

Banks, F; Leach, J; Moon, B. (2005) 'Extract from New Understandings of teachers' pedagogic knowledge.' *The Curriculum Journal*. Vol.16, no.3, pp.331-40.

Barton, K.G. & McCully, A. (2002) 'Identity and the history curriculum in Northern Ireland; An Empirical Study of Students' Ideas and Beliefs.' In McCully, A. and O' Neill, C (eds.) *Values in Teacher Education and Research*, Lancaster: History Teacher Education Network, pp.16-29.

Barton, K.G. & McCully, A. (2007) 'Teaching controversial issues...where controversial issues really matter.' *Teaching History*. Vol.127, pp.13-19.

Bassey, M. (1999) *Case Study Research in Educational Settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Bechhofer, F. & Paterson, L. (2000) *Principles of Research Design in the Social Sciences*. London: Routledge.

Bielenberg, A. (ed) (2000) *The Irish Diaspora*. Harlow: Longman.

BERA (2004) *Revised Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. British Educational Research Association.

Bhattacharyya, G; Gabriel, J. & S; Small, S. (2002) *Race and Power: Global racism in the twenty-first century*. London and New York: Routledge.

Bookseller (2001) *Bookseller's Yearbook: Whitaker Bookrack*. London: Bookseller.

Bookseller (2003a). *The Bookseller*, 24th January. Issue No. 5061. London: Bookseller Publications.

Bookseller (2003 b) *The Bookseller*, 18th April. Issue No. 5073. London: Bookseller Publications.

Bowcott, O. (2007) 'Orange parades turn from confrontation to jamboree'. *The Guardian*, Friday July 13th. Available from http://www.guardian.co.uk/Northern_Ireland/Story/0,,2125281,00html [accessed 18th July 2007]

Bracey, P. (1974) *The characteristics of the Huguenots in Bristol in the late 17th and early 18th century*. BA (Hons) dissertation, University of Leeds.

Bracey, P. (1976) *An Assessment of Richard Boyle as an instrument of central government down to 1633*. MA dissertation, University of Birmingham.

Bracey, P. (1995a) 'Developing a multicultural perspective within Key Stage 3 National Curriculum History.' *Teaching History*. Vol. 78, pp.8-10.

Bracey P. (1995b) 'Ensuring continuity and understanding through the teaching of British history.' In Watts R. & Grosvenor I. (eds) *Crossing the Key Stages of History: Effective History Teaching 5-16 and Beyond*, pp.56-73. London: David Fulton.

Bracey, P. (2001) 'The implications of National Curriculum 2000 for Initial Teacher Education: A Primary Perspective.' In Goalen, P. & O'Neill, C. (eds) *Curriculum Change and History Teacher Education*, pp.23-30. Lancaster: History Teacher Education Network.

Bracey, P. (2003a) 'Enjoying a good story.' *Primary History*. No.34, pp.6-8.

Bracey, P. (2005c) 'The English History Curriculum through an Irish prism: Research in Progress.' In: History Teacher Educator Network Conference, *Teaching Sensitive and Controversial Issues in History*, University of Nottingham: History Teacher Educator Network.

Bracey, P. (2005d) 'Teaching for diversity? An exploration of Irish History in the School History Curriculum in England since c1970.' In: History of Education Society Conference, *Education for all*, 2-4th December, 2005. School of Education, University of Birmingham: History of Education Society, unpublished conference paper.

Bracey, P. (2006a) 'An Irish Dimension in the English History Curriculum: Opportunities and Implications.' In: *Historical Association Steering Group for Teaching Emotional and Controversial History (T.E.A.C.H) 3-19*. June 24th 2006. Hemingford Grey Conference and Training Centre: The Historical Association.

Bracey, P (2006b) 'Teaching for Diversity? Exploring an Irish Dimension in the School History Curriculum since c.1970. *History of Education*, Vol. 35, no 6, pp.619-635.

Bracey, P. (in press) (2007) 'Is inclusion good enough? Examination of an Irish dimension in the English History Curriculum.' In: *Anglo-Irish Symposium. Current Challenges in Researching Inclusions*, 18th June, 2007. Northampton: University of Northampton.

Bracey, P. & Gove–Humphries, A. (2002) ‘Thinking Skills through History, Literacy and Citizenship: A Case Study of 1916 - Ireland, the Western Front and Easter Rising.’ In: Midlands History Forum Conference, *History is Citizenship?* 12th Oct. 2002. University of Central England, Birmingham: Midland History Forum, unpublished workshop.

Bracey, P. & Gove-Humphries, A. (2003b) ‘An evaluation of pupil perceptions of Ireland, Irish history and its contribution to history teaching in our multicultural society.’ *The Curriculum Journal*. Vol. 14, no 2, pp.201-215.

Bracey P. & Gove–Humphries A. (2003c). ‘Irish Experiences in 1916: Thinking Skills, Literacy and Citizenship through History.’ In: Midlands History Forum Conference, *History Project Conference*, 4th-6th July, 2003. Trinity and All Saints College, Leeds: Schools History Project, unpublished workshop.

Bracey P; Gove-Humphries, A; Jackson, D. (2005a) ‘Evacuee and refugee children: using historical fiction to enhance historical understanding (Key Stages 2-3).’ In: Midlands History Forum Conference, *Learning about War*, 19th March 2005. University of Central England, Birmingham: Midlands History Forum, unpublished workshop.

Bracey, P. & Gove-Humphries, A. (2005b) ‘Evacuee children: using historical fiction to enhance historical learning at KS2.’ In: *Primary Historical Association Conference*, 14th May 2005. Black Country Museum: Historical Association, unpublished workshop.

Bracey, P; Gove-Humphries, A; Jackson, D. (2006) ‘Refugees and evacuees: enhancing historical understanding through Irish historical fiction with Key Stage 2 and early Key Stage 3 pupils.’ *Education 3-13*. Vol. 34, no. 2, pp.103-112.

Branchereau, J.P. (1995) ‘Children’s understanding of the Gulf War and international politics.’ In Osler, A; Rathenow, H; Starkey, H. (eds) *Teaching for European Citizenship*, pp.135-148. Stoke on Trent: Trentham.

Brandt, G. (1986) *The Realization of Anti-racist Teaching*. London: Falmer.

Brennan, G. (1999) ‘Spell of Magic.’ *Times Educational Supplement* 2nd July, pp.8-9.

Bridle, M. & McCarthy, S. (1993) *Colonialism, Conflict and Change. Cross-curricular themes in the classroom*. Birmingham and Dublin: Development Education Centre/Trocaire.

BSA (1996) *Statement of Ethical Practice*. Durham: British Sociological Association.

Buckland, P. (kha200@aol.com) (31st May, 2007) *Re: Paul’s request for help with numbers*. e-mail to Bracey, P (Braceypmrl@aol.com)

Campaign against Racism and Fascism (2003) Burying Macpherson. *Institute of Race Relations*. Available from <http://irr.or.uk/2000/December/ak000002.html> [Accessed 10th March 2003]

Cannadine, D. (1987) ‘British History: Past, Present and Future.’ *Past and Present*. Vol. 116, pp.160-91.

- Charlesworth, S. (2000) *A Phenomenology of Working Class Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chinn, C. (2003) *Birmingham Irish: Making our mark*. Birmingham: Birmingham City Council.
- Claire, H. (1996) *Reclaiming our Pasts: Equality and Diversity in the Primary School*. Stoke Trentham.
- Colley, L. (1992) *Britons Forging the Nation 1707-1837*. London: Vintage.
- Conlon-McKenna, M. (1990) *Under the Hawthorn Tree*. Dublin: O'Brien.
- Conlon-McKenna, M. (1995) *Safe Harbour*. Dublin: O'Brien.
- Coogan, T.P. (2000) *Wherever Green is Worn: The story of the Irish Diaspora*. London: Hutchinson.
- Counsell, C. (2000) 'Historical knowledge and historical skills: a distracting dichotomy'. In Arthur J. & Phillips R. (eds.) *Issues in History Teaching*, pp.54-71. London: Routledge.
- Culpin, C. & Turner, C. (1987) *Making Modern Britain*. London: Collins.
- Curtis, L. (1984) *Nothing but the same old story. The Roots of anti-Irish Racism*. London: Russell.
- Davies, I. (2000) 'Citizenship and History'. In Arthur, J. & Phillips, R. *Issues in History Teaching*. London: Routledge.
- Davies, N. (1999) *The Isles: A History*. London: MacMillan.
- DEC/Trocaire (1986) *Half the lies are true...Ireland and Britain: a microcosm of international misunderstanding?* Birmingham and Dublin: Development Education Centre/Trocaire.
- DEC (1999) *Water for a City - an issue for debate in Victorian Birmingham: A case in local history*. Birmingham: Development Education Centre.
- DES (1990) *National Curriculum History Working Group: Final Report*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- DES (1991) *History in the National Curriculum (England)*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- DfEE (1997) *Excellence in Schools*. London: Department for Education and Employment.
- DfE/QCA (1995) *The History Order*. London: Department for Education/Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

DfEE/QCA(1999) *History: The National Curriculum for England Key Stages 1-3*. London: Department For Education /Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

DfES (2002) The Secondary National Strategy for School Improvement, formerly known as the Key Stage 3 National Strategy *The Standards Site*. London: Department for Education and Skills. Available from <http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/secondary/> [accessed 19th June 2007]

DfES (2003) *Excellence and Enjoyment. A strategy for primary schools*. Nottingham: Department for Education and Skills.

DfES (2004) *Every Child Matters: Change for Children in Schools*. Nottingham: Department for Education and Skills.

DfES (2006) Achievement and Attainment Table. *Ofsted*. Available from <http://live.ofsted.gov.uk/reports/index> [accessed 1st June 2007]

Dodd, P. (1986) 'Englishness and the National Culture'. In Colls, R. & Dodd, P. (eds.) *Englishness: Politics and Culture 1880-1920*. Beckenham: Croon Helm.

Dyer, A.M. (1982) History in a Multicultural Society. *Teaching of History Discussion Paper 2*. London: The Historical Association.

Edgington, D. (1982) 'The role of History in Multicultural Education'. *Teaching History*. No. 32, pp.3-5.

Evans, N. (1988) 'Debate: British History, Past, Present and Future.' *Past and Present*. 119, pp.194-203.

Evans, R.J (1997) *In Defence of History*. London: Granta Books.

Feketi, L. (2001) 'The Terrorism Act 2000: an interview with Gareth Pierce.' *Race and Class*. Vol. 43, no. 2, pp.95-103.

File, N. & Power, C. (1981) *Black Settlers in Britain 1555-1958*. Oxford: Heinemann.

File, N. (1983) *Assessment in a multicultural society: History at 16+*. York: Longman.

Foster, R. (2001) *The Irish Story: Telling tales and making it up in Ireland*. London: Penguin.

Fraser, A. (1997) *The Lives of the Kings and Queens of England*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.

Ferguson, N. (2003) *Empire: How Britain made the Modern World*. London: Penguin.

Field, K; Holden, P; Lawlor, H (2000) *Effective Subject Leadership*. London: Routledge.

- Gain, C. and George, R. (1999) *Gender, 'Race' and Class in Schooling*. Abington: Routledge and Falmer.
- Garlake, T. & Welshman, R. (1997) *Making Peace: teaching about conflict and reconciliation at Key Stages 3 and 4*. Oxford: Oxfam.
- Gay, L. (1992) *Educational Research*, 4th edn. New York: Merrill.
- Gillborn, D. (1995) *Racism and Anti-racism in Schools*. Buckingham: Oxford University Press.
- GLC (1984) *Policy Report on the Irish Community*. London: Greater London Council.
- Goodson, I. (2003) *Professional Knowledge, Professional Lives. Studies in Education and Change*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Gorsemoor Primary School (2007) 'Ireland in Schools.' *Gorsemoor Primary School*. Available from <http://www.gorsemoor.staffs.sch.uk/ireland.htm> [accessed 22nd January 2007]
- Greenslade, L. (1992) 'An Tonn Ghael Historical Reflections on Irish Migration in Britain in the 1980s.' In Buckland, P. & Belcham, J. (eds.) *The Irish in British Labour. History Conference Proceedings in Irish History*. Liverpool: Institute of Irish Studies, University of Liverpool.
- Goalen, P. (1988) 'Multiculturalism and the Lower School History Syllabus: towards a practical approach.' *Teaching History*. No.53, pp.8-16.
- Goalen, P. (1997) 'Cross current: history and national identity in the classroom.' *History Today*. Vol. 47, no, 6, pp.6-8.
- Grosvenor, I. (1997) *Assimilating Identities: Racism and Educational Policy in Post 1945 Britain*. London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Grosvenor, I. (2000) 'History for the Nation: multiculturalism and the teaching of history.' In Arthur, J. & Phillips, R. (eds.) *Issues in History Teaching* pp.148-58. London: Routledge.
- Grosvenor, I. & Myers, K. (2001) 'Engaging with history after Macpherson.' *The Curriculum Journal*. Vol. 12, no.3, pp.275-289.
- Haigh, C. (2000) 'The third way to error and confusion.' *The Times Higher Education Supplement*. 8th December, p.27.
- Hardy, J. & Vieler-Porter, C. (1992) 'Race Schooling and the Education Act'. In Gill, Mayor & Blair (eds.) *Racism and Education: Structures and Strategies*, pp.101-141. London: Sage.
- Harris, S. (2004) 'Move over Florence: Schools are told to ditch 'jaded' heroine Nightingale and give history lessons about a female Irish pirate.' *Daily Mail* 28th December, p.25.
- Haydn, T. (1992) 'History for ordinary children.' *Teaching History*. No 67, pp.8-11.

- Haydn, T. (1996) 'Nationalism begins at home: the influence of National Curriculum History on perceptions of national identity in Britain, 1987-1995.' *History of Education Society Bulletin*, pp.51-61.
- Haydn, T. (2000) 'Teaching the Holocaust through History'. In: Davies, I. (ed) *Teaching the Holocaust; educational dimensions, principles and practice*. London: Continuum, pp.135-49.
- Haydn, T; Arthur, J; Hunt, M. (2003) *Learning to Teach History in the Secondary School: A Companion to School Experience*. 2nd Ed. London: Routledge Palmer.
- Hickman, M. & Walter, B. (1997) *Discrimination and the Irish Community in Britain*. London: Commission for Racial Equality.
- Hickman, M. & Walter, B. (1995) 'Deconstructing Whiteness: Irish Women in Britain.' *Feminist Review*. Vol. 50, pp.5-19.
- Hitchcock, G. & Hughes, D. (1995) *Research and the Teacher*, 2nd Ed. London: Routledge.
- Hobsbawm, E. (1968) *Industry and Empire*. London: Weidenfield & Nicholson.
- Holmes, C. (1988) *John Bull's Island. Immigration and British Society 1871-1971*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Holmes, C. (1991) *A Tolerant Country? Immigrants, Refugees and Minorities in Britain*. London & Boston: Faber & Faber.
- Home Office (2001) *Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000. New Laws for a Successful Multi-racial Britain*. London: Home Office.
- Howe, S. (2000) *Ireland and Empire: Colonial Legacies in Irish History and Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Husbands, C.(1996) *What is History Teaching: Language, Ideas and Meaning in Learning about the Past*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Ireland in Schools (2007) 'About Us.' *Ireland in Schools: Making learning fun and challenging*. Liverpool: Ireland in Schools. Available from <http://www.iisresource.org.htm> [accessed 22nd January 2007]
- Issitt J. (2004) 'Reflections on Textbooks.' *History of Education*. Vol. 33, No 6, pp.683-696.
- Jackson, J.A. (1963) *Irish in Britain*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jackson, D; Gove-Humphries, A; Bracey, P. (2005) 'From the frying pan into the fire? Escaping the London Blitz. Exploring the use of historical fiction to support historical learning.' *Primary History*. No. 41, pp.24-28.
- James, E. (2001) *Britain in the First Millennium*. London: Arnold.

Jenkins, K. (1991) *Re-thinking the past*. London: Routledge.

Johnson, P. (2000) 'Analysis: Thinkers who want to consign our island to history.' *The Daily Telegraph* 10th October, p.6.

Jones, J. (1995) 'An illustration of the danger of non response for survey research.' In: *The Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association*. April, 1995. San Francisco: American Education Research Association. Unpublished paper. Cited in Mertens, D.M. (1998) *Research Methods in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*, p.139. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Joyce, P. (1998) 'The Return of History: Postmodernism and the Politics of Academic History in Britain.' *Past and Present*. No.158, pp.205-35.

Kearney, H. (1989) *The British Isles: A History of Four Nations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Khan, R. & Cannell, C. (1983) *The Dynamics of Interviewing: Theory, Technique and Cases*. Malabar FL: Krieger.

Kinloch, N. (1998) 'Learning about the Holocaust: moral or historical question?' *Teaching History*. No 93. pp.44-6.

Kinloch, N. (2001) 'Parallel catastrophes? Uniqueness, redemption and the Shoah' *Teaching History*. No. 8. pp. 8-14.

Kirkland, S. & Wykes, M. (2003) 'Grace O'Malley, alias Granuaile pirate and politician, c.1530-1603.' *Primary History*. Vol. 34, pp.34-36.

Lambert, D. (1999) 'Exploring the use of textbooks in KS3 geography classrooms: a small-scale study.' *The Curriculum Journal*. Vol.10, no 1, pp.85-105.

Lee, C. (1997) *The Sceptred Isle*. London: Penguin.

Lee, P.(1991) 'Historical Knowledge and the National Curriculum'. In: Aldrich, R. *History in the National Curriculum*. London: Kogan Page, pp.39-65.

Lee, P (1992) 'History in Schools: Aims, purposes and approaches. A reply to John White. In: Lee, P. Slater, J. Walsh, P, and White, J. *The Aims of School History*. London: Tufnell, pp.20-34.

Longley, E. (2001) 'Northern Ireland: commemoration, elegy, forgetting.' In McBride, I. (ed.) *History and Memory in Modern Ireland*, pp.223-53. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MacAleavy, T. (1997) *Conflict in Northern Ireland*. London: Collins.

Macpherson, W. (1999) *The Stephen Lawrence Inquiry: Report of a Committee of Enquiry*. London: The Stationary Office.

Mansell, W. (2007) 'New look Key Stage 3: will you cope when the shackles come off?' *Times Educational Supplement*. 25th May, pp.22-23.

May, T. (2001) *Social Research: Issues, methods and process*. 3rd Ed. Buckingham: Open University Press.

McCartney, P. (1972) *Give Ireland back to the Irish*. [Music Vinyl] [s.l] Parlophone.

McCully, A. Pilgrim, N. Sutherland, A. McMinn, T. (2002) 'Don't worry, Mr. Trimble, we can handle it. Balancing the rational and emotional in the teaching of contentious topics.' *Teaching History*. Vol. 106, pp.6-12.

McCully, A. & Pilgrim N. (2004) 'They took Ireland away from us and we have to fight to get it back: Using fictional characters to explore the relationship between historical interpretation and contemporary attitudes.' *Teaching History*. Vol.114, pp.17-21.

McGovern, C. (1994) *The SCAA Review of National Curriculum History: A Minority Report*. York: Campaign for Real Education.

McGovern, C. (2007) 'The New History Boys'. In: Whelan, R.(ed) *The Corruption of the Curriculum*. London: Civitas.pp58-85.

McLeod, J. (2000) *Beginning Postcolonialism*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

McQueen, M; Duckworth, N; Wright, P. (2006a) 'Every Child Thinks: Addressing secondary history through a thinking skills approach'. In: History Matters for Every Child: Raising the Profile of History in Schools. *Midlands History Forum Conference*, 11th November, 2007. Faculty of Education, University of Central England: Midlands History Forum, unpublished workshop

McQueen, M; Duckworth, N; Wright, P. (2006b) 'Addressing ethnicity through a thinking skills approach.' In: Gateways to the Past: Researching and Exploring Multiethnic Stories Through History Teaching. *History Teacher Educator Network Conference*, 11-13 July 2006. Edge Hill University: History Teacher Educator Network, unpublished workshop.

MEG (1988) *British Social and Economic History: G.C.S.E. History Syllabus 1606*. Cambridge: Midlands Examination Group.

MEG (1998) *School History Project. General Certificate of Secondary Education History Syllabus 1605*. Cambridge: Midlands Examination Group.

Milne, S. (1986) 'Time Lords: Seamus Milne takes a lesson from the History Men.' *The Guardian*. 14th January, p.21.

Morgan, K. (1999) *The Oxford History of Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Morrison, V. (1989) 'Coney Island'. In *Avalon Sunset*. [Music CD] [s.l]: Mercury.
- Morrison, V. & Maloney, P. (1988) 'I'll tell Me Ma.' In Morrison V and the Chieftains *Irish Heart Beat*. [Music CD] [s.l]: Mercury.
- Moser, C. & Kalton, G. (1983) *Survey Methods in Social Investigation*. London: Heinemann.
- Mullard, C. (1981) 'Multiracial Education in Britain: From Assimilation to Cultural Pluralism.' In: Tierney, J.(ed.) *Race Migration and Schooling*, pp120-133. London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Myers, K. (2006) 'Historical Practice in the Age of Pluralism: Educating and Celebrating identities.' In Panayi, P. & Burrell, K. (eds.) *Histories and Memories: Immigrants and their History in Britain since 1800*, pp.35-53. London and New York: Tauris.
- OCR (2001) *Examiner Report 1605/03 Coursework*. Cambridge: Oxford, Cambridge & Royal Society of Arts Examinations.
- OCR (2006) 'GCSE History (Pilot)' *Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations*. Available from <http://www.org.uk/qualifications/GCSEHistoryPilot.html> [accessed 6th March 2007]
- O'Connor, K. (1972) *The Irish in Britain*. Dublin & London: Gill & MacMillan.
- O'Sullivan, J. (2003) 'Gaelforce: Ireland's fascinating history offers ways of approaching the issue of cultural diversity. Respect. Teaching about cultural diversity. Common ground. How schools bring people together.' *Times Educational Supplement*. 4th July, pp.8-9.
- Ofsted (2002) *History in Primary Schools: Ofsted Reports Series 2001/2*. London: Office for Standards in Education.
- Ofsted (2007) 'History in the Balance. History in English Schools 2003-7.' *Office for Standards in Education*. 20th July 2007. Available from http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/assets/Internet_Content/Shared_Content/Files/2007/july/hstryinthebinc.doc [accessed 26th July 2007]
- Osborn, M; McNess, E; Broadfoot, P; Pollard, A; Triggs, P. (2000) *What Teachers Do: Changing Policy and Practice in Primary Education*. London: Continuum.
- Osler, A. (2000) 'The Crick Report: difference, equality and racial justice.' *The Curriculum Journal*. Vol. 11, no.1, pp.25-38.
- Parekh, B. (2000) *The Future of Multi-ethnic Britain: The Parekh Report*. London: Profile.
- Phillips, R. (1998) *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*. London: Cassell.
- Phillips, R. (2002) *Reflective Teaching of History 11-18*. London: Continuum.

Price, M. 'History in danger.' *History*. Vol. 53, pp.342-347.

QCA (1998) 'Why do we remember Florence Nightingale?' *Qualifications and Curriculum Authority*. Available from <http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/schemes2/history.htm> [accessed 26th January 2007]

QCA (2000) 'History at Key Stage 3. Unit 17: Divided Ireland - Why has it been so hard to achieve peace in Ireland?' *Qualifications and Curriculum Authority*. Available from http://standards.dfes.gov.uk/schemes2/secondary_history/his17/?view=get [accessed 27th November 2006]

QCA (2004) *History 2003/4 annual report on curriculum and assessment*. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority.

QCA (2004) 'Who needs Florence Nightingale? It worked for me: Key Stage 1 cameos.' *Innovating with history*. London: QCA. Available from http://www.qca.org.uk/history/innovating/history_matters/worked_for_me/ks1/comeo-1/index.htm [accessed 15th November 2004]

QCA (2007) *The Secondary Curriculum Review. Programme of Study: History Key Stage 3*. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. Available from <http://www.qca.org.uk/secondarycurriculumreview/subject/ks3/history/index.htm> [Accessed 28th July 2007]

QCA (2007) *The Secondary Curriculum Review. Programme of Study: History Key Stage 3*. London: Qualifications and Curriculum Authority. Available from <http://www.qca.org.uk/secondarycurriculumreview/subject/ks3/history/index.htm> [Accessed 10th June 2007]

Raleigh, Y. (1994) *Recording Oral History: A Practical Guide for Social Scientists*. London: Sage.

Ramdin, R. (1999) *Reimagining Britain: 500 Years of Black and Asian History*. London: Pluto.

Rayment, T. (2000) 'Art Teachers' Views of National Curriculum Art: a repertory grid analysis.' *Education Studies*. Vol. 26, No 2, pp.165-76.

Regan, C. & Sinclair, S. (1986) *Half the Lies are true...Ireland Britain; a microcosm of international misunderstanding?* Dublin & Birmingham: Trocaire & Development Education Centre.

Regan, C. & Sinclair, S. (1999) *Essential Learning for Everyone: Raising the debate about civil society, world citizenship and the role of education. The Development Education Commission*. Birmingham & Ireland: Development Education Centre & 80:20 Educating for a Better World

Richardson, R. (2000) 'Lies and Truths about the Future of Britain.' *Multicultural Teaching*. Vol.19, no1, pp.8-13.

Riverdance – A Journey (1996) Produced by Moya Doherty. 73 mins. Dublin: Tyrone Productions. [Videotape.]

Robbins, K. (1998) *Great Britain: Identities, Institutions and the Idea of Britishness*. Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman.

Robson, C. (2002) *Real World Research*. 2nd Ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rogers, P. (1987) 'The past as a frame of reference.' In Portal, C. (ed) *The History Curriculum for Teachers*, pp.3-21. Lewes: Farmer Press.

Rose, E.J.B; Deakin, N; Adams, M; Jackson, V; Preston, M; Vanags, A; Cohen, B; Gaitskell, J; Ward, P. (1969) *Colour and Citizenship: A Report on British Race Relations*. London: Oxford University Press.

Russell, L. (2006) *Teaching the Holocaust in School History*. London: Continuum.

Said, E (2003) *Orientalism*. 3rd Ed. London: Penguin.

Salmons, P. (2001) 'Moral Dilemmas: history, teaching and the Holocaust'. *Teaching History*. No 104. pp.34-40.

Samuel, R. (1998) *Island Stories: Unravelling Britain: Theatres of Memory, Vol II*. London: Verso.

Schama, S. (2000) *A History of Britain: At the Edge of the World? 3000 BC –AD 1603*. London: BBC Worldwide.

Schama, S. (2001) *The History of Britain 1603 –1776*. London: BBC Worldwide.

Schama, S. (2002) *A History of Britain: The Fate of Empire 1776-2000*. London: BBC Worldwide.

Seaton, N. (2007) 'Remember Lessons of the Past'. *Campaign for Real Education*. Available from <http://www.cre.org.uk/history.html> [accessed 31st May 2007]

Sexias, P (1993) 'Historical understanding among adolescents in a multicultural society.' *Critical Inquiry*. Vol. 23, no.3, pp.301-327.

Sharrock, D. (2007) 'After 50 turbulent years, Stormont shakes off heavy chains of history.' *The Times*. Wednesday 9th May 2007, p.30-1.

Slater, J. (1989) 'The Politics of History Teaching: A Humanity Dehumanised?' *Institute of Education, Special Professorial Lecture*. London: Institute of Education. Cited in Phillips, R. (1998) *History Teaching, Nationhood and the State: A Study in Educational Politics*, London: Cassell, p.14. and Haydn, T; Arthur, J; Hunt, M. (2003) *Learning to Teach History in the Secondary School: A Companion to School Experience*. 2nd Ed. London: Routledge Palmer p.19.

Solomos, J. (1993) *Race and Racism in Britain*. Basingstoke: MacMillan.

- Starkey, D. (2001) *Elizabeth*. London: Vintage.
- Strong, R. (1992) *The Story of Britain*. London: Pimlico.
- Swift, R. (1986) 'The Teaching of Irish History in the Secondary School.' In *Teaching History*. No.44, pp.16-19.
- TES (2007) 'A Brit neglected.' *Times Educational Supplement*. 27th February, pp.16-17.
- The Pogues (1989) 'Young Ned of the Hill.' In The Pogues, *Peace and Love*. [Music CD]. [s.l]: Island Records.
- TIDE (2001) *Building New Citizenship: Learning from change in Derry/Londonderry - a case study supporting citizenship education at KS3*. Birmingham: Development Education Centre, Teachers in Development Education & 80:20 Educating and Acting for a Better World.
- TIDE (n.d) 'Welcome to Tide.' *TIDE global learning*. Birmingham: Teachers in Development Education. Available from: <http://www.tidec.org/> [accessed March 22nd 2007]
- Trocaire (2006) 'Trocaire's Mission: Trocaire: Working for a Just world.' *Trocaire*. Available from <http://trocaire.org/policyandadvocacy/index.php> [accessed March 22nd 2007]
- Troyna, B. (1992) 'Can you see the join? An historical analysis of multicultural and anti-racist policies.' In Gill, D. & Blair, M. (eds.) *Racism and Education: Structures and Strategies*, London: Sage, pp.83-91.
- TTA (1998) *National Standards for Subject Leaders*. London: Teacher Training Agency.
- University of Liverpool (2007) About the Institute. Institute of Irish Studies. *University of Liverpool*. Available from <http://www.liv.ac.uk/irish/about/index.htm> [accessed 31st May 2007]
- Unwin, B. (1986) *History for You: Britain since 1700*. London: Hutchinson.
- U2 (1983) 'Sunday Bloody Sunday'. In U2, *Under the Red Sky*. [Music CD] [s.l]: Island Records.
- Walsh, B. (2000) *The Struggle for Peace in Northern Ireland*. London: Hodder Murray.
- Walsh, B. (2003) *Empires and Citizens Book 1*. Cheltenham: Nelson Thornes.
- Walsh B. (2007) 'The truth about the coffin ships? An investigation.' *Ireland in Schools*. Available from <http://www.iisresource.org.htm> [accessed 5th March 2007]
- Walvin, J. (1984) *Passage to Britain*. Harmondsworth: Pelican.
- Ward, H. (2007) 'Very 1970s: themes make a comeback.' *Times Educational Supplement*. Friday 8th June 2007, p.14.

Weight R. (2002) *Patriots: National Identity in Britain 1940-2000*. London, Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Williams, E. (1997) 'Pupils explore their Irish Ancestry.' *Times Educational Supplement*. 20th June. Available from <http://www.tes.co.uk/search/story/?story-id=55801> [Accessed 13th October 2006]

Williams, H. (2006) 'A nice bit of sparkle.' *The Guardian*. Saturday, 18th November 2006. Available from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/britain/article/0,,1951248.00.html> [accessed 1st June 2007]

Wilson, J.E. (2003) 'False and dangerous.' *The Guardian*. 8th February, p.22.

Wise, C. (2001) The Monitoring Role of the Academic Middle Managers in Secondary Schools. *Educational Management and Administration*. Vol. 29, no 3, pp.333-341.

WMEB (1983) *School Council History Project. Certificate of Secondary Education*. Birmingham: West Midlands Examination Board.

WMEB (1984) *Mode 3 History. Certificate of Secondary Education*. Birmingham: West Midlands Examination Board.

Wrenn, A; Wilkinson, A; Webb A; Gillespie, H; Riley, M; Harnett, P; Harris, R; Lomas, T. (2007) *Teaching Emotive and Controversial History 3-19*. London: The Historical Association.

Young, G. (2002) 'Churchill - the truth.' *The Guardian*. Monday, 30th September 2002 [cited 11th December 2002.] Available from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/comment/story/0,3604,801386,00.html>

Younge, G. (2007) 'Comment and Debate: To understand political violence, we must first recognise its potency.' *The Guardian*. Monday 14th May, p.27.

80: 20 (n.d.) *Let's Talk Northern Ireland: A Briefing Paper*. Bray: 80:20 Educating and Acting for a Better World, unpublished.

80.20 (2000) *Let's Talk: A Review*. Bray: 80:20 Educating and Acting for a Better World, unpublished.

80: 20 (2006) 'Introducing 80:20.' *80: 20 Educating and Acting for a Better World*. [s.l]: 80:20. Available from <http://www.8020.ie/about.htm> [accessed 22nd March 2007]

80: 20 (n.d.) *Let's Talk: Conflict, Peace and Reconciliation*. Bray: 80: 20 Educating and Acting for a Better World, unpublished

