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## TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACARA</td>
<td>Australian Curriculum and Reporting Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AITSL</td>
<td>The Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership came into being on 1 January 2010. Provides national leadership for the Commonwealth, State and Territory Governments in promoting excellence in the profession of teaching and school leadership. A public company limited by guarantee, established under the Commonwealth Corporations Act 2001 and subject to the provisions of the Commonwealth Authorities and Companies Act 1997. Funded by the Australia Government. The Minister for School Education, Early Childhood and Youth is the sole member of the company. The Institute operates under its own constitution, with decisions made by an independent board of directors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANZASA</td>
<td>Australian and New Zealand American Studies Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSARA</td>
<td>Authority for the Protection and Management of Angkor and the Region of Siem Reap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APTA</td>
<td>Australian Professional Teachers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>Board of Studies Curriculum Committee. Committees appointed (some members elected by the association or body they represented) to oversee the production of syllabus documents. Made up of representatives from major stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoS</td>
<td>Board of Studies. The ‘committee’ that was established by law in 1988 to take responsibility for writing syllabuses for use in secondary schools for students in Years 7 to 12. Also responsible for all aspects school assessment and licensing. Chaired by an appointed President, it includes representatives from various stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BoSTES</td>
<td>Board of Studies, Teaching and Education Standards. Statutory body responsible for curriculum in NSW. Created on 1 January, 2014. Combining the offices of the NSW Board of Studies and the NSW Institute of Teachers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BSSS  Board of Senior School Studies. A ‘committee’ that was until 1988 responsible for formulating curriculum in secondary schools for students in Years 11 and 12. Chaired by the Director-General of Education in NSW it included representatives from various stakeholders.

Curriculum  Term that describes the learning, intended and unintended, that takes place in schools and classrooms. Hence, the term ‘History curriculum’ describes what happens in History classrooms.

D-G  Director-General of Education. Chief bureaucrat of the Department of Education in NSW. Responsible for the formulation and deliver of curriculum in NSW prior to 1988. After 1988, responsible for administration only of education in government schools in NSW.

DoE  Department of Education. The bureaucracy that since 1988 administers state education in NSW. Before 1988, it was responsible for formulating and administrating the curriculum in NSW. It has changed its title and acronym regularly during my career. I have chosen to use this designation for the sake of avoiding confusion.

EFEO  French School of the Far East

ESA  Educational Services Australia

ETA NSW  English Teachers’ Association of New South Wales

GAP  Greater Angkor Project

GTIL  Great Teaching Inspired Learning. NSW Government’s plan to improve the quality of teaching and learning in the state’s schools. As part of its wide-ranging blueprint of reform, the government has announced plans worth $155 million to give greater support to beginning teachers in NSW government schools and empower government school Principals to manage teacher underperformance.

history  This lower case version is used throughout when referring to the past or to past events.

History  This upper case version is used throughout when referring to History as the product of historians or, the academic discipline, and for the school subject, History.

HSIE  Human Society and Its Environment

HTA NSW  History Teachers’ Association of New South Wales. The professional association for History teachers in New South Wales.

HTAA  History Teachers’ Association of Australia. The national association of History teachers in Australia. Represents all states.

HTAV  History Teachers’ Association of Victoria
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>Intelligence Quotient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACOS</td>
<td>Man: A Course of Study (Bruner)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAHA</td>
<td>Macquarie University Ancient History Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>National Curriculum Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCHE</td>
<td>National Centre for History Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>New South Wales. The most populous state of Australia. One of the world’s largest education systems with more than 2200 schools and nearly 800,000 students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWEHTA</td>
<td>North West NSW English &amp; History Teachers’ Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBoS</td>
<td>Office of the Board of Studies. The administrative arm of BoS established in 1995 to administers the curriculum and accredit schools in NSW. Headed by the President of the Board of Studies but run on a day-to-day basis by a Manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>The Professional Teacher’s Council. A body that is elected to represent the professional teachers’ associations at state level. Is affiliated with a national body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAAF</td>
<td>Royal Australian Air Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOSE</td>
<td>Studies of Society and Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSB</td>
<td>Secondary Schools Board. A ‘committee’ that was until 1990 responsible for formulating curriculum in secondary schools for students in Years 7 to 10. Chaired by the Deputy Director-General of Education in NSW it included representatives from various ‘stake-holders’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td>A centrally formulated and distributed document that sets out the prescribed knowledge and skills and options that are required to be taught in the study of each school subject. Hence, the History Syllabus is an integral element of the work of History teachers. It forms the basis of teacher planning and of assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TILT Plus</td>
<td>Technology in Learning and Teaching: Stage 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Towards a taxonomy: History teachers and History classrooms

This study is presented as a research-based professional portfolio for the degree of Doctor of Education. There are four parts to the portfolio. The first part is the evidence-based narrative of my personal, professional and scholarly development. This narrative is an overview of my career as classroom teacher, curriculum consultant, teacher educator and historian, and of the pedagogy that developed from these experiences. The second part is a research-based discussion and demonstration of that pedagogy, using a proposed taxonomy for doing history and studying History in schools. The third part is an exploration of a crucial element of that taxonomy, the role of empathy in historical thinking and a demonstration of how empathy may be promoted from studying artefacts. The fourth part is a further application of elements of the taxonomy to develop resources for classroom use and includes a discussion and illustration of some issues of change management and how appropriately developed resources can encourage change in classroom content focus.

Themes introduced and explored in the initial narrative are developed in each of the other components of the portfolio. Firstly, there is the continuing dialectic between teaching historical skills and content knowledge. The second theme is the consideration of achieving an appropriate balance in the classroom between explicit instruction teaching and inquiry learning. The third theme examines the contradiction inherent in the need for teachers to mediate the curriculum in favour of their students and systemic priorities that are designed to ‘teacher–proof’ the curriculum.

This study is timely within the current Australian educational context. The implementation of a national curriculum for History in Australia continues to initiate considerable discussion and debate about WHAT should be taught in History classrooms. However, this study will contend that the critical questions should be located in the discussion of HOW a national curriculum might be taught. Such an
argument is strongly informed by my lifelong professional experience as a classroom practitioner, teacher educator and historian.

Arguments surrounding the HOW of History teaching centre on the rationale for the teaching of history and of studying History. There can be little dispute that there are many good reasons for teaching History and perhaps inevitably these reasons determine the pedagogy of the History classroom. History is usually conceived as a pre-agreed body of knowledge that students should learn, teachers should teach, that needs to be transmitted to ensure the outcomes of the ‘subject’ are met. As a result, the History classroom often becomes a place where students are processed and particular instrumental knowledge is transmitted. Arguably, these classrooms are not involving students in the study of History. They are actually using a particular History as a context for the teaching and learning of some subject other than History.

Ironically, these approaches do assume, by default, that history can be manipulated. Unlike the natural sciences, for instance, it can be viewed from different points and used for different purposes, that it is, in fact, a variable, synthetic construction. This is not a post-modernist perspective but an inherent truism of history; in this sense, historians have always been ‘post-modern’. The nature of the sources of history and the process of historical inquiry, if implemented appropriately, make revision of the knowledge of, and ideas about, the past an inevitable result of the study of history.

This study then contends that the nature of the process of historical inquiry and historical materials, sources, should determine how History is taught. Furthermore, the study proposes that students and teachers in History classrooms should be actively involved in the processes of history; both should be doing history. Crucial questions then to be asked are: What does that look like? What do teachers do when they want students to do history? What do students do when they are studying History? Now that Australia is implementing a national curriculum, it would seem timely to explore whether there is a common terminology, indeed a taxonomy, that can describe and structure the processes that teachers and students are involved in while doing history and studying History at school. As mentioned previously, each of
these themes is introduced in the narrative and then taken up in three substantive research components that comprise the portfolio.

The development of a taxonomy of History pedagogy for classroom implementation is the subject of Project 1: *History teachers and History classrooms*. Project 2: *Artefacts and historical empathy* illustrates elements of the taxonomy through the medium of artefact analysis. In particular, it demonstrates the pedagogy that uses artefacts to develop historical empathy, and to begin the development of a sense of the past in young students. The argument here is that this is the essential awareness that students need to foster historical consciousness, the prerequisite for the continuing development of their historical thinking. For Project 3: *Resourcing the Khmer Empire*, materials for use when teaching about the Khmer Empire have been consciously tailored to assist with implementation of this ‘new’ topic. This project deliberately adopts tactics to counter and exploit the possibility of teacher resistance to change.

Implications of this study are critical and wide-ranging. In particular, the synthesis of research from the last four or five decades clearly establishes a powerful argument that students in secondary school History classrooms are capable of thinking historically. This sharply contrasts with the continuing reliance by the ‘system’ on mandating meta-narratives of established facts, on the coverage paradigm. The development of, and discussion of, a taxonomy for doing history and studying History clearly establishes the necessity for classroom teachers to mediate the curriculum in the interests of their students. Again, this is in sharp contrast to the continuing efforts of educational jurisdictions to limit teacher autonomy and ‘teacher proof’ the curriculum. In the area of professional learning, this study suggests that deliberately countering resistance to change at the micro-level of individual classrooms, where change actually happens, or conversely, does not happen, may have wider applications for implementation of wholesale reform at a national level, and for the professional learning of classroom teachers who will ultimately implement the ‘new’ *Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus*. 
CHAPTER 1: 
TEACHING HISTORY IN NEW SOUTH WALES

1.1 Domains and themes

My chief concern as an educator has been classroom practice. Over a period of 46 years as a classroom teacher, faculty Head Teacher, practising historian and teacher educator, I have thought seriously about the role of historical thinking in the education of students. This concern with the development of historical thinking is at the heart of this study. As a classroom teacher with 41 years’ experience, my interest has been how to teach History and mediate the curriculum in favour of students. At the same time, as a faculty Head Teacher for more than 35 years, I became concerned with how teachers react to and implement change, particularly those for whom I was responsible. As a historian, a provider of professional learning for teachers and, a teacher educator I have been critically involved in exploring and promoting the praxis for reconciling theory and practice in the teaching of History. In all these aspects of my career, I have become increasingly aware of my role as a change agent.

Much of this study is framed by the tension between policy and classroom practice. To assist the theoretical orientation of the study, I have followed the lead of Phillips (1998) and adapted the theoretical structure used by Ball (1990) to describe the elements of policy formulation. This structure consists of three related but competing contexts of education policy-making discourse. The context of influence where policy is initiated and evolved is an ill-defined combination of social networks, political lobbying, interest groups, market forces, employers and the media. This context can be monopolized or captured officially or unofficially to exclude or marginalise others. It relates ‘symbiotically’ to the second element, the context of text-production where policy-text is produced. This relationship is problematic and often an arena for struggle because there is always the possibility that text can be read differently and a tendency for product to be different from intention. The last element is the context of practice where teachers become responsible for implementation. This responsibility for delivery allows classroom teachers much creativity and initiative. Again, there is likely to be a discernible ‘gap’ between official intent and implementation (Bowe, Ball & Gold, 1992,
pp 13ff). I have chosen to apply this concept of contexts, but when applying it to the areas of my professional practice in which I have operated as a History educator, I have redefined the concept as domains. First, there is the domain of practice that comprises activities in the school and classroom where doing history and studying History occur. Second, is the domain of text-production that is defined by the various arenas in which I have written or composed texts about History and History pedagogy. Third, there is the domain of influence where I have been involved in official deliberations on the formulation and implementation of History curriculum. These domains will be used to frame the discourse of policy and practice in this study.

Figure 1.1: The domains of professional activity

The interfaces of these domains are meant to be both unpredictable and indistinct. My various experiences in these domains have given me both an ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’ perspective on making and implementing History curriculum in New South Wales (NSW) and Australia. For much of my career, I have been an insider ‘embedded’ in the domain of practice as a classroom teacher and a curriculum mediator. I have also been an ‘informed’ outsider in the domains of text-production as a curriculum developer, teacher educator and practising historian. I have had the opportunity to observe and work in the ‘system’ on both sides, to develop and exercise both the practical and theoretical knowledge about history and History pedagogy. Finally, as a provider of
professional learning for teachers, a member of official committees and a teacher of History pedagogy, I have gained some experience in the domain of influence. These vantage points have not been separated. They have been concurrent and linked. Depending on the domain, one perspective may have dominated but they have informed and enriched each other.

As a result of these experiences in the different domains of professional activity, three critical themes about history, History teachers and History classrooms emerge. These themes are central to this study. This overarching narrative will explore these themes and situate them in the narrative of my career.

The first theme is a general concern as an embedded insider for getting the pedagogical balance right in the classroom. My experience in the domain of practice, as classroom teacher, has made me very aware of the necessity to get the balance between ‘taught’, explicit instruction by a skilled teacher, and ‘caught’, learning through inquiry or ‘discovery’. My experience has convinced me that there is an important role for both teacher-centred activity and student-centred activity in the learning process. Getting this balance right is critical for students in schooling generally, but in the teaching of History, it is crucial for the development of knowledge and process concepts of historical thinking.

The second theme is about the purpose of teaching History. By History, I mean the secondary school subject or discipline. As an informed outsider, on occasions distanced from the daily challenge of the classroom, I have become aware that there is a great deal of disagreement about the purpose of doing history and studying History in schools. At the most basic level, this is expressed as a divide between teaching historical knowledge and historical skills. This dialectic could also be expressed in pedagogical terms of understanding the difference between learning History and studying it. At a more theoretical level, it is a choice between ‘facts’ and historical thinking. I believe that it is possible to identify within the teaching of History in NSW secondary schools the continuing and deleterious influence of an anomalous ‘coverage’ paradigm driven by the dialectic between teaching historical content and teaching historical skills and processes (Cowling, 1984).
The third theme is an insider/outsider perspective on the tension between the demands of the domain of practice and the domains of text-production and influence. This concerns the tension evident throughout my career between the dynamics of classroom teaching, systemic requirements and teacher accountability. On the one hand, my experience as an embedded insider has convinced me that teacher mediation of the curriculum to cater for students’ interest, needs and abilities, is an essential consideration in everyday classroom practice. At the same time, as an informed outsider and a member of various systemic committees, I am aware of increasing prescription and continuing attempts at the official level to use syllabus and other mechanisms to ‘teacher proof’ the curriculum. These attempts at minimising teacher choice and teacher impact on the curriculum, at a time when we are being told regularly in the media that improving teacher quality is a national priority, represent another dialectic. These systemic concerns with prescription and accountability have significant implications for teacher reaction to change and have been reflected in official attitudes to teacher professional learning.

My classroom experiences as a History teacher have made me less worried about the content or knowledge included in the official History curriculum and more about the opportunity for the teacher to mediate the curriculum and get the right pedagogical balance. I have learned from my experience in the classroom that if students are taught the skills of interrogation, analysis and evaluation of historical sources and evidence in a planned and organised way, perhaps using a heuristic, or following a taxonomy, they will become historically literate and develop the state of mind called ‘historical consciousness’. The pedagogical argument here is that students need to study history and History. They need to study the processes by which history is known. They need to study how History is created. This pedagogical approach can develop the habit of mind, the disposition called ‘historical thinking’. When discussing ‘gaming’ as an aid to learning, Kalantzis and Cope (2008) point out that, in the quest for mastery in a multimodal context, students can manage their own learning within a scaffold. Challenges through new skills and the opportunity to practise produce intrinsically critical responses. They make the telling point that the more that is known about how the game works, the better students ‘get at it’ (2008, pp. 218ff). Arguably, this works in the ‘game’ of history and History as well. Knowing how the ‘game’ works can equip
students with the skills and awareness to critically appraise and critique any historical or historicised material that confronts them. This effectively makes concerns about the content of the History curriculum redundant.

The tracking of my experiences as an insider and outsider in the History curriculum is a non-linear narrative; not strictly chronological but framed instead by these domains that have been the arenas of my career. As I plot my career through the domains described above the three themes, namely, the need to balance teacher-centred and student-centred pedagogy, the consideration of the dialectic between historical knowledge and historical skills, and the continuing impact of official attempts to teacher proof the curriculum are explored, and the impact of my career on the teaching of History in Australian schools is considered.

1.2 The domain of practice

1.2.1 Becoming an insider, 1968 to 1972

I trained to teach in ‘small schools’, particularly one-teacher schools. I spent my first year of teaching in a two-teacher school in the ‘bush’ 600 or more kilometres south west of Sydney where I taught Kindergarten, Year 1, Year 2 and Year 3 concurrently in the same classroom. Although the Inspector, a music specialist, had concerns that I had taught the children non-official versions of English folk songs that my grandmother had taught me, and that all the students, even the girls, sang in a bass voice, I was successful in the first of three mandatory annual inspections.

I spent the next year working out of a primary school in a large town in central South West NSW as a District Relief Teacher. I was on call each day to attend schools within 300 kilometres. Smaller schools were given first access to the two teachers available. Often we were booked weeks in advance. The last priority was given to secondary school classes. Coincidentally, that year I had my first experience teaching secondary classes in English, History, Science and Industrial Arts. At one of the secondary schools, I was asked to consider applying for a vacancy to teach senior Ancient History. My mandatory inspection that year was conducted at the base school. I was told in that morning which class I was to teach and which subject area. I was expected to access the
class program and plan a lesson. The Inspector believed this replicated my normal 
operation as a relief teacher. He chose the Social Studies area for my lesson and asked 
me to teach a History lesson. The class was Year 6 and the lesson was on Sir Francis 
Drake.

This was an interesting choice. The Inspector knew of my interest in history. Earlier in 
the year he had interviewed me after a complaint was made about my teaching. I had 
replaced a Principal of a small school for a week. The class was a combined Year 5 and 
Year 6. Very detailed instructions and lesson plans were provided except in Social 
Studies where I was to write the text from the textbook on the chalkboard for the 
students to copy ‘neatly’ into their notebooks. The topic was the ‘Spanish Conquest of 
the Americas’. Even then, copying from a textbook was not on my classroom agenda. 
Instead, I taught a series of lessons that included reading extracts from letters written by 
Spanish settlers, giving details of atrocities committed against the Indigenous peoples of 
America. The subsequent summary, a joint construction that I asked students to copy 
into their notebooks, was a cloze passage that provided various choices of words. For 
instance, students could choose between ‘civilise’ and ‘barbarise’. When students 
finished their summaries, we compared, reflected on, and discussed their choices.

This experience was one of the earliest that reinforced my belief that students of young 
ages could be taught difficult concepts from history and could think historically if the 
materials and the pedagogy were appropriate. I was becoming aware that mediating the 
curriculum would result in improved outcomes for students. However, the Principal was 
not impressed by my work. He demanded that the Inspector ‘Do something’. He 
claimed that I was a ‘Communist’. After an official interview, I was told to follow 
instructions in future. Nonetheless, my inspection was successful. However, the 
Inspector was disappointed with my deconstructionist approach, particularly with my 
description of Drake’s circumnavigation of the world as ‘accidental’. He claimed that I 
had neglected the potential attraction of the grand narrative, of the epic story. I learned 
from this experience and became a storyteller as well. Although I have never been an 
advocate of meta-narratives, throughout my career I have followed the adage that a 
story well told is a powerful teaching aid in the History classroom.
The next two years were spent teaching the lower stream of Year 5 in a large primary school. It was argued that with my small schools training I would be able to provide the assistance that lower stream students needed to cater for the differences in their development and abilities. I found this experience particularly frustrating because although my classes were studying a modified curriculum, and they worked hard each year, they were required to do the same assessment as the mainstream classes. Their failure was inevitable. While the ‘job’ I was doing with my class attracted praise, nothing I said or did could convince the school hierarchy that this assessment situation was inequitable. I was successful in my last inspection in 1970 and was awarded my teaching credential for NSW.

In the last 15 weeks of the school year of 1971, I volunteered to teach a class of children with an assessed ‘Intelligence Quotient’ (IQ) of less than 80. The Principal wanted to try a different approach to literacy and numeracy in the ‘special’ class; 19 of the 22 students aged 8-13 years were Aboriginal. The new approach abandoned the traditional Mathematics and Reading lessons as per a timetable. This approach had resulted in workbooks filled with meaningless and mostly incorrect classroom notes and exercises, poor behaviour and low self-esteem. Instead, we did shopping exercises from junk mail, sign reading, art and music in the mornings and lots of physical activities in the afternoon. I taught the students how to play a variety of games and introduced them to a range of sports. We finished the day with some relaxation exercises, often outdoors, while I told a story or read a serialised story to them.

The experiment of a more relevant curriculum mediated in favour of the needs, interests and abilities of the students was successful, resulting in improved literacy and numeracy outcomes apparent by the end of the year. I also taught the students Local History. In particular, I taught the history of the settlement of the area and the impact that this had had on the Aboriginal population. A number of students had elders in their community who retained their language and knowledge. I encouraged the students to learn from their elders and to bring this knowledge to share at school. Some even brought their language. By the end of the year, there was a noticeable improvement in behaviour and attitude from the students. Furthermore, staff attitudes towards these ‘special’ students
also changed. My nomination of one of the Aboriginal students from the class as the ‘Sportsman of the Year’ was supported and presented at Speech Night.

These experiences in a variety of educational settings convinced me that under the guidance of a thoughtful educator, children of all ages were capable of unexpectedly high levels of intellectual engagement and learning. The challenge was to find the medium and to design meaningful experiences that encouraged students to eventually discover meaning for themselves. This was the basis of my belief that explicit teaching of basic knowledge and skills in a systematic way is essential to achieving positive student outcomes. It is my experience that student inquiry and discovery require a great deal of thought and manipulation by the teacher. This became the fundamental methodology of my classroom, and, eventually of my pedagogy for teaching History. This pedagogy is founded in the conviction that the important things that we strive to teach will not happen incidentally in the classroom. They happen as the result of teacher planning and intervention in the learning process. The teacher must plan, design and teach explicitly for the acquisition of knowledge and skills. The essentials of any discipline are ‘taught not caught’. This requires teacher planned, guided inquiry and discovery. Hence, early in my career I became convinced that historical knowledge, skills and awareness, the essentials of historical thinking, must be at the forefront of teacher planning and of student activity in the History classroom.

1.2.2 Transition to secondary History teaching

In 1972 I was appointed to a large rural secondary school in North West NSW. The staff of the school was young and enthusiastic. Many thought I had been appointed to teach the ‘General Activity’ students who studied a modified curriculum on the basis that they had a less than average IQ. Apparently it was argued that my primary and small schools experience indicated that I was trained for the specialist teaching required. Fortunately, the English and History ‘Master’ (faculty Head Teacher) insisted that I had been appointed as an English and History teacher.

My allocation for that year included junior classes only in both English and History. A degree was considered essential before teaching senior students. The English program was very detailed and considered ‘innovative’ because of its emphasis on media other
than written text. The English Teachers’ Association of New South Wales (ETA NSW) later published this program as an exemplar for English teachers in NSW. My contribution to the English program was a scheme to teach Spelling. The methodology was based on encouraging students to become responsible spellers. The pedagogy included provision of a dictionary and the active teaching of contextualised spelling in a variety of ways. It was founded in my belief in ‘taught not caught’.

On my first day, the Head Teacher handed me a copy of the *History Syllabus Years 7-10* without comment. This was a series of foolscap folio stencilled sheets with black ink on soft fibrous paper. I learned that the syllabus had been recently revised and that I should not lose my copy. In 1972, to produce a copy required a tedious process of typing, ‘cutting’ a stencil master sheet and ‘running off’ each page by hand. Manual collation and stapling followed when copies were ‘dry’. It was a laborious and potentially dirty process that made copies precious, difficult to obtain and difficult to disseminate.

The Head Teacher’s only interest in the discipline of History was to see that those who taught it were qualified, and interested. I was advised to ask a more experienced colleague for advice and assistance. Ironically, the syllabus was written in such a way that there seemed little reason for anyone to require advice. The document was organised by school terms of 14 to 15 weeks with the course for each term described as a ‘survey’ with at least one ‘depth study’. There were 14 to 15 topics listed for each term. Each topic was divided into four dot points that represented the content for lessons of each week. If historical content was not being done in-depth, it had to be covered in the survey. It all had to be taught one way or another. This left little to the imagination. This was the knowledge that was to be taught and assessed. The course began with ‘Prehistory’ in Year 8 and concluded with ‘Australian History’ and the ‘Cold War’ in Year 10. There was a very obvious emphasis on content coverage. This coverage paradigm was the established and accepted paradigm for teaching and learning History. I remembered it unfavourably from my own experience of school History in the 1960s.

The impression that chronological coverage was the main goal of teaching History was quickly reinforced to me during a number of school inspections in the next three years. Inspectors inevitably asked me where was I ‘up to’ in the syllabus. There was an
obvious expectation that I should be teaching the content that corresponded to that particular week, or lesson, in the official document. However, my growing familiarity with the syllabus had made me aware that there were ways that it could be mediated. There was always the opportunity to teach skills, as well as knowledge, to teach them in tandem. My experience convinced me that by discovering and manipulating the content or knowledge of History, students could best practise the skills required for doing history and studying History.

Reading Burston’s *Handbook for History Teachers* (1962) reinforced this belief. The various articles, set in a British context, outlined and explored the controversies of History teaching and History writing that surfaced in Britain when the place of History in the school curriculum was being debated in the 1960s. This was a revelation for me. I became a more vocal advocate of teaching from historical evidence and developing historical thinking. My approach to the curriculum included negotiating depth studies and allowing students to select their own research projects and reporting media within the topics set down in the syllabus. The students could do almost any topic they chose as long as they worked from evidence and their output displayed historical thinking. At that time there were no external accountability mechanisms other than school reports. History was very popular as a consequence. The foundation unit, ‘What is History?’, that I developed with my colleagues was considered by other teachers to be innovative because of its emphasis on epistemology and historical thinking. It was published by the History Teachers’ Association of New South Wales (HTA NSW) in their publication *Bright Ideas* (1978) for dissemination to History teachers in NSW.

I had also mediated the coverage imperative from the syllabus. I understood that teaching History required students to learn about historical chronology. I was aware of the research that concluded that temporal issues prevented students from thinking historically (Peel, 1967; Hallam, 1969). The manipulation of macro and micro chronology was integral to the approach I took. All students created their own dynamic timeline set out on six to eight sheets of paper organised in a foldout ‘concertina’ in their History folder. This timeline was the basic organiser for the next three years of studying History. This temporal organisar allowed us to do a survey, as well as depth and thematic studies anchored firmly in chronology. Students were encouraged to add
their own research findings and to decorate and ‘illuminate’ their timelines. The number of Information Technology (IT) applications that are available for timeline construction today suggests that this would be even more engaging for students in the age of the Internet. Eventually, I complemented the use of a timeline with a chronologically organised database set in a spreadsheet that can be filtered and sorted at will. This database, or note-builder, was intended for continued use for the four to six years that students studied History and became the main tool for note-building exercises.

This approach to mediating the curriculum and attempting to minimise the impact of the coverage paradigm was sometimes a contentious issue. In 1975, the faculty Head Teacher was being inspected for promotion to Deputy Principal. In the previous year, it had been made clear via announcements and publications that the perception that all content had to be taught in a lock-step week-by-week progression was a misreading of the 1972 History syllabus. This advice came from the Directorate of Studies. This unit within the NSW Department of Education (DoE) was staffed by specialist subject inspectors and curriculum officers and had responsibility for the development of syllabuses for each subject area via Syllabus Committees. However, inspectorial teams that came to schools were not always composed of subject inspectors. In 1975 one of the three Staff Inspectors who was assessing our faculty asked me the inevitable question, ‘Where are you up to in your Year 8 class?’ After answering, I pointed out that the question was now largely irrelevant and quoted what I had read and been told by the History Inspector from the Directorate of Studies. This Staff Inspector made a major issue of our failure to ‘follow the syllabus’. He chose to ignore all evidence that the requirements had changed, although he did eventually provide a positive report for the faculty head’s promotion. This experience may have been a ploy that allowed the team of three inspectors to determine how the Head Teacher responded under pressure in what was a variation on ‘good cop/bad cop’. My lasting impression, however, is that it took a number of years before this perception of the 1972 History Syllabus as ‘lock-step’ was broken down. Communicating and disseminating such information, and getting it into the hands of all teachers were more difficult in pre-photocopy and pre-Internet 1975.
The result of our mediation of the syllabus at the school level proved to be very positive because the number of students who chose to study History in Years 11 and 12 (senior school) also increased. The faculty had more History students and therefore needed to allocate more staff to teach History classes. My interest and expertise in Ancient History and Archaeology had also had a significant impact when we introduced Ancient History as a subject choice in the senior years. The combined English and History faculty grew. By this time I had become faculty Head Teacher. Eventually, the faculty was split. I chose to head the History faculty. This gave me the opportunity to concentrate my time and effort on further exploring the teaching of History and the means by which we could facilitate the development of historical thinking.

These earliest experiences in the context of practice made me a firm advocate of the value of explicit instruction, of ‘taught not caught’, and convinced me that mediation of the curriculum in favour of students was the prime responsibility of a classroom teacher. Regardless of the content of the syllabuses that I am teaching, today I continue to apply these two principles. These central tenets of classroom practice were further reinforced by my earliest involvement in the context of text-production. The continuing discussion of these themes will be a central element of this study.

1.3 The domain of text-production

1.3.1 Memorandum 21 and integrated studies

My introduction to the contexts of influence and text-production was initiated by my attendance in 1974 at a conference of History teachers at Katoomba in the Blue Mountains near Sydney. This event was jointly organised by HTA NSW as a professional learning course, an ‘in-service’ course under the aegis of the Directorate of Studies History Inspector. This arrangement allowed History teachers from DoE to apply for funding and teacher relief. Its location made it easier for rural teachers to attend. This state-wide conference was a response to a perceived threat to the integrity of History in schools. The conference was the first step in a planned ‘fight back’. HTA NSW, the History Inspector and the members of the History Syllabus Committee organised a program that was meant to begin a renewal of History teaching in NSW. I had completed a Bachelor of Arts and was now the most senior History teacher in the
faculty. While the situation at our school did not reflect state-wide concerns, the Head Teacher decided that we would both attend.

The threat was contained in an official document entitled *Memorandum 21*, issued by DoE NSW in 1972, introducing a new subject called ‘Social Science’ for the first year of secondary schooling. It theoretically integrated geographical, social and historical studies. It had some resemblance to Bruner’s *Man: A Course of Study* (MACOS) (1964). Many schools took up this course enthusiastically as an interesting new option. It was usually allocated to Geography teachers. The course was introduced into an arena of ongoing tension. It heightened the annual elective competition for students between History and Geography faculties. Neither History nor Geography was compulsory. Students chose one or the other at the end of their first year of secondary school. Student choice could cause significant changes in the size of each faculty’s projected teaching responsibility. Few teachers taught History and Geography. Teachers could be forced to teach outside their discipline specialty. Changing numbers of students electing one or the other subject could determine who would lose staff in the subsequent year and in turn could determine the retention or loss of faculty status and Head Teacher positions.

Geography teachers had an advantage in the possibility of influencing student choice. Geography faculties used this immediately popular new subject to promote the cause of Geography as the preferred option beyond first year. In comparison to the lock-step week-by-week History courses being offered in many schools, this integrated course may have appealed as a new and exciting option. Schools also added Social Science to the curriculum mix for students to elect for study in later years, thereby offering continuity. Apparently, the impact was immediate (Johnson, 1982). Some in the History teaching community saw the increasing popularity of this new course as the vanguard of a push for integrated studies. Consequently, it was seen as a threat to the maintenance of History as a separate discipline in NSW schools. Social Science did not prove a problem for History in my school. Much to the consternation of Geography teachers and faculty, students continued to choose History in increasing numbers.
The Katoomba conference was a salient event for History in NSW, as well as for me professionally. Teachers, curriculum personnel and academics met en masse for the first time and established the contacts and networks needed to work together on the renewal of History in NSW schools. The introduction of a new NSW Secondary Schools Board (SSB) Syllabus in History for Years 7-10 in 1981, the culmination of six years, development by the NSW Directorate of Studies, the NSW SSB Syllabus Committee and more than 160 secondary school teachers and university lecturers from all regions of NSW (Johnson, 1982; Cowling, 1984) was the result of the work begun at the 1974 conference in Katoomba.

While the threat to the discipline proved illusionary, much of the credit for the growth of History as a secondary school subject from 1974 can be attributed to the positive leadership given to History teachers of NSW on occasions such as this memorable conference at Katoomba in 1974. It was at Katoomba that I first made the contact with HTA NSW and established the network of like-minded teachers and academics that has sustained my teaching since. It was in the context of such gatherings that the drive and enthusiasm that sustained History teaching in NSW in the decade until 1981, and since I believe, was originally generated. It was because of my attendance at this conference that I made contact with HTA NSW and the History Inspector from the Directorate of Studies. Subsequently, I was given opportunities in the contexts of influence and text-production as an insider, a classroom teacher. This enabled me to present and publish my ideas on teaching and studying History for teachers in NSW and increasingly to become involved in more formal, outsider, text-production and curriculum development with NSW DoE.

### 1.3.2 Professional learning for History teachers

One activity where the context of text-production overlaps with the context of practice is in the provision of professional learning for teachers. During the 1970s and 1980s I was a member of the North West NSW English & History Teachers’ Association (NWEHTA). Professional learning happened after school. Often I drove 100-200 kilometres each way to present at these meetings, and regularly presented on both
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History and English teaching at the association’s Annual Conference. I was NWEHTA President and convenor of the annual conference for teachers from 1977 to 1979.

After 1978, when I was the DoE Curriculum Consultant for Ancient History for North West Region, I reported on Ancient History curriculum issues and tried to update teachers on subject content such as the ancient Set Texts that students were required to study for HSC. I was also a member of the DoE Regional History Curriculum Committee that met at least once each term to plan development and professional learning activities for the region. To assist dissemination of our work I founded and became editor and main contributor to the regional journal, *Are We History?* Between 1980 and 1985 the DoE published and issued this journal to all public schools in North West and Western regions of NSW. On occasions I also produced more specific publications such as *For Teachers of Ancient History* (1984) to support new syllabus documents or texts for Ancient History. On one occasion I presented and subsequently published *Marking History at the Higher School Certificate*. This discussion and publication of the ‘confidential’ marking procedures for the matriculation examination (HSC) was not well received by DoE but forced the adoption of more transparent procedures that since have ensured that teachers and students in remote areas are not disadvantaged in their preparation for HSC. While this was the context of text-production and influence on a regional, perhaps micro-level, it was good preparation for what followed when I was appointed to a Sydney school.

### 1.3.3 Interlude: 1986 to 1988

I spent several years overseas in the late 1980s. I spent the last couple of days of May 1986 at a DoE NSW consultation conference for final pre-implementation advice on a new Modern History syllabus. In the next 30 months, I held various permanent casual appointments at the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF) School on the island of Penang in Malaysia. I was in turn the Librarian, Physical Education and Sports K to Year 10 teacher and Grades 3 and 4 teacher. The impact of such an experience, living and working in a significantly different culture, is inestimable. From a history educator’s perspective however the opportunity that residence in South East Asia offered for cheap
and frequent travel was a bonus that I took full advantage of from the first available holiday period.

I had previously managed to visit ancient sites in Italy, Greece, Yugoslavia, Turkey, Israel, Egypt and a number of Greek islands on one extended but relatively brief ‘grand tour’ earlier in the 1980s. That experience had impacted immediately on my teaching of History. There was an almost tangible immediacy about my classroom ‘tours’ of the sites that I had visited and extensively photographed. I made up sets of slides housed in Kodak ‘Carousel’ and Hanimex slide ‘boxes’ for classroom use. At the time, this was the latest technology and I exploited it as best I could. I had already made many sets of slides by photographing pictures from books using an SLR camera with multiple lens attachments and an enlarging stand. But now that I had actually visited these sites, the experience gave a new dimension to my previously vicarious knowledge of the archaeology and history I was teaching. I maintain my interest in archaeology today by teaching at a museum and by close association with the Greater Angkor Project (GAP) team from the University of Sydney. Archaeological materials and processes are important to my pedagogy, as I demonstrate in Project 2 where I illustrate my approach using artefacts, and in Project 3 where the preparation of resources for an archaeological study are used again to demonstrate elements of my pedagogy.

Between 1986 and 1988, I visited a wide range of countries and historical sites, both ancient and modern, in Asia and Europe. I revisited some sites in Turkey, Greece, and Italy and added some previously omitted. I also visited sites in Thailand, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macao, Singapore, China, Austria, Germany, Netherlands, Belgium, France, USSR, Britain and Switzerland. The application of the concept of a site study to topics for Modern History became very apparent to me. The experience of these sites and the contextual settings proved a successful strategy in all facets of my teaching when I returned to Australia to my position as a secondary school Head Teacher of a History faculty.

In subsequent years, I have continued to travel regularly to the sites that I teach about on what I like to think of as self-funded sabbaticals. These trips have taken me to archaeological sites in southern France, Tunisia, Libya, Spain, Portugal and Morocco.
My growing interest in South East Asian archaeology has been fuelled by further travel in Asia to Laos, Vietnam, China and Indonesia. The 2004 refocus of the Ancient History syllabus to include a compulsory core study of the archaeology of Pompeii and Herculaneum has necessitated a number of return trips to Rome and three visits to Pompeii and Herculaneum, one being a resource gathering excursion officially sanctioned by a ‘permesso’ from the Superintendance Pietro Guzzo. An interest in, and the use of, archaeological materials for teaching History have been elements of my pedagogy since I became a History teacher. My practices are discussed and explored in Project 2: Artefacts and historical empathy and Project 3: Resourcing the Khmer Empire.

1.3.4 Public and commercial History

Other interesting excursions into the context of text-production, and obliquely the context of influence, have occurred when, as an insider, I have acted as an outsider, an historical consultant, to give advice to and write materials for community and History education providers. These include Historic Homes, National Trust, Department of Veteran Affairs, Discovering Democracy, Museums’ Association, Curriculum Corporation, Radio Blue Skies, Education Services Australia, Oxford University Press, Classroom Video, Learning On-Line, Screen Australia and the Aboriginal Studies Association. I have also done some ghost writing on Australian History and on History education for a Sydney Morning Herald journalist. It is my experience that public providers of History have a different aim and different understanding of what teachers need or want, of what students do in the History classroom, and on the reasons for studying History. I have been surprised when my insider advice about the pedagogy or classroom orientation of a publication or resource has been queried, or on occasions ignored, by those far removed from the classroom. Outsiders with no experience of the classroom have revised my materials without notice. Most recently in 2013, an outsider edited my contribution to a text for History teachers in such a way as to break the continuity of the pedagogical process, of ‘taught not caught’, that I was establishing.

My profile with HTA NSW has also given me a number of opportunities to share my passion for classroom teaching in various education forums. In July 2005, I was an
invited participant and session Chair at a United States Embassy sponsored *Australian and New Zealand American Studies Association (ANZASA) Conference* for teachers and academics in Canberra. I was an invited presenter and panel member on ‘Using documentary film in the Classroom’ at a conference organised by the Film and Television School at Macquarie University. I was an invited panel member and presenter at ‘Using digital (re)sources in the History Classroom’, a Swinburne University of Technology conference in Newcastle NSW. I am also a regular presenter for Macquarie University Ancient History Association (MAHA) HSC Study Days for both students and teachers. In some of these arenas, in the context of influence and text-production interface, it has been very apparent to me that my advice about the intention and design of resources based on insider classroom expertise is often ignored or overlooked in favour of providing masses of textual materials for student use. Consistently, knowledge seems to dominate over skills. On occasions, my preference for a prize entry that shows evidence of sound research and historical thinking was ignored in favour of one that provided much mundane information or was visually attractive or apparently IT savvy. My attempts to avoid the banal and provide sources that allow students to critique the record of the past, and bring different perspectives for instance, have on occasions been greeted as almost unpatriotic. The materials produced in these contexts are designed to be adopted by teachers, without modification. My advice that teachers are more likely to adapt materials rather than adopt them, and that much of the material provided in the form of lesson plans is a waste of time, and my contention that teachers want resources, such as sources of evidence, regularly falls on deaf ears.

This tension between insider educational concerns and outsider concerns for various altruistic issues of tradition, or identity, or more venal concerns with commercial viability, are indicative again of the dominant paradigm issue that is a major theme of this study. There appears to be a general belief that history and History are about content and about a predetermined or agreed body of knowledge. Many bureaucrats, politicians and members of the public seem to have a History that they believe should be taught in schools. It is the contention of this study that this belief is inappropriate and continues to damage the cause of History in schools by ignoring the need, or
opportunity, to teach historical skills, develop historical literacy, promote historical consciousness, and to practice historical thinking.

### 1.3.5 The Australian History Channel and the History Classroom

Another area where the crossover between contexts of text-production and influence is apparent is the proliferation of historical and historicised materials thrust at students by the media, particularly in digital mode on television and, increasingly, on personal computers and tablets. In 1999, the Australian History Channel invited me to establish the History Classroom, a resource for schools across Australia and New Zealand where schools gain access to all documentaries shown on the History Channel under a record and replay licence. In collaboration with the channel programmer, I choose a weekly program to support some aspect of the History curriculum in Australia. This program has a regular time slot and its own logo. An on-line study guide for teacher and student use supports this weekly program. In 2013, the target was the Australian Curriculum: History, but previously I unashamedly favoured the NSW curriculum because it represented by far the largest audience, and, until 2006, NSW was the only state where History was taught predominantly as a separate discipline for Years 7/8 to 12. My rationale for the study guide is to provide material that can be used independently by students or under the guidance of a teacher without a History background. I was thinking of students in remote and rural areas, in small school settings, when I designed the template. I know from feedback that teachers and students in diverse settings use the guides. A classroom teacher has given me an adapted version of one as a handout at a professional learning workshop.

Over the years, I have tried to select programs for both older and younger students but there is an obvious imbalance in the material available; not much is made specifically for young children. But that is the nature of the subject. History is not usually written for children, especially as many perceive that history does not happen for children. When I write each study guide, I try to incorporate material for both groups, where appropriate. This can be tricky because I know that some topics taught in senior school in NSW are taught elsewhere in other states and vice versa. A good example is the ‘Middle Ages’. The Australian Curriculum: History has partially solved that dilemma.
The study guides are based on my practices as a classroom teacher and as a History pedagogue. They are the sequence of exercises that I would initiate in my classroom in response to viewing a documentary program, and to decoding an historical source. These exercises are based on interrogating, analysing and evaluating the evidence found in the ‘source’ and include consideration of epistemology and significance, issues that underpin the development of historical literacy and historical thinking. The final step is an exercise in synthesis, some student output, communication of, or about, historical issues as summative exercises.

My classroom experience suggests that some students will question this process. At first, they may resist the level of commitment that is required and often they prefer to be told the answers. My experience has shown that perseverance on the part of the teacher and students will reap rewards and once most students realize how much they are learning and how much they know as a result of this approach, they will appreciate that the commitment is worth it. The premise here is that at the most basic level, most students want to learn. They want to know ‘stuff’! This approach filled my senior classrooms with avid students for more than 30 years. Over the years, students have reported that the confidence and skills learned in the History classroom carried over to other subject areas. This model for teacher mediation of the History curriculum and its classroom practices will be more fully described and discussed in Project 1: History teachers and History classrooms.

1.3.6 Professional learning for teachers in the new millennium

In 2001, I undertook the DoE NSW training course, Technology in Learning and Teaching: Stage 2 (TILT Plus), a course in multi-media IT. This gave me an IT professional learning accreditation, qualifying me to offer professional learning courses for classroom teachers on IT in the classroom generally, in particular, to develop WebQuests for students and construct websites. A number of my WebQuests have been published on the HTA NSW website and were referenced at the ‘World’s Best WebQuests’ website. On this occasion, I was the only participant that completed the training course and qualified as an IT instructor. I thought this was a worthwhile initiative. The use of IT seemed to be the way of the future and I immediately ran a
series of after-school courses to train teachers in the classroom applications of multimedia. In Project 3: Resourcing the Khmer Empire, IT will be a significant element in the types of resources provided and the pedagogy displayed.

I began using IT, initially word processing, in my classroom in the late 1970s when ‘personal’ computers first became available. I worked with a team using a Tandy® TRS-80 for administrative purposes, such as producing report forms. Later, I used Micro Bees® to teach computing. I collaborated with a colleague from the Mathematics faculty who was even then an IT specialist and designed courses for teachers. I learned how to program in three different but related languages. I presented papers on the use of computers and word processing in History at NWEHTA conferences at the University of New England in the early 1980s. I purchased the first colour computer that became available in Australia, and after translating programs from computer magazines, made Mathematics games on it for my daughter’s use. When I returned from Asia in 1986, I brought back a Mac 2-E® and much educational software. I taught Computing Studies in both the junior and senior school in my next school. As older computers were replaced by the next generation, I hoarded and cannibalised them when necessary, to provide hubs in my classroom where my students learned word processing, databases and spreadsheets in History without having to elect Computing Studies as a separate subject. This proved particularly powerful for the Indigenous students who opted to do the Aboriginal Studies elective that I offered. Consequently, my commitment to this IT training opportunity was substantial. Unfortunately, like most recent professional learning initiatives of DoE NSW, the TILT Plus program was shut down without warning while I was in the middle of teaching one of my courses. I finished the course, but no notice, explanation, apology or payment followed.

During my career, the provision of ‘in-service’ as it was once called, ‘professional learning’ as it is now called, has become less and less of a priority for DoE NSW. I gave my first in-service presentation for DoE in 1976 but since then the responsibility has been assumed, perhaps by default, by professional associations such as HTA NSW. This has been accompanied by the loss of specialist subject advisor or ‘Inspector’ positions in the DoE. This pattern has been particularly true since its exclusion from the process.
of formulating curriculum, now in the domain of Board of Studies (BoS) and Office of the Board of Studies (OBoS).

During the ‘history war’ of 1998 to 2001, the NSW DoE spokesperson for the curriculum area that included History, Human Society and Its Environment (HSIE), was adamant on a number of occasions that HTA NSW was exceeding its brief as a professional association by assuming a political advocacy role (Hilferty, 2004). He maintained that the role of a professional teacher association should be exclusively professional learning support for teachers. The history of HTA NSW reflects the opposite. It was formed in response to what was perceived as a political threat to the discipline of History, a threat that required advocacy. There was very little professional learning support in its original operations.

DoE seemed to want professional associations to take over responsibility for in-servicing classroom teachers. But they were reluctant to fund the associations to make this possible. Associations had to make application to DoE for individual courses. Funding then became available, but never more than a set amount based on a formula to ensure ‘equity’. But this policy did not take into account subject popularity or student and teacher numbers. Applications had to be written in the terms of the initiatives, such as ‘Civics and Citizenship’, that were being espoused by DoE at the time. The outsiders did not want to fund or provide professional learning but attempted to control it and set the agenda.

In a short period of time, the available funds shrunk dramatically and now in the era of the Australian Curriculum, it has become non-existent. Professional learning is very much dependent on the ability of professional teachers’ associations to maintain themselves as self-funding entities. Ironically, the latest initiative from DoE NSW in December 2012 was to evict the NSW Professional Teacher’s Council, the peak body
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1 No longer BoS. The NSW Board of Studies and the NSW Institute of Teachers were amalgamated on 1 January 2014. The new body is named the NSW Board of Studies, Teaching and Education Standards (BoSTES).
for professional associations in NSW representing 50 or more professional associations, from its premises at a public school.

In the recent NSW government ‘paper’, *Great Teaching Inspired Learning (GTIL)*, the NSW Institute of Teachers \(^2\) has set itself the goal of supporting professional associations in providing professional learning experiences that will allow classroom teachers to meet the demands of the increasingly stringent institutional requirements and media generated public ‘awareness’ of professional standards. The role of professional teacher associations is yet to be fully defined. There will be many challenges, including ensuring the provision of professional learning that is useful and meaningful to classroom practitioners, that does more than allow teachers to register and claim hours towards accreditation. The implications of *GTIL* are the necessity to change and improve classroom practices. This improvement will involve direct confrontation with teacher resistance to change. The implications of this confrontation are discussed in Project 3: *Resourcing the Khmer Empire*.

### 1.3.7 The Greater Angkor Project (GAP)

For many years, I have maintained an active interest in Asian history, sparked by a three-week school excursion to Indonesia in 1975. My experiences at the great archaeological sites of Borobudur and Prambanan, which I photographed extensively with an SLR camera, were an early impetus to teaching archaeology in Ancient History. On subsequent visits to Bali, I researched and visited archaeological sites at Goa Gaja (‘The Elephant Cave’) and Pura Gunung Kawi (‘The Rocky Temple’), which I then wrote about as archaeological ‘puzzles’ for students and teachers in NSW.

As a result of my short stint in 2004 as a member of the University of Sydney GAP archaeological team working on Angkorian sites around Siem Reap in Cambodia, I am fully committed to raising the profile of South East Asian History and archaeology in NSW and now the *Australian Curriculum: History*. Consequently, I have published and

\(^2\) Now incorporated with the NSW Board of Studies as the NSW Board of Studies, Teaching and Education Standards (BoSTES).
presented at various professional learning occasions on the value of teaching the Khmer Empire. I have presented papers at HTA NSW state and HTAA national conferences on the topic, as an option, a society study for younger students. I have also spoken on the work of GAP and the history of the archaeology of the Khmer Empire at professional learning days at Macquarie University. In my work at the Museum of Ancient Cultures at Macquarie University, it has become common for this presentation to be requested by schools for students in Years 11 and 12.

I have maintained a connection with GAP through attending symposiums at Sydney University, by invitation, and consulting with the director of GAP, Professor Roland Fletcher, on how we can encourage the adoption of Khmer and South East Asian History generally by Australian History teachers. We have co-written submissions to both Australian Curriculum and Reporting Authority (ACARA) and NSW OBoS in response to the national curriculum and its NSW version. Our efforts were successful for Years 7 to 10. I provided initial advice to the writer and reviewed the unit of work for the study of the Khmer Empire that was eventually included as an elective option in the new *Australian Curriculum: History*. Unfortunately, at the senior level, we were unable to overcome the labelling of the topic as ‘Medieval’. Nonetheless, we are developing an archaeological unit that will suit the national curriculum for Ancient History in NSW. We are hopeful that this archaeological option will be included in the NSW syllabus.

Since 2010, I have also been organising and conducting teacher study tours to Cambodia and Laos each January. A day spent with the archaeologists of GAP, my involvement and a program of pedagogical workshops during and after these tours allows teachers to claim significant hours towards their NSW Institute of Teachers accreditation requirements. In another initiative, we have addressed the provision of resources for teachers by establishing an ‘Educational Resources’ ‘window’ on the official University of Sydney GAP website. This is in direct response to my belief that access to plentiful resources is the most crucial aspect of the practical problem of encouraging change of topic focus for teachers. I will also provide pedagogical advice for teachers on aspects of implementation and classroom teaching as part of this
resource provision. This resource will be in the form of a teacher’s ‘Start Up Kit’ of resources and pedagogy. This is the subject of Project 3: *Resourcing the Khmer Empire*.

My interest in the Khmer Empire has become widely known. In late 2012, a Senior Publisher from Oxford University Press approached me to review a publication on Angkor for use in Australian schools. I was subsequently contracted to emend the chapter and write pedagogical materials for an accompanying ‘Teachers’ Guide’. More recently, I was contracted by Educational Services Australia (ESA), formerly Curriculum Corporation, to write an online unit of work on the Khmer Empire for use in the *Australian Curriculum: History* throughout Australia. This unit was written to inform those not trained as History teachers and includes detailed pedagogical materials based on the approach to teaching History that I have discussed throughout this study. It is my hope that this will encourage History teachers to take up this potentially exciting new Asian topic. The challenge of encouraging teachers to change content focus is the subject of Project 3: *Resourcing the Khmer Empire*. I presented a paper on this implementation problem in Singapore in December 2012. This paper was expanded on request and has subsequently been published for educators in Asia. This paper is included as Chapter 6: *The practicality ethic and teacher professional learning*.

### 1.4 The domain of influence

In the 1990s, I became deeply involved in the curriculum process as a teacher insider and educator outsider because my involvement in History education extended beyond the classroom and faculty again. My concurrent experiences as the President of the HTA NSW and Chair of the Board of Studies Curriculum Committee (BCC) for History, as well as a number of other positions and responsibilities in various roles as office bearer or committee member, engaged and involved me increasingly in the hand-to-hand combat that occurs at the interface between the contested contexts of text-production and influence (Phillips, 1998). These various experiences that are described and discussed below confirmed and reinforced my beliefs about pedagogy and history as expressed in the themes that I have been developing in this narrative.
1.4.1 The History Teachers’ Association of New South Wales (HTA NSW)

My election to the executive of HTA NSW in 1990 began a long association with the professional association that represents a significant number of History teachers in NSW. In 1994, I was appointed editor of the quarterly journal *Teaching History*. By default I became sole editor for the next 18 months. There is a sense in which this role made me an informed outsider who provided ideas and guidance for classroom practice. Although I have maintained an editorial role, others were later enlisted as co-editors. I am the longest serving editor of the journal that celebrated its 50th year of publication in 2011. I am also the most prolific contributor to this publication with contributions from 1976 to 2013. This journal is the association’s ‘flag ship’ with more than a thousand subscribers in NSW, sixty percent of whom are school History faculties.

As President of HTA NSW from 1998 to 2000, my concern was to ensure that the association journal maintained the high standard that it had recently achieved. I was also committed to getting HTA NSW ‘on-line’. These were achieved, but my energies were mainly directed towards what some have called the ‘history war’, what became a struggle for history and History curriculum in NSW (Clark, 2004; Parkes, 2011). Since 2002, I have been Treasurer of the association. In this role I have presided over the professionalisation of our office and particularly our financial affairs.

A significant involvement in another aspect of the context of text-production was possible because of my involvement with the professional association. I have been a regular presenter at professional learning days for teachers in NSW on issues of pedagogy, as well as content from Australian, Ancient and Modern History. I have also been a regular presenter at HSC Study Days for Year 12 students for the last decade or more. These are generally held at the University of Sydney and attract four to five thousand Year 12 students and teachers over three days. I present lectures on both HSC Ancient and Modern History topics and on how best to prepare for, and negotiate, the HSC examination. Since 2002, I have also presented on the Extension History course. My position on the History Extension HSC Examination Committee has precluded my talking on this subject most recently.
HTA NSW has always espoused a commitment to students and teachers in rural NSW. As a teacher with significant rural experience, I am aware of the resource issues that isolation, even in the era of the Internet, presents for students and teachers. As Treasurer, I have encouraged the formation by rural schools of local ‘Networks’. The association provides annual funding of regional activities in the form of seeding grants for annual expenses and extra funding for planned professional learning activities. Where appropriate, a ‘Flying Circus’ of experienced classroom teachers and practitioners funded by HTA NSW visits and takes part in the planned professional learning activities. The network’s professional learning plan is often supplemented by a separate HSC study day for students. As a member of the crew of these visits, I have travelled to all regions of NSW to present professional learning for teachers and HSC study days for students. All our professional learning activities carry NSW Institute of Teachers accreditation for teachers and this is extended to regional events when we participate. In August 2013, I recorded the first of a series of on-line tutorials for students on the most popular topics in HSC Ancient History. This will be expanded in 2014 to cover the most popular topics from senior Modern and Ancient History syllabuses.

1.4.2 Office of the Board of Studies (OBoS)

At this point, I discuss and describe my personal experience in relation to the NSW Board of Studies (BoS) and its administrative wing, the Office of the Board of Studies (OBoS), organisations that have become the most potent players in the context of influence since the division of responsibility for Education in NSW. I have worked with, and for, OBoS in a number of different situations. Since 1989, I have been an HSC marker for Ancient History. For many of these years I was a Senior Marker responsible for training new markers and maintaining standards in the marking process. In the latest, December 2013 manifestation of the marking process requiring on-line marking, I was a ‘pilot’ marker, one of three who set the standard for other markers to follow. During this time, I was also an HSC Advice Line advisor for Ancient History and Extension History. In 1994, both as a member of the Syllabus Committee for Aboriginal Studies Years 7-12 I wrote support materials for teachers for the new Syllabus. In 1995, I was a member of the committee that set the HSC examination in Aboriginal Studies. In 1997,
I wrote support materials for the *Aboriginal Studies Syllabus Year 7-10*. From 2010 to 2012 and in 2014, I was the academic representative on the OBoS committee that set the HSC examination for Extension History. The irony that I have found most interesting in these situations revolves around my insider, classroom, and context of practice expertise. That is the essential reason why I am invited, elected or appointed to these committees, yet there appears to be no hesitation at all when it suits to ignore, modify or replace my advice or the materials that I have provided. It is my impression that too much reliance on insider advice may be inconvenient in terms of the managerial imperatives of the outsiders at OBoS. Listening to teachers, insiders with practical classroom expertise, is often seen as an unnecessary complication in the curriculum.

In 2010 when OBoS made the controversial decision to introduce ‘objective style’ (multiple-choice) questions to assess part of the compulsory source-based core study in the HSC History examinations, I wrote the exemplar questions for source-based assessment for Modern History that OBoS published on its website as guidance for teachers. The decision to introduce objective style questions was not popular among teachers, and it was not popular with me either. Accepting that I could not change the decision, my intention was to ensure that the questions were source-based, skills-based and designed hierarchically to increasingly demand more analysis of sub-text and evaluation of evidence. OBoS eventually published a series of exemplars for teachers that reflected this approach. However, in the last two years the HSC questions in Ancient History and Modern History have degenerated into a kind of ‘show and tell’, for example, ‘What is this building?’ or ‘Name one weapon shown in Source A’. Currently, the test is based mainly on basic knowledge. Again, the dialectic of what is important in history and History, skills or content knowledge emerges. Even at the HSC level, it appears that content may be considered more important than skills. The defence of this use of very low level questioning is that it allows students of all abilities to ‘access’ the examination. While that may be so, the exemplars that I provided began by testing lower level skills such as basic comprehension. The skills-based hierarchy that I had developed from the work of Macintosh (1995) and others was quickly abandoned. The default situation for outsiders always seems to be reliance on a recall of instrumental knowledge, upon the elements of the coverage paradigm (Seixas & Peck,
One major arena in which I have observed the tensions at the interface of the context of influence and of text-production is in the production of syllabus documents for History in NSW. Before 1988, the History Syllabus Committee that represented major stakeholders of education in NSW, teachers, academics, parents and the community controlled the context of text-production. They wrote the syllabus document for History. I would argue that at this point they ‘captured’ or took control of the context of influence. Once they took over the responsibility for delivering the official document, they had control of the policy process. The Inspector who oversaw the production of the syllabus and essentially controlled the context of influence at the point of implementation was an ex-classroom teacher of History. Both the Inspector and committee sought advice from various groups in the process of its deliberations.

As a result of networking from the 1974 Katoomba conference, I became involved in History syllabus writing and revision in the context of text-production in NSW. Syllabus change was based on a continuous ten-year cycle of consultation, implementation and evaluation. In the early 1970s, my involvement was both informal and formal. I was one of a number of young teachers from rural NSW who operated as an unofficial ‘think tank’ where our insider classroom expertise and experiences were used by the Inspector to inform deliberations. On occasions, my role became more formal, more of an outsider role. In 1977 and 1978, I was invited to a number of conferences of teachers held to produce materials to support the implementation of curriculum for History. This was my first experience as a curriculum authority outsider working in the context of text-production. At one of these conferences in 1979, I argued that students in the first years of secondary schooling were capable of historical thinking, challenging the hold that a misreading of the research of Piaget seemed to have over the thinking of the Syllabus Committee. This hold was evidenced in the proposed outline that we had been given of a syllabus requiring only transmission of knowledge to students aged 12 to 16 years, with skills being left until later when the
students would be capable of historical thinking. This challenge, which other classroom teachers present supported, proved to be a liberating moment. History syllabus making in NSW was no longer based on the idea that students in the age group of 12 to 16 years were incapable of historical thinking. Students in History classrooms in NSW could now study History rather than learn it. The implications for the new History Syllabus Years 7-10, its pedagogy and implementation were significant. These will be discussed in Chapter 2 as part of the discussion of the taxonomy (Mootz, 2010) that is at the core of this portfolio.

**Syllabus committees**

My first official involvement in the context of influence came in the early 1980s when I was elected as a union representative to the Ancient History Syllabus Committee. Unfortunately, the DoE refused to allow me to take up the position because I was teaching in a remote rural area. This decision was particularly frustrating because I had been very involved in the development of new curricula for the study of Ancient History. Ancient History in NSW was undergoing some significant revisions. Near Eastern History had been introduced as alternative content to balance the emphasis on Classical Greece and Rome. There was resistance at the highest level. The previous chair of the Ancient History Syllabus Committee, a Professor of Classics at the University of Sydney, expressed a generally held position when he explained that our ‘civilisation’ owed nothing to the cultures of Egypt, Israel, Assyria and Persia. There was simultaneously a growing demand from younger, more recent graduates for more explicit inclusion of archaeology in the content of Ancient History. Again, the resistance came from classicists who claimed that the origins of western culture could be found in the classical texts, not in archaeology. It was apparent that in some sectors, Ancient History was viewed as a useful subject only because it could provide context for the study of Latin and Classical Greek. These narrow views resurfaced recently in the Australia-wide consultation and negotiation for senior curriculum in the Australian Curriculum: History.

In 1977, I was a vocal advocate and promoter of both planned changes of emphasis. In 1974, I had presented my teaching program for Near Eastern History and Archaeology
at an in-service course for Ancient History teachers held at the University of New England in rural NSW. I had also presented at DoE History in-service conferences held in more remote regions of NSW, in the West, North West and Far West. My program was subsequently published by the regional DoE and made available to all schools in NSW. I also presented on my approach to teaching Egyptian History at an HTA NSW annual State Conference. This paper was included in a HTA NSW publication, *New Challenges in Senior History* (1980). During 1977, I was involved in a number of conferences and workshops at which support materials for teaching Ancient History from archaeological evidence were prepared for distribution to teachers in NSW. I chaired the group of teachers and academics responsible for the production of materials for Greek topics and consulted on the Near Eastern and Roman materials. These materials were published by DoE to support a new *Ancient History Syllabus* for Years 11 and 12 in which it was possible to choose from two options to emphasise either written evidence or archaeological evidence, but it was no longer possible to preclude either. There were also materials developed to support those teachers who chose to emphasise written evidence. This decision to split the course was a deliberate plan by the Syllabus Committee. It is reasonable to believe that they felt this would require, perhaps force, every teacher of Ancient History to include some archaeology in their program of study. The plan was eventually to reunite the subject in a new syllabus that gave equal weighting to all forms of evidence. This plan seemed to work. It was subsequently reported that there was anecdotal evidence from markers of the HSC that archaeological evidence was being used more commonly than previously and was being used in association with written evidence as well. The planned reunification became possible in the mid 1980s when the cycle for revision of the *Ancient History Syllabus* was complete. Since this reunification, the number of students studying Ancient History has grown substantially in NSW. It has grown against a trend that has seen most traditional subjects losing their relative share of the candidature in an increasingly crowded senior curriculum. It could be argued that this is the result of the appeal that archaeology has for a wide range of students.

The NSW Board of Studies (BoS) was established in 1988 by an act of parliament in NSW. It is responsible for the formulation and administration of curriculum for NSW schools. It comprises elected and appointed representatives of ‘stake-holders’ of
Education in NSW. In 1995, the Office of the Board of Studies (OBoS) was established, and it assumed responsibility for formulating curriculum through the production of syllabus documents. Interestingly, in my experience, the employees of OBoS are often very quick to deny the ‘accusation’ that they are, or were, classroom teachers. Most are outsiders far removed from any experience in the context of practice. The NSW DoE was now responsible only for implementing the curriculum, managing schools and the general administration of Education. This new duumvirate, with divided responsible for curriculum in NSW, was an uneasy relationship to begin with, and still remains problematic when details of implementation become an issue. The structure and procedures for producing syllabus documents also underwent fundamental revisions as the necessity to revise syllabus documents exposed tensions in the new curriculum generation structure.

**Dynamic change**

In 1994, I had direct experience of the tensions and subsequent changes in the curriculum-making process when I was elected as a union representative to the Aboriginal Studies Syllabus Committee. This was my first formal experience of curriculum development as an authority outsider at the interface between the contexts of influence and text-production. In 1997, I was the interim chair, representing the committee at the Civics and Citizenship Expert Group Forum that was initiated by the federal government of Australia. At this point, the committee’s role was changed and it became the Syllabus Advisory Committee. The revised role of the Syllabus Committee was obvious in the new name. They were to advise. Apparently OBoS was finding the process of syllabus-making ‘inefficient’. Syllabus documents would now be written by specialist project teams under the direction of a BoS Inspector responsible for that discipline area. In Ball’s terms, the context of influence was being ‘ministerialised’ and the text-production arena from which the insiders were now increasingly excluded would become even more hotly contested (Bowe, Ball & Gold, 1992, pp. 13ff; Phillips, 1998, pp. 6ff).

My knowledge of the production of the 1992 syllabus for History suggests that this perception of inefficiency may have been directly related to the determination of the
History teachers on the History Syllabus Committee to control the content and the process of the syllabus writing operation. The production and intention of the 1992 History syllabus caused considerable controversy among teachers and community stakeholders. It attracted significant media attention, focusing on its use of terms such as ‘invasion’ to describe both the settlement of Australia and the 1915 landing at Gallipoli (Parkes, 2011, pp. 72ff). I had been working overseas during the consultation period but upon my return I became an informal participant through direct consultation by the Syllabus Committee. On this occasion, viewing the draft syllabus I was an outspoken critic of the proposed syllabus at both formal and informal consultation forums because I believed it was returning the focus to content and away from skills. I also believed that it failed to give enough pedagogical guidance about how to organise its themes to prevent them becoming disconnected. However, the general response by teachers in NSW was positive and the controversial syllabus became official. Subsequently, the procedures of OBoS were subject to review.

In 1997, the NSW Professional Teachers’ Council (PTC) appointed me as their representative on the new History Syllabus Advisory Committee. I was on the committee when it was disbanded and replaced by a new Board of Studies Curriculum Committee (BCC) for History. I was immediately appointed by PTC to the new body and from 1998 to 2003 chaired the inaugural BCC for History. In its original conception, the BCC’s brief was to oversee the production of three new syllabuses for the teaching of Australian and World History (with Civics and Citizenship), Modern History and Ancient History. From the outset, there was obvious tension between the BCC and various officers of OBoS as we proceeded to produce a new History syllabus for Years 7 to 10. This tension eventually resulted in further revisions of the operations of OBoS and its BCCs, a process which was explained by the President of the BoS after I queried it, as a ‘dynamic’ change process.

One example will suffice to illustrate this process. When I refused as Chair to sign off on the Inspector’s minutes of a BCC meeting because I believed that they were not a true and accurate record of proceedings, the requirement for the Chairman’s signature to affirm the proceedings of the committee was immediately revised. It was no longer necessary for the Inspector’s record of proceedings to be verified by a member of the
committee. These minutes went directly to the members of the Board of Studies to inform their deliberations. It resulted in the BCC being effectively sidelined, easily and completely side-stepped in the production of any syllabus. The syllabus could now be produced without reflecting any input from the BCC. Syllabuses were now possible without input from official representatives of identified stakeholders, parents, communities, tertiary institutions and classroom teachers. The managerialism of outsiders and OBoS now drove the syllabus revision process in NSW.

Significantly, the issues that were the origin of tension between BCC and OBoS were directly related to the determination of the Inspector and her project team to write a syllabus dominated by content. There were to be 93 topics taught in 100 hours. There was also to be a public examination to ensure the accountability of teachers. This was an obvious attempt to reintroduce or reaffirm the coverage paradigm and at the same time, teacher proof the History curriculum in NSW. There will be further discussion of this ‘history war’ in NSW in Chapter 2.

1.4.4 A new curriculum for a new millennium

My involvement with OBoS in the domain of influence was complicated by my continuing involvement with HTA NSW. In November 1997, as President-elect of HTA NSW, I accompanied four colleagues to a meeting that was arranged by the Head of the Assessment Branch of OBoS. There had been a change of government in NSW in 1995 and the new Minister for Education had commissioned a ‘White Paper’ in preparation for legislation to bring about a major change in the secondary curriculum. Like many occasions in the history of education, the public was being told that standards had dropped. The remedy for this was to be a major review and redrafting of the official curriculum. A compulsory course in ‘Australian History and Civics and Citizenship’ for students in Years 7 to 10 would address a concern that ‘young’ Australians in NSW knew too little about Australia, its institutions and ‘heritage’. This would be facilitated and guaranteed by the introduction of a compulsory public examination for all students at the end of four years of secondary schooling. This would also serve as a certification step for those who had attained the school-leaving age. There would also be a review of senior school syllabuses aimed at lifting standards and returning the curriculum to the
perceived ‘rigour’ of the past. The formation of new BCCs was the first step in preparing new syllabus documents for most subjects in the secondary school. All so-called ‘soft options’ were to be discarded.

The existing curriculum in NSW reflected official recognition that the combination of higher employer expectations and the extension of the school leaving age in recent years had changed the candidature that was to be prepared for the HSC matriculation examinations each year. Consequently, there were stratified courses offered in most disciplines. This differentiation in courses allowed students to choose a course of study commensurate with their abilities, needs and interests. This made teacher mediation of the senior curriculum relatively easy. Now it was proposed that all courses in each subject discipline were to be amalgamated into a ‘one size fits all’ curriculum.

It could be argued that summoning HTA NSW for consultation indicates that there was a perception that the association could become problematic for the plans of OBoS. As it eventuated, this meeting was set up so that the position of the OBoS Assessment Branch could be made clear to HTA NSW. Basically, the message was that under instruction from the Premier of NSW, the Minister of Education had decreed that there would be curriculum change in History. They were meeting with us specifically to inform us that there was little that HTA NSW could do to interfere with, or to influence this process. When we questioned the process as outlined, we were given an example of the unequal position in which we found ourselves. We were told by the OBoS senior assessment officer that if the Assessment Branch so desired, the syllabus for Ancient History would be rewritten to include only two compulsory studies, Greek and Roman, and that the HSC examination would compose of fifty compulsory multiple-choice questions on each study. This was put forward as a possible outcome of the process that was about to begin. It was made very clear that there was little HTA NSW could do to interfere with this process. An enlightening further example of this bureaucratic hubris can be found in Hilferty where she quotes my recollection of what she called a ‘farcical consultation’ meeting between the History BCC and an Assessment Branch officer during the actual revision process in 1999 (2004, p. 138).
Some credit the Premier of NSW, Bob Carr, a renowned supporter of History in schools, with this initiative (Clark, 2004), but it was clear from this meeting that the philosophy, the agenda if you like, driving this review of school History came from the ‘White Paper’ committee members, all of whom were educational bureaucrats and political appointees of the Minister of Education. These men had captured and were now driving the context of influence. The philosophy of the ‘White Paper’ as such was expressed to me privately in the elevator as I left this meeting. I was informed that they believed that setting higher standards from the outset would ensure a higher achievement. I was also told that I was partially responsible for this belief. During their consultation, a well-known senior bureaucrat from DoE shared his views on education, that is, setting high expectations brought improved results. This was based on the experience of his own children in the government school system in NSW. Coincidentally, it was their experience at the school where I was teaching, and specifically, their experiences in my English and History classes, that he claimed had made his children successful students. I remembered his children well because of who they were, and also because of their foster father’s earlier profile as Secretary of a major NSW teachers’ union. I also remembered his obvious anxiety about his children at parent/teacher nights. My impression was that he had completely underestimated the ability of his children. My aim in my classroom was to provide all students with opportunities to participate and to show their ability. I mediated the curriculum in ways that catered for their interests and abilities. In this atmosphere, his children responded and consequently did well. In this case, my expectation of them was high because I could see that their abilities made this a realistic and reasonable expectation.

I was disturbed that this sort of anecdotal data should have been significant in any educational setting, in particular, when I knew that it was being misinterpreted and misapplied. I was always surprised by the description of my teaching as ‘innovative’ and myself as an ‘innovative programmer’. I programmed and taught in response to the students in my care. My innovation appears to be that I found successful ways to mediate the curriculum in the interests of the student’s performance and development. My immediate indignation at the attitude, hubris and plans of this ‘committee’, and then my own unreasonable feeling of responsibility, steeled my resolve to ensure as best I could that this review would have realistic outcomes for students and teachers of NSW.
As an historian, I have since found it interesting when I reflect on this tense period that in one subsequent PhD study, the researcher claims to know what I was thinking and what motivated me. I had not told this researcher about my experience at this initial meeting. She attributed my actions to the desire of HTA NSW to hang on to ‘power’ (Harris, 2002). It may be truer, as another researcher has claimed, that HTA NSW was ‘tribal’ and in this sense was attempting to protect what it saw as its own territory (Hilferty, 2004). We felt that history and school History were under threat from decision-makers in the context of influence, who were outsiders, distant from the classroom and who did not know and apparently did not care about what History teachers did in the classroom. Consequently, we responded to ensure a reasonable outcome for our discipline, for our subject and for those who taught and studied it at school. Our response, based on our insider classroom experiences, may have epitomised some elements of what has been called the ‘practicality ethic’ (Doyle & Ponder, 1978).

An old paradigm and integration … again!

I became aware at a later time that the members of the minister’s ‘White Paper’ committee had also been members of the History Syllabus Committee in the 1990s. They had made it clear at that time that they did not support the proposed syllabus. They had put forward and openly sponsored an entirely different draft, but in the consultation process, History teachers across NSW overwhelmingly rejected it as a possible syllabus. It was this previously rejected draft that was now, a decade later, being proposed for implementation in NSW schools. It was obvious to me from the outset that its essentials had already been written. It was a chronological ‘hop’ through a century of Australian and World history with an emphasis on ‘Civics and Citizenship’. It was a return to the coverage paradigm. It was also another attempt to create a social studies course, but this time by integrating History and ‘Civics’. It was an official default reaction to the paradigm shift to historical perspectives required by the 1992 syllabus. In its original form, the integration of Civics and Citizenship threatened to reduce the History content to 93 dot points in a 100-hour course. It was not quite ‘compulsory patriotism lessons’ but one of its major proponents from DoE curriculum branch did publicly support the integrated course in terms of the current American civics pedagogy. It was called a ‘Civics Syllabus’ in the media and in public forums.
In December 1998, I was involved in a public debate about the merits of this proposed syllabus with a number of its supporters, including the conservative federal politician Tony Abbott. This was just after the election of George W. Bush had exposed a number of embarrassing flaws in the US electoral system. I argued that the US model was hardly encouraging given its recent performance in Florida. However, my main argument was that this was not a ‘Civics Syllabus’. It was a History syllabus. My aim as History BCC chair and President of HTA NSW was to ensure that what resulted from this revision was a History syllabus. I argued for, and published, a position paper (2000) at state and national levels, on an approach to Civics education that did not subsume History as a subject but allowed history to remain the main focus of the school subject.

I also ensured that the Premier of NSW had the opportunity to express his views on History as often as possible by inviting him to address teachers at HTA NSW professional learning days. This strategy was particularly important. As BCC chair, I was aware that the OBoS approach to integrating History and Civics was directly opposed to the Premier’s belief that ‘history was history’ (Hilferty, 2004). In this pre-email world, I encouraged all HTA NSW members to write to or fax the Premier, pointing out the disparity between his view and that of the officers of OBoS. As a consequence, HTA NSW became the major lobby group within the teaching fraternity, agitating to ensure that syllabuses produced for the study of History in NSW were ‘doable’ and teachable by teachers in the classroom. I headed a small action committee from the executive from 1998 to 2000 that, during this period of ‘dynamic change’ at OBoS, mobilised the History teachers of NSW and ran a campaign in the media to ensure that the syllabus revision process was followed.

**A ‘blue moon’ victory**

On occasions, this campaign was quite acrimonious and received considerable media coverage when threats of industrial action were mooted to as a last resort (Harris, 2002; Hilferty, 2004; Parkes, 2012). One national radio ‘shock-jock’ questioned my credentials to know about Australian History on the basis that my name was not very Australian. It was an industrial campaign and as such, could not influence the content of the syllabus. We aimed to ensure that the process as legislated was followed, that the
various stakeholders were properly consulted and represented in the proceedings of the BCC and OBoS. One notable success we had was to show that the results of the consultation process were being skewed in OBoS reports. Our efforts in the media, a prolonged fax machine driven campaign amongst our membership and a public symposium at the University of Sydney of stakeholders, HTA NSW members and teacher unions eventually encouraged OBoS to allow an independent company, Blue Moon Consultants, access to their consultation data. This independent report confirmed what HTA NSW had contended. Respondents to OBoS consultation, History teachers and other stakeholders in NSW, had overwhelmingly rejected this proposed syllabus. A rewrite was the result. Content was substantially reduced to 43 topics. A very significant change that occurred was that structurally a set of ‘Inquiry Questions’ took precedence over the content outline in the setting out of the document. This format should have deflected the view from the chronological content guidelines somewhat, and signalled the primacy of ‘inquiry’ as the essential pedagogy of History. It should have challenged the coverage paradigm that was inherent in the original document. It was widely recognised by the History teaching community that the resulting Syllabus for History Years 7-10 was still flawed, but it was acceptable and most teachers could teach History from it. It was revised in 2004, well ahead of the normal cycle. The Premier of NSW explained to me privately, unofficially, that students heckled him during a school ‘media grab’ visit. They expressed their boredom with their History course in such negative terms that he felt a revision was warranted.

Managerialism and the domain of influence

In 1999, I made a more formal excursion into the domain of influence when I was invited by the Premier of NSW to sit on two committees. One committee judged the NSW Premier’s Annual History Awards for various categories of published historical materials. The other committee established the application guidelines and selection criteria for the award of a number of NSW Premier’s American History Teacher’s Scholarships to allow NSW History teachers to travel and research overseas. This committee was composed of myself, the Premier of NSW, the Director-General (D-G) of Education for NSW and a representative of the Fulbright Scholarship Commission. This initiative continues to the present day but is much reduced as a result of the
withdrawal of private and government funding. HTA NSW is now the sole sponsor of two scholarships for History teachers in NSW in 2014.

As a result, I gained outsider insight into the domain of influence and into the thinking of the Premier who was called at the time, and still is by some, ‘the History Premier’ because during his ‘watch’, History was made compulsory in NSW in the junior school and, of the chief education bureaucrat in NSW, the D-G of Education. The Premier expressed a genuine interest in history and in promoting the study of History by school students. The curriculum process he had initiated in NSW appeared to excite him. But his views on history and History were confused and confusing. Historians who write well particularly impressed him. He had very little idea of what happened or could happen in a History classroom. He did go to a school and teach a couple of classes at one stage. He admitted that the experience was not what he had expected. He reported that he did not realise how hard it was to prepare a lesson or to engage students. It was clear that he was a very busy man. It became obvious to me that in many respects, that in the proceedings of his day-to-day office, the Premier was very dependent on the quality of advice and information that he was given by his personal assistant. In the proceedings of the committee, the D-G proved that he had a sharp mind and that he was a ‘doer’. He had little time for unnecessary talk or discussion. He was a very pragmatic problem-solver. When an impasse was met in our deliberations, he quickly found a compromise or a solution. Interestingly, he usually deferred to my insider advice or opinion on anything pertaining to the domain of classroom practice.

I found the same qualities of intellectual managerialism in my interaction as BCC Chair with the President of the BoS. He was dependent on the advice of his associates, the manager of OBoS and the BoS History Inspector who was heading the project teams that were writing the syllabuses involved. The President did not meet with me one-on-one for discussion of any issues that arose from the proceedings of the BCC. The Director of Curriculum OBoS or the History Inspector, or both, were always present. Interestingly, both the Director of Curriculum of OBoS and the President of BoS were mathematicians from Western Australia, one of the smallest educational jurisdictions in Australia. Neither knew much about history or History. They made it clear that they relied on the History Inspector for advice and briefings on the proceedings of the
History BCC. The expertise and personal commitment of the Inspector was a crucial element in the syllabus process.

When writing about bureaucracy, Pusey (1976) made the point that the interface between authority and implementation, and between influence and practice in terms of this study, was always likely to be a locus of tension. The managerial perception that History curriculum was specific, determinant, impersonal and easily programmable was apparent in the proceedings of OBoS and its officers. Their obvious intention was an attempt to ‘teacher proof’ History curriculum in NSW. Listening to the concerns of teachers, of the insiders, about ‘options’ and choices appeared to be an unnecessary ‘complication’. The result was, as Pusey theorised, a ‘self–protective counter response from classroom teachers and their representatives’ (1976, pp. 38ff). At the point where the domain of text-production is actually dependent on the third domain, practice, for implementation, managerialism may be counterproductive because of its tendency to alienate those responsible for the domain of practice (Pusey, 1976, pp. 90ff).

Managerialism is also evident in much of the professional learning provided at the systemic level, particularly when syllabus change is mooted or being implemented. The expectations of being a representative attendee, and attendance at generic presentations by non-discipline outsider specialists who are far removed from classroom realities, are among the complaints made by teachers who participate. This problem of overcoming teacher resistance and the implications for professional learning are both addressed in Project 3: Resourcing the Khmer Empire.

1.4.5 History Teachers’ Association of Australia (HTAA)

A further point of excursion into the domain of influence has been provided by my commitment to providing professional learning for teachers. This has involved me in the national professional association as well as the state entity. I attended my first national history teacher’s conference in 1978. In 1998, while President of HTA NSW, I became a Director of the History Teachers’ Association of Australia. I have since maintained that position and have held office since as Vice-President and currently, as Secretary. My brief as national Secretary is to provide governance and constitutional advice to the affiliate state associations.
I have been a regular contributor at HTAA annual conferences, presenting on a range of topics from both Modern and Ancient History, some content focused and others pedagogical. Since the beginning of the latest national curriculum process I have concentrated on the issue of a common vocabulary, syntax and taxonomy by presenting on the taxonomy and historical literacy. This will be more fully discussed and developed in Project 1: *History teachers and History classrooms*.

While Vice-President of HTAA in 2006, I took responsibility for creating the *Australian History Skills Competition*, a national competition intended for History students in Years 9 and 10. The concept for the skills test was based on an exercise that I conducted with students in my classroom. While renovating my 1880s inner-city terrace house, I discovered a number of artefacts in the back of the risers of a staircase. I bundled these and used them in the classroom to reconstruct the life and times of the people who had lived in the house previously. I had talked in terms of it being a ‘shoe box’ of artefacts. This then became the aim of the skills test, that is, to provide students with a shoebox of artefacts and documents and then test them on the knowledge and understandings that they could glean from the contents. The test was a series of source-based multiple-choice questions without any presumed historical knowledge. This task was appropriate in the context of the disparate curriculum situation that existed. I drew upon my previous experience of developing materials from the *British Schools History Project 13-16* kit and its assessment regimes to create an hierarchical scheme for using sources for assessment. I found the sources necessary for a model and put together a kit that could be used as guidance by those contracted to write the questions for the test. With the help of a professional artist I designed a logo featuring Klio, the muse of History. As befitted a national initiative I distributed the kit that I had created to other state HTAs. Unfortunately, the next step, the quest for sponsorship, was out of my control. Consequently, the test was not implemented immediately.

In 2010, Paul Kiem President of HTAA recognised the relevance of a national skills test in the context of the discussions of a national curriculum. The test was resurrected, renamed and rebadged with a commercial sponsor who had also recognised the change in the national scene. Since its redefinition, it has two versions for Years 8 and 10 based on historical content from the *Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus*. I have been
involved as a question writer and reviewer. The contest has been running as the *Australian History Competition* since 2011 and is beginning to grow in popularity across Australia. In 2013, there were enough participants to return our commercial partner a small profit. The data we have collected incidentally will be used in a future research project with HTA NSW and HTAA colleagues on the impact of this national contest on the development of historical skills across Australia.

### 1.4.6 The Professional Teachers’ Council of NSW (PTC)

Another potential entree to the domain of influence was provided in 1996 when I was elected as a Board Member of the NSW Joint Council of Professional Associations, the peak body representing the interests of Professional Teachers’ Associations in NSW and an affiliate of the national body, the Australian Professional Teachers’ Association (APTA). I served for five years on this first occasion. In 2007, I became Director of the NSW PTC as it is now called. I am currently Vice-President. In July 2013, I represented PTC at an Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) ‘Learning Collective’ and along with a number of other teachers was recognised for my contribution to ‘Teaching and School Leadership in Australia’. However, when we participated in round table discussion of recent AITSL initiatives, it was obvious that the professional outsiders, officers of AITSL, had little interest in what the insiders had to say about the curriculum generally and the classroom particularly. They were more concerned with attempts to focus our discussion on their latest slogan or gadget for promoting AITSL’s profile in Australian schools.

Recently, an area of significant activity for PTC NSW has been providing advice to, and consultation with, the NSW Institute of Teachers. With the introduction of national standards for teachers by AITSL and publication of the recent GTIL report, this has expanded. PTC NSW has become increasingly involved in providing guidance to teacher associations to ensure that their professional learning proposals meet the Institute of Teachers accreditation requirements. There is growing demand for advice from teachers and their supervisors as accreditation issues arise. This aspect of PTC NSW responsibilities will grow quickly as all teachers in NSW become subject to
annual review in terms of the NSW Institute standards and requirements. At the moment that is the challenge for PTC NSW.

The short-term goal of PTC is to contribute positively to the restructuring needed to fulfil the challenges of this new focus. The long-term goal is to strengthen and maximise professional learning for teachers in NSW by forging links with jurisdictions and teacher unions, to minimise the potential waste of resources by eliminating unnecessary competition. My concern for and involvement in professional learning for teachers will be further developed and discussed in Project 3: Resourcing the Greater Angkor Project.

1.4.7 Teaching pre-service History teachers

In 1998, the opportunity to be active in the interface where the domains of influence and practice overlap expanded significantly when I was invited to apply for a position as a casual lecturer in Education at the University of NSW. The History Method courses were being revamped and classroom practitioners were preferred. There may have been internal systemic reasons to do with casualisation for this decision, but the rationale for this preference, as explained to me, was that my continuing classroom experience, what I have called ‘my insider knowledge’, would be a powerful element in the courses that I taught in the pre-service preparation of History teachers. This was telling in my decision to apply.

I have written, taught and coordinated two courses for pre-service History teachers since. Each semester course includes 80 to 100 students. These courses are driven by the dialectic of skills and content knowledge, exploration of guided inquiry and injunction for teachers to mediate the curriculum. I ensure that my tutors are experienced and talented practising classroom teachers. One is an outstanding graduate of the course and a former colleague from my last stint as faculty Head Teacher. Another is the current president of HTA NSW, an award winning History teacher and well-known social historian. I have continued my involvement since my retirement from full-time classroom teaching. I keep my own classroom expertise current by teaching in the Museum of Ancient Cultures at Macquarie University where, as an Education Officer, I spend one or two days a week working with school groups from Years 7 to 12. This also
includes regular visits to schools. Recently, with my increasing involvement, we have expanded the museum’s outreach program to include topics from Modern History and Extension History as well. The pedagogy that I model when I teach and that I attempt to impart to pre-service teachers is considered in Project 1: *History teachers and History classrooms*. My involvement at the museum and the approach I have developed to teaching from archaeological artefacts is the subject of Project 2: *Artefacts and historical empathy*.

### 1.5 Towards a Taxonomy

This narrative has demonstrated the domains in which I have operated as a classroom teacher of History, a provider of professional learning for History teachers, a developer of History curriculum, teacher educator and historian. This personal narrative has clearly flagged my concerns with explicit teaching, with teacher mediation of the curriculum and with practical classroom-based professional learning for teachers.

When discussions of a national curriculum began again in 2008, it seemed timely to explore whether there is a common terminology and vocabulary for discussing what classroom teachers and their students do. Perhaps a taxonomy might follow that can describe and suggest a structure for the pedagogy and for the processes that teachers and students are involved in while doing history and studying History in the secondary school classroom.

It is my belief that the synthesis of research in the late 1970s and 1980s with more recent research done by educators and educational psychologists can be enlightening. I think there is something valuable to be gained from returning to the seminal work from Great Britain to allow History teachers to properly situate and accommodate the more recent research done in North America. The research of British educator Martin Booth and the work of the British Schools Council History Project 13-16 (BSCHP) influenced my own classroom operation as a teacher and the pedagogical settings that I have since attempted to propagate to others. My more recent reading indicates that there are elements of this work done in Britain informing the work of Seixas and Wineburg in North America. A synthesis should be informative.
The common thread of my career has been classroom practice. The focus of my career has been pedagogy. The syntheses of my experiences inside and outside the History classroom with research findings from several decades have determined the elements of a taxonomic model, a pedagogical approach to teaching History. My initial project for this doctorate, therefore, will take the form of a literary review with analysis and synthesis that will provide rationale and justification for classroom practices that have been developed into a taxonomic model. This review will be situated in the contexts of my career. The taxonomic model is intended to be a start only; a provocative start, I hope. I will argue that the nature of the process of historical inquiry and historical sources should determine how history is done, how History is studied and how History is taught. I have attempted to do this in and out of classrooms for nearly 40 years. This practical classroom developed and classroom-based pedagogy is the basis of the guidelines of the taxonomic model that I have formulated and is described and discussed incidentally throughout this study. Students and teachers in History classrooms should be actively involved in the processes of history. In the pedagogy that informs my taxonomic model, both should be doing history and studying History.

From my synthesis and development of the taxonomy, critical questions then become: What does this taxonomic model look like in the History classroom? What do teachers do when they want their students to do history? What do students do when they are doing history and studying History? These questions will frame the discussion in Project 1: History teachers and History Classrooms. These questions are then further extrapolated and applied in Project 2: Artefacts and historical empathy. In Project 3: Resourcing the Khmer Empire, the model is again applied to classroom resources and the implications for their adoption and implementation are considered.
There are two chapters in this project. Chapter 2 is a discussion of the theory behind the formulation and initiative for a taxonomic model of History teaching. Chapter 3, is an outline and discussion of the taxonomy, in the form of a published conference proceeding (Mootz, 2010) that has been updated to reflect movements in the taxonomy as both the study and the theoretical model have evolved.

This project is both a culmination of the professional, theoretical and pedagogical processes described in Chapter 1 and now located within current movements towards national curricula. When an Australian Curriculum: History, was first mooted I was immediately reminded that my experiences at the national level had demonstrated that there was no common terminology, or common vocabulary for discussing what teachers and their students do in the History classroom. There is also no accepted structure to describe the processes that teachers and students are involved in while doing history and studying History. This study and the taxonomy are direct responses to this realisation.
CHAPTER 2:
TOWARDS A TAXONOMY FOR TEACHING HISTORY

Chapter 2 details and discusses the various experiences, reading and research that have shaped my pedagogy and classroom operation and formed the basis for the taxonomy that sits at the heart of this study. There are three sections that follow in this chapter.

The first section is a discussion of the *Australian Curriculum: History* to provide a context for the ideas explored throughout. This involves contextualising my developing pedagogical approach during two very important periods of my career. Firstly, I deal with the impact of my own personal ‘history war’ with the NSW Board of Studies (BoS) in the late 1990s and early 2000s and its role in crystallizing my beliefs about classroom intention and actual practice. This is further contextualised within more recent efforts to establish the Australian ‘National Curriculum’.

Section 2.2 introduces and discusses the key theoretical ideas that underpin the taxonomy. I explain how the experience described in Section 2.1, as an involved insider participant in the development of a history curriculum in NSW, married with professional reading and research that I had done in the 1980s when as a History faculty Head Teacher, I was responsible for the ‘professional development’ of 13 teachers, most of whom had been my colleagues. This theoretical discussion foregrounds the description and demonstration of the elements of the taxonomy that follow in Chapter 3.

Section 2.3 utilises key theoretical ideas to frame a discussion and demonstration of the pedagogical implications of these ideas for doing history and studying History.

2.1 The research context

Chapter 1 has clearly flagged my concerns with teaching the skills that will develop historical thinking, with mediation of the curriculum, explicit teaching and practical classroom-based professional learning for teachers. It is my belief that the synthesis of the research of the late 1960s, 1970s and 1980s, with more recent research done by educators and educational psychologists, particularly in North America, will inform the
formulation of the appropriate syntax, language and structure to describe what happens in classrooms when teachers and students do history and study History. For the purposes of the taxonomy that results an important distinction, both syntactical and theoretical needs to be drawn between history and History. The past, history, and accounts of the past, History, are not the same, and are not the same thing. The past is in real terms unknowable and irretrievable. Some remnants are available and from these using the methodology of historical inquiry, historians attempt to recover or construct History, an account of the past. The term History may also be applied to the discipline practised by historians, taught and studied in universities, and also taught in schools.

I believe that I have done history, reconstructed the past, and studied History, the accounts of the past, with my students during my teaching career. The research of Martin Booth and the work of the British Schools Council History Project 13-16 (BSCHP) influenced my classroom operation as a teacher and foregrounded the pedagogical settings that I developed and have since attempted to propagate to others. More recently, concerns with defining historical literacy and historical thinking that have emerged from North American scholarship, particularly from Wineburg and Seixas, have helped crystallize my beliefs about doing history and studying History.

This practical classroom developed, classroom-based pedagogy, the way I have successfully taught History for nearly 40 years, is the basis for guidelines of the taxonomic model that I have formulated and is embedded in all aspects of this study. For the purposes discussing, describing and illustrating the taxonomy that follows an important distinction, both syntactical and theoretical needs to be drawn between history and History. The past, history, and accounts of the past, History, are not the same, are not the same thing. The past is in real terms unknowable and irretrievable. Some remnants are available and from these using the methodology of historical inquiry, historians attempt to recover or construct History an account of the past. The term History may also be applied to the discipline practised by historians, taught and studied in universities, and also taught in schools.”
Students and teachers in History classrooms should be actively involved in the processes of history; both should be doing history and studying History.

2.2 A national History curriculum for Australia

The relevance of a taxonomic model is nowhere more obvious than when History teachers from the various states of Australia meet to discuss their discipline and its pedagogy. I was first aware of this in 1978 when I attended the History Teachers’ Association of Australia (HTAA) annual conference in Melbourne in my capacity as the Ancient History Curriculum Advisor for North West NSW. It was my responsibility to provide professional learning for History teachers in the region upon my return. One of the informal topics that became a main thread of the social interaction between the delegates from across Australia was the pessimistic outlook, the considerable doom and gloom, expressed by states such as Victoria and Tasmania where the teaching of History in secondary schools was being eroded by the introduction of integrated studies such as Social Studies and Studies of Society and Environment (SOSE). The problem was being reflected immediately in diminishing numbers of students opting to do History courses when given the choice in non-compulsory senior school. A major conclusion from the 1999 national report on the state of History in Australia, The Future of the Past (Taylor, 2000), was that integrated studies caused considerable damage to History in schools. In 2010, some states of Australia still expressed this concern. This may change with the implementation of the Australian Curriculum: History.

On the last day of the conference in 1978, this problem was a topic of formal business. At my urging, the NSW Directorate of Studies History Inspector introduced the NSW Role of History document and discussed the guidance and confidence that it gave History teachers when involved in curriculum debate or discussion at school, or system level, and the impact that it had already had in NSW in resisting the challenge of integrated studies (Johnson, 1982). This underlines the importance of a theoretical framework for pedagogical guidance. The need for some guidance about what to teach and how to teach History is no more apparent than in those states where the majority of teachers of History in 2013 and 2014 will have almost exclusively the experience of
teaching integrated studies. In this context, initiating discussion of a taxonomy for doing history and studying History will be potentially important.

A personal observation from the 1978 national conference is that in the 1970s there appeared to be no agreed or unified body of knowledge that could be called ‘Australian History’ being taught in Australia. Delegates from other states explained, sometimes quite forcefully, that they saw little reason to teach about events such as the British invasion of the East coast in 1788. They insisted that what occurred on the east coast of Australia was the history of NSW, not of Australia, or of whichever state they represented. Most states, even those on the east coast that were once included in the generic name NSW, appeared to teach only the History of their state since its formal foundation. This was particularly true also of Western Australia that founds its History in the primacy of the Dutch discovery of Australia. This is particularly important to them because it pre-dates the first English exploration of Australia and any recorded contact with the East coast. This phenomenon was on display as recently as 2006 when the first recorded Dutch ‘discovery’ of Australia by the ship *Duyfken* was commemorated by an official re-enactment, a voyage along the south coast of Australia, west to east, from Western Australia to South Australia. This was an interesting manifestation of this focus. The 1606 voyage of the *Duyfken* actually occurred at the opposite end of Australia, in North Queensland. The ship sailed north to south along the coast of the Gulf of Carpentaria before resuming its original course along the southern coast of the island of New Guinea. The challenges for a successful national curriculum or an agreed national History can be extrapolated from this one example. These and other challenges were addressed at the *Australian History Summit* and subsequent *History Forum* that were held in 2006 as the first steps in formulating a national curriculum.

### 2.2.1 The Australian History Forum, December 2006.

The first step in the formulation of a national curriculum in History was the *Australian History Summit* held in Canberra by the federal government of Australia in August 2006. This was followed by broader consultation in the *Australian History Forum*. Because I was nominated twice to this forum, as both a teacher and academic, I was
allowed to decide which session I felt most appropriate at any particular time. On the last day of the forum, I decided to attend the ‘academic’ session discussing what History should be taught in schools and why it should be taught in the 21st century.

I was sure that the recommendations from an academic forum, perhaps representative of the context of influence, would have more impact when formulating any initiative that might arise from a conservative government sponsored national forum. My experience as a member and chair of various committees in NSW had brought this point home to me on many occasions during the 1990s. Research done in Britain and NSW at the time (Phillips, 1998; Harris, 2002; Carroll, 2004; Hilferty, 2004) suggested that in policy-making concerning schooling, those who control the domain of practice, the insiders, classroom teachers, were the least likely to be consulted and listened to by those distant from the classroom, by outsiders and educational managers. This particular academic session was attended by some of Australia’s renowned historians and history academics, among them Henry Reynolds and John Hirst.

After some rather esoteric discussion of foundation concepts, such as ‘land’ and ‘democracy’, the discussion was foundering on the issue of ‘how’ and on ‘what’ defensible basis the study of the discipline of History could be justified in the increasingly crowded modern school curriculum. How would a place for History be justified to curriculum decision-makers, managerialists and equally pragmatic politicians? Eventually, I raised the issue of transferable cognitive skills and mentioned the development of adductive or synthetic thinking as a particular advantage of studying History. I had to explain what I meant by ‘adductive thinking’. This concept was borrowed from British educator Martin Booth whose research from the 1970s and 1980s into school-aged children’s cognitive processes laid the foundation for my personal pedagogy for doing history and teaching History.

There was only one History academic in the room who had heard of either the concept of ‘adductive thinking’ or of Martin Booth. The defining debate about ‘old’ History and ‘new’ History, between attainment of content and skills development, previously described as the “great debate” (Phillips, 1998, p. 3) had no resonance in this forum. As an insider, I introduced this dialectic, but it had little impact. After a few minutes
discussion, the forum moved on to something else. The discussion was wholly concerned with historical content concepts. There was no recognition that students needed and were capable of learning the procedural concepts that I will call ‘historical literacy’. The chief architect of the next stage of the national curriculum process was absent from this forum, which may have been fortuitous because when he produced a paper in 2009 to guide the formulation of the national curriculum in History, Stuart McIntyre displayed a much more informed and broader understanding of History education.

2.2.2 The Australian Curriculum: History

In the ‘Framing Paper’ to guide discussion for the Australian Curriculum: History, McIntyre (2009) made reference to research work from both sides of the Atlantic in what was an encouraging overview of the best research into History education. However, as the curriculum exercise unfolded, it became apparent that those given the responsibility for administering the process of writing a document that would be palatable to, and satisfy the concerns of, the various state authorities were more interested in the managerial, bureaucratic goals of meeting deadlines and ‘ticking the boxes’. This difference between intention and result has been commented on in other national contexts (Phillips, 1998, pp. 6 & 132). As a retired classroom teacher, I had no official role in the curriculum writing exercise, but as a confidante and colleague of a number of the curriculum writers, I can report that this was a very frustrating exercise for people with current classroom expertise. These writers were insiders, that is, classroom teachers employed on the advice of the HTAA. They were chosen for the currency of their experience in the context of practice and for their expertise in classroom and subject knowledge. During this process, I was told that the advice and work of the writers were regularly disregarded or ignored at the whim of outsiders with little or no classroom experience or expertise who controlled the context of text-production. This practice became so pronounced that the HTAA President publicly withdrew from the process in frustration at its inadequacy and contradictions. Eventually, Stuart McIntyre appeared to be disenchanted with the process as well.
HTAA relied on the certainty that most states would manipulate and adapt the syllabus to its best effect for their particular context. This adaptation happened in NSW. The general impression in NSW is that History teachers are quite at ease with what the *Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus* requires of them in 2014 and 2015. I have some minor concerns with the attempts to include an environmental perspective to studies of past societies such as Japan and Cambodia. This suggests to me one of the ‘historical fallacies’ described by Fischer (1970, pp. 209ff). It would appear to be the result of the influence of the advocates of integrated studies, SOSE, who I believe attempted to hi-jack the *Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus* and embed themes such as ‘sustainability’ in the study of national and world history.

There is a troubling indication that in a number of states the new national syllabus will not result in the discrete study of History. Australian History may still be taught in an integrated social studies course. It would appear from the latest developments in Victoria, as reported by History Teachers’ Association of Victoria (HTAV) President Dr Rosalie Triolo at the HTAA Annual General Meeting in Hobart in September 2013 that integrated studies, SOSE in this case, has survived the national curriculum exercise and can be taught in Victoria instead of, or perhaps masquerading as, History. This is permissible as long as one topic from the *Australian Curriculum: History* is included. It is interesting that in publications advocating integrated studies, there have been recent questions asked about the place of History in the curriculum (Gilbert, 2012). There may be some substance to the concerns raised by these critics about the *Australian Curriculum: History*, particularly questions about the obvious disparity between the framing paper, its rationale, and the apparently instrumental concerns for specific content that are embedded in this document. The challenge of mediation and skills development is also a concern with the amount of content that is prescribed for coverage. Every state has implemented its own version of the curriculum and is likely to continue to teach its own version of the History of Australia. It would be appropriate in 2013, at the end of the first phase of this national process, to ask to what extent we have an ‘Australian’ *Curriculum: History*. 
'Back to the future'

Before the September 2013 Australian Federal Election, the media reported both the alternative Education Minister and alternative Prime Minister stating their intention to overhaul what they described as an ‘ideologically driven’ National Curriculum: History. In September 2013, they became the federal government of Australia. At this very moment of writing, they are reviewing the Australian Curriculum: History and preparing for a new National Curriculum: History. This process is meant to address a number of issues raised about the syllabus. Claims of ideological bias appear nonsensical given that the process included 26,000 submissions and dozens of writers. Of more concern is their stated intention of restoring ‘rigour’ to the syllabus. For ‘rigour’, read content! According to the Education Minister’s media releases, the content of the syllabus will be amended to reflect more of the ‘western’ tradition and the ‘Judeo-Christian’ heritage of Australian society. It would appear that we are returning to something akin to compulsory ‘patriotism’ lessons (Muller, 1978, p. 15) and ‘white man mythology’ (Parkes, 2012, pp. 66f). It has been suggested that this is the expected response when the establishment, the context of influence, feels threatened by the implied loss of control of the dominant historical narrative (Tupper, 2005; Taylor, 2007; Levesque, 2009, Sheldon, 2011; Parkes, 2012; VanSledright, 2014) and this is almost certainly true of an increasingly multi-cultural Australia. In that context, this discussion of the pedagogy and purposes of studying History in schools could become both informative and important.

At this point, I will detail and discuss aspects of the theory and practice that have informed my developing pedagogy for doing history and studying History in the secondary school classroom.

2.2.3 Curriculum making in Great Britain and Australia: The other ‘history wars’

In July 1999, I hosted Robert Phillips, a lecturer in History Education at the University of Wales at Swansea, for a few days while he was in Australia. At that time, I was involved in what I call my own personal ‘history war’ when as an insider, a classroom teacher, the President of the History Teachers’ Association of New South Wales (HTA
NSW) and ironically, as an outsider firmly ensconced in the context of text-production as the Chair of the Board of Studies Curriculum Committee (BCC) for History, I led a defence of the teaching of History in NSW schools against the new managerialism of the outsiders from the recently founded Office of the Board of Studies (OBoS) (Carroll, 2004; Hilferty, 2004; Parkes, 2011). Phillips was coincidentally the author of an award-winning monograph (1998) that described the process of producing the 1990s National Curriculum in Great Britain. Over a couple of days, we discussed the issues that had arisen in Great Britain, as well as those arising from my own experience in NSW. There were many parallels and comparisons that could be made between the two processes, but three areas that were very obvious were firstly, indications of a fundamental distrust of teachers; secondly, attempts by policy-makers to exclude teacher input from the context of text-production; and thirdly, the content overload with which teachers were confronted.

The ‘discourse of derision’

What stood out most from the comparisons was the obvious distrust shown towards teachers as practitioners (Phillips, 1998). In my own experience in NSW, this distrust manifests itself in all contexts of the curriculum-making process in the context of influence, of text-production and of practice. In the context of influence, there is a discourse of dissatisfaction at least, if not ‘derision’, in the media reporting of such trivialities as the campaign to highlight how few young people could name the first Prime Minister of Australia and in the public debate generated by former Prime Minister John Howard and his criticism of contemporary History pedagogy as a ‘stew of themes’ in the Australia Day address on 25 January 2006. The current criticism of the Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus is consistent. These issues are easily addressed and answered by scholars but such responses never receive the media currency of the original claims or enter the public discourse in the same way as the criticisms (Taylor, 2013).

There is a continuing discourse in the media in Australia in which the role of the teacher in educating children is continually referred to as the ‘crucial element in the success of children’ and the maintenance of ‘standards’ (Clark, 2008, pp. 1ff). As recently as 4
November 2013, *The Age* newspaper editorial applauded the new federal government of Australia for its ‘commitment to lift the quality of teacher preparation’. This discourse would firstly appear to be stating the obvious about the importance of teachers and teaching in educational settings. It might appear to be a positive take on Education, but it is always followed by a diagnosis that standards are lower than they used to be and the almost inevitable conclusion that something needs to be done about improving the quality of teachers. There is a general sense in which the public believes, or are being encouraged to believe, that ‘things’ are not what they used to be. There is nothing new in this intergenerational criticism. Socrates supposedly decried the failings of the younger generation. Criticism can be found in many jurisdictions (Phillips, 1998; Wineburg, 2001) but increasingly in the Australian context it is teachers who are seen as the problem, as the cause of falling ‘standards’.

In my experience, positive reporting about, or comment on, teachers is rare in the NSW media. In the early 2000s, I congratulated the Director-General of Education in NSW for his full-page acknowledgement in a major NSW daily paper, congratulating the teachers of NSW on improved international ratings for NSW students. I pointed out to him that it was the first time in my career that I had seen or heard positive media comments concerning NSW teachers from anyone at the higher levels of the government of NSW or educational bureaucracy that employed and administered the thousands of teachers in public education in NSW. Sadly, it remains so.

Unfortunately, these attitudes can be found within all milieu in which teachers operate. A senior curriculum person from the NSW Department of Education (DoE) once confided to me that there was little wrong with History education in NSW if ‘we’ could only get teachers to do as ‘they were told’. Some outsiders at the NSW OBoS cringed when I asked if they had been classroom teachers at some time in their educational experience. They regularly displayed these attitudes of distrust and derision towards classroom practitioners, that is, towards the insiders.

*Teachers as consumers of policy*

In the context of text-production, this discourse results in attempts to depower classroom teachers in the curriculum process (Phillips, 1998; Carroll, 2004). This
distrust translates into efforts to exercise control over insiders in the classroom in the context of practice, which is usually manifested in prescribed content and limited options available to teachers and their practices. While I was the History BCC Chair, it was made very obvious to me that the concept of ‘options’ in History syllabus documents causes considerable bureaucratic angst. Options are seen as an unnecessary complication for assessment and moderation procedures. In another context, I have found that organisations, public and private resource providers that I have consulted for and produced resource materials for, express similar concerns. They want to provide lesson plans and programs that leave nothing to chance, that will remove teacher decision-making, adaptation or mediation from the equation. A common question in these exercises is, ‘How can we ensure that they will teach it?’ Teachers are positioned as consumers of materials rather than creators and mediators. These attempts to regulate and constrain the work of classroom teachers, of the insiders in the context of practice, have been described by some teachers as a ‘straightjacket’ (Phillips, 1998, pp. 112ff). Research findings from Britain’s national curriculum process indicated that this perception caused much anger, bitterness, incredulity and frustration for British teachers (Phillips, 1998). I shared similar personal feelings as an insider struggling against the outsiders in NSW. These were supported by the research I conducted on behalf of HTA NSW through the various surveys by which I sought the imprimatur and support of History teachers in NSW to oppose aspects of the new curriculum-making process. It was obvious from the responses to HTA NSW fax surveys that a large number of History teachers in NSW shared those feelings of anger, bitterness, incredulity and frustration. This was also proven when consultation responses were subjected to independent review.

One area where there were some important differences was in the context of text-production. My understanding of the British context is that classroom teachers, insiders, may have had some influence on text-production through exercising choice of which syllabuses to adopt and teach at the local and regional level. There were various curriculum documents and examination regimes available. For example, the *British Schools Council History Project* was only one of a number of syllabuses that could be adopted for use. However, this was a limited influence on text-production. The situation in NSW was different in the sense that History teachers had been involved informally
and formally in text-production for many years. Some History teachers claimed that prior to the 1990s it was teachers who wrote the syllabus (Hilferty, 2004).

It was my experience as a member of syllabus committees prior to 1998 that it was certainly the case. When a document was written for the committee to discuss for possible adoption or implementation as part of the curriculum-making process, it was generally the teachers on the committee who volunteered or were commissioned to write these documents. In this sense, insiders, classroom teachers, exercised considerable control over, and power in, the context of text-production. Final approval or endorsement and therefore implementation, of course lay with the bureaucracy and, finally with their political masters, with those outsiders who controlled the context of influence. However, in 1990 and 1998, History teachers of NSW were mobilised successfully in quite different ways. By effectively voicing their disapproval of projected curriculum developments, they exercised significant control, even in the context of influence. It was my experience as BCC chair that as a result of restructuring the curriculum-making process in NSW, there were continuing efforts to distance classroom teachers from the process of formulating History curriculum and to position them as consumers of curriculum.

Content overload

What was most striking for me from my conversations with Phillips was our third area of comparison, that is, the similarity between the developments in the context of practice on either side of the world. This related to attempts to depower teachers in the context of practice, in the classroom (Phillips, 1998, p. 24). The overall context of the national curriculum in Great Britain, when compared to my own experiences of the NSW situation as outlined in the Chapter 1, appeared to be reruns of the skills versus content debate. Phillip’s description of public and media campaigns by the ‘New Right’ in Great Britain indicated their belief in, and advocacy of, the coverage paradigm as the appropriate medium of ‘real’ school History (Phillips, 1998, pp. 3ff). Accordingly, they argued that there were a number of well-established and acknowledged facts that students needed to know about History. According to the media, everything else was tainted, supposedly by declining standards and reliance on ‘progressive’ teaching
methods, the products of a teacher dominated education establishment (Phillips, 1998, pp. 5ff). The critics of the Australian Curriculum: History have been labelled as neo-conservatives and would appear to share this commitment to an agreed meta-narrative for Australian History (Taylor, 2013).

There is evidence to suggest that attempts at regulation and constraint directly affect the way teachers operate in the classroom (Phillips, 1998; Harris, 2002; Carroll, 2004). In Chapter 1, I have discussed the possible defaults that existed in NSW for teachers who were driven by confusion or content overload into what I often describe in lectures as the ‘pedagogy of desperation’. This concept of default pedagogy has been commented on elsewhere (Carroll, 2004). Frustration with the national curriculum process in Britain caused many teachers to ignore the national curriculum ‘entirely’ (Phillips, 1998, pp. 112ff). The aim of HTA NSW’s activism from 1998 to 2000, knowing that we were being forced into a ‘conservative’ role, almost rear guard action, as we sought to prevent History being submerged by Civics and Citizenship, was to minimise the content overload and ensure that the syllabus was inquiry focussed (Parkes, 2011). We felt that this would allow teachers to mediate the curriculum in favour of skills development. We attempted to limit the content that would need to be covered to allow time for mediation by the teacher. Skills development requires time for mediation of the curriculum, for explicit instruction by teachers and practice by students. Skills and dispositions are not easily acquired by ‘galloping through the material’ (Booth, 1971, p. 66; Phillips, 1998, p. 115), not by the pedagogy of desperation and not by the coverage paradigm.

At the same time that we struggled to maintain the discipline integrity of History in NSW, there were developments in the national arena.

2.2.4 National Centre for History Education (Australia)

In the late 1990s, debates about the place of History in school education, perhaps fuelled by conservative concerns about the changing identity of Australia in the wake of multicultural immigration, inspired the government of Australia to commission the National Inquiry into History Teaching, and its report The Future of the Past, released in 2000. As a result, the Internet entity the National Centre for History Education (NCHE) was established in October 2000 and funded until June 2006.
At that time I had become a part-time teacher educator, an informed outsider. I was also operating very formally as an informed outsider in the context of text-production as the Chair of the NSW BCC for History. In this context, the availability to teacher educators of the NCHE publication *Making History* (Taylor & Young, 2003) had significant impact. This compendium of educational and historical ‘know-how’ introduced me to the concept of historical literacy. My first reaction was that this was a term of convenience, that it was the only way that the NHCE could describe what might be learned in the disparate classroom situations that characterised History teaching in Australian states where most students learned History for most of their schooling in the context of some form of integrated studies. However, I came to understand that this was actually the current term being used by researchers in North America to describe those understandings and concepts that students required to be able to do history and develop historical thinking. The research and discourse about doing history and teaching History in schools from the 1970s and 1980s appeared to have been reinvented, reframed and re-invigorated in the 1990s by researchers in Canada and the USA.

The works of Sam Wineburg (2001) and Peter Seixas (2006) on historical literacy, historical consciousness and historical thinking resonated with my insider beliefs about doing history and studying History in the secondary classroom. The framing of elements of historical consciousness and historical thinking in terms of benchmarks or second order skills and concepts as a form of historical literacy struck me as elegant and useful, eminently practical for the purposes of mediating the History curriculum in favour of skills and awareness, for designing classroom activities for students. I was also encouraged in my belief about history and History by Wineburg’s apparently glib but insightful approach to presentism and historical thinking.

At this point, I will visit the works of Seixas and Wineburg. Both these corpuses have influenced me, and have influenced my taxonomy, although as any insider is likely to do, I have adapted their conclusions for my own purposes based on my assessment of their applicability to classroom practice in secondary schools in Australia. These adaptations will be fully explained in Chapter 3: *A taxonomy for teaching History*. 
2.3 Towards a taxonomy

Peter Seixas (1996, 1999, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2012) has researched and written about what he originally called historical consciousness but has more recently referred to as historical thinking. Wineburg has used both the term historical literacy and historical thinking to describe the processes that he has observed and researched in post secondary school students. At the outset of this chapter I reserved the right as an insider, a classroom practitioner in the domain of practice to adapt their work for my own purposes, to suit my own ‘ecology’. Because both Seixas and Wineburg have defined historical consciousness and historical thinking in terms of a set of concepts, of second order knowledge or skills, I believe that their work best fits the definition of historical literacy as provided by Taylor and Young who defined historical literacy as “a systematic process”, with particular sets of skills, attitudes and conceptual understandings, “that mediates and develops historical consciousness” (2003, p.5). The six elements that Seixas and Wineburg have variously used and investigated as indicators or benchmarks of historical consciousness and historical thinking are just such a “set of skills” and as such have been redefined for the purposes of this taxonomy as “historical literacy”

2.3.1 Peter Seixas and historical understanding

Seixas’s elements or benchmarks of historical thinking represent the raft of skills and awarenesses that students will need to work historically and think historically. I used the term ‘elegant’ to describe it above because it was immediately accessible and made sense to me as a classroom teacher because it represented many of the ideas about history that I already held as a classroom practitioner. This scheme succinctly and accurately encapsulated what I had been aiming to do in the History classroom in a more ad hoc fashion. It gave some theoretical frame to ideas and activities I had developed from classroom practice. It was describing things that I recognised from my own classroom practice, the nature of historical evidence, agency, significance, change, causation, consequence and empathy. My understanding and appreciation of historical literacy has evolved since my first encounter.
When discussing the ‘state’ of History teaching Seixas (2008) references a familiar discourse of ‘derision’ directed against the insiders, classroom teachers, in North America, Great Britain and Australia in the 1990s. The result he claims was usually an attempt to introduce ‘uniform standards’, attempts to control and constrain teacher activity as mediators of the curriculum, possibly an outsider’s trope for a ‘straightjacket’. Seixas described the main elements of the BSCHP and its influence and impact on the curriculum in Great Britain. Interestingly he concluded that its major influence came because of the decision made by outsiders, in the context of influence, to change the external examination structure in such a way as to make it viable to teach about history and History in the classroom in such a way as to be faithful to the discipline and, at the same time prepare students for external examination. A reasonable conclusion here would be that the research done by, and on, insiders by Booth (1971, 1980, 1983, 1987, 1994 & 2004) originally, and later by Shemilt, (1976, 1980 & 1984), McIntosh (1980 & 1996) and Boddington (1980 & 1984) had demonstrated that the ‘new’ History could be made to work in the classroom and at the same time deliver something that was acceptable to the outsiders. As Phillips has argued, interaction with, and exposure to, the concerns and practices of insiders over a significant development period in the national curriculum exercise impacted on the context of influence in such a way that they were increasingly converted (1998). Seixas’s work (1996, 1999, 2000, 2004, 2006, 2008 & 2012) in the area of defining and redefining historical consciousness and historical thinking will be a major point of discussion in Chapter 3 and following as the taxonomy (Mootz, 2010) is described, illustrated and discussed.

2.3.2 Sam Wineburg and the unnatural act of historical thinking

When Wineburg’s work is referenced by the title of his book, Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts (2001), the mention of historical thinking as an ‘unnatural act’ is often, usually, greeted by wry smiles from teachers and pre-service teachers. That is a useful segue for me to then explain why Wineburg is being entirely serious with his choice of description. He makes it very clear that thinking historically is not something we humans do ‘naturally’ (Wineburg, 2001, p. 15). In the terms of one of the important themes of this study, he is suggesting that historical thinking needs to be taught, that it will not be caught (Wineburg, 2001). Learning the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of historical
thinking requires more than intuition. It requires interaction with historical materials in contexts that are intentional and well planned. This includes both explicit instruction by a teacher and inductive, discovery inquiry by students. The experience of working historically will foster historical consciousness and hence encourage historical thinking (Wineburg, Porat, Mosborg & Duncan, 2006).

Wineburg places his work within the context of a discourse of ‘derision’, including examples of criticism and complaint drawn from the early 20th century (2001, p. viii; 2006). He confronts the 1990s revival of the coverage paradigm in the USA and asks why we teach History, what we should teach in History and how we might best equip students for the world outside school (Wineburg, 2006; Wineburg & Schneider, 2011). He concludes that students need to be guided, to be taught how to think about problems in History, how to think historically about ‘documents’ (Wineburg & Schneider, 2011, paras 3-7) and how to ‘piece’ together a ‘story’ from the fragments of the past, from conflicting accounts (Wineburg & Martin, 2004, para. 7).

The work of Seixas and Wineburg positions historical consciousness and historical thinking as major elements in a form of critical historical literacy. They suggest that in the 21st century students cannot afford to be uncritical. They share a concern about the challenge of preparing students for the assaults, the bombardment, that will be made on them by the ‘historicising’ of the media and their seductive, ‘sexy’ presentation of History (Seixas & Peck, 2004, p. 109; Wineburg, 2006, Introduction) that is designed to ‘sweep’ the viewer into the past (Seixas & Peck, 2004, p. 109).

Teachers of History they argue, must make students aware that the media can make history look realistic without being accurate. They must teach students to make sense of the ‘facts’ of history. In the terms of this portfolio, teachers must make students historically literate. They must teach them the elements of historical thinking (Seixas & Peck, 2004; Wineburg & Martin, 2004). Students need to be equipped to navigate the myriad ‘images’ of the past that they will encounter, to ‘read’ and answer those who would seek to ‘deceive’ them through their ‘browsers’ (Wineburg & Martin, 2004, para. 8; Wineburg, 2001, p. viii). Students need to become informed readers, writers and thinkers about the past and about History (Wineburg & Martin, 2004; Wineburg 2004).
Students must be lead to develop the ability to ‘judge’ what they find on *Google*. This awareness is described as a basic ‘survival’ skill and echoes the claim of an earlier USA historian, Becker, who states that we should not allow ourselves to be ‘duped’ (cited in Fischer, 1970. p. 40). This positioning of historical thinking in the context of an increasingly digitised ‘I-world’ should give the domains of history and History new impetus in the classroom. It is the responsibility of all teachers to equip students with the skills and awarenesses that they will need to read and survive in this increasingly seductive media world. For History teachers, that means teaching historical literacy, developing historical consciousness and practising historical thinking.

Furthermore, Seixas and Wineburg conclude that developing historical consciousness and historical thinking requires systematic teaching (Wineburg, 2001; Seixas & Peck, 2004). They indicate that when teaching historical consciousness and historical thinking from sources, the first step is to analyse. At this point, we diverge temporarily because my insider perspective suggests that for students aged 12 to 16 years there is an earlier intervening step. The first step is to ‘decode’ the document, to ask what is it saying or showing. This work with the ‘text’, what I call ‘data collection’, is an essential foundation skill for source analysis. Data collection eventually graduates to being called ‘research’. Reading and decoding the ‘text’ of sources should be an ubiquitous element of history pedagogy for students at this stage of development (Coltham, 1971; Bernbaum, 1972; Shemilt, 1987; Husbands, 1998). Students gradually learn to deal with data as evidence. Analysis, which involves working with ‘sub-text’, and evaluation, the synthesis of text and sub-text for the sake of judgement, should be demonstrated by the teacher initially and then regularly, routinely, scaffolded for students as they reflect on the results of their data collection (Collingwood, 1961; Coltham, 1971; Dickinson, Gard & Lee, 1978; Wineburg, 2001). This discourse is expanded in Chapter 3 when the elements of the taxonomy for classroom use are outlined.

Research in Britain from the 1970s and 1980s demonstrated that student thinking about history and History matured as a result of the experience of doing history and studying History (Booth, 1971, 1980, 1983 & 1987; Shemilt, 1976, 1980 & 1984; Boddington, 1980 & 1984; McIntosh, 1980 & 1996). The elements of historical literacy, epistemology, agency, cause, consequence, significance and empathy are not abstract
concepts. They are the procedural concepts and dispositions that provide the structure that shapes the practice of history (Seixas, 1999; Seixas, 2006; VanSledright, 2014). Awareness of them will develop through carefully planned interaction with historical materials, through the experience of being taught how the ‘game’ of history works (Seixas, 1999; Taylor, 2003; Taylor, 2007; Seixas & Peck, 2008; Levesque, 2009; Sheldon, 2011; VanSledright, 2014). In the taxonomy that I am proposing, historical thinking is tied to these benchmarks or competencies of historical literacy.

For those concerned with historical knowledge, with ‘content’ coverage, it should be salutary to reflect on the shared belief in both paradigms that historical thinking is only possible with substantive content. There must be something, some historical knowledge to discuss, decode, analyse, evaluate and to think historically about. While this approach to teaching History suggests that historical knowledge should no longer be the ‘end’ of the study of History, it is very clear that historical knowledge, that is, knowledge of History and knowledge about history, is the essential vehicle for the study of History (Seixas, 1999; Wineburg, 2001).

The work of British researchers and BSCHP 13-16 from the 1970s and 1980s is referenced and discussed by Wineburg and Seixas. However, Wineburg’s conclusion (2001, pp. 40f) that although this was the era of the ‘cognitive revolution’, there was ‘nothing’ for History, overlooks the seminal work of Martin Booth. I want to propose here that Booth’s research into cognitive development in the History classroom makes a critical contribution to the work of Seixas and Wineburg. This proposal now follows.

2.3.3 Martin Booth, History and Piaget

In 1995, the HTA NSW brought British academic Martin Booth to Australia for a series of lectures and workshops with History teachers. They had previously published much of Booth’s work in A Martin Booth Reader (Fitzgerald, 1990). His research and writing on the development of historical skills and historical thinking were quintessential influences on my pedagogy as it developed in the 1970s and 1980s. Booth’s work in the 1960s and 1970s on the development of historical thinking in secondary school students was seminal. He was the first researcher to respond to the challenge posed by the work of educational psychologists such as Peel (1960 & 1967), Hallam (1969, 1970 & 1972)
& Steele (1976) that concluded that school-aged students were not capable of historical thinking. His research, conducted initially in the late 1960s while operating in the domain of practice, as a classroom teacher, has been described as “ground-breaking” (Husbands, Kitson, & Pendry, 2003). This portfolio reflects the recognised academic argument that Booth’s work had an enormous influence on the teaching and examination of History in schools in the United Kingdom, stimulated the Schools History Project (BSCHP), the largest research project of its kind in the English speaking world, and helped to shape what would become the GCSE, the most used United Kingdom syllabus in History. Booth continued his contribution to the domain of practice from 1976 to 1987, as the editor of *Teaching History*, the professional journal of the Historical Association of the United Kingdom. Eventually he moved into teacher education and finished his career as Head of the Department of Education at the University of Cambridge. While the research of his contemporaries Fines (1969, 1983 & 1994), Shemilt (1980 & 1984), Boddington (1979, 1980 & 1984), Evans (1995), McIntosh (1980 & 1996), Lee (1978, 1984 & 1987), Dickinson (1978 & 1984) and Ashby (1987), is referenced throughout this portfolio, in a sense all other British researchers were by implication following Booth’s lead. While the concurrent BSCHP may have attracted more attention elsewhere, this portfolio has adopted a reasoned position that in NSW it was Booth’s pedagogy, a pedagogy that did not require a resource “kit”, that had the first and perhaps most permanent impact."

Contemporary statements by students that history was ‘boring’ and ‘useless’ were the initial context for his research. The conclusion from this initial research was that generally History teaching in England was dominated by the coverage paradigm, by a ‘rush through the centuries’ (1971, p. 65). He further concluded that this ‘time honoured’ approach was a vestige from a past where History was seen as a means of

---

3 Martin Booth’s obituary, written by a Cambridge University colleague, is available at [http://www.kings.cam.ac.uk/files/about/annual-report-2008-pt2.pdf](http://www.kings.cam.ac.uk/files/about/annual-report-2008-pt2.pdf)
explaining and justifying ‘Empire’ (Parkes, 2011, p. 66). This has been described as an imperative of the dominant ‘white man mythology’ (Parkes, 2011, p. 85). But the world had moved on, and in the 1960s, History, under increasing pressure in schools from new subjects, was struggling to maintain a place in the curriculum. He also concluded that History educators were rightfully ‘pessimistic’ about its future in British schools (Booth, 1971, p. 65).

As an insider, a classroom teacher of History working in the domain of practice, Booth was particularly concerned about then recent and influential research and discussion around the intellectual capacity of school students, particularly research in England by Peel (1967) and Hallam (1968/69) that appeared to show that students below the age of 14 years were incapable of what was termed ‘historical reasoning’ (Booth, 1971, p. 74). Contrary to the conclusions of the 24 dissertations or theses between 1955 and the 1970s that concluded that there was little evidence that acceleration was possible for 13 to 14 year olds, Booth claimed to have practical and anecdotal evidence from the History classroom that students in secondary schools were capable of historical thought and therefore capable of doing history (Booth, 1978). Over more than three decades he conducted research in schools, as both insider and outsider, to investigate and corroborate his conclusions (Booth, 1971, 1978, 1980, 1983 & 1987; Booth, Sato & Mathews, 1995; Larsson, Mathews & Booth, 2004).

Following the work of Bruner (1962), Booth maintained that History’s place in the curriculum could be defended if History pedagogy was based on the unique structure and methodology of the discipline of History. What was needed was a coherent ‘theory’ of History teaching (Booth, 1971, p. 66). In this research context, he defined history as the ‘totality’ of human actions in the past but used the term ‘histories’ when describing the selective accounts that result from investigating and reporting the past (Booth, 1971, p. 67). These ‘histories’, accounts of the past, the products of the work of historians, are what I have chosen to call History in this study. This distinction between the sources and evidence of the past, history, and History, the accounts of the past, implies that students and teachers need an understanding of the fundamental structure of the subject to ensure that meaningful teaching and learning about both history and History occur.
The claim that students in the early years of secondary school are capable only of learning History by memorising ‘facts’, and do not have the intellectual capacity to think historically and therefore cannot do history or study History, was the main argument used to justify the coverage paradigm and integrated studies. This raises fundamental questions about the curriculum: What history can be taught? Can history be taught effectively? Can history be taught honestly? And can a claim be made to include History in the curriculum (Booth, 1983b, pp. 103f)? These same questions have been addressed in NSW each decade of my career as the curriculum was revised and new syllabuses implemented. They are still being addressed in the 2010s with the National Curriculum: History ‘debate’ having been re-ignited.

While Booth acknowledged his debt to Piaget, he also pointed out that Piaget had been challenged (1969 & 1983b, p. 105). He argued that logical thought in history is not necessarily the same as in the natural sciences. It is not primarily deductive, and not governed by rigid and limiting ‘covering laws’. The modes of thinking used by historians are different from any others, and history, the human ‘past’, is fundamentally different from the natural sciences (Booth, 1983b, p. 106). In this analysis, he followed Hexter on the nature of history and the historical process (Curthoys & Docker, 2006). According to this view of history, historians extract from sources what they believe to be ‘significant’ evidence, ‘facts’ from a past that is uncertain and debateable using ‘common sense judgments’. But they are confronted by unsolvable ‘problems’ in response to which they put forward the most convincing ‘account’ of the past, of History. This is a form of speculation or ‘directed’ imagination, of ‘vicarious’ living (Booth, 1983b, p. 106). This argument suggests that deductive thinking is only a minor part of what historians do. They are more concerned with grouping and synthesising, with adductive thinking, a form of inductive thinking in which they use facts as they arise to form a ‘new’ synthesis (Booth, 1983a, p. 105). This resembles Collingwood’s analogy of stretching a web over a set of pegs (1961, p. 24 & pp. 243ff). As the position of the pegs changes, or new pegs are added, then the shape of the web changes. Deductive thinking may be used when evaluating sources and evidence but the historian is not looking for an answer based on a single source or a single piece of evidence. The historian seldom solves problems from the past. That is practically impossible, but using
informed speculation and vicarious imagination the historian can put forward the most convincing account of the past, the ‘best fit’ account from the evidence available.

A series of longitudinal studies that investigated students’ use of evidence, their understanding of major concepts, their attitudes to History as a school subject and the nature and structure of their historical thinking (Booth, 1983a, p. 4) demonstrated that explicit teaching of historical thinking in a course emphasising ‘inquiry’ and ‘discussion’ and using a range of ‘source materials’ had produced ‘improvement’ in the ability of students aged 13 to 16 years to think historically (Booth, 1971, pp. 74ff; Booth, 1980a, pp. 18ff; Booth, 1980b, p. 10; Booth, 1987, pp. 28f). As a result, Booth put forward ideas and pedagogy for doing history and studying History based on strategies to improve and raise expectations of student historical thinking (1987, p. 22).

A number of important practical classroom strategies emerged from this research. It strongly supported the proposition that teacher mediation and guidance were necessary because developing historical thinking depended on the possession of concepts and historical knowledge, and an appreciation of the ‘problems’ of history (Booth, 1983a, p. 88). Booth concluded that students needed classroom experiences that developed both concepts and historical knowledge and activities that provided the opportunity to use information in opened-ended inductive situations where ‘synthesis’ was involved, as well as deductive situations where evidence was deconstructed (Booth, 1980a, pp. 118f). The research results strongly supported the proposition that concentration on guided personal research, inductive thinking and personal synthesis can help students to make sense of the past and develop ‘personal constructs’ (Booth, 1983a, p. 119).

Booth’s conclusion was that students need experience in comprehending, interrogating, analysing and evaluating a wide variety of carefully chosen historical sources, and any assessment of students’ historical thinking needs to be balanced between different types of items (Booth, 1983c, p. 7). Students should learn the significance of the various types of evidence. The combination of experience as a classroom teacher, an insider, and subsequent researcher convinced Booth that it was possible to teach, and for students to learn to use and understand these elements (1978, pp. 4f). An important suggestion was that they should encounter sources that show disagreement. Equally as important when
dealing with sources, Booth highlighted the difference between thinking based on the analysis of ‘text’, which he characterised as ‘concrete’ and thinking based on analysis of ‘sub-text’, described as ‘formal’. He concluded that there was evidence that both deductive and inductive reasoning were used by students when making sense of evidence, but that there also seemed to be a broader ‘framework’ of concepts and knowledge required. Here he introduced the importance of the affective domain of imagination and empathy (Booth, 1983a, p. 107).

Again, Booth articulated that students should communicate and present their viewpoint. A variety of opportunities for students to engage in transformations of historical materials from one medium or text to another is an essential element in the process of learning that Booth, after Piaget, termed ‘equilibration’. In particular, to develop ‘thinking’, a personal viewpoint and personal response, students need open-ended discussions and ‘low risk’ interaction that allow them the opportunity to develop the ‘linguistic’ techniques needed to order ‘new’ thinking (Booth, 1983c, p. 8). Students need time to manipulate, talk about and reflect on what they have experienced or learned. This may allow the processes of adaptation and organisation to take place. How the findings of his research could be utilised in the classroom, in pedagogy, is the subject of Section 2.3.4.

2.3.4 Historical thinking in the classroom

One significant conclusion that can be drawn from Booth’s research is the suggestion that limitations in student thinking stemmed mainly from inappropriate classroom practice (1971, p. 75). Students were not being taught to think historically. They lacked experience in the divergent, imaginative thinking that researchers sought to assess. More positively, the results suggested that improvement in the ‘maturity’ of student thinking could be affected in classrooms (Booth, 1971, p. 76). This research demonstrated that open-ended inductive thinking was most characteristic of doing history and that it could be done at an abstract level by a high proportion of students aged 14 to 16 years (Booth, 1978, p. 8; Booth, 1983a, pp. 118f). Contrary to the traditional paradigm, secondary school students were shown to be capable of creative, inferential, synthetic historical thinking (Booth, 1983a, pp. 10f). A great many students
aged 14 to 16 years were capable of genuine historical thinking, of adductive historical thinking. The keys were system and classroom structures, teacher mediation and explicit teaching of skills (Booth, 1983b, pp. 11ff). This was a statement of pedagogical import. Historical thinking was taught, not caught.

The other major concept of the traditional paradigm was the belief that secondary school students were hampered in the development of historical thinking by poor perception and concepts of historical time (Peel, 1967; Hallam, 1969). Booth’s research also addressed this perception of students’ imperfect understanding of ‘time’ in a typically practical insider way. He suggested that limiting the time span of any study would assist student understanding. He argued that the best approach for school history for secondary school students was to use topics or themes, ‘patches’ and ‘studies in-depth’ (1971, pp. 71f). This would allow for what psychological research had identified as the uneven development of a ‘sense’ of time by avoiding vast periods, and would compensate for the lack of concept development in children by demanding less ‘generality’ across or between periods.

This problem of chronological orientation may be of prime importance in the classroom. In my experience, very often when students say they are ‘bored’ (Clark, 2008, pp. 1ff) this is actually adolescent speak for ‘I am lost!’ and ‘I don’t understand this!’ I would argue, from my experience, that the most obvious cause of ‘boredom’ in History classes is that students are lost in time, confused by competing themes, or struggling with a new glossary of terms. Carefully constructed multi-layered timelines, glossaries and even databases can help overcome and avoid these problems. Booth’s insider experience as a teacher also suggested that students responded well to the opportunity to come to grips with a manageable, definable topic such as ‘The Tudors’ and to investigate the basic elements of lifestyle such as dress, food and housing (Booth, 1971, pp. 70ff). This also refocuses the materials of history and History from ‘great’ men and ‘great’ deeds to the everyday life of ordinary people. Providing the time for immersion in a topic of this nature is, from my own experience, the ideal opportunity for students to do history, to further develop their historical skills and engage in historical thinking.
Booth’s research addressed the main concerns that resulted in students learning History rather than studying history and that justified the coverage paradigm (Wineburg, 2001). If Booth’s thesis is accepted, and there are compelling reasons to do so, then an argument that secondary school students are unable to study and do history in schools can no longer be sustained. This research showed repeatedly that by teaching students to use historical materials in an historical way, the skills and concepts of historical thinking could be nurtured. And most importantly, perhaps, throughout the studies, the survey results suggested that the students developed and maintained a positive attitude to doing history and studying History. They were not bored and they thought History was important. It was no longer possible to argue that students are only capable of learning History. Booth’s research established that school students were capable of doing history and studying History. They could be taught the intricacies of the ‘game’ and they improved their performance as a result. Taken together, the work of Booth, Seixas and Wineburg provides substantial guidelines for developing classroom pedagogy for doing and studying History. The synthesis of their work may also provide the syntax and vocabulary for beginning the discussion of a taxonomy for history and History teachers.

2.4 Pedagogical implications for the teaching of History

As outlined at the beginning of Chapter 2, Section 2.4 brings together the key theoretical ideas of the previous sections with my insider classroom experiences to frame a discussion of the pedagogical implications for doing history and for teaching History. In the discussion that follows, I have addressed a number of issues and basic questions about the nature of the school subject, History. I have located these discussions within my own career in NSW schools. I have reintroduced the problem of competing paradigms for teaching History in NSW schools and will consider these paradigms in the light of the previous theoretical discussion.

2.4.1 New history, old History

It is obvious from this study that History in schools has been the subject of discussion and criticism throughout my career to this point. The major concern has often been that it is irrelevant to the generation to whom it is taught, being regularly described and
denounced as ‘boring’ (Thorne, 1977; Booth, 1980; Halse, 1997; Clark, 2008). At the same time, the popularity of historical and historicised media has often been commented upon (Watts, 1972; Bryant, 1972; Steele, 1976; Halse, 1997; Clark, 2008; Taylor, 2013). As leisure, ‘history’ is a growth industry (Bryant, 1972, cited in Steele, 1976).

What explains this apparent contradiction? This is a dilemma to which a large number of teachers of History in Britain and Australia have addressed themselves in an effort to save their subject from being submerged by integrated studies and the demands of an expanding curriculum. How was History in schools to be rescued from this perception of irrelevance, of ‘boredom’ and its place in the curriculum justified and maintained?

In general terms, the traditional justification for History’s inclusion in the curriculum is that it has value as a body of knowledge that will enrich the student (Burston, 1972; McIntyre, 2009). It is believed that the study of History will contribute to a young person’s education by working some change upon them (Collingwood, 1961; Dickinson, Gard & Lee, 1978; Rogers, 1984; Young, 1991; Marchetto, 1994; Taylor, 2003; Barton, 2005). However, many researchers have found the reality of the school situation quite different. In Australia, the research suggests that there were very few occasions where student intellect and/or imagination were being challenged by the exhilarating contrasts and experiences that doing history and studying History could provide (Halse, 1997; Taylor, 2000; Clark, 2008). This was true of earlier research in Britain. According to one observer:

*Up and down the country children are being bored to tears by syllabuses of constitutional and political history leading to examinations seemingly based upon the belief that the ability to memorise is the most important criterion of education.*

(Fines, 1969, p. v.)

This bleak diagnosis was supported by the findings of the British Schools Council Enquiry of 1968 that found that History had a low ‘interest’ rating and a low ‘usefulness’ rating from students of both genders (Watts, 1972, p. 74). The subject was said to be divorced from reality, boring and irrelevant (Boddington, 1984, p. 131). The basis for such opinions was students’ experiences of History as it was being taught to them in their classrooms across the countryside. Such complaints are not new, having
been made regularly in various jurisdictions since the early 19th century (Steele, 1976; Apple, 1976; Phillips, 1998; Seixas & Peck, 2008; Levesque, 2009). It has been suggested that this perception of History may be related to the fact that in the age of information, history and History teaching seemed to have been least affected by the many developments in educational theory, aids, methods and media (Steele, 1976; Halse, 1997). However valid this conclusion may be, the problem is more fundamental than a technological ‘lag’ suggests. There are both pedagogical and philosophical explanations that get closer to the root of this problem than a failure to exploit the technological wizardry that is available today.

The Cambridge Institute Enquiry of 1970, a study of History teaching for 11 to 14 year old students, found that 77% of the schools in its study taught a chronological syllabus in which History was treated as a study of the evolution of the present. History was being taught as a continuous process that culminated in the ‘present’, in courses designed to ensure that students gained basic information and ‘a sense of time’. This information, historical knowledge, was to be the foundation for later studies. The study of History at school had little rationale other than it provided a foundation of knowledge for a future in which it was assumed some further study of History would take place, or a future in which this knowledge would in some way be useful (Elford, 1976; Elton, 1976). This may appear a logical reason for teaching History and may even appear as a valid reason for learning History, but on both counts this approach ignores consideration of a number of issues fundamental to any discussion of History’s place in the curriculum.

School History was dictated by the coverage paradigm described previously in Chapter 1. The coverage paradigm ignores both the psychological development of children and the contribution that the study of history may make to that development. It ignores the proposition that History be taught in its own right in the secondary school (Steele, 1976; Booth, 1980) and the notion that doing history and studying History should be included in the school curriculum on the basis of their intrinsic value.

The paradigm debate that has been contested during my career was introduced in Chapter 1. Here, I will expand the discussion and analysis of what I have suggested are
the competing matrices of practice in NSW History classrooms during my career as both insider in the domain of practice and outsider in the domain of text-production.

2.4.2 What is History?

The fact that teachers of History should have problems with their attempt to define the nature and value of their subject is not surprising when one considers the range of views held by professional historians and philosophers of History in this age of post-structuralism and postmodernism (Steele, 1976; Curthoys & Docker, 2006). The views available represent fundamental differences about both the nature of history and what constitutes historical study and historical materials. This is reflected in debate about the nature of, and rationale for, teaching History in schools. At a basic level, these views reflect substantial disagreement about adolescents and about the intellectual development of the students that teachers encounter in their classrooms. At one extreme, some have argued that children are ill-equipped to do History in schools, at all, because the maturity of intellect and experience demanded by the discipline, and the nature of the material with which the historian works is lacking (Burston, 1967; Coltham, 1971; Watts, 1972; Elton, 1976). At the other extreme are those who claim that learning History has an important contribution to make to the development of any student in the progress towards what is considered adulthood (Watts, 1972; Seixas, 2006; Wineburg, Porat, Mosborg & Duncan, 2006). The polarisation of views that is obvious at such a level of practicality is one product of the debate about, and re-examination of, the nature of history and History teaching that in my experience began in the 1960s and 1970s and has been in progress throughout my career as History teacher and history educator.

The exploration of some essential philosophical questions will inform any attempt to settle the concerns that have arisen about History teaching: What is history? What do historians do when they investigate the past? Coming to grips with these potential dilemmas will assist in discussing the significant pedagogical concerns of why we do history and teach History in schools and how it might best be taught. It would seem reasonable to expect that because teachers of History in secondary schools aim to teach history, it is important that they have some conception of what it is that they would have their students study and presumably learn. As teachers, it is essential that they
endeavour to organise their teaching material in such a fashion that it is intelligible to their students and is able to be communicated to them. The fundamental problem that remains is to decide how to teach the school subject History in such a way that it is accessible to students but at the same time, maintains the integrity of the discipline of History (Burston, 1972), and be sure that the material and practices reflect the nature of history, the past.

There is a continuing dialectic in history teaching and policy making between competing paradigms in the contexts of influence, of text-production, and of practice. These paradigms are described and discussed next.

**The traditional ‘coverage’ paradigm**

The traditional paradigm views history and History as the same thing, that is, a body of knowledge produced by historical study that when acquired will enrich the student. According to this view, the History taught in schools was exclusively the writings of historians (Burston, 1972; Elton, 1976). There has always been a concern from history teachers and historians that the History taught in school should remain faithful to the academic discipline, History. It was feared by some that in an endeavour to make school History ‘interesting’, ‘real’ and ‘relevant’, decisions might be taken about what to teach, and how to teach it, that would be contrary to the nature of the academic discipline of History.

At this point, it is important to note the distinction between the ‘practical’ past and ‘historical’ past. The term ‘historical past’ is used in reference to studies concerned with investigating the past for its own sake because the past is intrinsically interesting and the study of it is valuable for no reason other than that it is the past (Walsh, 1967, p. 76). These studies are concerned with establishing the importance of particular events in the past to the people involved in the past, in the context of these and other past events, not in the context of present events. This view of the past emphasises the individuality and uniqueness, the particularity of historical events as characteristic of the discipline of History (Burston, 1972; Watts, 1972; Wineburg & Schneider, 2011; Seixas, & Peck, 2004).
The term ‘practical’ past is used in reference to studies that concentrate on only those past events that can be shown to have had some direct influence upon the present. In these studies, history, the past, is reduced to a chronicle of events leading inevitably and inexorably to the present. History is studied with one intention only, that is, to find the supposed origins of the present (Burston, 1972). Thus, past events are shorn of their context, and perhaps their meaning. Only the ‘relevant’ is emphasised. This is a major concern about integrated studies where certain historical events or materials are used to give context to concerns other than history (Young, 1991; Taylor et al., 2000; Taylor, 2007; Peck & Seixas, 2008; Sheldon, 2011; Seixas, 2012). In this context, a valid view, an historical view of the past, does not emerge. This search for the practical past has been described as ‘the’ historical fallacy (Fischer, 1970, p. 209). However, this is the diet of History that is regularly served to the general public via the media. It is also the driving belief for many politicians and other major players in the context of influence when they begin to talk about History in the school curriculum (Muller, 1978; Tupper, 2005; Barton, 2005; Taylor, 2007; Seixas, 2008; Peck & Seixas, 2008; Levesque, 2009; Sheldon, 2011; Seixas, 2012).

Those who object to this practical use of the past to make History relevant do not deny that the study of history may be useful in illuminating the present. The past conceived as a contrast with the present is of immense educational value (Burston, 1972; Booth, 1980; Wineburg & Schneider, 2011). The profound and penetrating understanding of the past, afforded by an historical study of the past, can assist students’ understanding of the contemporary world in a way that no other subject is able to achieve (Burston, 1972). But this understanding results from the challenging and illuminating contrasts and comparisons that can be drawn between the present and the past, not from the facility of the past to provide ready-made answers and explanations for the present (Collingwood, 1961; Wineburg, 2001).

This practical notion of History does sometimes include the proposition that there is value in the study of History because it also provides a ‘way of thinking’ (Burston, 1967, pp. 3ff) that is peculiar to the subject. This ‘historical thinking’ can be applied to contemporary problems and may assist students to understand the modern world (Wineburg, 2001, pp. viiiff; Seixas & Peck, 2004). This view of school History has been
under scrutiny since the beginning of the 20th century (Booth, 1980; Shawyer, Booth & Brown, 1988; Phillips, 1998; Wineburg, 2001; Peck & Seixas, 2008; Levesque, 2009).

In the classroom, the practical past has usually been associated, indeed, goes hand-in-hand, with transmission of a meta-narrative and the coverage paradigm. This paradigm and its pedagogical counterpart have been under siege for most of my career from the proponents of a ‘new’ paradigm for both history and the classroom. This ‘new’ paradigm sits at the heart of my pedagogy and hence my taxonomy. It will be explored next.

**A ‘new’ paradigm**

A new view of history and subsequently, of History teaching, emerged from the research of the 1960s and 1970s. A new paradigm was defined. Bruner’s (1962) influence may be discerned in the view that history is not the end product of investigations but is the process of investigation itself (Steele, 1976; Phillips, 1998; VanSledright, 2014). This paradigm suggests that what should be studied is the process involved in doing history, of producing History. In schools this dynamic view of history relies upon the interaction of students and historical material (Collingwood, 1961; Watts, 1972; Booth, 1983; Seixas, 1996; Seixas, 1998; Seixas, 1999; Taylor, 2003; Wineburg & Martin, 2004; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Levesque, 2009; Sheldon, 2001; VanSledright, 2014). Students become the ‘producers’ of History rather than the consumers (Sawyer & Laguardia, 2010, p.1998). The BSCHP definition that History is an ‘investigation, an observation of the facts, an examination of evidence’ was eventually the most widely publicised of the versions of the ‘new’ view of History (Boddington, 1984, p.133). The initial response was to dismiss this notion as unhistorical (Burston, 1972). Some historians and educators questioned it suggesting that it could be applied to any discipline (Watts, 1972).

This dynamic view of history suggested that history is ‘an emotional or intellectual reaction to the knowledge, or belief that certain things were so in the past’ (Watts, 1972, p. 43). This was another way of expressing the commitment to the historical past that the traditional paradigm practises as a prerequisite for the valid interpretation and reconstruction of the past. The difference here is that Watts (1972), Booth (1969, 1971
& 1980), Shemilt (1980), Boddington (1984), Wineburg (2001, 2004, 2006 & 2011), Seixas (2000, 2004 & 2013) and others place their emphasis on the process of response and reconstruction, not on the product. It is doing history, the reconstruction of the past, being actively involved in the process, not the knowing, that constitutes studying History. Doing history and studying History develop historical thinking and therefore should be the matter of school History.

As with the traditional paradigm, this approach insists that intellectual and emotional immersion in the past is the means of allowing a valid reconstruction of past events and involves treating the material from the past in an historical way. The argument follows that ‘what makes subject matter historical is the way it is studied’ (Watts, 1972, p. 50). The material of history, the evidence, has to be thought about in a distinctive way. It has to be critically examined (Booth, 1971; Watts, 1972). The historical past and History are both the product and the process of a particular way of examining the evidence of the past. There is the same concern in the ‘new’ view of History as in the traditional paradigm for maintaining the integrity of the historical past and avoiding the practical past.

Uncertainty and debate emerge in this analysis as two central features of history because this view also recognises that much of History is interpretation and sub-textual. The new History does not abandon the use of the writings of historians since they are plainly one of the sources of the material to be studied in History (Watts, 1972). This view of history gives a central place to the idea that history is about people and about people involved in particular events (Watts, 1972). In this sense, there is very little difference between the ‘new’ History and the traditional paradigm.

The major difference between the two views of History is the emphasis they place on the content of history. In the traditional paradigm, the content of history is the product of the historical process, the writings of professional historians. This finished product, History, becomes the accepted evidence of the past, and thus is the proper subject matter for the study of school History. The new paradigm does not maintain this emphasis. It describes the writing of the professional historian, not as the subject matter of history, but as one of the materials of history that students should experience as they do history.
and study History, as they engage in their own investigations, in their own endeavours to make sense of the past. This change in focus does not devalue the traditional concept of historical content or knowledge. In fact, by emphasising that historical knowledge is open to interpretation and debate, it properly acknowledges the complexity of the historical process and historical knowledge (Little, 1983; Phillips, 1998; Levesque, 2005; Chapman, 2005; Smith, 2012; VanSledright, 2014). This difference may seem slight, a matter of emphasis only, but the pedagogical implications are extremely significant. This slight difference arises from profound disparities in curriculum and teaching purpose and produces profound disparities in practice. These difference and their implications are discussed next.

2.4.3 The historical process: Investigating the past

Before considering the pedagogical implications of the two paradigms, it is important that we return to the matter of ensuring that what we teach as history in schools is in keeping with the discipline of History. The next step in that analysis is to consider more fully what historians actually do as they investigate the past. From remains of the past, that is, the sources, historians select and interpret the evidence of history. They compile data concerned with uniqueness, particularity and individuality (Holloway, 1967; Elton, 1976; Booth, 1980a, p.105; Jurd, 1981; Lee 1984; Shawyer, Booth & Brown, 1988; Fines, 1994; Husbands, 1998; Wineburg, 2001; Seixas & Peck, 2004). Historians are engaged in ‘interpreting the raw data which pertain to history … in order to make statements, which we also call “history”…’ (Holloway, 1967, p.11). In this way, historians describe the past in an endeavour to tell us what precisely happened and to make the past come alive (Collingwood, 1961; Walsh, 1972). They also seek to understand the past. In doing so, they attempt to identify continuing processes by analysing trends and making statements about the regularities they find (Walsh, 1967; Holloway, 1967; Seixas, 1999; Wineburg, 2001). At the simplest level, this allows them to label and classify. At another level, this allows them to generalise, formulate laws and predict outcomes (Collingwood, 1961; Holloway, 1967; Burston, 1967). This does not deny the historian’s concern for the particular and the individual. The use of generality enables the historian to describe how an event was unique and how it was not, and this is the usual practice (Burston, 1972; Thompson, 1972).
The proponents of the ‘new’ History found little to disagree with in this traditional view of what the historian does when investigating the past. However, they place significantly more emphasis on one particular aspect of historical thinking, that is, the emotional, or affective, nature of this essentially inductive process (Booth, 1971). Supporters of the new History would agree that historical thinking is a colligatory activity, an exercise in synthesis, but they stressed the need for ‘heart’ as well as ‘head’ (Booth, 1971, pp. 105-6). Watts suggested that this affective aspect of historical thinking is important in what he called ‘historical intelligence’ and ‘historical intuition’ (Watts, 1972).

The traditional paradigm recognised this emotional response to the past as a prerequisite for immersion in the past and for the reproduction of the historical past. It is the ability to identify with the people of the past, to become immersed in the past, that enables the sort of thinking, best described as ‘a form of speculation, directed imagination or vicarious living’ that characterises the historian’s attempts to bring the past to life (Booth, 1971, p.105; Burston, 1972, pp.34f). It is this ‘empathetic understanding’ that distinguishes historical explanation from the general scientific pattern (Popper, cited in Perry, 1967, p.28; Phillips, 1998, p.13) and as such, it must be seen as a fundamental characteristic of history and an essential element in the process that historians involve themselves in when they investigate the past. This is where the difference in emphases lies. The new paradigm declares that this empathetic response to the past is the essential element that sets history and historical thinking apart from other forms of investigation. Empathy, the historical past and hence historical thinking, are inextricably linked.

2.4.4 Why do we teach History in schools?

In Section 2.3.2, the competing paradigms of History and history were outlined. At this point, I discuss how this difference in emphasis might affect the vital questions of why we include doing history and studying History in the secondary school curriculum.

**The traditional paradigm: Learning History in schools**

The literature suggests that the traditional paradigm of History, as represented by Burston and Elton, was less concerned with the development of adolescents. This may
be expressed in other terms. The traditional view is more subject-oriented, more content-focused, less child-centred and less skills-focused. The concern for the development of historical thinking becomes almost an end in itself (Burston, 1967, p.61, 1972a, pp.149, 185-6), taking no account of intellectual appropriateness or changing social, economic and political circumstances. Seemingly, the traditional paradigm eschews the practical past but since its avowed purpose is expressed in terms of providing the means by which we may illuminate the present by contrast with the past (Burston, 1972a), it could be argued that this gives a hint that under the pressure of the crowded curriculum of the 1960s and 1970s, the traditional paradigm may have sought refuge in ‘relevance’.

When writing at its height of the debate in the early 1970s, critics dismissed the ‘new’ History because it did not emphasise ‘content’ (Burston, 1972a, pp.39ff) and, again because it was contrary to the traditional pattern of training the historian (Burston, 1972b; Elton, 1976). In doing so, they betrayed the twin concerns of the traditional view. The first purpose was that History was included in the school curriculum to ensure the transmission of a set body of knowledge (Burston, 1972; Muller, 1978; Levesque, 2009; Seixas, 2012; VanSledright, 2014). There was an agreed narrative that students should learn. Some have described this approach in terms of ‘compulsory patriotism lessons’ or attempts to control the archive, even as a pedagogy of indoctrination (Muller, 1978; Tupper, 2005; Taylor, 2007; Levesque, 2009, Sheldon, 2011; Parkes, 2011; Seixas, 2012). The second purpose of school History was to provide a background for the preparation of those who would eventually become professional historians (Burston, 1972a; Elton, 1976). The first purpose would ensure the national heritage was intact and taught, no doubt in less than inspiring circumstances. The second purpose did not take into account those who had no desire to become professional historians or who were not destined for that role. The traditionalists betray more than a hint (Burston, 1972) of that adult superiority that Watts cautions us against (1972, pp.13f) when we presume to make decisions ‘in the best interests of our students’ for no reason other than that we believe we know better, regardless of the available evidence to the contrary. Watts (1972) pointed out that there was a tendency for arguments about what we should, or should not, teach in History to draw their evidence from the assumption that adults know while children are ignorant.
Wineburg has also commented on this situation in the USA (2006). Watts’s solution to this problem was eminently straightforward. Echoing Piaget (1958), he suggested that if children were ignorant we should teach them (Watts, 1972). Attempts to introduce more content into History syllabuses are often accompanied by a discourse of derision and punctuated by a belief that one generation knows what is best for the next (Phillips, 1998; Bergmann, 1997; Myers, 2005; Taylor, 2007; Seixas, 2008; Clark, 2008; Levesque, 2009; Taylor, 2013). This reliance upon creating a discourse of failing students and falling standards seems to be the main justification for attempts to revert to the content-driven, content-focussed paradigm of coverage.

A ‘new’ paradigm: Doing history and studying History in schools

The new History is characterised by an obvious concern for developing the adolescent student. It is concerned with more than historical thinking and critical analysis while being concerned with both (Watts, 1972; Fines, 1994; Philips, 1998; Wineburg, 2001; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Levesque, 2009; VanSledright, 2014). By assuming the goal of immersion in the past as the essential activity of the historian, by emphasising doing history, engaging adolescents in the same, or a similar process of investigation to that which historians engage in, and developing the ability to identify with and empathise with the people of the past, the new paradigm aims to provide those exhilarating opportunities to engage both intellect and spirit in the past, and thus, make contributions to the emotional, intellectual, social and psychological development of adolescents. This contribution to the development of students in ways other than intellectual has been regularly commented upon (Collingwood, 1961; Dickinson, Gard & Lee, 1978; Rogers, 1984; Young, 1991; Marchetto, 1994; Wineburg, 2001; Taylor, 2003; Barton, 2005; Levesque, 2009; Seixas, 2012; VanSledright, 2014).

Contrary to its critics’ claims, “new” History does not involve abandoning historical content, but rather enshrines historical content as the essential context of history. Historical knowledge provides both the context and materials of investigation (Boddington, 1984; Phillips, 1998; Chapman, 2005; Seixas, 2006; Levesque, 2009; Smith, 2012; VanSledright, 2014). A major diversion from the traditional paradigm, however, is what is meant by historical content. The content of history is the whole
spectrum of available historical evidence, not just History, the finished products of professional historians, but the raw materials of history themselves (Boddington, 1980a). Historical content is both knowledge of History, of the end product, and knowledge about history, about the process. Students study the processes of history and History (Gosden & Sylvester, 1968; Shemilt, 1980; Seixas, 1999; Chapman, 2005; Wineburg, 2007; VanSledright, 2014). They become knowledgeable about the way the ‘game’ works. How better to develop historical consciousness, to understand present society and, gain some conception of the national heritage, than to be involved personally in investigating problems and issues in the context of that heritage?

This new History was formulated specifically to redress the harm that was being done to the subject by employing methods that gave rote-learning precedence over developing the skills and attitudes that could be derived from a study of history (Boddington, 1984; Seixas, 2008; Levesque, 2009; VanSledright, 2014). These skills and attitudes take a central position in ‘a pedagogy stressing the place of skills, imagination and evidence’ (Boddington, 1984, p. 133). This pedagogical re-focus is supported by research in North America (Seixas, 2008; Levesque, 2009; VanSledright, 2014). In this context, the value of the study of history is derived from its basic strategy, engaging students in the exercise of judgement as they deal directly with historical evidence (Collingwood, 1961; Gosden & Sylvester, 1968; Shemilt, 1980; Boddington, 1984, p. 133; Seixas, 1999; Chapman, 2005; Wineburg, 2007; VanSledright, 2014). In terms of broader education, this approach makes a substantial claim for the inclusion of History in the curriculum because of the transferable skills that experience in exercising historical judgement fosters. This experience assists in the progress from ‘subject’ thinking to ‘adult’ thinking (Watts, 1972, pp.36ff). The importance of this maturation of judgement and thinking is essential to developing life-skills (Wineburg, 2001; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Seixas, 2012).

The most substantial argument made by critics of the new History was that adolescents were incapable of working at the intellectual level which historical investigation, historical materials and historical thinking demand. This belief was based on the work of Piaget and those who sought to replicate his work in the area of history and the development of historical thinking. Some critics of the traditional paradigm expressed
this rigid reliance on Piaget in terms of being hamstrung or ‘cowed’ by the psychological research (Booth, 1980a, p.107). Others have commented on the reliance on this research (Shawyer, Booth & Brown, 1988, p.211; Marchetto, 1994; Wineburg, 2001; Taylor, 2003; Levesque, 2009; Sheldon, 2011). There was a prevailing belief that students were incapable of the level of intellectual ‘sophistication’ that historical thinking required (Burston, 1967 & 1972; Elton, 1987; Shawyer, Booth & Brown, 1988). A reading of the research results of Booth (1971, 1978, 1980a, 1980b, 1983a, 1983b, 1983c & 1987) and of Boddington (1979, 1980a, 1980b & 1984), McIntosh (1980 & 1996), Evans (1995) and Shemilt (1976, 1980 & 1984) in evaluating BSCHP, might show any critic that this contention about adolescent thinking was no longer tenable. The results in centrally set examinations in England indicated that the use of the What is History? kit encouraged adolescents to think historically (Shemilt, 1978; Boddington, 1984). More importantly, Booth’s corpus of research showed that improving the cognitive abilities of adolescents was not dependent on a pre-packaged ‘kit’. Even in very young students, limited but valid historical thinking could be brought about by teacher mediation, by explicit teaching of skills and by the practice of historical thinking (Booth, 1987). It would be reasonable to argue that there was no longer a defensible rationale for the primacy of content or for maintaining the coverage paradigm. Therefore, there was no longer, is no longer any reasonable argument against, or obstacle to, doing history and studying History in the secondary classroom.

2.5 Summary and conclusions

In Chapter 2, I discussed the various experiences, reading and research that have shaped my pedagogy and classroom operation and now form the basis for the taxonomy that sits at the core of this study.

At the same time, I contextualised my developing pedagogical approach during two very important periods of my career. Firstly, I dealt with the impact of my own personal ‘history war’ with the NSW BoS in the late 1990s and early 2000s and its role in crystallising my beliefs about classroom intention and actual practice. This was contextualised within efforts to establish an Australian ‘National Curriculum’.
Section 2.2 introduced and discussed the key theoretical ideas underpinning the taxonomy. I explained how the experience described in Section 2.1, as an involved insider participant in the development of the history curriculum in NSW, married with the reading and research that I had begun in the 1980s. This theoretical discussion foregrounds the description and demonstration of the elements of the taxonomy that follow in Chapter 3.

Section 2.3 utilised the key theoretical ideas to frame a discussion and demonstration of the pedagogical implications of these ideas for doing history and studying History.

Chapter 2 has argued that a classroom practitioner, an insider working in the context of practice, can draw a number of conclusions from the paradigm debate and associated research over the last half century. It has been argued that these are enhanced by a synthesis of Booth’s earlier work and more recent work on historical literacy and historical consciousness by Seixas and Wineburg. This synthesis is demonstrated and discussed in the conference paper that is presented as Chapter 3: A taxonomy for teaching History.

### Appendix 1:
**Some terms and definitions**

| Historical consciousness and historical thinking | Historical consciousness has been described as awareness of the process by which certain events and their stories do or don’t become History (Taylor & Young, 2003). This is a basic statement of the epistemological process by which history, the past, becomes History the account of the past. The awareness of this process and the understanding of the selective nature of the accounts that we call History is, in this taxonomy, the essential awareness that constitutes historical consciousness. It is this awareness that triggers the critical response to historical and historicised materials that this taxonomy has labelled as historical thinking.

Historical thinking is the critical response to the ambiguities and uncertainties that this historical consciousness presupposes as implicit in historical or historicised materials and interpretation of the past (Taylor & Young, 2003). Historical thinking is an intricate process of critical “reading” that, among other things, requires analysis and evaluation of evidence, of inferences and of |
|---|---|
Historical empathy is defined in the current syllabus in NSW, *Syllabus: History K-10* (2012), *Glossary* (pp.137-142) as empathetic understanding, as the “capacity to enter into the world of the past from the point of view of a particular individual or group from that time, including an appreciation of the circumstances they faced, and the motivations, values and attitudes behind their actions”. This capacity is described in this taxonomy as context-sensitivity. Because historical empathy may allow students to avoid presentism and thus can assist them to understand the motivation and behaviour of people in the past it is described in this taxonomy as the essential element in recovering history and gaining a proper understanding of past events. It is recognised that historical empathy is potentially slow to develop and hierarchical, moving through stages from deficit, or ‘contempt’, towards contextual understanding. (Taylor et al, 2012)

As stated on pp.114ff of this portfolio, a major aim of the study of History is to develop historical knowledge. However in this taxonomy there is more to the notion of historical knowledge than what might be called “content” knowledge, such as names and dates. This taxonomy recognises the complexity of historical knowledge by including second order concept and process knowledge as an integral part of the study of History. In this paper History is any attempt to reconstruct or construct the past. In that sense a History is an account of some area or element of our knowledge of the past (Seixas, 1999). Thus a History, as an artefact from the past, becomes an element of our knowledge of the past. This is the context in which History should be studied, as a representation, a source that has its own inherent perspectives and context.

As stated on p. 52 of this portfolio, in this taxonomy historical literacy is that set of concepts, second order knowledge or skills that provide students with the means by which they can interrogate, analyse and evaluate historical evidence. It is these skills and their application in “a systematic process”, with particular sets of attitudes and conceptual understandings, “that mediates and develops historical consciousness” (Taylor & Young, 2003, p.5).

This taxonomy requires an essential understanding that the past and accounts of the past are not the same, are not the same thing. The past, *history*, is in real terms unknowable and irretrievable.
Some remnants are available, and from these using the methodology of historical inquiry, historians attempt to recover or construct accounts of the past. In this taxonomy those constructs, the accounts of the past, are called History. The term History is also used as the name of the discipline practised by historians, taught and studied in universities, and also taught in schools.

| Old and “new” paradigms | The “old’ or traditional paradigm, what I have called the “coverage” paradigm of History education on p.65ff, is based on the belief that children are not able to do history or study History. As a result of this belief children are taught an approved or agreed master narrative, History. This History essentially involves the chronological sweep of historical events or a national story, with the memorisation of content as the way of developing a proper sense of historical consciousness (Taylor & Young, 2003). A more productive approach to the effective teaching and learning of History in schools, is suggested when school History focuses more clearly on the development of historical literacy rather than mere recall of historical facts (Taylor & Young, 2003). Hence the advocacy for a ‘new’ paradigm that focuses on skills and process concepts, as well as knowledge, for the History classroom. This divide between content and skills and processes has been observed as operating in both Australia and UK since the 1970s (Booth, 1971; Cowling, 1984; Phillips, 1998; Taylor & Young, 2003). |
| sources and evidence | As stated on p. 67, referencing Hexter and Booth, in this portfolio I have used the terms sources and evidence in a particular way. By a source I mean any remnant or residue of the past. All sources can be interrogated to provide data that once analysed and evaluated can be used as evidence in an historical inquiry. This usage is based on my understanding of the syllabuses with which I have worked in NSW schools. The current syllabus in NSW, Syllabus: History K-10 (2012), Glossary (pp.137-142), defines a source as “…written or non-written materials that can be used to investigate the past” and defines evidence as “…information contained within a source that tends to support an historical argument or provides information for a specific historical inquiry.” It further states: “A source becomes ‘evidence’ when it is used to support or refute a viewpoint or contributes to an historical inquiry.” |
| taxonomy | The term taxonomy is used variously in other disciplines to indicate a scheme by which actions or elements are classified. In this portfolio the term is being used to indicate the need and possibility of organising and classifying activities that are involved in recovering the past, doing history, and in reconstructing or constructing History, an account of the past. It is suggested that |
once organised and classified these elements will be instructive and help guide pedagogical decisions about how students should do history and study History in secondary school classrooms in the 21st century.
CHAPTER 3: 
A TAXONOMY FOR TEACHING HISTORY

I have presented the taxonomy on a number of occasions. It has changed and evolved since the first occasion when I presented ‘Towards a taxonomy: What is history?’ in July 2010 at the History Teachers’ Association of Australia Annual Conference in Sydney, NSW. In December 2010 at Macquarie University, Sydney, I discussed elements of the taxonomy in a presentation titled ‘What is h/History: ‘istoria?’ to students and teachers at the History Teachers’ Association of New South Wales (HTA NSW) Extension History conference. A few days later in December 2010, I presented the taxonomy as a paper, ‘Teaching History’, at the 2nd East Asian international Conference on Teacher Education Research: Teacher Education for the future: International perspectives at the Hong Kong Institute of Education. In July 2011 at the HTA NSW Annual Conference for teachers in Sydney, I presented the taxonomy as ‘Why teach History?’ In October 2011, I had modified the presentation but retained the title ‘Why teach History’ for the HTAA Annual Conference in Adelaide, South Australia. In October 2012, at the HTAA Annual Conference in Hobart, Tasmania I presented the current version of the taxonomy as ‘Teaching historical thinking’. As this summary shows, the taxonomy I propose has evolved through several iterations as I have engaged with audiences at conferences, and teachers throughout this study. The paper presented in this chapter is the final version, the culmination of my research, engagement and theorising about doing history and studying History.
TEACHING HISTORICAL THINKING

Why a taxonomy? And why now?

Now that there is an *Australian Curriculum: History* it is opportune to explore whether there is a common terminology, perhaps a taxonomy that can describe and structure the processes that teachers and students are involved in while doing history and learning History. I have come to some conclusions about classroom practice, about the context of practice, as a result of my forty years at the ‘chalk’ face, as a teacher, provider of professional learning, historical consultant, teacher educator and historian. It was argued once that a taxonomy was inappropriate or premature, because there was no agreement about what should be taught as History in schools and how it should be taught (Coltham, 1971; Jones, 1973). While the agreed goal of teaching and learning History might be described as historical thinking, because of concerns about the cognitive appropriateness of historical materials for secondary aged students, there was no consensus as to what historical thinking might actually entail and how it might be achieved. Hence we had, or have, the paradigm debate. Martin Booth and the experience of the British Schools Council History Project 13-16 (BSCHP) in the 1970s and 1980s demonstrated that teaching for historical thinking had substantial positive impact on the cognitive abilities of students well before the previously accepted age for formal operational thinking. Hence this concern about cognitive development was shown to be unfounded. There was no longer a rationale for the coverage paradigm as the dominant mode of delivery of the History curriculum in schools.

The concerns about the challenges of the historicised and digitised world of the present and future (Wineburg et al, 2001; 2004; 2006; 2011; Seixas et al, 2004; Parkes, 2011) and reports of how little awareness tertiary students have of historical thinking (Hughes-Warrington et al, 2009) suggest that we can no longer sit on our hands in this circumstance. History education and educators in Australia need to catch up to the main game of historical literacy and historical consciousness. However while the contribution of the latest theoretical research is acknowledged, the ‘paucity’ of practical pedagogical advice for History teacher has been commented upon as well (Roberts, 2011, pp. 3ff). The taxonomy that follows in this paper is offered as the beginning of a conversation to redress this imbalance between research and classroom practice.
Intellectual context

The development of the *Australian Curriculum: History* has made it very clear that History educators in Australia use the same terms to mean very different things. There is no consistency of terminology used to describe and discuss what happens in History classrooms across the continent. Neither does there appear to be a common understanding of what should be taught and why it is important. One thing that has been consistent is the attempts by the advocates of integrated studies to influence the *Australian Curriculum: History*. Immediately it was published there was criticism and the suggestion that History could not justify a place in the curriculum (Reid, 2012; Gilbert, 2012). This again raises the issues of what it is that the study of History has to offer to students and why History should be studied as a discrete discipline?

In the recent past in an increasingly crowded curriculum History in many states of Australia has been submerged in interdisciplinary or integrated studies based on sociology, civics or geography or some version of ‘Social Studies’ (Young, 1991; Taylor, 2000). Integration often means that the essential core and methodology are left behind or consciously abandoned (Booth, 1971; Young, 1991; Taylor, 2000; Taylor, 2013). There was much insider discussion at both state and national level as the writers of the *Australian Curriculum: History* struggled with the demands of the exercise. In this context of text-production there was much ‘hand-to-hand fighting’ (Phillips, 1998, p.6). There were difficulties caused by the managerialism of the Australian Curriculum and Reporting Authority (ACARA) with constantly shifting deadlines and ‘dot points’ but there were also problems that were passed down from the context of influence where advocates of integrated studies occupied positions of significant moment. The inclusion of ‘sustainability’ as a major theme in the new *Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus* appears as an anomaly in the record of the historical past. The rescue work needed on two different History textbooks from major publishers in 2012 and 2013 suggested the problems writers encountered when researching and providing appropriate materials for this theme from ancient and medieval societies. The same concern has been aired about the inclusion of ‘globalization’ as an historical theme in the *Australian Curriculum: Modern History Syllabus* that is now available for adaption and implementation for senior students in the various states of Australia. This is a
problem of instrumentality. If the theme can be identified in a particular historical context then it should be studied in that context. To impose a theme on every context regardless of relevance is ahistorical.

The efforts of the critics, and those who tried at the level of context of text-production to influence the syllabus content, indicates that they believe that historical materials have an important role in their exploration of social, economic or environmental issues. A few ‘dates’ and ‘facts’ can quickly establish a context for the work they intend. Some have argued that this is the only rationale for the study of History (Thornton & Barton, 2010). This instrumental use of historical materials, in utilitarian terms may help us to understand the present. Doing history may show why something was done or happened in the past, but historical events remain particular to an historical context.

It is almost inevitable that at some stage in their career History teachers will encounter a ‘bored’ student who will pose the question, ‘Why do we have to study history?’ Or perhaps ask, ‘History is about the past, why can’t we learn about the present?’ These question need to be confronted with an explanation of why it is important for them to do history, and consequently, why it is important to study History. There are many answers including, ‘It is good for you to know where you came from’. Humans may have a psychological imperative to know and understand their antecedents, hence the success of movies, paperbacks and digital games with historical content or settings, and the phenomenal popularity of genealogy on the Internet and elsewhere. The proposition that studying history may help them understand the present, and more effectively prepare students for the events and challenges of the future, an apparent endorsement of instrumentalism should always be balanced by reference to A.J.P. Taylor’s axiom that while knowing some History may help you avoid the mistakes made in the past, it is unlikely to stop you making new ones, in the present or future (1963b).

Arguably, the most important reason for learning History and teaching history is the development of what might be called, in colloquial terms, a ‘Hang On!’ response. In their future, current History students need to be able to view, hear, read, experience History in any, every possible context and be able to stop and say, ‘Hang on! That is not likely to have happened’; or, ‘That does not follow from the evidence’; or, ‘That is not
an accurate representation’; or, ‘Where is the evidence for that’, and perhaps, ‘That isn’t a logical conclusion!’ They will need to be historically literate enough to develop a practical and enduring historical consciousness that will trigger their historical thinking, their critical questioning of the media and other sources of information that will increasingly bombard them as they practice their active citizenship (Wineburg, 2001; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Wineburg, Porat, Mosborg & Duncan, 2006). Doing history and studying History can equip students with the skills to read the rhetoric and the polemic, to be alert to the sub-text implicit in the historicised world that awaits them (Wineburg, 2001; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Parkes, 2011).

This paper argues that the past, as distinct from Histories of the past, existed in its own right. It did not happen and was not experienced, for the sake of the present or the future. The study of history, of the past, may illuminate the present and assist our understanding, but much of history will not (Booth, 1971: Taylor, AJP, 1963b). This paper contends that doing history and studying History in schools can bring a ‘freedom of mental movement’ (Booth, 1971, pp. 71f) that can bring about a change in students. The development of historical literacy and historical empathy can provide students with the skills and awarenesses that may enable students to stand more confidently in their own age, because with historical consciousness they can become capable of historical thinking. They may be able to avoid being duped by the media, ensnared by social media or misled daily by their browser (Wineburg & Martin, 2004). In this context this paper argues that attempts to ‘teacher proof’ the History curriculum inevitably detract from the perceived values of doing history and studying History. It follows that attempts to integrate history into a social studies course, where it loses its identity will reduce its impact and value as a means of equipping students to read the increasingly complicated and historicised digital world that awaits them after school.

**Are we speaking the same language?**

There was a basic problem of syntax and vocabulary in the recent discussion and description of pedagogical practice in doing history and teaching History in Australia. This problem is not confined to Australia, or to the 21st century. It has been commented on before when both history pedagogy and professional History have been discussed

This does not make sense to someone who studied the Sumerians at school in Year 7 in the 1960s in Australia and remembers that the Sumerian culture and history were fascinating, even extraordinary. There were ziggurats (we built one) and mud brick cities, cuneiform, astrology and astronomy, as well as various systems of measurement and the first legal code, all indications of a thriving society. Obviously the Sumerians left us a great deal of history. Yet a highly respected archaeologist, historian and philosopher has published what is ostensibly a nonsensical and utterly unhistorical statement about such a vibrant ancient civilisation. If Collingwood was referring to a perceived absence of written accounts or attempted contemporary reconstructions of Sumerian history, if we assume that he was actually talking about Sumerian History, his statement would read, ‘The ancient Sumerians left behind them nothing at all that we should call History’. In the terms of this paper this would make perfect sense, though some may argue with his conclusion, and his definition of what constitutes History.

What this illustrates is that historians and history educators should be aware that the past, and, History, accounts of the past, are not the same thing. In this paper I am arguing that the past has no structure or meaning other than that imposed upon it by historians as they create accounts or attempt reconstructions of the past. To avoid misinterpretation I call these accounts, these attempts to reconstruct the past, History. It follows that the discipline studied in schools and elsewhere should also be called History. I have chosen to call the past ‘history’, unless forced to capitalise because of sentence position. History educators and teachers should be aware of, and attempt to reach some understanding of, this relationship, of the dialectic, that exists and operates between the past, history, and the accounts of the past, History. Failure to recognise this epistemological difference, and its implications, can have a profound impact on classroom pedagogy.
In this paper I demonstrate how this dialectic can be exploited in History classrooms by providing, a pedagogical model that can guide classroom practice. I am arguing that the nature of the process of historical inquiry and historical sources should determine how history is done in classrooms and how History is studied in classrooms. Students and teachers in History classrooms should be actively involved in reconstructing the past. They should be involved in the processes of doing history. Both students and teachers should be doing history. They should be involved also with History, with studying the accounts of the past and with writing their own account of the past. This will involve addressing a number of questions about pedagogy: What does it look like when teachers and students do history? What do teachers and students do when they are studying History?

Investigating some fundamental issues about history and History should allow the identification of common vocabulary and syntax for talking about history and History. Some of these issues can be addressed by asking the following questions:

**What is history?**
- What is the historical process?
- What do historians do?

**What is historical literacy?**
- What are historical questions?
- What is historical reasoning?

**What is historical empathy?**
- What is the historical imagination?

**What is historical knowledge?**
- What is History?
- Who are historians?

**What is historical consciousness?**

**What is historical thinking?**
As the list above indicates there is a hierarchy of major and minor questions and issues here. Answering the minor questions, addressing the minor issues, should illuminate the explanation of the major question. This paper will argue that the discourse involved in the investigation of these questions can provide the elements of a taxonomy, or taxonomic scheme, a theoretical model to be applied in the History classroom that will facilitate the development of students’ abilities and knowledge while doing history and studying History. This taxonomy could become a basis for further discussion, dissemination and modification.

In this discourse, I am suggesting that when we talk of history we mean the past. This is a fundamental concern in this discourse: What is the past? According to a Year 7 student in the 1970s, the past, history, is, ‘All that has ever been done by every man and woman who ever lived’. This may appear a naïve assessment. But it is perhaps more naïve to imagine that history, when defined as the past, is anything less. When we consider the past, we need to be aware of certain characteristics. We can establish certain substantial truths about the past, but the past is transient. It has passed. It is gone and is not able to be fully recovered. There has been an unimaginable myriad of events and happenings, biological, geological and celestial, at micro and macro levels, since the beginning of ‘Time’, or as the ‘Big’ or ‘World’ historians would have it, since the ‘Big Bang’. This would suggest that it is naïve to imagine that we can ever effectively recover the past or, it follows, know the past.

There are vestiges, raw materials from the past, that survive. We have artefacts, documents, traditions, ruins, remnants, accounts, all of which are sources of evidence from which we can attempt a partial reconstruction of the past, of history, but the very nature of history means that any particular investigation will be based on an incomplete data set. This makes prediction and explanation, even description, problematic. There is no implication in this definition that historians waste their time, are wasting their time, when they attempt a reconstruct of the past, but attempts to formulate ‘laws’ are problematic or to argue that there is a definitive meta-narrative available from the past, or to attempt to predict ‘thresholds’ is, I think, both naïve and misleading.
This paper does not suggest that historians should not seek to know about the past, even to seek truth. The great achievement of the Greek Historian Herodotus was that he showed that it was possible to recover some of the past. According to prevailing Greek philosophy only the eternal, the unchanging, could be known, and, the reasoning concluded, since the past is transient, changing, it could not be known (Collingwood, 1961). By questioning his sources and identifying evidence of the past, Herodotus pioneered an approach to the recovery of the past. By showing that it was possible to recover some of the past, some of history, he invented History. What is recovered will always be conjectural and in most cases not able to be demonstrated, although some experimental archaeology does allow simulation. Recovery of the past will be based on interpretation and therefore will be problematic, and likely to be disputed. Historians and History educators should never lose sight of these truths about the past, about history, about the epistemology of historical knowledge and of History because they are the essence of history and of what we want our students to do when they study History in the classroom. The awareness of the epistemological dialectic is the essence of historical consciousness. This epistemological dilemma had its genesis when Herodotus first reconstructed history from the evidence that he had uncovered by interrogating, analysing and evaluating sources and when, as a consequence he invented ‘istoria. The cultural phenomenon often called the ‘history wars’ had its genesis when a contemporary, Thucydides, challenged the motivation and methodology of Herodotus. A brief consideration of this first history ‘war’ will be enlightening for the purposes of this paper. It will frame the further discussion of the epistemological dilemma that all historians face.

The first ‘history war’

Thucydides does not mention Herodotus by name, but when, in The Peloponnesian War, he made reference (Thucydides, Bk 1.22) to his decision to rely only on what we would call primary sources, only on what he observed himself or was told by eyewitnesses, it is generally accepted that this is a lightly veiled criticism of Herodotus’s inquiry methodology (Finley, 1972) and, particularly of what was seen as Herodotus’s failure to properly interrogate his sources (Thucydides, Bk 1.20). Herodotus’s stated intention was to ‘record the traditions of the various nations just as I
heard them related to me’ (Herodotus, Bk 11, 123). His *Researches* was a reconstruction of the past. While Thucydides (Bk 1.22) cites two examples of errors derived from this methodology there are numerous instances in the *Researches* where Herodotus made judgements about the evidence that he had gleaned from his questioning, from his ‘sources’ (Bk. 11.3, 11.20, IV. 109, V. 57, V1. 137, V11. pp. 152ff).

It is suggested that Thucydides has obliquely acknowledged his debt to Herodotus by making it obvious that he has read his work (Finley, 1972) but his criticism reveals a very significant difference in the methodology and intentions of each historian. This difference reveals something fundamental about the nature of history and of History. Herodotus collected his data from various sources. He very often named them and usually made some judgement about their reliability or authenticity. He did not discard data that he felt was inaccurate or misinformed because that would have been contrary to his stated aim (Bk 11.123). He was not selecting evidence to construct History, a narrative of the past. He was conducting an ‘inquiry’ based on the principle that he ‘ought to repeat what is said’ by his sources (Burns, 1972, p.29) and, incidentally, what resulted from that inquiry was a perspective-laden chronological narrative that reflected what his sources felt or believed about the past. In this sense Herodotus was “doing history” by reconstructing an account of the past, a History, from the evidence available in his sources.

Thucydides operated differently. He did not name his sources. He made it very clear that when dealing with sources and evidence that he was being selective (Bk. 1.22f), based on his analysis and appraisal of the evidence from his sources. He was selectively constructing History, an account of the past, from the evidence he chose from his sources. As a result he claimed to have discovered *aletheia*, the ‘truth’. An historian might ask immediately, ‘Whose ‘truth’?’ Herodotus does not seek or claim to have found the truth. There is a fundamental difference here in the aim of doing history and the writing of History, and it has existed from the outset of the practice of the discipline.

My own experience of being the subject of History during the history war in NSW in the late 1990s made me aware that the writing of History is problematic. In this case three ‘historians’ interviewed me and were given access to my personal archive of HTA
NSW correspondence. The result was one account positively inclined to the HTA NSW cause and my conduct, one negative, and one that appeared not to have listened to me at all, and even confused me with myself by quoting me both by name and then anonymously as a past President of HTA NSW (Clark, 2002; Harris, 2004; Hilferty, 2004). One thing these accounts had in common was that the writers each claimed in their discourse to know what I was aiming to do and why. In essence they each claimed to know what I was thinking and why I was thinking it! Each had discovered their ‘truth’ about my actions and my motivation. Essentially each was wrong! This experience supports the contention of some, that seeking the ‘truth’ in doing history and writing History, can be a self-fulfilling endeavour (Collingwood, 1961; Taylor, A.J.P., 1963; Parkes, 2011).

By reporting what he was told Herodotus produced a multi-perspective History without any claim to writing the definitive master narrative or discovering the truth. An historian might conclude from Herodotus that there are a number of possible ‘truths’ in the account of any set of events, depending on your perspective. It is likely, in the terms of recent discourse, that Herodotus would be labelled a post-modernist, or a deconstructionist, because of this relativist approach. Thucydides on the other hand, claims to have used reasoning and judgement to sift through his evidence and find the definitive account, the one truth, about the events he is reporting. In this sense Thucydides is more like a modern ‘scientific’ historian. He could be labelled as a modernist. The problem with such labelling of historians is obvious in this situation, from the beginnings of History. A more useful labelling of these first historians might be to suggest that their intention sets them apart from each other. It could be argued that Herodotus was attempting to reconstruct the past, that is to report history, what was known about the past. Hence he includes ‘tales’ and represents multiple perspectives. Thucydides has written about the past based on his judgement and selection. He has discarded any evidence of the past, from the past, that he has judged not to be important or significant. It is a single perspective, his version. He has constructed the past. He has written a History. At least one well-known researcher has suggested that what Thucydides did was ahistorical and not an appropriate use of history (Collingwood, 1961). In a very real sense both narratives become artefacts of their time, and are of course, the beginnings of historiography.
But more importantly in the terms of this paper this initial difference in intention and product of the earliest historians frames the discourse that will emerge about the dialectic inherent in the epistemology of history. What students should learn is, how we know rather than what we know. They should learn that all historical knowledge deserves critical scrutiny because of this dialectic. They do not have to take sides, but they should be aware that there are sides, or perspectives, in any historical discourse. It is from this epistemological awareness and with this critical disposition that students will become historically conscious and, begin to think historically as a result of doing history and studying History.

A taxonomy for the classroom teacher of History

What follows is the series of questions that I have asked and then endeavoured to answer in order to discover a context for and to frame thinking and theorizing about history and History. These are arranged in an hierarchy that is suggestive of a taxonomy of ‘operations’ for historical inquiry. A ‘growth’ or building analogy frames the discourse around the thinking and theorizing of this study. This seems very apt, because it best reflects the development of the various elements of historical thinking. For most students it will be a ‘learning curve’. I think this is what teachers should plan for rather than expecting ‘eureka’ moments. The building analogy also involves having a plan of operation and some idea what the finished product should look like. It involves the use of appropriate materials and accepted processes for the construction. I could build a wall from bricks or stone blocks. The analogy of a fruit bearing plant, where the rate of growth of fruit is variable, dependent on a host of environmental factors would work. But I have chosen instead to build a classically inspired temple. As the temple is built each element, the foundation platform, lintel, pillars and pediment are shown to be essential to the maintenance and support of the structure, and thus help create and frame the cella, or inner sanctum of ‘historical thinking’, shown in Figure 3.1.
Figure 3.1: How do we build historical thinking?

The foundation platform

In the terms of this paper the foundation platform of historical thinking is built on the premise that students should study history. They should work historically with historical materials. They should inquire into history and reconstruct history (Collingwood, 1961; Booth, 1983c; Boddington, 1984; Seixas, 1999; Wineburg, 2001; Taylor, 2003; Levesque, 2009; Sheldon, 2011; VanSledright, 2014). They should start to learn the rules of the ‘game’. Hence the foundation platform of our edifice is constructed by inquiry from, and analysis of, historical sources and evidence.
To construct our foundation platform we need to consider essential concerns about the nature of history, of historical method and the work of historians. We need to explore the first of the three taxonomy discussion questions: What is History? What is the historical process? and What do historians do?

What is history?

This is the most fundamental question for teachers of History to confront, to ask their students. All students of History and doers of history should have an answer to this question. The answer(s) should determine the pedagogical choices that teachers will make at both macro and micro levels. The answer(s) will indicate to the aware teacher the level of experience with historical materials and the extent of the development of historical literacy and consequently of historical consciousness on the part of the students.
As previously argued in this paper, history is the unrecoverable past (Seixas, 1999; Taylor, 2003; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Levesque, 2009; Seixas, 2012). This is the true epistemology of history. But, as Herodotus proved, we do have remnants from the past that allow us to know the past in some ordered and understandable way. Because they contain evidence, sources from the past are the essential materials of history. This evidence is the basis of description of events, beliefs, personalities and cultures from the past (Collingwood, 1961; Burston, 1967; Booth, 1971; Peel, 1969; Turner, 1973; Elton, 1976; Shawyer, et al, 1988; Bailyn, 1994; Fines, 1994; Macintosh, 1995; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Chapman, 2005; Tupper, 2005; Wineburg, 2007; Sawyer & Laguardia, 2010; Parkes 2011).

The materials and methodology of the study of history can be established readily from this definition. When doing history the student or historian should work directly with sources to extract evidence of the past. This is a forensic process that should include the analysis and evaluation of sources and the evidence they contain as well (Collingwood, 1961; Booth, 1971; Macintosh, 1996; Husbands, 1998; Seixas & Peck, 2004; McIntyre, 2009). It can be argued that doing history is a forensic ‘science’ in the pure sense of both words. It involves building knowledge by asking questions of evidence derived from sources.

What is the historical process?

Herodotus’s work Istoria is best translated as Inquiries or Researches (Collingwood, 1961; Herodotus, Bk 1.1, Burns, 1982). This title is an important indicator of the methodology of history and the production of History. Historical methodology is a process of inquiry about the traces and remnants of the past (Elton, 1976; Lee, 1984; Evans, 1997; Parkes, 2011). This methodology involves the retrieval, selection, comprehension, interpretation, judgement, evaluation and explanation of historical sources and the evidence they contain (Collingwood, 1961; Perry, 1967; Burston, 1967; Holloway, 1967; Peel, 1967; Rogers, 1984; Macintosh, 1995; Drake, 2003; Seixas, 1998; Wineburg, 2001; McIntyre, 2009; Seixas, 2012; Sheldon, 2013). To work historically is to put the sources, and the evidence they contain, through a process of interrogation to determine their value as evidence of the past. Historians enter into a
dialogue with the past (Seixas, 2012). The investigation of evidence is a form of informed speculation. They have a set of ethics and processes for dealing with sources and evidence that constitute appropriate methodology. These processes are now described.

**What do historians do?**

It follows from above that historians seek historical evidence of the past through inquiry into sources, the residua of the past (Collingwood, 1961; Chapman, 2005; Seixas, 1999; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Wineburg, 2007; Levesque, 2009; VanSledright, 2014). They collect data and extract evidence by interrogation, in response to research questions. This data and evidence are not the facts of history. The facts of history are what the historian selects in the attempt to describe and explain the events of the past (Watts, 1972; Elton, 1976; Garvey & Krug, 1977; Cowie, 1978; Booth, 1978; Fitzgerald, 1980; Shemilt, 1980; Lee, 1984; Husbands, 1998; Wineburg, 2001; Seixas & Peck, 2004). Based on decisions about the significance of evidence, historians attempt to derive a coherent whole from past events through judgement, interpretation, evaluation and explanation (Thomson, 1967; Burston, 1967; Holloway, 1967; Peel, 1967; Rogers, 1984; Wineburg, 2001; Drake, 2003; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Levesque, 2009; Seixas, 2012).

Since the events of the past most often involve human beings, the historian is also concerned with the sub-text of events, with the motives and intentions of those who were involved in these activities. Textual, contextual and sub-textual analysis and evaluation of the evidence are applied for the purposes of authentication (Burston, 1972; Wineburg & Schneider, 2011). The questions, answers, data and evidence, are fitted together by a complex process of mutual adjustment, synthesis, to become a version of the past that can be called History and thus further builds our knowledge of the past (Collingwood, 1961; Garvey & Krug, 1977; Taylor, 2003). According to personality, the Age in which they live, and their beliefs, historians will select, omit, emphasise and interpret evidence to explain the events of the past (Holloway 1967; Booth, 1971; Macintosh, 1996; Husbands, 1998; Seixas & Peck, 2004; McIntyre, 2009). Thus because they are not objective and certain, because they are subjective and uncertain,
the product of a process of selection and interpretation, facts should be subject to critical examination (Collingwood, 1961; Coltham, 1971; Dickinson, Gard & Lee, 1978; Wineburg, 2001).

In terms of the taxonomy the understanding and awareness that the past is fragmentary, irrecoverable, contested and problematic and therefore requires critical analysis, are important elements, because this awareness of the epistemology of historical knowledge frames the entire historical process. If this were not true of history, if history, the past, was known and established to be ‘true’ then we would not need to study it. We would only need to learn it. We would not need historians. We would have an agreed meta-history for all to learn. This paper has argued that there is no such meta-history available, no established ‘truth’ of history. As a consequence, it has been argued that history needs to be investigated and actively studied in classrooms, not learned, and, the most fundamental way in which that investigation may be facilitated, has been described as a forensic inquiry process.

The load bearing pillars

Applying the forensic inquiry process, described in the previous section, will build historical knowledge. This will eventually form our lintel. It will need support. Pillars made from concepts, skills and awareness would be ideal. There are two sets of pillars supporting our taxonomy. The first set is constructed by the application of the second order process knowledge and concepts that constitute historical literacy. These will be informed and elaborated by the second set of pillars that is constructed from the context-sensitivities of historical empathy. The mechanics of the ‘game’ can be experienced and explored through the interaction of these two sets of skills, concepts, dispositions and awareness as they are used to extract and analyse evidence from historical sources. These two elements combine to frame the forensic process by which historical knowledge is built.
Next we consider the questions: What is historical literacy? What is historical empathy? These questions, and the mechanics of historical questioning and historical reasoning, are relevant to the construction of our pillars. The major concern with historical empathy is to understand the nature and exercise of the historical imagination. This paper now addresses these questions and issues.

**What is historical literacy?**

To make sense of the past historians need structural ‘tools’, a framework to guide their selection, judgement, and evaluation of evidence (Shemilt, 1980; Macintosh, 1995; Husbands, 1998; Seixas & Peck, 2004; McIntyre, 2009). This framework is best described as historical literacy, a set of competencies derived from concepts about history, and the historical process, that guide historians in their critical reading of the sub-text and context of historical sources. Historical literacy requires a deep
understanding of historical events tempered by the skills and awareness to detect the differences between the uses and abuses of history. These skills and awarenesses are essential for the development of that historical consciousness that makes historical thinking possible. They provide the structure that should shape the practice of history (Seixas & Peck, 2004; Levesque, 2009; Seixas, 2012). In this taxonomy, historical literacy is one of the twin pillars that make the construction and support of historical consciousness possible.

Historians consider the origin of information, the epistemology of the sources and evidence we have from past. Sources and evidence must be scrutinised for authenticity, relevance and reliability. The basis for valid selection of evidence is the judgement of the historian that the evidence available is authentic and reliable, and of some significance, that it matters in some way (Seixas, 2006; Levesque, 2009). While judging authenticity and reliability are logical processes of cross-referencing the judgement of significance is a form of rational speculation that enables a convincing account of the past to be put forward (Perry, 1967; Booth, 1978b; Parkes, 2011). Significance may be derived from a consideration of how important events may have been in relationship to the historical context, some recognition of impact, but also includes a measure of the importance of any single piece of evidence in the reconstruction of events and the attempt to explain the event. Significance depends upon the historian’s perspective and purpose (Booth, 1983a; Seixas, 2006; Levesque, 2009). This is the ‘So what?’ question. Often these decisions of significance will frame the discourse of the historian. The conclusions drawn by historians from sources and evidence must be subjected to logical analysis. Their account and explanation of events in the past, their History, must be critically examined (Fischer, 1971).

Historians also examine the past in terms of continuity and change over time; this includes an evaluative capacity, the recognition of progress and decline. Judgments of continuity and change, of progress and decline, can be made on the basis of comparisons between some point in the past and the present, or between two points in the past (Seixas, 2006; Levesque, 2009). These are important elements in the attempt to impose some order on the past. This concern with order is meant to be explanatory not predictive (Lee, 1984).
Historians also need to have an awareness of how power is distributed in society, of cause and consequence, to explain how things happen. People, as individuals and as groups, play a part in promoting, shaping, and resisting change (Seixas, 2006; Levesque, 2009). Human or societal agency may cause change. Again considerations of cause and effect are meant to be explanatory not predictive.

The media and public discourse are filled with explanations of cause and consequence, with descriptions of progress and decline. These need to be critically read. These second order concepts, the knowledge of the processes of history and History, are the components of historical literacy and they can facilitate that reading of the world. But the basic mechanism of inquiry that builds these concepts and dispositions remains, asking historical questions.

**What are historical questions?**

When investigating the past, historians ask basic questions such as, ‘Who?’ ‘What?’ ‘When?’ ‘Where?’ These questions can provide the data needed for reconstructing events (Perry, 1967). Eventually the questions, ‘Why?’ and ‘How?’ should also be asked for the purposes of explanation, of discovering cause and effect. Historians should also ask, ‘So what?’ This will begin the exploration of significance, which is integral to historical thinking. Historians use questions to discover not just what happened, but why it happened, not just what we know, but how we know it. They ask questions not just to know about events, but also to understand, ‘Is this important?’ This questioning separates data from evidence. There are analytical and evaluative questions about context and sub-text that historians should ask of the evidence they research. There are various regimes, heuristics, for decoding, analysing and evaluating sources. The fundamental process of history is inquiry. It follows that questions will be an important element of inquiry. Historical literacy guides the inquirer and frames the concerns that are questioned. Historical reasoning allows the data uncovered to be processed and assessed as evidence.
**What is historical reasoning?**

When interrogating, analysing and evaluating sources and evidence, historians use recognised forms of logic and reasoning. Historians use deductive reasoning when specific conclusions are drawn from generalised observations. For instance, the specific conclusion that ‘Augustus intended Rome to rival Alexandria’ might be deduced from the general observations that ‘Great Hellenistic cities, like Alexandria, were built in marble’ and, that ‘Roman buildings were transformed from brick to marble during the Augustan period’. Inductive reasoning is evident when the historian draws a generalised conclusion from specific observations. For instance, the observations that ‘Trench warfare was a response to modern weapons’, and, that ‘Trench warfare had a high mortality rate’, could lead to the generalised conclusion that ‘Modern weapons were responsible for the high mortality rate in WW1’.

Where there is a range of evidence to be explained, it has been suggested that historians also use adductive reasoning to infer, the explanation or hypothesis that would best explain all the relevant, authentic evidence (Collingwood, 1961; Booth, 1980a, 1980b). This might be termed as ‘best fit’ reasoning. This requires a form of synthesis that determines plausible explanations, thus allowing historians to find ‘answers’ that accommodate all of the available evidence (Fischer, 1971). Essentially, Booth’s research affirmed what others had suggested previously (Collingwood, 1961; Fischer, 1970), that is, reconstructing history and writing History are processes of synthesis in which all available authenticated, relevant and reliable evidence is accommodated. It follows that historians should be judged on the basis of how they deal with evidence.

This discussion of historical reasoning has been concerned with drawing inference from evidence. Inference is a fundamental element of historical inquiry. Inference requires the exercise of historical empathy based on context-sensitivity and the historical imagination. This paper will argue that historical empathy is the second of the twin pillars of historical consciousness. For History, empathy is both controversial and essential (Taylor, 2003; Cunningham, 2004; Levesque, 2009). To use sources well, they must be set in their historical contexts. Every historical source represents a perspective (Wallach, 2006). The recognition of perspective is the first, most basic ethical
consideration of the methodology of history. This argument is the subject of the discussion that follows.

**What is historical empathy?**

In this taxonomy historical empathy, the ability to view the past with judgement suspended, has been extracted from the body of concepts that make up historical literacy and accorded more importance in the development of historical consciousness. Historical empathy is a sensibility, that involves intellectually ‘entertaining’ a set of beliefs that are not your own (Boddington, 1980b; Shemilt, 1984; Ashby & Lee, 1987; Seixas, 1996; Wineburg, 2001). It is also an awareness that the past was different, and therefore cannot be judged by our contemporary ideas and standards. Historical empathy is the ultimate form of relativism because it requires perspective-taking (Wallach, 2006; Peck & Seixas, 2008).

Historical empathy recognises that there were external differences between the past and present evidenced in historical remains (Seixas, 1996). These external differences are easily illustrated and understood through artefact study, document study or site study. But there are also internal differences, differences in belief systems and worldview that may be more difficult to illustrate, to explain, and to understand (Boddington, 1980b; Shemilt, 1984; Seixas, 1996; Wallach, 2006; Henderson, Mallan & Allan, 2013). The major problem with recognition of this level of difference may be the almost unavoidable human tendency towards presentism and anachronism. Presentism has been described as our ‘natural state’ (Wineburg, 2001). Others have highlighted its existence (Burston, 1967; Seixas, & Peck, 2004). An example will help here. When studying ancient Rome it is obvious that by most modern values and standards, the Roman games, the *munera* and *venationes*, gladiatorial combat and beast ‘hunts’, would be considered barbaric and inhumane. How then should we judge the Romans? Historians could argue that in the Roman world these games were important affirmations of very basic beliefs about the universe, and the place of humans in that cosmic view. This appreciation does not excuse the actions of the past but may help explain them. It does not make the *ludi* any less abhorrent but perhaps allows us to appreciate that the Romans were not necessarily barbaric and inhumane by nature.
When historians seek to reconstruct or construct events from the past they also attempt to understand the peoples of the past, perhaps even ‘better than they understood themselves’ (Burston, 1972; Shawyer et al, 1988). This is reiterating to some extent Ranke’s concept of *wie es eigentlich gewesen*, of reporting what actually happened (Steele, 1976; Fines, 1994; Curthoys & Docker, 2006; McIntyre, 2009). Historical empathy can help overcome the general ‘historian’s fallacy’ whereby known results of an historical period are used as the structural element in the explanation of the development of those results. Hence in retrospect events are easily explained as inevitable (Fischer, 1970, p. 209). The historian should be alerted by historical empathy to appreciate that events were never inevitable in the eyes of those who lived through them. It could be argued that Thucydides committed this error of historical reporting when explaining the inevitable causes of the Peloponnesian War (Collingwood, 1961; Fischer, 1970; Hume, 1973).

The position and wisdom of hindsight can provide the historian with an opportunity for a relatively dispassionate examination of the past. Historical empathy provides both proximity and distance (Seixas, 1996; Wineburg, 2001). Armed with the advantages of not being involved at first hand and, of knowing results, the historian is able to go beyond motives and intentions, to a potentially more profound understanding than that available to a contemporary observer (Burston, 1972; Wallach, 2006).

The sources from the past must be read as a product of a particular time to bring the events of the past to life and, in doing so, to give some insight and perhaps understanding of the way people thought and acted in the past (Thompson, 1972; Taylor, 2003; Wineburg, 2007; Seixas, 2008; Wineburg & Schneider, 2010). It is historical empathy that distinguishes History from the natural sciences (Perry, 1967). It is this opportunity to gain a special insight into the affairs of human beings that is the basis for the variously expressed belief that the study of History should have an important place, perhaps an unique place, in an adolescent’s education (Collingwood, 1961; Burston, 1972; Turner, 1973; Tabart, 1976; Dickinson, Gard & Lee, 1978; Skilbeck, 1979; Shemilt, 1980; Rogers, 1984; Young, 1991; Marchetto, 1994; Wineburg, 2001; Taylor, 2003; Seixas & Peck 2004; Barton, 2005; Levesque, 2009; Taylor, Fahey, Kriewald & Boon, 2012), VanSledright, 2014). Advocates of the study
of History would claim that no other subject in the school curriculum provides such opportunities to gain insight into the doings, beliefs, joys and despairs of human beings.

While this paper argues that historical empathy is the most essential element of historical consciousness, it also argues that it is likely to be the last element to develop because it involves emotional maturation, moving from egocentricity to sensitivity (Black, 1977). This paper also argues that historical empathy is likely to be most difficult to engender, because it requires a context-sensitive imagination (Sawyer & Laguardia, 2010). Context-sensitivity is the essential element that allows historical literacy to be expressed as historical consciousness, and brings the historian closest to understanding the past (Lee, 1984). Empirical and anecdotal studies have shown that historical empathy develops with systematic teaching and classroom experience designed to encourage its development (Shemilt, 1976; Boddington, 1984; Ashby & Lee, 1984; Taylor, 2003; Wineburg, 2007; Taylor et al, 2012).

The events of history are past and therefore not available for observation. As a result in many cases the judgement of the historian is based upon informed speculation. From an analysis of the evidence and its context using both reasoning and inference, the historian, clothes the events of the past and fills in the gaps that exist in the narrative of human experience (Collingwood, 1961; Burston, 1972; Parkes, 2011; Epstein, 2012). This combination of reasoning and inference, the historical imagination is described next.

**What is the historical imagination?**

It has been argued that all past events have to be imagined (Collingwood, 1961; Burston, 1967; Elton 1976; Lee, 1984; Evans, 1997; Levesque, 2009). When making inference about the past, from the evidence of the past, historians are forced to use their historical imagination (Collingwood, 1961; Lee, 1984; Levesque, 2009). This is not to say that they exercise their ‘fancy’. The historical imagination is structural not ornamental. It must be grounded in evidence and based on analysis of context to allow the synthesis that is the act by which history is reconstructed and, by which History is constructed (Collingwood, 1961; Burston, 1972; Turner, 1973; Booth, 1980a; Levesque, 2009; Wineburg & Schneider, 2011), but there are likely to be gaps in any
attempted narrative of the past. The logical consideration of historical context, that is historical imagination, is needed to see the possibilities that may lie in the evidence to fill the gaps (Peel, 1967; Elton, 1976; Levesque, 2009). For instance, we are told in a written source from the second century CE that on a particular day in 49 BCE Julius Caesar was at the Rubicon River. Some days later certain towns of northern Italy swore allegiance to Caesar. Eventually he arrived in Rome itself. We can logically conclude that he had travelled through, or near these towns, and may be able to infer an itinerary, an imaginative reconstruction of his progress to Rome.

This combination of evidence and imagination is an important means by which historians reconstruct history and construct History, and thus build on our knowledge of the past. An immersion in the past is fundamental to the study of history (Burston, 1972; Shemilt, 1984; Seixas, 1996; Evans, 1997; Levesque, 2009) and, an emotional commitment, a disposition to contextualise for the integrity of the past, is required for historical imagination to function as valid historical thinking (Booth, 1978b; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Wineburg & Schneider, 2011). As this suggests, when reaching conclusions, or seeking explanations based on the available evidence, historians use a combination of historical reasoning and their gap-filling historical imagination. In this sense representing history requires both heart and head (Wineburg, 2001).

The lintel – what completes the framing of our edifice?

The historical process, the exercise of historical literacy and historical empathy, generates historical knowledge. This knowledge is an essential prerequisite, perhaps a fulcrum, for the application of the developing critical skills and awareness implied in historical consciousness. As they interact with sources bringing, to bear their developing historical literacy and context-sensitivity, to identify and authenticate evidence, students will produce their own version of the past. This historical knowledge, the reconstructed or constructed account of the past, is what this taxonomy calls History. The knowledge that is generated, and the process by which it is attained by students, are necessary for the development of the state of mind we call historical consciousness. By being involved first hand, like historians, in the generation of historical knowledge, of History,
students are more likely to gain some insight into the epistemological dilemma that must be appreciated to become historically conscious.

What is historical knowledge?

The prominence given to historical knowledge in this taxonomy should satisfy the concerns of those who lead the discourse of derision in the arenas of the media and public debate, because it properly recognises the complexity of historical knowledge. To say that historical knowledge is open to interpretation, that it is contestable, does not diminish the importance of historical knowledge (Phillips, 1998). Historical knowledge remains the fulcrum of pedagogy. Critical analysis is enhanced by the quality and extent of background and contextual knowledge (Shemilt, 1980a, p.24; Wineburg, 2001, p. 150). But there is a concern here for two elements, or aspects, of historical knowledge, both historical content and historical process (McIntyre, 2009; Roberts, 2010; Parkes,
This dual knowledge is required if studying a discipline (Bruner, 1962; Kalantzis & Cope, 2008). In the discipline of History this has been expressed in terms of learning about History, and, learning from history (Shemilt, 1976; Phillips, 1998; Wineburg, 2001).

The acquisition of historical content knowledge should not be an end in itself. Content knowledge without critical awareness has been described as ‘blindness’ and a ‘void’ (Cowie, 1978, pp. 6f). All historical knowledge should be acquired with the understanding that it is not definitive. It has been understood for a long time that there is no meta-narrative that everyone need know (Burston, 1967). Nonetheless, historical content knowledge remains a prerequisite for the effective interrogation of sources and the collection of evidence (Shawyer et al, 1988; Larsson, Mathews & Booth, 2004). Historical knowledge is an essential element in both the application of historical method, and the development of historical consciousness, because it is the vehicle for confronting issues in history (Phillips, 1980; Shawyer et al, 1988; Wineburg, 2001; Larsson, Mathews & Booth, 2004; Seixas & Peck, 2004).

**What is History?**

In this paper History is any attempt to reconstruct or construct the past. In that sense it is an account of some area or element of our knowledge of the past (Seixas, 1999). This definition is not confined to the end product of the endeavours of historians as they attempt a recovery of the past by sifting and sorting to make sense of the evidence of the past. It includes any discourse about the past (Husbands, 1998). Hence the term History is also used in this paper to describe what is taught in classrooms and lecture theatres as well. In this paper the syntactical differentiation between history and History is not a matter of pedantry. It is an attempt to delineate the raw materials of the historian, history, from the finished product, the discourse, History.

There is no definitive History. History represents the historical knowledge that was known or accepted at the time of its writing. In this sense it is the product of the forensic process outlined above in the elements of the taxonomy. History is the meaning that historians glean from the remnants of the past, and becomes the means by which our knowledge of the past is ordered or packaged (Elton, 1967; Hume, 1973; Dickinson,
Gard & Lee, 1978; Wineburg, 2001; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Seixas, 2008). It follows from the taxonomy that History will always be selective, personal and biased (Booth, 1971; Cowie, 1978; Husbands, 1981; Lee, 1984; Shawyer et al, 1988). This paper argues that it follows from this that History is the product of, or an artefact from, the time in which it was written (Smith, 2012).

How and why historians write History has been the subject of recent discourse in response and reaction to ‘post-modernism’ (Elton, 1967; Evans, 1998; Curthoys & Docker, 2006; Parkes, 2012). This taxonomy suggests that the nature of history and of historical sources and evidence almost predicate a post-modern relativist approach to doing history. There is a perspective available in every source. Objectivity has been described as a ‘modernist trick’, historiography as a ‘constant conversation’ with the past (Smith, 2012, p.323). The raw materials of history make labelling its processes problematic.

It is recognised that historical methodology is not fool proof (Holloway, 1967; Fischer, 1971; Kuhn, 1972; Wineburg, 2001; Seixas & Peck, 2004). Presentism and anachronism distort attempts to know the past, therefore the context of past actions must be explored and, an attempt made to understand the world from the perspective of those involved (Booth, 1971; Wineburg, 2001; Seixas & Peck, 2004). Immersion in the past is one means by which anachronistic and presentist moral judgements may be avoided.

The lack of a permanent moral compass in the past concerns some historians. Some have railed against the perception that post-modernism and relativism are inherent in the raw materials of history (Elton, 1967; Evans, 1998). The events of the past are particular to their context and that includes their morality. Attempts to see the world from the perspective of the people of the past should not be considered a means by which their actions are justified or excused but should be seen as a means by which the actions of the past are explained or understood.

An interesting perspective on post-modernism is provided by Smith when he claims that ancient historians were not as ‘traumatically challenged’ by post-modernism and the ‘literary turn’ as were their modern counterparts (2012, pp. 316ff). He suggests that they
are less positivist and more aware, perhaps, of the relativist nature of the evidence of the ancient past, because they were more used to dealing with the implications of tropes (White, 1975) from the ancient world because of their familiarity with the problems of translation and the contexts of ancient texts. They also deal increasingly with the ‘untapped archive’ of archaeological and scientific discoveries and that requires constant revision of their knowledge of the ancient past and their versions of ancient History (Smith, 2012). These circumstances may combine to produce a more relativist, a more epistemologically aware, attitude and approach to history.

If generating historical knowledge produces History then all who engage in this exercise deserve the label of historian. The implications of this premise will be explored in the next section.

**Who are historians?**

In the terms of this paper anyone who attempts to bring meaning to, to make sense of, and to extend our knowledge of the past by using historical evidence can claim to be an historian (Elton, 1967; Jurd, 1981; Lee, 1984; Shawyer et al, 1988; Fines, 1994; Bailyn, 1994; Husbands, 1998; Wineburg, et al, 2006; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Parkes, 2011). This definition will include academics working in universities, professionals working in museums, libraries, political offices, schools and elsewhere. It will also include self-publishers, amateur genealogists, Internet crackpots, and of course, feature filmmakers. We should not dismiss any History. The best response to concerns about good or bad History is to subject the historical methodology that produced it to critical assessment and judgement. Does the historical methodology hold up under scrutiny? For instance, a decision to give significance only to the evidence that suits a particular construction of the past, is the hallmark of a poor historian. In historical terms this is unethical.

In this age of social and other media, the claims and accounts of all who put themselves forward as historians need to be subjected to the same critical scrutiny. This paper argues therefore, that the accumulation of historical knowledge is an important aspect of a critical reading of history and History. There is general agreement that the disposition to critical reading of historical and historicised materials requires a good working knowledge of history and History (Collingwood, 1961; Little, 1983; Seixas, 1999;
Levesque, 2009; Wineburg, 2001; Smith, 2012; VanSledright, 2014). These dispositions to exercise historical consciousness and historical thinking, are important to the personal development of the students in our classrooms. These two elements and their relationship will be considered next.

The pediment – what crowns our edifice?

**Figure 3.5: The pediment – historical consciousness**

In this taxonomy historical consciousness is a state of mind that predisposes students to recognising and understanding the essential dialectic that is at the core of the epistemology of history and History. The research suggests that this awareness will develop as students are taught how to do history and study History.

**What is historical consciousness?**

Historical consciousness is a state of mind that predisposes historians to recognise and understand the essential characteristics of the past, of history. The awareness that the past and accounts of the past must be subjected to critical scrutiny because of their
origin, is the historical consciousness that this paper has consistently addressed. Historical consciousness can be defined as a sense of the past and, of the fundamental role that history plays in our lives, our society and our culture (Roberts, 2011). But historical consciousness also needs to include a sense of the incompleteness, and the fundamental epistemological challenges of history and historical materials. The awareness that the past, and its representations, are not the same is fundamental to historical consciousness (Bailyn, 1994).

As the elements of this taxonomy demonstrate, historical consciousness requires the concurrent development of historical literacy and historical empathy. These vital elements need to be framed by, the acquisition of historical knowledge, contextual and factual, as well as procedural. Evidence from research since the 1970s in Australia, Canada, UK and USA indicates that these elements are developed and acquired in a systematic fashion. They must be taught, and experienced, systematically and explicitly (Collingwood, 1961; Apple, 1976; Shemilt, 1984: Boddington, 1984; Seixas, 1999; Wineburg, 2001; Taylor, 2003; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Larsson, Mathews & Booth, 2004; Levesque, 2009; VanSledright, 2014). They are ‘taught not caught’.

Historical consciousness allows students to exercise historical thinking, to critically confront and read the alternative, historicized world curriculum of GOOGLE and, the I-world that awaits them outside the classroom (Seixas, 1993; Seixas, 1999; Wineburg, 2001; Barton, 2005; Wineburg, 2007; Levesque, 2009; Seixas, 2012). In this sense it should be considered a life skill because of its connection to historical thinking. The nature and exercise of historical thinking, the ultimate goal of this taxonomy, is discussed next.
The dynamic, organic building process that this taxonomy has attempted to describe and demonstrate culminates with historical thinking, the habit of mind to pause and read the world critically.

**What is historical thinking?**

Historical thinking is a disposition or ‘habit of mind’ (Seixas, 2008, p.280). It is a critical facility based on the skills and concepts that develop as historical literacy and historical empathy, and, on the awareness of the epistemology of history that comes with historical consciousness (Gosden & Sylvester, 1968; Shemilt, 1980; Chapman, 2005; Seixas, 2006; Wineburg, 2007; VanSledright, 2014). Historical thinking requires a critical response when engaging or being engaged by historical or historicized materials. Historical thinking is a form of critical literacy that can enable students to
read the historical world around them. The basic concepts that are the elements of historical thinking can help make sense of the past (Taylor, 2003; Peck & Seixas, 2008) and are detailed above as historical literacy.

Historical thinking can be informed and facilitated by the recall of historical facts, but historical thinking is more than factual recall (Levesque, 2005; Chapman, 2005; Seixas, 2006; Levesque, 2009; Smith, 2012; VanSledright, 2014). Without understanding, historical knowledge becomes little more than trivia (Cowie, 1978; Lee, 1984; Wineburg, 2001; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Wineburg, 2007). Historical thinking also requires more than just being aware of the historical world that we inhabit. Historical thinking is a form of reasoning based on a raft of skills and awarenesses that constitute developing concepts about the nature of history and the nature of History. This critical disposition, and the skills and awareness developed through historical literacy, historical empathy and historical consciousness will enable students to better read their world (Collingwood, 1961; Wineburg, 2007).

The next section of this paper will summarise and offer a brief identification, and discussion of the implications for classroom practice from this taxonomy. It will describe the elements that can be derived from this taxonomy for guiding classroom activity. These it will be argued should be the basis of the pedagogy of doing history and studying History.

**Summary: Pedagogical and classroom implications**

The article has presented a taxonomy and, in so doing has proposed that it may be used as a pedagogical framework for teachers and students as they are involved in doing history and studying History. Questions then arise as to what this taxonomy might look like in the context of practice where students do history and study History and how might it be translated into classroom practice. These questions can be answered in three ways. The first, is through a reaffirmation of the conceptual framing and underpinning of the taxonomy. The second, is through a repositioning of the student dispositions and pedagogical processes that are at the core of the taxonomy. The third, is through a consideration of the activities that students should undertake in the History classroom.
Concepts underpinning the taxonomy

From the discussion and evolution of the taxonomy in the previous sections, the following broad conceptions of history and History emerge:

- The raw materials of history are sources from the past.
- The methodology of history is inquiry.
- Historical inquiry requires interrogation, analysis and evaluation of sources.
- Historical inquiry seeks to recover authentic and reliable evidence from the sources of the past.
- Historical evidence must be processed in a rational and ethical fashion.
- Historical evidence is the raw material of History.
- History, any record of the past, should be subject to critical evaluation.
- History, any representation of the past, should be based on these precepts and procedures.
- The aim of doing history and studying History is to develop historical thinking.

Dispositions and pedagogical processes in the taxonomy

The conceptions outlined above play out through student dispositions that form the goals of History teaching, and the core of History pedagogy.

- Historical thinking is a habit of mind predicated by awareness of the epistemology of history, by historical consciousness.
- Historical consciousness is a state of mind born of the skills of historical literacy and the sensitivities of historical empathy.
- The development of historical literacy and historical empathy requires reasoned analysis of, and informed inference from historical materials.
• Pedagogy should be based upon acquiring knowledge about the processes of history and knowledge of History from historical materials.

• The pedagogy of doing history and studying History should be inquiry based.

Importantly, these concepts and dispositions can be developed through challenging, engaging and authentic pedagogy that embeds guided inquiry in classroom activities.

**Classroom activities**

To recapitulate, this paper has argued that the essential activity of an historian is inquiry that involves extracting evidence from historical sources.

Consequently it suggests that in the History classroom:

• Students should learn through inquiry, by asking questions about historical materials, about sources, about evidence and about the past. This is a critical activity that involves interrogation, analysis and evaluation. Guided inquiry needs to be mediated by the teacher involving, among other things, heuristics and analysis schemes that require explicit instruction through modelling, demonstration and scaffolding to give students opportunities, and experiences of using their imagination in historical ways (Booth, 1987; Wineburg, 2001; Drake, 2003; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Communique, 2009).

• Students should apply historical questions, in forensic interrogation of sources for text and sub-text. Students should work with and experience directly the remnants and residua of the past, with the whole range of sources available, material, oral, written, visual and digital (Seixas, 1996, pp.766f; Levesque, 2009; McIntyre, 2009, pp. 7ff). By reconstructing history and constructing History from these materials students should also build awareness of the epistemological characteristics of history, and thus develop both historical content knowledge, and historical consciousness.
• Students should study History, as the product of the historical process. Accounts of the past must be interrogated with the skills of historical literacy and empathy, that allow historical consciousness, and hence historical thinking.

• Students should do history and study History, not learn History. History should not be a mimetic subject where the knowledge of the past is replicated or rehashed (Tupper, 2005; Kalantzis & Cope, 2008).

• Students should be involved in creating new knowledge, their own version of the past. Wineburg’s assertion that the only way to understand ‘the past’s multiplicity is by the direct experience of having to ‘tell it’, by having to ‘sort through the contradictions in the past and produce a story written by our own hand’ (2001, p.131), supports the proposition of this paper that students will learn about history and History by engaging with historical materials in the classroom, by doing history, by studying and writing History.

In conclusion, the taxonomy and associated concepts, dispositions, processes and classroom activities do not mean that students will be expected to be ‘historians’, but they can replicate and practise the processes that are inherent in the discipline that is taught as History in secondary schools. It won’t be entirely ‘real’ History perhaps. What makes it not real, is the intervention and mediation of the teacher who is repositioned as the designer of the practical exercises, provider of the materials and equipment, and, teacher of the processes. What might well be real, nonetheless, are the challenging, engaging and authentic classroom activities that teachers and students are involved in while doing history, and studying History.
### PROJECT 2: ARTEFACTS AND HISTORICAL EMPATHY

There are two chapters in Project 2. Chapter 4, *Using artefacts to teach historical empathy*, is a conference paper that discusses and illustrates classroom practices which demonstrate that heightening student empathy for the people of the past can make a considerable contribution to the development of historical consciousness and hence historical thinking. Chapter 5, *Artefact analysis in the classroom: Some resources and pedagogy*, is a discussion of resources and the pedagogy I have designed and created to encourage the use of context-sensitive artefact analysis in the History classroom.

This project is a culmination of the professional, theoretical and pedagogical processes described in Chapter 1 and, is located within the taxonomy for teaching History and doing history that has been introduced in Project 1. This study has argued that historical empathy is the essential element that predicates the raft of concepts and awarenesses that make up historical literacy, historical consciousness and historical thinking. The resources and the pedagogy discussed are direct responses to this argument.
CHAPTER 4: USING ARTEFACTS TO TEACH HISTORICAL EMPATHY

I originally delivered this chapter as a conference paper, *Reading sub-text from artefacts*, at a conference for museum educators and classroom teachers, *Teaching Archaeology to Kids, in and Out of the Classroom*, held at the Big Dig Archaeology Centre, The Rocks, Sydney, on 27-29 May 2012. There were two parts to the presentation. In the first session I delivered a theoretical paper in which I situated artefact analysis and historical empathy in the context of developing historical consciousness and historical thinking by demonstrating, from my own practices as museum educator and classroom teacher, the potential for establishing context-sensitive data and evidence, sub-text, from artefacts. In the second session I was involved in a ‘speed dating’ exercise, where I briefly demonstrated with artefacts the practices that I had introduced earlier, to nine different groups of educators who visited my table, for 10-15 minutes each time. These sessions were videoed and posted on the Internet.

Subsequently, I was asked to expand my presentation to include some examples from the ‘speed dating’ presentations for publication. In particular I was asked to use mainly ‘modern’ artefacts as my examples in this paper, to demonstrate that these strategies for using archaeological materials were not confined to Ancient History classrooms. The expanded paper has been accepted for publication and is with the editor.

The paper follows as the subject of this chapter. Details of the conference and the abstract can be accessed at http://teacharchaeology.com/abstract/denis-mootz/).

USING ARTEFACTS TO DEVELOP HISTORICAL EMPATHY

The 21st century digital revolution may be challenging, even daunting, for most digital ‘immigrants’ (Prensky, 2001) but more importantly it should have signalled a fundamental change to the classroom focus for History teachers. No longer do we need to concentrate on teaching our students how to find information. We need to focus our pedagogy on teaching them what to do when the information finds them, on how to deal with the inevitable expansion of the Internet or, perhaps ‘Infinet’ (Mootz, 2010). They
will need to be aware of, and alert to, the ‘black spots’ awaiting them on the ‘information super-highway’. They will need to be historically conscious and equipped with the skills of historical thinking. Historical thinking is the product of historical consciousness, the interplay of the elements of historical literacy and historical knowledge. However the essential element that makes historical consciousness possible is the affective skill of historical empathy, the ability to see the world through the eyes of the people of the past, or to walk in their shoes.

Teaching students to read the sub-text of an artefact can open a powerful window into the world of the people of the past and contribute substantially to the development of this all-important empathic awareness. This is easily done in the classroom by the compilation of an ‘objects’ box. A collection of real and facsimile objects from the past will allow you to simulate the processes by which archaeologists examine evidence of the past.

Recent comments in a journal devoted to integrated studies (Gilbert, 2012) questioning the role of History in the school curriculum should make teachers of History aware that the struggle to keep History as a separate discipline in schools continues. While the reactions of the various state affiliates of the History Teachers’ Association of Australia to the introduction of a discrete History syllabus was very positive and continues to be so, at the jurisdictional level, in the context of influence, it is becoming increasingly obvious that integrated studies still have a very firm hold on the thinking of bureaucrats and educational policy makers.

This resurgence of support for some form of integrated studies is further illustrated by the continuing use by Australian Curriculum, Assessment and reporting Authority (ACARA) spokespeople of the term ‘humanities’ when referring to History in presentations across Australia. This usage is undoubtedly designed to quieten the concerns of the many conservative teachers in those states where History was subsumed by integrated studies such as Social Studies and SOSE in the 1970s. At a briefing for teachers conducted by the Professional Teachers’ Council of NSW in 2012 the audience of teachers was told that the inclusion of History in the first four ‘foundation’ subjects for the National Curriculum, as it was then called, should not be taken as a sign that
History had been accorded any ‘special’ status in the planned curriculum for schools. This is certainly not the impression that was given to the community generally and to History teachers and educators particularly at the beginning of the process. The same bureaucrat, now promoted to manage the operations of ACARA, has been at some pains since to show how the new *Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus* can be effectively integrated with existing Geography and Civics and Citizenship syllabuses. In the light of this practice it is hard to fathom his more recent statement in response to the History Teachers’ Association of Australia (HTAA) President’s expression of concerns about developments at the national level that it is not ACARA’s job to promote any ‘particular pedagogy’.

During my 40 years of History teaching in NSW schools there has always been a clear understanding that History makes a contribution to the development of the ‘whole’ student. This argument has been inherent in the rationales that have prefaced syllabus documents since the 1970s. In particular there is a belief that teaching and learning History provides students with experiences that develop particular transferable cognitive and affective skills; ways of thinking that may not be developed in other subjects. I know from my experience as Chair of the Board of Studies Curriculum Committee for History from 1998 to 2002 that it was an anecdotal report of ‘research’ evidence to this effect from an academic that convinced the Office of the Board of Studies that History should have a senior ‘Extension’ course. Previously no argument from parents, teachers or the community had had any impact. But recent comment (Gilbert; 2012) on the *Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus* has asked whether there is any evidence that what is set down to be taught will deliver the results claimed for History in the philosophical statements that preceded and informed formulation of the syllabus. Many History teachers may ask the same question. This could be perceived as a challenge being laid down for History teachers. If we want to meet this challenge, to prove that History education means more than performing a chronological survey of past events, or more than transmitting some prearranged version of the past, then History teachers need to be very certain about what they are doing in the classroom and why they are doing it. Ensuring that History classrooms develop historical thinking may provide the answer to this fundamental challenge and, provide justification for History in the school curriculum.
Historical thinking

Recent research in North America (Wineburg, 2001, 2007; Seixas, 1996, 1999, 2000, 2006, 2012) should remind us that what sets apart the study of History from other subjects, is the contribution it makes to students in the area of historical thinking. Historical thinking is a form of critical literacy. It is an awareness that there is always a sub-text to the evidence we have from or of the past, a sub-text that needs to be read to allow fuller understanding of the past. Freire (1974) would recognise historical thinking as a form of critical consciousness, an educative tool that makes learners judgemental and discerning, that engages learners in questioning the nature of their historical situation. It is one of the means by which they learn to ‘read the world’ (Freire, 1974, pp. 50ff). This is one of the requirements for maintaining a democratic society.

Normally when I refer to Wineburg’s book Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts (2001), there is an outbreak of wry smiles in the audience. It sounds like a joke, but it isn’t. The whole point of Wineburg’s work is that, what he calls ‘historical’ thinking, is not something that comes naturally to human beings. It has to be learned and therefore it has to be taught. Why is historical thinking unnatural? According to Wineburg humans are not wired for historical thinking. He argues that our ‘natural state … (is) presentism’(Wineburg, 2001, p.15). This leads us to be ‘ahistorical’ naturally, to make unhistorical comparisons and make unhistorical judgements about history, about the past and about the people in the past. How do we overcome our presentism? How do we guard against it? The good news is that research since the 1980s in both the United Kingdom and North America has shown that students of just about all ages can be taught to think historically.

From the 1970s until the early 2000s Martin Booth, a History teacher and educator in England, conducted a series of projects in response to the prevailing, research based orthodoxy that school age students were not capable of historical thinking. The results of his research clearly established that students could think historically from a very early age. The ‘trick’ was to provide students with experiences from which they would learn what was required of them to do historical thinking. What he effectively showed was that earlier research by Hallam (1971) was flawed because it was conducted in
contexts where students had not been taught the skills and awareness that historical thinking requires. Concurrent with Booth’s work was the British Schools Council History Project 13-16 (BSCHP), a centrally funded initiative that produced and trialled ‘innovative’ materials for use in schools. This project was publicly reported and externally evaluated. It also reported significant evidence that children younger than previously claimed were capable of historical thinking. The common denominator was the provision of instruction in the skills required and experience with materials deemed appropriate for the particular student level. More recently Seixas (2006, 2012) and Wineburg (2001, 2007) have reinforced these findings with their work in North America.

In summary the results of the various research indicate that the development of historical thinking requires systematic and consistent teaching of the skills required, the skills of historical literacy, and also experience with appropriate materials to develop the awareness, the historical consciousness, that is necessary for historical thinking to become a natural response. A powerful counter to presentism is the development of historical empathy.

**Historical empathy**

The argument in the taxonomy (Mootz, 2010) that informs this paper is that the natural presentism of students can be mitigated by developing historical empathy, by making them empathetic to the people of the past. The taxonomy positions this as the essential element of an awareness, a sensibility if you like, that is called historical consciousness. The obvious question that follows is: consciousness or awareness of what? To read the world students need to be aware that all History, all historical narrative or discourse, deserves critical analysis and evaluation. In essence, all History deserves to be ‘read’. History is only as good as the evidence used to construct it. While this capability to ‘read’ History requires the development of what are usually called cognitive skills, it also requires the development of affective skills based on the understandings that these cognitive skills will enable. It is a common classroom tactic to hook students by connecting with the past through similarities with the present, similarities that students will recognise, but students need to see that the past is also very different from the
present. There are the obvious external differences of artefacts and technology. Trying to work out what an unfamiliar object may have been can be made very enjoyable, but it is from the internal differences, the different ‘world view’ and belief systems, that students will best profit in terms of developing an awareness of the needs, desires and motivations of the people of the past. Arguably, it is in the differences, both external and internal, that students can learn most about the past and begin to develop the affective ability to step back from their present world and begin to see the world of the past from an ‘unnatural’ but empathetic perspective.

Handling and interrogating artefacts can be a powerful means of awakening historical consciousness and historical thinking because the ensuing analysis and reflection are likely to allow the teacher to encourage the development of historical empathy. The appeal of the artefact, of an object from the past, sometimes familiar, sometimes ‘mysterious’, sometimes thousands of years old, cannot be underestimated. There is a sense of connection, a communication between like minds, between humans, when students handle something that was used by the people in the past. This hook has the potential to encourage student engagement with the artefact and with the process of interrogation and analysis. The correlation between engagement and genuine learning is significant. Beginning a topic, any topic, with artefact interrogation lessons may enhance initial and continued engagement with the topic.

The interrogation process that I normally use places an emphasis on delving into the processes of production of the artefact, identifying the fabric, determining the processes involved in the manufacture, exploring the underlying scientific and technological knowledge and understandings that are essential to this production process, or can be inferred from it. I make students aware of the complexity of ordinary things that they might normally totally ignore or brush over quickly. This interrogation process discloses the sub-text of the artefact and opens a ‘window’ onto the world of the past in a way seldom made available to students. My experience in the classroom and museum suggests that the more that students know and understand about the world of the past, the more they will be able to suspend their natural presentism and see that world, the past, on its own terms. Again the research suggests that this awareness, this empathy,
develops with systematic teaching and experience of appropriate historical materials (Boddington 1984; Shemilt 1980).

**Historical literacy**

Seixas has identified a number of elements, what I call ‘tools’, of historical literacy (Seixas & Peck, 2004; Seixas, 2006). These are concepts that imply a set of questions by which the sub-text of any document or artefact can be teased out for analysis and evaluation. In my experience awareness and understanding of these concepts will help students to assimilate historical knowledge in such a way that many of them begin to think historically. These ‘tools’ of historical literacy are discussed in turn.

**Change and continuity: Progress and decline**

While Seixas has discriminated between the concepts of continuity and change, and progress & decline I generally discuss them at the same time. I think these are essential, and related, organising concepts in studying history. They allow students to connect with the past through the seemingly familiar, and yet, by opening the past to scrutiny when the unfamiliar is encountered, they can bring us closer to the past. In the classroom they inevitably produce initial presentist responses and reactions and thus provide ideal opportunities for the development of empathy.

**Significance**

I have always answered the question, the inevitable question, from Year 9 students, ‘Why do we have to study History?’, with the answer that they will encounter History throughout their lives, and that I want them to develop the ability to say ‘Hang on!’ when someone makes an unsupported or unhistorical remark about the past. Teaching students to look at evidence, and then reflect on its importance or significance, to ask ‘So what?’ is important to their awareness. Some might say this is ‘common sense’, implying that it doesn’t need to be taught, but sense is not as common in classrooms, as often believed and, must also be modelled and allowed to develop by opportunities to reflect on the impact that any piece of evidence has on our knowledge of the past, ‘So how does this ‘new’ evidence affect what we already know?’ This is part logic, and part intuition, but again needs guidance and experience to develop. Not telling students
everything, allowing evidence to ‘leak’ out in controlled ‘doses’, forcing a rethink with each new disclosure, is a good tactic in my experience.

**Agency**

I find that a consideration of who, or what makes ‘things’ happen, or, how ‘things’ work, often accompanies the discussion of significance. Again common sense and intuition are important but agency also demands consideration of the nature of human society and human motivation. Obviously these areas are difficult for our students. We should never lose sight of the fact that most of what we ask them to do while studying history and History is beyond their experience. History is about adults and about the adult world, things of which they have only second hand experience. It is obvious to me from the media, from social interactions and, from reading some History books that many adults also find agency a challenging concept. How will students overcome their natural and understandable naivety if they are not guided, if they do not have the opportunity to experience the materials and the reflection that will raise this issue? Most learning theories suggest that learning does not occur in isolation, that deliberately, explicitly, teaching even the very complicated and difficult, improves student understanding and achievement.

**Epistemology and evidence**

Epistemology is concerned with the nature and scope of knowledge, with what knowledge is, how it is acquired, and the possible extent to which a given subject or entity can be known. This essential concept requires students to become aware that the historian is dependent on the evidence from the past for the creation of History, for, if you like, our knowledge of the past. This requires students to develop an awareness of the fragmentary nature of the evidence from the past and therefore of the historical record available to us and, it follows, of the tentative and problematic nature of any attempted reconstruction or construction of the past, or, of any historical judgement or conclusion about the past. Initially younger students may find this insistence on evidence a bit frustrating but it does not take long before they develop the mantra, ‘And what is your evidence for that?’ I think that this is the core of historical literacy. Once
the nature of historical evidence is understood, the processes of historians can be better understood and the construction of History can be better understood.

While these elements of historical literacy are treated separately in this outline, my experience is that the process of analysis is holistic. There is no element that starts or finishes the process. It is likely to be different with each artefact, or each group, with which you work. There is also no reason why the artefacts examined in this way should be ancient. I have a number of more modern artefacts that I use when teaching particular topics in Modern History as well. These are usually used slightly differently, students are usually older, more experienced, more knowledgeable, and I usually have much more specific intentions. Two examples will be enough to illustrate the use of more modern artefacts for developing historical literacy and historical empathy.

**Historical literacy and historical empathy from artefacts**

When teaching about WW1 I use a collection of memorabilia to ‘personalise’ and revitalise one of the ‘statistics’ of the conflict by making one of the war dead ‘come alive’ for students. This is based on a premise I learned from a ‘Holocaust’ educator’s course in Israel. The concern there was that because of the vast numbers involved, the individual tragedies are most often subsumed by the statistics, every victim loses, all victims lose, their humanity as a result. I feel that this is also true of WW1 and work to ensure that this is not the case.

My collection includes the service record, the medals, the notification of death, photos of the grave site, the ‘dead man’s penny’, quite a few post cards from the front to both wife and children, a photo of ‘pals’ from Ypres (‘All dead’ is hand written on the reverse), photos of the children, some wartime memorabilia such as a German ‘Gott Mit Uns’ belt decorated with buttons and badges collected in the trenches and an inscribed Bible, all from one individual soldier, my paternal grandfather. By examining, interrogating and reflecting on these items students and I construct a narrative of this soldier’s service and a profile of his life and death in the trenches.
I do this in increments. I ‘release’ the materials that allow the reconstruction of service and death, medals, ‘penny’, notification etc, first. From this material we can reconstruct a narrative of WW1, from enlistment, to training, to embarkation, to the trenches and death at Passchendaele in late 1917. Reflection on the nature of awards, official recognition and commemoration of war service, is possible also, ‘How do we explain the fact that the ‘Service’ medal and ‘Victory’ medal have different dates for the same war’? There are two different dates recorded for the soldier’s death. Ypres is spelled ‘Yres’ on the official mass produced card sent from the King! I include an official ‘field’ postcard with multiple-choice options, to be crossed out by the sender, as well.

Next I use the postcards, a number of which have salutations and messages to both wife and children from the battlefield, some with censor’s initials. Most are silk embroidered postcards made by French women and available for purchase by soldiers at the front. Some have pockets in them for smaller cards as well. They all have a ‘message’, ‘Forget Me Not’, ‘To My Loving Wife’ or ‘To My Dear Children’. Some have patriotic mottos or celebrations of significant events, ‘Entente Cordiale’, ‘Royal Horse Artillery’ and ‘R.N.’. By considering why particular cards were chosen I endeavour to take the students into the emotional and psychological concerns of this soldier. Interestingly some were chosen because his wife was ‘collecting’ them. This interrogation becomes more intense when we read and analyse the messages he wrote to his loved ones inside, and on the back of the cards. We learn the ‘pet’ names he called his infant children. The inscribed Bible with a message to his infant daughter and a discussion of why the photo from the front, from Ypres, has a pencil cross above one of the four NCOs ‘tops this off’.

Finally we look at the German belt and the various badges he collected, swapped or bought while in France. Some badges are easily identified, others not so; some are British, some French and some German. We discuss the nature of the possible war crimes that this collection implies. The implication of the motto on the buckle, God is with Us (Gott Mit Uns) usually elicits an interesting discussion. I choose a slim boy or girl to try the belt on for size. This exercise surprises them because, the belt designed to be worn over a service tunic, perhaps with greatcoat, is very small. I use this to introduce them to the concept of boy soldiers. This belt was sent home to England.
shortly before the soldier’s death in late October 1917. This raises the question of whom
the Germans were recruiting for service in 1917. This can become the springboard for
exploration of the end of the war and the reasons for Germany’s defeat.

I have the notice that was placed in the local Manchester newspaper that mentions the
grief of the soldier’s mother. I show them a photograph of his wife and children on ship
to Australia to start a new life in 1921. I also have some artefacts belonging to the
soldier’s brother-in-law, the husband of his twin sister. This second young man was
killed at the Somme in September 1916. His wife never remarried. In my experience
this reconstruction is an emotional exercise for most students. The magnitude of the
tragedy of WW1 seems to be much better appreciated afterwards. The personal
tragedies of all individuals, of their mothers, wives, siblings and children is much more
likely to be understood and appreciated. Why the people of the next generation may
have turned to ‘appeasement’ or pacifism also becomes easier to comprehend with the
empathy developed in this exercise.

The use of the ‘slow release’ or incremental method has sound basis in the theory of
source work. This guided-inquiry tactic also lends itself to interspersing the essentially
teacher-centred artefact sessions with student-centred data collection or research
periods. The conclusions about an individual soldier could become the basis for
questions about soldiers generally and hence the basis of student research. Many
students may find that their family has a similar archive available and this would open
further opportunities for personal research. Students could also be encouraged to find
and ‘adopt’ a soldier from registers such as those at the Australian War Memorial
Museum or the Commonwealth War Graves Commission, or their local War Memorial
for WW1, to become the subject of their research.

In the second example, I use a collection of German postcards from the ‘Revolution’ of
1919 and some Weimar bank notes and stamps. I use these in a similar fashion to the
WW1 memorabilia but with a different purpose. My intention here is to restore some
semblance of humanity to the German people through eliciting some empathetic
understanding of their situation when threatened by economic crisis in the late 1920s
and early 1930s. The intention of exercises designed to elicit or encourage empathy
should be to assist understanding by providing an affective insight into the context of the artefacts and those who used them. In this case it is my intention to make students aware that many Germans would have chosen Nazism over potential economic collapse that might result in Communism, because of their experiences between 1919 and 1923. This is not meant to excuse their allegiance to Nazism but does help to explain it and perhaps increase understanding of the choices made by the German population. I inherited these German postcards from a retiring colleague; one heralds the arrival of the ‘world revolution’. They show the reality of the German revolution that is often dealt with by a few sentences in school textbooks. Mass demonstrations under a ‘Red’ flag, and Freikorps firing machine guns into crowds of German communists, indicate something larger, more dangerous than most accounts recognise.

I purchased the Weimar bank notes when I saw them in a coin and stamp shop when I was buying some Japanese ‘Occupation’ money. The stamps I collected as a child without an awareness of their significance. The bank notes were mostly printed during the period of hyperinflation in Germany in 1923, but I ensured that I bought some from the earlier, more stable period. I also identified some stamps from my collection that were printed before and after this particularly hectic period in German economic history.

I introduce the 1919 postcards when beginning the topic. Interrogation and analysis of them establishes that for many Germans the communist threat would have appeared to be very real in 1919. This is gradually embedded in the context of the history of the Weimar Republic and the growing popularity and continuing activity of the German Communist Party (KPD) and what one might call a National Socialist (Nazi) response. It is not too demanding of students to be asked to answer a question such as this, ‘In these circumstances, which would you choose?’ This exercise demands consideration of change, continuity, progress and decline, significance and agency and can develop empathy for, awareness of and some understanding of, the circumstances faced by ordinary Germans. This is an affective activity. It requires something more than cognitive skills. Students are being asked to intellectually and emotionally connect to people in the past.
When dealing with the inflation crisis of 1923 I usually play a ‘game’ with students in groups that leads to our examining and interrogating the banknotes and stamps. I have the different banknotes in plain (marked) envelopes. One envelope contains a collection of stamps. I ask the first student to show the group what is in their envelope, a Mk 100 note. I tell them to assume that Mk 1.00 is equivalent to an $A1.00. I question the ‘lucky’ recipient of this windfall, ‘What could you buy?’ ‘What will you buy?’ I ask the next student to reveal the contents of the next envelope, Mk 50,000. The same questions are asked, ‘Next?’ Mk 1,000,000! The notes that follow increase in value, 10 million, 20 million, 100 million, 10,000 million (10 milliard), and finally 1 billion (1,000,000 million). Student responses become more ambitious, even grandiose, as they grapple with these increasing values.

Eventually I ask for the last envelope to be opened. The collection of stamps is arranged in order of value, some are over-stamped with new values, Mk 100, Mk 75,000, Mk 2 million, Mk 5 million, Mk 10 million, Mk 50 million and Mk 20 milliard. With each stamp we consider what we could “buy”, ‘What has happened to your wealth?’ This is reinforced with some cartoons from Weimar showing large banknotes being used as toilet paper and photographs of children building cubby houses with bricks of large denomination banknotes. The reality of hyperinflation is obvious. The feeling of loss is palpable, able to be appreciated. Further examination of the paper, the printing, the overprinting, all serve to reinforce the hectic nature of this crisis. Interrogation of what is written on the banknotes reveals that each has an expiry date after which it became worthless. This raises the issue of whether this is actually uncontrolled inflation. This is a question of significance and agency, ‘Was this controlled inflation?’ This is an entirely new ‘can of worms’! When this hyperinflation is placed in the context of rising support for National Socialism it is possible for students to overcome their natural presentism and empathise, at least a little, with the situation faced by the German people in the years after 1923.

I also have a set of German ‘Kriegs’ cards, post cards printed for use in Germany before and during WW1. Interrogation of these in a similar ‘slow release’ exercise can offer an interesting alternative perspective to our usual Anglo-French explanation of the causes
of WW1. There are broader applications of this artefact interrogation in the History classroom.

**Using an ‘Objects Box’ to teach students to read sub-text from artefacts**

I began collecting artefacts or ‘objects’ early in my teaching career. They were on display in my classroom, ‘The History Room’. I bought facsimiles from museums in Athens and Rome. When feasible I have purchased real artefacts. A number of my objects are family heirlooms, some donated by past students and their parents. I also regularly replicated ancient technology with my students. We made stone tools and cuneiform tablets; grew wheat; mummified zucchinis; made soap and cooked meals. I have collected images and video of technology and processes, weaving, sculpting, carving etc both ancient and modern from various societies in Europe and Asia. My first objects box was a cardboard archive box reinforced with duct tape. However most recently I have been using a recyclable shopping bag. Since I now use different objects for different purposes or topics, I load the bag as each situation requires.

I usually introduce the questions that set the parameters of our observation immediately students are seated, and wearing their gloves, by writing them on the nearest available whiteboard or chalkboard. I point out that the natural tendency is to want to know the answer to the third question (see below) first, but stress how important the observation process is for archaeology and attempts to reconstruct the past. For younger, perhaps less experienced students, I provide some hints in the form of scaffolding to assist them to make the basic decisions about each artefact. My emphasis upon close critical observation was reinforced in an interview I conducted with archaeologist Dr Jaye McKenzie-Clark at Pompeii in 2011. Dr McKenzie-Clarke has a background in art history, book illustration, photography, architectural drawing and ceramic production but in answer to the question of what was the most important skill an archaeologist needed she answered, ‘Observation skills’.

After a period of observation, the artefacts are passed around the table. We answer the questions through a process of ‘Q & A’ with prompting, probing and explanation as required. I have based my current socratics on a procedure originally introduced to me
when I joined the staff of the Museum of Ancient Cultures at Macquarie University but since modified by my own experience of teaching at the museum, and the workshops that I have run independently in a variety of school contexts for students Years 7 to 12.

**Question 1: What is the artefact made from? (What is its ‘fabric’?)**

- metal? (copper/bronze/lead/iron?)
- stone?
- bone?
- wood?
- pottery/ceramic?
- other?

With younger students I often collect the artefacts after the observation period and group them according to their ‘fabric’. I ask a student to choose a group for our analysis. We begin by identifying the fabric of the group and perhaps identifying differences within the group. I will also quiz them on how well they observed with questions about any decorative or other features of each artefact. With older students I usually ask them to put all artefacts in the centre of the table where all can see them. From here I ask someone to choose an artefact and identify its fabric. We then identify artefacts of a similar fabric and continue with the Q&A on each.

**Question 2: How was it made?**

- natural?
- handmade?
- machine made?
- mass produced?

There is often a good deal of quizzical body language from students when I suggest the last two possibilities. Students equate machines and production with engines. There is a whole series of ‘So what?’ situations in the analysis that follows. This is my unofficial fourth question, ‘So what does this tell us about the people of the ancient world?’ I am very keen to introduce as much information about the technology and scientific
knowledge that is obvious or implied by most of these objects. For instance, I ask, ‘What makes clay a material that will allow you to manipulate and transform into pottery and ceramics’, ‘Where would you look for clay?’, ‘How was the process of ‘throwing’ a pot discovered or invented?’, ‘How would you make a kiln or oven to bake the clay?’ ‘How do you make a fire hot enough, for long enough, to fire (bake) pottery?’, ‘How do you think such processes were discovered or invented?’ This process of questioning is repeated with artefacts made from faience, from glass, from copper, from bronze and so on.

The questions come easily. Not so the answers. But the ‘simple’ ‘unsophisticated’ people of the past are unlikely to be seen this way again. I also like to tease out the societal implications of the existence of these forms of knowledge and expertise, ‘How was there time available for people to spend their time making pots?’ ‘Who taught these skills and this knowledge?’ ‘What does mass production suggest about an economy?’ I may introduce Heron of Alexandria, Mekanikos, and his steam machines built for entertainment and allusion. The discussion of the use of analog computers in the ancient world, such as the Antikythera device, also has an impact with most students. I have even discussed Charles Pellegrino’s (2004) calculation of the likelihood of Roman space travel.

At some stage I also make students aware of how dependent they are on modern technology and explore how much they know about it. I sometimes turn off the lights and refuse to turn them on until someone tells me how to ‘make’ electricity. We sit in the dark for some time until I relent. The looks of horror elicited by contemplations when asked to consider a world without electricity, and all the i-gadgets and Apps that implies, beggar description! But it also can make students aware that they are not more sophisticated, or more knowledgeable than those in the past. I may even refer to Newton’s famous adage about the ‘shoulders of giants’ in this context. Only when these scientific and technological aspects have been covered, do I approach the question of what each artefact might be and its use.

**Question 3: What was it? What was it used for?**

- what for?
• when?
• where?
• how?
• who?
• why?

Whether doing artefact analysis, ‘hands-on’, as part of the Museum program or in the classroom, I usually select artefacts purposely to allow me to create some kind of narrative from our analysis. For instance, a Greek perfume container, aryballos, a Roman ‘soap’ container, ungentarium, and some oil lamps from Phoenicia and Egypt will allow me to describe the olive oil ‘cycle’ and its place in the everyday life of the people of the ancient past. Add an ancient ‘razor’, a strigil, and I can demonstrate bathing and grooming practices for Greeks and Romans. In this way students gain an understanding of the basic lifestyle and everyday practices of the people of the past.

They are more likely to develop knowledge and understanding, and empathy, through this exploration of daily realities than from studying great men and associated political events. Always I encourage students to reflect on what we uncover in our analysis. This is the evaluation stage. We constantly confront the most important question, ‘So what?’, ‘What does all this mean?’, ‘What have we learned?’ and ‘Has our view of the people of the past changed?’

**So what?**

In conclusion, why is developing historical empathy and historical thinking important? One example from current society may suffice. In the past 15 years I have watched and prepared study guides for 600 documentaries for the *Australian History Channel’s ‘History Classroom’*. At least half have been on Ancient History. My overwhelming impression is that these documentaries, popular History, targeting a specific non-specialist audience, are very often initiated by, or informed by, ideas and attitudes that are unnecessarily sensationalised for programming and advertising purposes. More disturbing however is the tenor, or tone, that many adopt towards the people of the past. This can best be described as misanthropic. Even when presenting ‘new’ research or discoveries, or solving an old ‘mystery’, they are most often delivered in a
condescending tone that borders on disbelief that the people of the past, the ancient past particularly, could be capable of such achievements. I have spent many valuable lessons demolishing the ahistorical constructions of successive generations of ‘pyramidiots’ and those who claim to walk in the ‘footsteps of the gods’! My most recent experience confronting the concerns expressed by young students about the impending ‘end of the world’ calculated, for 21 December 2012, only reinforced my concerns.

It is my contention that historical empathy, the awareness of the differences and similarities between the past and the present, is the essential element that transforms historical literacy into historical consciousness, and further, that historical consciousness is what makes historical thinking possible. This process of opening the sub-text of artefacts can help younger students to begin to see the world through the eyes of the people of the past. It may help to break down the presentism and the ‘contempt’ for the people of the past often exhibited by younger students. In particular it may guard against the impact of misguided popular History. Generally the development of the ‘Hang On!’ response mechanism, and the ‘So what?’ question, should better equip students to ‘read’ their world by applying the historical thinking learned through artefact analysis.
In Chapter 5, it is argued that the development of historical empathy is the essential element of the taxonomy outlined in Chapter 3. I argue that by finding ways to develop affective awareness and ability to ‘read’ the past from the perspective of those who experienced it, we can assist students to overcome their natural tendency to presentism. By overcoming their ‘contempt’ for the people of the past, we may begin the process of developing historical thinking.

Different ways are suggested in which artefacts can be used to encourage the development of historical empathy. This is demonstrated in a series of student worksheets or work cards that are designed for use in the History classroom for artefact analysis. Lastly, I describe and discuss a classroom activity that demonstrates another context in which empathy can be developed. This discussion considers the efficacy of hands-on history strategies introduced in Chapter 4. This discussion is located within the taxonomy for teaching and studying History and doing history that has been introduced in Project 1.

This study argues that historical empathy is the essential element that predicates the raft of concepts and awarenesses that make up historical literacy, historical consciousness and historical thinking. The resources and pedagogy discussed are direct responses to this argument. What follows is a theoretical discussion and argument that frames the resources that I have prepared for classroom use.

The most crucial criticism of the utilitarian use of history in integrated subjects is that integration often means that the essential core of history, its methodology, is lost, submerged or left behind, as history is reduced to a few dates or facts as context for a study of society or government (Booth, 1971; Young, 1991; Taylor, 2000; Taylor, 2007; Peck & Seixas, 2008; Sheldon, 2011; Seixas 2012). This study has argued that there is much more to history and History than a few dates or facts. It has argued that students
should not be allowed to lose sight of the ‘totality’ of the discipline, of the sum of its parts (Booth, 1971; Young, 1991) because direct experience with historical materials and historical methodology can ‘transport’ students back in time and develop their historical imagination and empathy for the people of the past (Booth, 1971; Seixas, 1996; Levesque, 2009; Zarmati, 2012a).

What is that essential core of historical methodology? I argue in this study that the core of historical methodology, historical consciousness and historical thinking is the contested epistemology of history. This epistemology is further complicated by the recognition that all sources have perspective embedded at the sub-textual and contextual level (Wallach, 2006). Unpacking the perspective(s), the sub-text inherent in every source from the past in a contextually appropriate way, an ethical way, requires historical skills and awareness. Historical empathy, the ability to see the past in its own terms and to read the past on its own terms, is the product of these skills and awareness.

5.1 Developing historical empathy

Historical empathy has not been popular within the context of influence (Taylor, 2003; Cunningham, 2004; Levesque, 2009). It has been claimed that empathy was at the ‘heart’ of the British School’s Council History Project 13-16 (Boddington, 1980b; McMullen, 1980), yet any mention of it was omitted from a 1981 NSW syllabus that claimed to be founded on the British Schools Council History Project 13-16 (BSCHP) (Johnston, 1982; Cowling, 1984). Historical empathy was dismissed from the National Curriculum in Britain in the 1990s (Cunningham, 2004). Nonetheless, many would claim that exercising historical empathy is central to doing history and the study of History (Collingwood, 1961; Gosden & Silvester, 1968; Coltham & Fines, 1971; Boddington, 1980b; Lee, 1984; Taylor, 2003; Cunningham, 2004; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Wallach, 2006; Wineburg, 2007; Gelski, 2010; Taylor, et al, 2012, VanSledright, 2014). Historical empathy helps the historian make sense of the past. It is considered an important element of reconstructing the past whereby the ‘structural’ imagination is used to construct a ‘second record’, a re-enactment of events of the past that takes into account past feelings and thoughts to attain an understanding of those events (Shemilt, 1980; Boddington, 1980b; Little, 1983; Macintosh, 1995; Seixas, 1996; Cunningham,
Historical empathy needs evidence to provide the parameters for the reconstruction of, and connection to, past events. It has been described as the ‘thread connecting evidential dots’ (Cunningham, 2004, pp. 24ff).

Historical empathy is also a form of context-sensitive imagination that is required for the critical analysis of documents in terms of contexts, or for context-sensitive judgments of past behaviour (Collingwood, 1961; Turner, 1973; Dickinson, Lee & Gard, 1978; Seixas, 1996; Wineburg 2001; Cunningham, 2004; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Sawyer & Laguardia, 2010; Wineburg & Schneider, 2011). Knowing what a source ‘means’ is the most important thing for an historian (Collingwood, 1961, pp. 260ff). This involves understanding the past in its own terms and knowing what the evidence meant in the world it comes from, in its own context (Fines, 1994).

One issue addressed in the literature is the difficulty of defining or maintaining a definition of historical empathy. Newman (1988), Cunningham (2004) and Gelski (2010) each addressed this problem in their research. There is general agreement that historical empathy is based on, and requires, historical imagination. It is an emotional exercise that requires listening to the voices of the past and participating imaginatively in the dramas of the past (Burston, 1972; Boddington, 1980b; Little, 1983; Marchetto, 1994; Hughes-Warrington et al, 2009). But, it is also a cognitive exercise that must be tied to evidence (Turner, 1973; Boddington, 1980b; Stockley, 1981; Wineburg, 2001; Wallach, 2006; Rantala, 2011). Cunningham (2004) called it ‘imagination in a straitjacket’. The restraint is afforded by historical knowledge and historical evidence (Husbands & Pendry, 2000; Foster, 2001; Lee & Ashby, 2001). Seixas (2006) suggested that empathy can be achieved without emotional involvement but that data is essential. Gelski (2011, pp.25ff) cautions against losing or ‘dissolving’ one’s self. Similarly, Cunningham claims that the real insight comes when the ‘self’ is left out of the explanation, because the exercise should be about how others felt in the past, not how the modern historian would feel in the same situation (2004, pp.24ff).

Taking perspectives, exercising historical empathy may bring the past to life, bringing us closer to understanding. This is the goal and challenge for both the historian and the History teacher (Collingwood, 1961; Thomson, 1967). Historical knowledge without
understanding is a waste of time (Cowie, 1978). Without understanding, there is no explanation, no connection between intentions, circumstances and actions and hence, no insight (Boddington, 1980b; Lee, 1984; Lee & Ashby, 1987; Shawyer et al, 1988; History Syllabus NSW, 1993; Marchetto, 1994; Cunningham, 2004).

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, historical empathy is considered to be an essential prerequisite to the habit of mind called ‘historical thinking’ (Collingwood, 1961; Lee, 1984; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Cunningham, 2004; Peck & Seixas, 2008; Gelski, 2010; Taylor, et al, 2012; Henderson, Mallan & Allan, 2013). Historical empathy can act as a powerful antidote to some habits of the presentist (Burston, 1972; Wallach, 2006). It is clear that empathetic awareness is an essential element in historians’ attempts to reconstruct the past in a valid or ‘real’ version (Collingwood, 1961; Boddington, 1980b; Shemilt, 1980; Macintosh, 1995; Cunningham, 2004). In describing the ‘historian’s fallacy’, Fischer (1970, pp.209ff) reminded historians that the people of the past were not able to see into the future. They did not have the same perspective on events as we do in present day. A conclusion that events should have been predictable, or foreseen by those involved, overlooks the probability that there were innumerable conflicting signs that suggested innumerable possibilities at the time. Only in retrospect do these events seem obvious or inevitable. Signs that pointed in other directions tend to be ignored when History is constructed (Fischer, 1970; Wallach, 2006). For example, teaching ‘Cold War’ History in schools has changed dramatically since the events of the early 1990s. Many teachers would agree that it has become ‘easier’ because we can now see its many dead-ends. We know which paths to follow when looking for explanations. On occasions, the people of the past are somehow indicted for their failure to read and understand the future, to see the dead ends (Fischer, 1970). Another example of hindsight bias is when the people of the past are found wanting because they lack current knowledge or know-how. The Roman Emperor Nero has been criticised in terms of Keynesian economic theory for his inflationary spending after the Great Fire of Rome. There is often a hint of hindsighted ‘contempt’ for the people of the past because they did not know what we now know (Fischer, 1970; Ashby & Lee, 1987; Taylor et al, 2012). It has been argued in this study that historical imagination is based on logical inference. Hindsight judgements of this kind are actually problems of the logic of inference, which can be overcome by the analysis of evidence.
and application of logic (Fischer, 1970). However, this logic must be empathetically constructed.

There is no suggestion in this cautionary note that historians should not conduct retrospective analysis, but historians must beware the ‘snare and delusion’ of this ‘fallacy’ of historical methodology (Fischer, 1970, p. 212). Hindsight bias may not be presentism, a condition whereby present-day ideas, such as moral standards, are projected into the past to make judgements about the past. But it is a product of the same failure to empathise and connect with the people of the past, of the same failure to recognise that the past was different, and therefore requires some attempt to be understood in its own context. A combination of cognitive skills, comprehension, analysis, interpretation and evaluation is needed for developing this affective propensity, the state of mind of historical imagination and historical empathy (Booth, 1971; Burston, 1972; Boddington, 1980b; Little, 1983; Cunningham, 2004). It is these skills, other than cognitive ones, that are inherent to historical empathy.

5.2 Classroom implications

One significant issue that emerges from the literature is that historical empathy must be taught in the History classroom while students are doing history and studying History. Put another way, it will not be caught. This conclusion is based on the provision of numerous models of the development of historical empathy from researchers. These models of development generally have between three and six stages. There is general agreement that most students begin from a presentist viewpoint by being ‘contemptuous’ of the past, or the people of the past. This deficit theory is based on a perception that the people of the past did not know things we know, or as much as we know, in our sophisticated technology driven I-world (Lee, 1984; Ashby & Lee, 1987; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Taylor et al, 2012). Addressing this lack of knowledge and understanding of the past is the starting point for the classroom teacher.

The development of historical empathy is described variously, but its acquisition is usually described in terms of a contextualized awareness, or recognition of the difference in ‘mentalities’ in the past that will allow students to engage in ‘perspective-
taking’ (Seixas, 2006). With maturity, perspective-taking can result in humane understanding, in a propensity to consider the perspective of the ‘other’, that will allow students to read the past more effectively (Black, 1977; Shemilt, 1984; Lee 1984; Ashby & Lee, 1987; Newman, 1988; Foster, 1999; Seixas & Peck, 2004; Seixas, 2006; Wallach, 2006; Gelski, 2010; Rantala, 2011; Smith, 2012).

Some researchers have suggested the use of particular activities, such as simulations and/or role-plays as an appropriate and effective means of teaching historical empathy (Thompson, 1983; Newman, 1988; Cunningham, 2004). While these may be important opportunities for ‘role-taking’ (Newman, 1988), the suggestion clearly misses the point that perspective-taking should be something that happens automatically in the classroom as students do history. There should be a reference to perspectives in every lesson where historical materials are encountered. In terms of this study, that effectively means every lesson! Every source, whether primary or secondary, that students work with, or from, is a ‘perspective’ that requires them to engage in perspective-taking in an effort to go beyond the data towards evidence and understanding (Cunningham, 2004; Wallach, 2006). Students aged 13 to 14 years have no trouble with attempting to answer questions such as, ‘Why do you think the Christians portrayed the Viking as barbarians?’ or ‘Did the Viking think it was right to plunder churches?’ When answers are not forthcoming, more detail often helps (Shawyer et al, 1988; Wineburg, 2001). ‘Probing’ with questioning based on existing knowledge may be necessary to assist students to move from superficial to substantive answers (Cunningham, 2004, pp. 24ff). The interrogation, analysis and evaluation of the sub-text of sources require an attempt to appreciate the perspective of the creator of the source (Coltham, 1971; Little, 1983; Wineburg, 2001; Cunningham, 2004; Seixas, 2006; Wallach, 2006). Historical materials are inherently ‘perspectival’ (Wallach, 2006, p. 450). This study argues that interrogating, analysing and evaluating material sources, that is, contextualizing the evidence found in artefacts, is a powerful agency for breaking down the deficit theory in younger students and opening a window on the past that can begin the development of historical empathy.
5.2.1 Hands-on

A substantial body of research, based on the UK museum sector, that has evaluated the ‘hands-on’ learning approach, has identified clear and significant benefits deriving from object-based learning (Staats, 2010, Zarmati, 2012a). Because they offer direct human connection, commonality and fascination with the human experience, artefacts can engage learners, stimulate curiosity and deepen understanding. The objects themselves ‘carry stories’ of real people and make the abstract past tangible and current (Staats, 2010). The literature supports the proposition that learning from objects accommodates the needs of pupils with different learning styles, results in improved learning and attainment and increases student engagement (Staats, 2010, Zarmati, 2012a). Artefacts analysis can be the context for thinking and interpretation about everyday life, as well as exposing and addressing ethical issues. The literature supports the contention that handling and interrogating ‘objects’ can teach abstract and complex concepts. Artefacts can tell multiple narratives and they can challenge the normal interpretation of elements of past cultures (Staats, 2010). The literature supports the contention that artefact analysis, source study, requires an interpretative framework to assist students to develop their skills of inquiry (Staats, 2010).

5.3 Artefact analysis worksheets

The following worksheets are intended for use in hands-on history but recognizing that the actual artefacts may not be available, they have been designed to be used in their absence. The artefacts were chosen deliberately to illustrate that they do not have to be from the ancient world. As demonstrated in the paper presented in Chapter 4, this hands-on approach has as much relevance to modern and contemporary History as it does to ancient History.

This is a guided-discovery activity. There is an interpretative framework suggested for interrogating each artefact. Teachers should give students time to observe and make judgements about the artefacts by following the framework of interrogation and analysis. There is provision for notemaking on each worksheet. Classroom organisation is flexible, but pair/share works well with younger students, and small groups can work for this exercise.
The aim of this exercise is to analyse the sub-text of an artefact and discover what it shows about the people who made and used it. This exercise also develops observation skills, encourages historical empathy and requires historical thinking. The basic scientific and technological knowledge implied in the production of any artefact usually proves to be a powerful element in establishing empathy, the ability to see the world (even just for a moment or two) through the eyes of the people who lived in the past. The technology ‘hook’ is particularly effective with secondary school students, who tend to believe that, because we live in the digital age, we are all technologically ‘savvy’. But I have used this approach successfully with a range of students from Grade 4 to Grade 12.

This activity can take 40 to 50 minutes if using an array of artefacts, but it can be used at any time for examining a single artefact. It is useful as a hook for a lesson or topic opener. The artefacts can be real or virtual. If using virtual artefacts, an interactive whiteboard is suitable for displaying the images and PowerPoint is ideal for creating a ‘show’ from images. A Microsoft media ‘slide show’ would work well because the teacher can ‘magnify’ each view. It is best to view images from a number of angles, if possible. Of course, three-dimensional views would be best, if available.

The interrogation framework includes questions that will unpack the science and technology involved in creating or manufacturing the artefact. This is often the aspect or sub-text that students overlook or take for granted until it is pointed out through teacher probing that there is a wealth of information about a society embedded in these objects. There is information on each worksheet about the artefact, its manufacture and possible use as ‘Teacher Notes’ that may assist with the background knowledge that teachers need to frame the questioning and probing that will alert students to this sub-text. Information is provided on the basis that giving students more detail is an obvious way to improve their knowledge and inquiry skills, ‘So what if I was to tell you that … ?’ Probing by the teacher, as a form of Socratic questioning, is the appropriate pedagogy for these exercises in interrogation and analysis at the earliest stages of secondary school. Increased student responsibility and subsequent ‘invisibility’ of the teacher are projections for the future as students become more experienced and mature.
The framework also includes a question that focuses students on the daily life of the people of the past. This is usually the first question that students ask, ‘What is this?’ or ‘What was this used for?’ These questions are addressed after exploring the sub-text. In many cases, the previous probing and ensuing discussion will help in solving this ‘mystery’. While the worksheets are intended for use in single lesson situations, a glance through them will alert teachers to the fact that there are some common themes or aspects, such as provision of lighting or bathing practices from the cultures and societies represented that could be taken up for further discussion through linking and comparisons. Some suggestions are provided for further research on these themes or topics that could be utilised by a teacher seeking more background information or could become the basis of student research.

The last question in the framework is a reflective opportunity. Students should have the time for formal or informal reflection on this process. By asking the fourth question, ‘What does it tell you?’ the teacher can provide an opportunity for students to share and explore each other’s ideas. Research suggests that this exercise in sharing between students may be the most powerful element in this process in terms of encouraging students to read the past (Larsson, Mathews & Booth, 2004; Kalantzis & Cope, 2004).
5.3.1 Worksheet 1.

Carefully observe and examine this artefact. Handle it carefully. Wear your gloves. You can make notes in the space provided after each question.

**Interrogation**

You may work in pairs to consider the following questions:

1. *What is this artefact made from?*
   - Is it a natural material or fabric?
   - Is it a metal?
   - Is it ceramic?
   - Is it a ‘plastic’ material?

2. *How was this artefact made?*
   - Is it naturally occurring?
   - Is it human made?
   - Was it hand made?
   - Was it machine made?
   - Was it mass-produced?
   - Does it have any distinguishing ‘markings’ or decorations?

3. *What might this artefact have been used for?*

4. *What does it tell you?*
Description
This is a Roman unguentarium, a perfume or ‘soap’ container.
It is from a soldier’s burial in Lebanon c. 2nd Century CE.

Teacher Notes
The flask is made from glass (Latin: glesum). It is very light fine glass. It has been blown and shaped in a partial mould. The manufacture and production of glass began in Mesopotamia in about 2200 BCE. There was glass production in the Sinai area in the 1st century BCE. Glass is made from heating chemicals until they melt and become ‘plastic’. This requires a very high temperature (1800-2100°C). The salts needed for this reaction such as sodium oxide (NaO), sodium bicarbonate (NaCO₃) and lime (CaO) occur naturally in the sand in the deserts of the Sinai and Egypt. These are the same salts that are the source of natron, the salt compound used for desiccating bodies in the mummification process.

The process of glass production may have been discovered after lightning strikes in the desert. The sand is also quartz-rich (SiO₂). Something similar is suggested in a ‘legend’. The temperature of 1800°C generated by lightning is enough to cause the formation of fulgurites or glass tubes in quartz-rich sand. Fulgurites are sometimes called ‘petrified lightning’. Much experimentation followed to produce glass that could be worked and variations in the mix to make the process easier. Substituting sodium bicarbonate for sodium oxide for instance, significantly lowers the temperature needed for this process to work. The Romans introduced the technology to make cheap light glass by ‘blowing’ and using moulds.

Bathing was a normal part of Roman (and Greek) life, possibly daily for most people. Hence unguentaria were very common. They are fragile and Romans did recycle materials such as glass. They were also provided for the journey to the afterlife. They are very often broken or melted as a result of the cremation process. It is obvious that this flask is not perfect. It is slightly misshapen. This indicates that it was relatively cheap and probably mass produced for market sales. The soap was most likely olive oil, often perfumed with some crushed herbs or flower petals. A stopper perhaps of bee’s wax or cork may have been used as well.

The oil would be rubbed over the body after exercising and removed before entering the various pools of the bathhouse. Perfumed oil may have been applied after bathing as well. Slaves played a role in a visit to the thermae.

A perfume ‘factory’ at Pompeii from about the same period suggests that the customer could choose which herbs or flowers to use in their individual oil flask. Originally such objects were made in ceramic but as glass became available and cheaper because of mass-production it replaced pottery. Often the glass flasks are coloured. The green brown colour in this case is probably due to some metallic oxide impurities in the sand that makes up 70-74% by volume of the glass mix.
There are many contextual and sub-textual areas that could be explored here:

- How would the process of glass making be discovered?
- How would glassblowing be invented?
- What scientific processes were involved in working out the formula of the mix and then variations on it for different purposes?
- How would they make a fire hot enough to melt the ingredients?
- What are the implications of mass-production?
- Who would have done this difficult and dangerous work in this society?

Recent work on bodies at Pompeii and Herculaneum suggest that the Romans were long-lived and healthy.

- How does hygiene contribute to longevity?
- What other factors affect longevity?
- Who would like to rub themselves all over with olive oil each day?
- What are the implications of the name Colgate-Palmolive? Think about it?
- Why would bathing materials be needed in the afterlife?

Possible extensions.

- Greek and Roman bathhouses and bathing practices – A brief but outlandish example of the bathing routine can be found in Petronius, *The Satyricon*, Bk 5.XXXV. Access at: [http://www.sacred-texts.com/cla/petro/satyr/sat06.htm](http://www.sacred-texts.com/cla/petro/satyr/sat06.htm)
- The olive oil industry
- Slavery
- Hygiene in Greece and Rome
  - [http://www.greekmedicine.net/hygiene/The_Greco-Roman_Bath.html](http://www.greekmedicine.net/hygiene/The_Greco-Roman_Bath.html)
  - [http://www.jaypeejournals.com/eJournals/ShowText.aspx?ID=4159&Type=FREE&TYP=TOP&IN=&IID=325&Value=28&isPDF=YES](http://www.jaypeejournals.com/eJournals/ShowText.aspx?ID=4159&Type=FREE&TYP=TOP&IN=&IID=325&Value=28&isPDF=YES)
  - [http://historyoftheancientworld.com/2011/07/roman-toilets-were-quite-stinky-large-international-study-reveals/](http://historyoftheancientworld.com/2011/07/roman-toilets-were-quite-stinky-large-international-study-reveals/)

More information on ancient glassmaking can be found at:

- [http://www.umich.edu/~kelseydb/Exhibits/WondrousGlass/MainGlass.html](http://www.umich.edu/~kelseydb/Exhibits/WondrousGlass/MainGlass.html)
- [http://www.romanglassmakers.co.uk/linksrom.htm](http://www.romanglassmakers.co.uk/linksrom.htm)
Interrogation
You may work in pairs to consider the following questions:

1. **What is this artefact made from?**
   - Is it a natural material or fabric?
   - Is it a metal?
   - Is it ceramic?
   - Is it a 'plastic' material?

2. **How was this artefact made?**
   - Is it naturally occurring?
   - Is it human made?
   - Was it hand made?
   - Was it machine made?
   - Was it mass-produced?
   - Does it have any distinguishing 'markings' or decorations?

3. **What might this artefact have been used for?**

4. **What does it tell you?**
**Description**

This is a white ground Greek lekythos, (pl. lekythoi), an oil container for use in the afterlife. It is Athenian from c. 450-425 BCE.

**Teacher Notes**

Lekythoi became the most dominant tomb offering after c. 500 BCE. They did not hold much oil but were meant to be impressive. Some were offered in the grave but others were left as markers for the tomb and were on public display. The new ceramic technique of using a white background rather than the usual red on black, or black on red, was introduced c. 530-525 BCE. It seems to have inspired fine painting of previously unseen scenes associated with death and burial rituals.

Democratic Athens passed laws in the first half of the 5th century, after the Persian Wars, to regulate grand funerary monuments. The evidence from elsewhere in Greece suggests that these 'white ground' lekythoi did not 'take off', were not exported to areas outside Attika, as were the black and red figure vases. It may be that the representations of scenes of death and mourning precluded their popularity. But in Attika they were prolific. The fine outline drawings, as on this example, may have provided one means of getting around the laws against 'elite' funerary displays. There is also a democratising element in the scenes that are depicted. Death is no longer monstrous; monsters do not inhabit the underworld. Death is something that comes to all; all undertake the journey to the after-life under the care of Hermes and Charon.

The white 'ground' of this lekythos contains what appears to be an intimate interior scene. The shape of the vase means that it needs to be turned to see both figures at the same time. Almost an animated scene. A man watches or advises a woman as she dresses. She is putting on a tiara. This would normally be associated with her wedding day.

The man carries the caduceus staff and wears an unusual hat. This identifies him as Hermes. Hermes played an important role in guiding the dead to the underworld.

Hermes is wearing his hat of invisibility. This signifies that living humans cannot see him. This suggests that the female subject is already a 'shade'.

She is probably dressing for her own funeral and journey to the afterlife. There may be a funerary stele in the background.
There are many contextual and sub-textual areas that could be explored here:

- What sort of clay do you need to make ceramics?
- How was the process of ‘throwing’ a pot likely to have been discovered?
- What is the process of firing a pot that is decorated in some way?
- What causes pots to have different colours?
- What temperatures are needed to fire pots?
- How did the Athenians produce the famous red and black figure wares?
- What would you expect to find in a ceramic ‘factory’?
- What does the mass-production of ceramics suggest about the Athenian economy?
- Where did the term ‘ceramic’ originate? Implications?

There is much to be learned from interrogating the ‘text’ on the vase: the certainty of death is a universal subject for humans. It is a very human concern.

- What is happening in the scene depicted?
- Who is the man?
- What is the significance of his staff? Of his hat?
- Who is Hermes?
- What role did Hermes play in the death and burial of 5th century Greeks?
- Who is the woman?
- Why is she getting dressed?
- What is she wearing on her head? Implications?
- How would you describe the mood of this scene? Implications?

There are also opportunities here to initiate research into some significant aspects of Greek society and history:

- Death & burial.
- The afterlife
- Red figure ceramics
- Black figure ceramics
- Athenian democracy

Further information on Attic ceramics can be accessed at:

- http://www.ancient.eu.com/Greek_Pottery/
- http://www.metmuseum.org/toah/hd/vase/hd_vase.htm
Carefully observe and examine this artefact. Handle it carefully. Wear your gloves. You can make notes in the space provided after each question.

**Interrogation**

You may work in pairs to consider the following questions.

1. *What is this artefact made from?*
   - Is it a natural material or fabric?
   - Is it a metal?
   - Is it ceramic?
   - Is it a ‘plastic’ material?

2. *How was this artefact made?*
   - Is it naturally occurring?
   - Is it human made?
   - Was it hand made?
   - Was it machine made?
   - Was it mass-produced?
   - Does it have any distinguishing ‘markings’ or decorations?

3. *What might this artefact have been used for?*

4. *What does it tell you?*
Description

This is a copy of an Attic white-ground kylix or drinking ‘cup’ from c. 470 BCE. Its diameter is c. 20 cm and height 9 cm from foot to rim. It is attributed to the Pistozenos Painter (or the Berlin Painter, or Onesimos). It is from a tomb, probably that of a priest, at Delphi. It is held now in the Archaeological Museum of Delphi, Inv. 8140, room XII.

Teacher Notes

The interior of the ‘bowl’, the tondo, depicts Apollo, under the heading APOLLON, wearing a laurel or myrtle wreath, a white tunic, peplos and a red cloak, himation, and sandals. Apollo was the Greek god of light and the sun, truth and prophecy, healing, plague, music, poetry, and more. Apollo was the son of Zeus and Leto. His twin sister is the huntress Artemis. He is portrayed as a beardless, athletic youth, the ideal of the young athletic Greek man, the kouros. He was also associated closely with the oracle at Delphi by which he supposedly guided the affairs of the Greek world.

The god is seated on a lion-pawed folding stool, a diphros. He holds a kithara in his left hand and pours a libation with his right hand. Facing him is a black bird, probably a raven. The raven was associated with prophecy and divination. It was considered one of the chief means used by Apollo to send messages to humans.

Drinking cups of this style are associated with the male drinking party, the symposium. Some have decoration around the exterior of the cup … even on the foot. But usually it is inside the cup that is decorated, as in this case. Some appear to be designed so that the image in the cup becomes slowly, partially visible as the cup is drained of wine. There are some that appear to be sending a message about drinking too much to the ‘reader’. One kylix has an image that may be an attempt to remind the drinker that his wife is at home in the kitchen!

The kylix could be held in one hand by the foot or in two by the handles. Other cups could be used at a symposium. Both the skyphos and kantheros are sometimes shown. There is a number of different ‘pots’ that were used as part of the rituals of watering down and serving the wine at the symposium. An unusual use of the kylix was to play the game kottabos by spinning it on a finger by one of its handles when the cup had only a few drops or dregs in the bowl. Sometimes the aim was to spill the wine in the shape of the first letter of a fancied female acquaintance. In other variations the wine might be aimed at other drinkers or objects set especially for the contest. The room for the symposium, the andron, was made with a waterproof floor.

The various events of the symposium are often the subject of the decoration of the kylix including the sex games and erotic elements provided by the presence of flute-girls and hetaerae.
There are many contextual and sub-textual areas that could be explored here:

- How is this vessel constructed?
- How is the ‘white ground’ accomplished?
- How is the ‘pot’ painted?
- Is this for everyday use?
- Is it for the use of the ordinary ‘man in the street’? Implications?
- What was important about wine drinking? Implications?

There is much to be learned from interrogating the text on the cup:

- Can you read the name on the bowl?
- How is the Greek letter alphabet different from our own?
- Who is depicted?
- How do you know?
- What is his role? Implications?
- How is he dressed? Implications?
- What is he doing? Implications?
- What else is depicted? Implications?
- What might the drinker be reminded of as he drinks from this cup?

There are also opportunities here to initiate research into some significant events of Greek society and culture.

- Oracles
- The Delphic Games
- Prophecy and divination
- The symposium
- Dionysius and the Mysteries

A brief history and guide to the different pots and vases can be accessed at:


More information about the symposium can be accessed at:

- http://www.users.globalnet.co.uk/~loxias/symposium.htm


Be aware that the modern translation is usually uncensored.

An introduction to divination and prophecy is available at:
http://www.ucpress.edu/content/pages/9308/9308.ch01.pdf
5.3.4 Worksheet 4

29 cm high x 79 cm wide

Carefully observe and examine this artefact. Handle it carefully. Wear your gloves. You can make notes in the space provided after each question. Interrogation: you may work in pairs to consider the following questions.

1. What is this artefact made from?
   - Is it a natural material or fabric?
   - Is it a metal?
   - Is it ceramic?
   - Is it a ‘plastic’ material?

2. How was this artefact made?
   - Is it naturally occurring?
   - Is it human made?
   - Was it hand made?
   - Was it machine made?
   - Was it mass-produced?
   - Does it have any distinguishing ‘markings’ or decorations?

3. What might this artefact have been used for?

4. What does it tell you?
Description
This is a copy of a sculptural relief from the surrounds of the base of a kouros (pl. koroij), a male funerary statue from the main cemetery of Athens, the Keramikos, from c. 500 BCE. This section was recovered from the Themistoclean wall that was built after 479 BCE. The original frieze is in Pentelic marble and is 29 cm high by 79 cm wide.

Teacher Notes
This is the work of an outstanding sculptor and perhaps illustrates the competition that seems to have been waged by the elite to outdo each other in the area of funerary commemoration. As early as 594 BCE the reformer, Solon, addressed the obvious disparity in wealth that such monuments demonstrated but the competition did not cease.

The kouros, an idealised statue of a young man, probably originated with artists from the middle east and was a popular funerary monument from c. 800 BCE until 500 BCE when in the aftermath of the Persian Wars the dead youths, usually victims of war, were for a short period at least, buried communally. There are other sections of this frieze in existence. They show different scenes from the palaestra or exercise court. The six young men are exercising. They are playing a ball game. The youth on the far left has the ball. The other youths are anticipating his throwing the ball. Perhaps they are playing ‘piggy-in-the-middle’.

Their muscular bodies are obviously the main concern of the artist. The bodies are shown in different poses twisting and turning to stretch and distort the muscles for the benefit of the viewer. Their hair is braided for convenience when exercising. This may be the prelude to their daily bathing ritual.

The nudity was normal in the palaestra and the baths but in the context of a funerary monument nudity also implies some form of heroic analogy. The nudity of the statue that would have stood on top of the base formed by these structural elements was also meant to suggest an association with the heroic. Heroic in the Greek world meant close to the gods.

The base of the kouros opposite gives an idea of where this frieze was located.

Kouros c. 530BCE
Akropolis Museum Athens
There are many contextual and sub-textual areas that could be explored here:

- How is marble quarried?
- Where do you find marble?
- Why would people have begun to carve or sculpt in marble?
- What sort of society can afford to have people who sculpt?
- How is marble carved? Implications for metallurgy?
- What is bas-relief?
- Who were the sculptors of Greece?
- Who were their customers?
- Why was their competition for funerary monuments?
- Why were laws passed to limit the size of funerary monuments?

There is much to be learned from interrogating the text of the sculpture:

- Are these young men enjoying their game?
- Do they appear to be competitive?
- Do they look fit and healthy?
- Why are the youths naked?
- Would we feel comfortable exercising nude in a public area?
- Did women normally appear nude in public areas?
- Why was exercise so important to the Greeks?
- What are the implications of the motto a ‘healthy mind and a healthy body’?
- Why was the ‘body beautiful’ so important to the Greeks? Implications?
- What did the Greeks want people to remember about them after their death?
- Do you think these youths are just everyday ordinary Athenians? Implications?

There are also opportunities here to initiate research into some significant aspects of Greek culture:

- Heroes in Greek mythology
- Greek sculpture
- The Delphic creed
- The palaestra and the baths
- The gymnasion
- The museion
- Greek religious Games … Olympia, Delphi, Korinth, Athens, Isthmia
- Greek athletics and games

More information about Greek sculpture can be accessed at:

- http://www.artlex.com/ArtLex/g/greek.html
5.3.5 Worksheet 5

Carefully observe and examine this artefact. Handle it carefully. Wear your gloves. You can make notes in the space provided after each question.

**Interrogation**

You may work in pairs to consider the following questions:

1. *What is this artefact made from?*
   - Is it a natural material or fabric?
   - Is it a metal?
   - Is it ceramic?
   - Is it a ‘plastic’ material?

2. *How was this artefact made?*
   - Is it naturally occurring?
   - Is it human made?
   - Was it hand made?
   - Was it machine made?
   - Was it mass-produced?
   - Does it have any distinguishing ‘markings’ or decorations?

3. *What might this artefact have been used for?*

4. *What does it tell you?*
Description
This is a copy of an oil lamp (Grk: lampas) from Korinth c. 800-700 BCE.
This is a loop-handed lamp, meant to be carried by hand.

Teacher Notes
The lamp was hand-made in two parts which were allowed to dry until firm but not leathery. These were then pressed into a mould, probably ceramic, of top and bottom. The two halves were then allowed to dry until leathery. The halves were then glued together with liquid clay, ‘slip’, and allowed to dry fully.

The vessel was then decorated, painted with coloured slip. The firing process included three steps. The first step was to heat the kiln to about 800C with all air vents open. This will fire both clay and slip. The kiln was then heated to 950C with vents closed and allowed to cool then to 900C. This changed the colour of both the pottery and the slip as the available oxygen was used up. Allowing the kiln to slowly cool with all vents open caused the pottery to assume its original colour as it absorbed oxygen but the slip was fixed and did not change colour. Using different coloured slips varied this process to produce different coloured ‘grounds’ and ‘figures’. This lamp has been covered with white kaolin slip before painting. It is a forerunner of what would later emerge as ‘white ground’ ceramics in Attika. In this usage ‘ground’ means the background on which the painting was done.

The decoration of the lamp is an image of one of the Stymphalian birds. This was a reference to one of the ‘Labours’ of Heracles. In this case Heracles could not solve the problem he was set by brawn or bravery. He used his brain instead. The cycle of Heraclitian myths was very popular for decoration of ceramic vessels. Heracles was very popular with all Greeks because of his flawed nature and the fact that he became a god after his death. His myths are the origin of the cult of the Hero.

The lamp has a reservoir for oil that can be filled from the middle of the body. There is provision for a flax wick to be inserted at the front of the lamp. The wick would absorb oil from the reservoir. These lamps are relatively safe because they are covered. Earlier lamps were generally open bowls. Fire was a considerable danger in the ancient world.
There are many contextual and sub-textual areas that could be explored here:

- What sort of clay do you need to make ceramics?
- How was this vessel made?
- What causes pots to have different colours?
- What is ‘slip’?
- What temperatures are needed to fire pots?
- What temperatures are needed to fire glazed pots?
- Why was light so important?
  Why were the Greeks afraid of the dark?

There is much to be learned from interrogating the text on the lamp.

- What are the Stymphalian birds?
- Where do they figure in the Heraclitian cycle of myths?
- Why was Heracles so popular as a figure of myth?
- What lessons could humans learn from the myths of Heracles?
- What was used as fuel in the lamps?
- Where did fuel fit into the olive oil ‘cycle’?
- What was used as a wick?

There are also opportunities here to initiate research into some significant elements of ancient Greek culture.

Ceramic manufacture:

Heracles:
- http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/Herakles/birds.html

Greek mythology:
- http://www.theoi.com/
- http://www.greece.com/info/mythology/
- http://www.mythweb.com/
- http://www.abc.net.au/arts/wingedssandals/
- http://www.ancientgreece.com/s/Mythology/

Fear of the dark:
- http://www.umass.edu/newsoffice/article/shades-antiquity-be-afraid

Olive oil production:
- http://www.whyoliveoil.com/olive-oil-history/
Carefully observe and examine this artefact. Handle it carefully. Wear your gloves. You can make notes in the space provided after each question.

Interrogation
You may work in pairs to consider the following questions:

1. What is this artefact made from?
   - Is it a natural material or fabric?
   - Is it a metal?
   - Is it ceramic?
   - Is it a ‘plastic’ material?

2. How was this artefact made?
   - Is it naturally occurring?
   - Is it human made?
   - Was it hand made?
   - Was it machine made?
   - Was it mass-produced?
   - Does it have any distinguishing ‘markings’ or decorations?

3. What might this artefact have been used for?

4. What does it tell you?
Description
This is a copy of a Roman oil lamp (Latin: lucerna) from Spain c. 1st to 2nd Century CE.
This is a facsimile from the site museum at Conimbriga (Coimbra in Portugal).

Teacher Notes
This lamp has no handle so it was designed to sit in a fixed position. It could have been used in a number of contexts including on a large ‘chandelier’. This would allow a large space such as a dining room to be lighted. In a large house it would have been the daily job of at least one slave to fill and trim the wick of each lamp in preparation for the night.

The lowest quality olive oil was used as fuel for lamps. This would have come from the third or fourth press when the olive mash needed to be mixed with water to get the last available oil from it. There are various machines from the ancient world that were used for separating and pressing olives.

In comparison to earlier lamps this style has provision for the lamp not to be over filled. Any extra oil will sit in the recess above the reservoir rather than be wasted by overflowing.

The central reservoir of the lamp is decorated with an impression of a winged goddess carrying a circular object. This impression would have been created when the clay was pressed into the ceramic mould. The lamp would have been mass-produced in a potters ‘factory’. The general workforce was probably made up of slaves with a master overseeing the work.

The object being carried by the goddess could be a wreath and may indicate that the goddess is Victoria, the Roman Victory. That may mean that this lamp was celebrating Roman military domination of Spain. It took them a long time to subdue all of Spain. It could be a general attempt to celebrate the success of Roman arms under the Emperors. Another possibility is that this is Aurora the goddess of the dawn and light. That would be very appropriate for a lamp. But she usually carries a jug, or pitcher from which she drops her tears as the morning dew.
There are many contextual and sub-textual areas that could be explored here:

- What sort of clay do you need to make ceramics?
- How was this vessel made?
- How is this vessel decorated?
- How and in what situation would it be fired?
- Was this an expensive item?
- Was it utilitarian or meant to ‘look good’?
- How did a small fragile object survive all the years to turn up in a museum?

There is much to be learned from interrogating the text of the lamp:

- Why were gods and goddesses popular images on lamps?
- What other images were popular?
- Why do so very few of these lamps show signs (carbon residue) of use?
- Why were lamps provided for the dead?
- How alike were Roman and Greek beliefs about the after-life?
- How alike were Roman and Greek religion generally? Implications?
- Why did Romans burn a lamp all night in the bedroom (cubiculum)?

There are also opportunities here to initiate research into some significant aspects of Roman culture.

Lamps:
- http://ancientlamps.com/ancientlamps.html
- http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GsOEOohYjI

Roman domestic spaces:
- http://www.roman-empire.net/society/soc-house.html
- http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/roman_houses.htm
- http://rome.mrdonn.org/houses.html

Roman dining:
- http://www.u.arizona.edu/~afutrell/404b/web%20rdgs/tour%20pomp/cuisinepomp.htm
- http://www.historylearningsite.co.uk/roman_food.htm
- http://rome.mrdonn.org/dinner.html

Greek influence on Roman culture:
5.3.7 Worksheet 7

Coin 1: Obverse

Coin 1: Reverse

Coin 2: Obverse

Coin 2: Reverse

Coin 3: Obverse

Coin 3: Reverse

Coin 4: Obverse

Coin 4: Reverse
Carefully observe and examine this artefact. Handle it carefully. Wear your gloves. You can make notes in the space provided after each question.

**Interrogation**

You may work in pairs to consider the following questions:

1. *What is this artefact made from?*
   - Is it a natural material or fabric?
   - Is it a metal?
   - Is it ceramic?
   - Is it a ‘plastic’ material?

2. *How was this artefact made?*
   - Is it naturally occurring?
   - Is it human made?
   - Was it hand made?
   - Was it machine made?
   - Was it mass-produced?
   - Does it have any distinguishing ‘markings’ or decorations?

3. *What might this artefact have been used for?*

4. *What does it tell you?*
Description

This is a facsimile Roman coin.

NB: all coins are stamped WRL … identifies them as facsimiles.

Explain the difference between a ‘fake’ that is meant to fool you into thinking it is genuine and a facsimile that is a certified copy for study or collection. Warn students against buying any artefact on site when they travel. They should always buy from a reputable dealer.

Teacher Notes

Coin 1: Bronze sestertius, minted in 71 CE
Obverse: Vespasian … titles: CAES (Caesar) VESPASIAN AUG (Augustus) PM (Pontifex Maximus … chief priest of the cult of Vesta) TRI (holder of Tribuniciun Potestas … supreme political power) IMP (Imperator … military leader) COS 111 (Consul … supreme magistrate for the third time).
Reverse: SALUS AUGUSTA … seated goddess Salus with dish for pouring (patera). A sign of the safety & well being of the Imperator.

Coin 2: Bronze dupondius, minted 65 CE, Lugdunum
Obverse: NERO CLAUD (Claudius) CAESAR AUG (Augustus) GERM (Germanicus) PM (Pontifex Maximus … chief priest of the cult of Vesta) TRP (holder of Tribuniciun Potestas … supreme political power) IMP (Imperator … military leader).
Reverse: SC … goddesses Salus and Concordia … harmony and well being … AUG … Augustus … MAC … Macellum Magnum … great market building, statue with sceptre in doorway.

Coin 3: Bronze as, minted 50-54 CE, Rome
Obverse: Ti (Tiberius) CLAUDIUS CAESAR AUG (Augustus) GERM (Germanicus) TRI (holder of Tribuniciun Potestas … supreme political power) IMP (Imperator … military leader) PM (Pontifex Maximus … chief priest of the cult of Vesta)
Reverse: SC … Salus & Concordia … harmony & well being … in the centre … Minerva … wisdom & war … celebrates victory in Britannia.

Coin 4: Silver denarius, from a mint moving with Caesar, at the beginning of the civil war, 49-48 BCE
Obverse: sacrificial elements. The religious objects, simpulum, sprinkler, axe and apex were associated with the office of Pontifex Maximus, the chief priest of the cult of Vesta. A reminder that Caesar was Pontifex Maximus and that the Senate had ‘outlawed’ Rome’s chief priest.
Reverse: CAESAR (the Dictator) … war elephant tramples snake … signifies the conquest of Gallia.
Salus was the goddess of security & well-being. Her festival was held on 30 March. Her temple, built in 304 BCE, was in the Alta Semita, an older region of Rome that included the Viminal and Quirinal Hills. She became associated with peace and harmony when her statue was erected in the Temple of Concord at the head of Forum Romanum.

Minerva was the goddess of wisdom, war, art, schools and commerce. She was the Roman counterpart to Greek Athena. She was born, with weapons in hand, from the forehead of her father, Jupiter. There was a temple of Minerva on the Aventine Hill that after 207 BCE was known as a haven for poets and actors. She was also included in the triad, along with Juno and Jupiter, installed on the Capitol Hill as the state cult. Her festival, the Quinquatria, was held during the day from 19-23 March, with a minor version for flute-players on 13 June.

Vesta was the goddess of the cult of the eternal flame. This flame was brought from Troy by Aeneas and signifies the founding of Rome. A small circular temple at the southern end of the Forum Romanum housed this ‘eternal’ flame. The flame was associated with the well-being of the city and was tended by the college of Virgins. This college was the most prestigious in Rome. The Pontifex Maximus headed the college. This was a life long position of considerable influence. Every Roman house would have included a small shrine at which Vesta and other household gods were honoured every day.

The Macellum Magnum was a large public provisions market area built by Nero on the Caelian Hill. It was dedicated in 59 CE. Maintaining the food supply to a city of a million people in the pre-industrial world was a major commercial and logistical challenge. The fate and the reputation of Emperors often depended on how well they managed the food supply. Large numbers of Roman citizens were dependent on the distribution of grain in the form of the annona or ‘dole’. Food riots and general unrest accompanied times of shortage. Grain was shipped from Egypt and North Africa.

Coins were an important means by which information (propaganda?) was communicated to the Roman people. They utilised both words and images to cater for a largely illiterate audience.

Roman coins were originally worth their weight in the precious metal from which they were cast. As a result, gold and silver coins were always much smaller than bronze coins. In the early Empire after the ‘Great Fire’ Nero debased the coinage by reducing the precious metal content. This explains why there is a bronze rather than a silver sestertius after Nero. Unfortunately this ‘inflation’ continued unchecked for more than a century.
The only official evidence we have for the value of the money is from 301 CE when Diocletian issued new coinage and a general price index for wages and commodity costs. The value of each coin had changed considerably, for instance a gold aureus originally worth 25x a denarius was then worth more than 800x a denarius.

Roman coins in the early Empire

Aureus (Gold) = 25 denarius

Denarius (Silver) = 4 sesterces (a day's work for a labourer?)

Sesterces (Silver) = 2 dupondius (changed to bronze in early Empire)

Dupondius (Bronze) = 2 as

As (Bronze) = 2 semis

Semis (Bronze) = 2 quadrans

Quadrans (Bronze) = Lowest denomination coin…admittance to the public baths.

There are many contextual and sub-textual areas that could be explored here:

- How are alloys like bronze produced?
- How would this process have been discovered?
- How do you make a fire hot enough to melt metals?
- How was the source of metals (ore) discovered?
- Who worked the mines?
- How is the metal extracted from the ore?
- How were coins struck?
- Why are some coins larger than others?
- What do you think happened for the sestertius to be devalued from silver to bronze?
- How would inflation affect the ordinary people of Rome?
- Why was the issue of a coin with Julius Caesar’s image on it controversial in 44 BCE?

There is much to be learned from interrogating the text on the coins:

- What titles did the Emperors advertise?
- Implications?
- What powers did the Emperors advertise?
- Implications?
- What was the role of religious imagery in the propaganda of the Emperors?
- Which gods are included?
- Implications?

Why was the safety and well being of the Emperor so important?

There are also opportunities here to initiate research into some significant events of Roman history:

- Caesar’s conquest of Gaul.
- Caesar’s assassination.
- Claudius’s conquest of Britannia.
- Nero’s reign.
- Vespasian and the ‘Year of the Four Emperors’.
- The role of gods and goddesses in imperial propaganda.
- Building programs of the Emperors
- Feeding Rome, the annona and ‘bread and circuses’

More information about, and catalogues of Roman coins can be accessed at:

- http://numismatics.org/ocre/

For all things Roman – http://www.vroma.org
5.3.8 Worksheet 8

Carefully observe and examine this artefact. Handle it carefully. Wear your gloves. You can make notes in the space provided after each question.

**Interrogation**

You may work in pairs to consider the following questions.

1. *What is this artefact made from?*
   - Is it a natural material or fabric?
   - Is it a metal?
   - Is it ceramic?
   - Is it a ‘plastic’ material?

2. *How was this artefact made?*
   - Is it naturally occurring?
   - Is it human made?
   - Was it hand made?
   - Was it machine made?
   - Was it mass-produced?
   - Does it have any distinguishing ‘markings’ or decorations?

3. *What might this artefact have been used for?*

4. *What does it tell you?*
Description
This is a piece of obsidian, naturally occurring volcanic ‘glass’.
It is from an ancient lava flow in Cappadocia in central Turkey.

Teacher Notes
Obsidian is formed when the surface of a rhyolitic (silica rich) lava flow cools quickly. Because it cools quickly there is limited crystal growth. Hence it appears to be very dense. Like manufactured glass it is 70% or more, silicon dioxide (SiO₂). High concentrations of iron and manganese generally account for its dark brown to black colour. In this case it is black.

Obsidian is hard and brittle and will fracture along its surfaces to produce very sharp edges. Its use can be traced from prehistoric times (c.100,000 BP). Trade in obsidian around the Mediterranean began c. 12,000 BP. Obsidian from Cappadocia has been found in sites in Lebanon and central Asia.

Obsidian’s most obvious use is for cutting blades and arrowheads, or as tips for boring tools. It produces edges sharper than modern scalpels. It was used for ritual circumcision in some ancient cultures. It has been used experimentally as a scalpel in modern brain operations.

Obsidian can also be made into jewellery. The coloured and translucent varieties are sought after for this purpose. It was also used as a reflecting surface in early mirrors.

In Roman households, obsidian was one of the materials along with flint that made up the fire starting ‘kit’. There were no matches until c. 500 CE. When struck by, or, on iron, obsidian will produce sparks. Obsidian was probably a common fire starter in the ancient world. Starting the fire for cooking and for lighting lamps was an important part of domestic routine.

All volcanic materials contain some water. Magma and lava are usually up to 10% water. Obsidian normally has about 1% moisture content but absorbs water at a defined rate when exposed to air. In modern archaeology this has meant that obsidian can be an aid to the dating of sites.

In the 1960s a relative dating technique known as OHD (Obsidian Hydration Dating) was used to calculate the water content, and therefore the length of exposure of obsidian found on sites. Since 2002 the use of SIMS (Secondary Ion Mass Spectrometry) has expanded this technique. Absolute dating may be possible if an accurate record is available of the mining and use of the obsidian being studied.
There are many contextual and sub-textual areas that could be explored here:

- Where would this item be found?
- How would it be ‘extracted’?
- How would its value and uses have been discovered?
- How could an arrowhead or drill bit be made from this material?
- What ‘know how’ is required to make a bow and arrow?
- How are arrows made to fly?
- How did a ‘drill’ work? What was it used for?
- Why was the ability to make ‘fire’ so important?
- How would a fire starting kit be put together?

There is much to be learned from interrogating the text of the object:

- What does the use of obsidian for tool making suggest about tool making?
- Why would men and women be attracted to this item?
- Why would people use it as a mirror?
- Did you notice how sharp the edges were?
- What did that suggest to you?

There are also opportunities here to initiate research into some significant aspects of the past:

**Obsidian:**
- http://volcano.oregonstate.edu/education/facts/obsidian.html
- http://www.academia.edu/1808438/Obsidian_Source_Use_in_Tongan_Prehistory(New_Results_and_Implications

**Prehistoric uses of obsidian:**
- http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4B21l2EFkPs
- http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u8m7VcvJ9EM

**Relative and Absolute dating:**
- http://archaeology.about.com/cs/datingtechniques/a/timing.htm

**Mirrors:**
- http://www.getty.edu/research/exhibitions_events/exhibitions/obsidian_mirror/through_the_mirror.html
Carefully observe and examine this artefact. Handle it carefully. Wear your gloves. You can make notes in the space provided after each question.

**Interrogation**
You may work in pairs to consider the following questions.

1. **What is this artefact made from?**
   - Is it a natural material or fabric?
   - Is it a metal?
   - Is it ceramic?
   - Is it a ‘plastic’ material?

2. **How was this artefact made?**
   - Is it naturally occurring?
   - Is it human made?
   - Was it hand made?
   - Was it machine made?
   - Was it mass-produced?
   - Does it have any distinguishing ‘markings’ or decorations?

3. **What might this artefact have been used for?**

4. **What does it tell you?**
Description
This is a corset hook, or a buttonhook, or a boot lace hook.
The larger hook is probably for corsets. It could be used from over the shoulder?
The smaller hook would work for buttons and boot laces.
They are both Victorian, from between c.1837 – 1901 CE.

Teacher Notes
The larger implement is made of two metals. The hooked shaft is made from steel or iron. There is some evidence of rust on its hook. The handle, however, is of silver that has been worked in a floral design. The hook is fitted into the handle and perhaps, secured with some solder.
The smaller implement is made of metal and either bone or ivory. Again rust suggests steel or iron was used for the shaft. The shaft is fitted into the bone handle and secured by a metal clasp.
These were vital elements of a Victorian man or woman’s wardrobe or toilet.

Source: Wikicommons

The use of corsetry was a fashion that originated in the ancient world, but became popular in Europe after 1300 CE. The name is derived from French, meaning ‘laced bodice’. Corsets went in and out of style for women over time and by 1800 were designed to lift and support the bust. Victorian era corsets were made from linen stiffened by glue and reinforced for shape by whalebone inserts. They were laced behind and after 1830 ‘tight lacing’ to achieve an ‘hour-glass’ shape became fashionable. This fashion was criticised officially because it might interfere with a woman’s ability to reproduce. Victorian men wore corsets to achieve a more balanced body shape. By 1900, concepts of an ideal body shape had changed and corsets became less restrictive. Eventually, brassieres and girdles replaced them for women. They still remain in use by men.

Almost as important was the lacing of boots that were worn by both men and women during the Victorian era.
There are many contextual and sub-textual areas that could be explored here:

- What materials are used in these implements?
- What are the sources of these materials?
- What processes are involved in producing these implements?
- What forces drive ‘fashion’?
- How does modern society respond to changes in ‘fashion’?

There is much to be learned from interrogating the text of the implements:

- What fashion made these tools part of the toilet of a fashionable woman?
- What fashion made these tools part of the toilet of a fashionable man?
- Do these tools suggest difference in social status?
- Would wealthy men and women need these tools?
- What impact would ‘tight lacing’ have upon a woman’s capacity to work?
- What are the implications of the official criticism of the fashion of ‘tight lacing’?
- Do you think a fashion like ‘tight lacing’ could take off today?
- Do you know any fashions that have been criticised because they involved a health risk?

There are also opportunities here to initiate research into some significant events of Victorian society:

- ‘Service’ in Victorian society
- The industrial revolution
- Social impact of industrialization and urbanization.
- Beginning of consumerism

There could be a link here to the pursuit of the ‘body beautiful’, the heroic, in the ancient world.

More information about:

**Corsets:**
- [http://www.elizabethancostume.net/corsets/history.html](http://www.elizabethancostume.net/corsets/history.html)
- [http://deyoung.famsf.org/blog/corsets-context-history](http://deyoung.famsf.org/blog/corsets-context-history)
- [http://www.staylace.com/textarea/history/aboothof.htm](http://www.staylace.com/textarea/history/aboothof.htm)

**Domestic Service:**

**The industrial revolution:**
- [http://www.yale.edu/ynhti/curriculum/units/1981/2/81.02.06.x.html](http://www.yale.edu/ynhti/curriculum/units/1981/2/81.02.06.x.html)
- [http://www.history.com/topics/industrial-revolution](http://www.history.com/topics/industrial-revolution)
Carefully observe and examine this artefact. Handle it carefully. Wear your gloves. You can make notes in the space provided after each question.

**Interrogation**

You may work in pairs to consider the following questions.

1. *What is this artefact made from?*
   - Is it a natural material or fabric?
   - Is it a metal?
   - Is it ceramic?
   - Is it a ‘plastic’ material?

2. *How was this artefact made?*
   - Is it naturally occurring?
   - Is it human made?
   - Was it hand made?
   - Was it machine made?
   - Was it mass-produced?
   - Does it have any distinguishing ‘markings’ or decorations?

3. *What might this artefact have been used for?*

4. *What does it tell you?*
Description
This is a miniature of a Coca-Cola bottle. This is a miniature of a Coca-Cola can.

Teacher Notes
The miniature bottle is made from some form of quite solid plastic. It is embossed with the Coca-Cola logo. It has a metal bottle ‘top’. It is in every way a miniature facsimile of the ‘small’ Coke that was the size that most people drank when this miniature was made in the 1950s. This miniature bottle was distributed as promotional material by the Coca-Cola Bottlers Company, an Australian owned subsidiary of The Coca-Cola Company, to both children and adults in 1954 during the coronation visit of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth 11 to Sydney, Australia. It may originally have been produced in the USA in the 1940s to be given by salesmen to retailers who stocked Coke in their coolers.

The miniature can is made from tin-plate although it appears to be aluminium. It is the distinctive red colour of the real thing and has the Coca-Cola logo and its nike-like slash painted on in white. As would be expected it has a ring-pull on top for opening the can. The Coca-Cola Company distributed this miniature can for promotional purposes to adults at educational conferences in Sydney, Australia in 2008. They can be bought at on-line retailers.

Each miniature ‘opens’. The bottle is a rudimentary cigarette ‘lighter’. The upper half of the bottle can be filled with flammable fluid and there is provision for a small wick. Below the small wheel that can be seen on top of the stem there is a flint that provides a spark to ignite the wick that would have absorbed lighter fluid from the reservoir below. These internal workings appear to be made from brass. They are not corroded or discoloured from use. This may be because the lighter was too small for practical purposes and its mechanism was never very good. It very quickly became a collectable rather than practical item for use.

The miniature can is a high speed external ‘thumb-drive’ (flash-drive) for a computer. It will store more than two gigabytes of data. The internal thumb-drive is secured within the can because it is magnetized. It has an attachment on top to allow it to be used with a lanyard.

The miniatures could also be discussed in terms of progress and decline, the evaluative aspect of change and continuity.
Use same questions for both miniatures.
There are many contextual and sub-textual areas that could be explored here:

- What materials have been used to make it?
- What different elements are involved?
- How are they produced?
- What are the implications of the manufacturing process?
- What sort of society can mass-produce such items?
- What do these artefacts demonstrate about change and continuity?

There is much to be learned from interrogating the text of the object:

- Would the process to make these be expensive?
- Why is this cost necessary?
- How is the vast advertising budget of companies paid?
- What impact does advertising have on consumers today?
- What impact does advertising have on you?
- How has the ‘target group’ of advertising changed over time?
- Why does the ‘target group’ of advertising change over time?
- What is the most interesting thing about the change in focus of these items?
- Does this change in focus represent progress or decline?

There are also opportunities here to initiate research into some significant issues of Australian History and society:

- Australia’s relationship with USA 1902- 2014
- The growth of the consumer society
- The Americanisation of Australia
- The role of multi-nationals in the world economy
- Globalisation

American cultural influence on Australia:

- http://www.convictcreations.com/culture/yankaussie.htm

Globalisation and Australia:

5.4 Slow release: Jolting student perspective

To recapitulate, this study argues that perspective-taking is an important element in working with historical materials because sources are inherently perspectival. This implies that perspective-taking should be an integral part of all source study. The argument here is that sources are the materials that should be used in the History classroom. Therefore, perspective-taking will become an important element of most History lessons. Many researchers have suggested that forcing students to explore different, even contradictory, sources is an important aid to developing their historical consciousness and historical thinking (Burston, 1967; Hallam, 1969; Coltham, 1971; Sawyer & Laguardia, 1998, p. 1996; Seixas, 1999; Tupper, 2005; VanSledright, 2014). This has been expressed in terms of interrupting with ‘breaking’ news (Tupper, 2005) or ‘jolting’ students from one viewpoint to another (Sawyer & Laguardia, 1998, p. 1996). I now describe and discuss ways that this perspective-taking pedagogy can be implemented through topic studies with students in varying stages.

In Chapter 4, I demonstrated that introducing students to sources and evidence in controlled increments allows the teacher to manipulate the sources in a way that students are forced to think historically. This is very much a teacher mediated and guided process of inquiry. Students are given sources that have been chosen for a specific purpose, or sources that are related in some way. This process could begin with artefacts or archaeological evidence. Students examine or study the text of these sources for useful data, and analyse them, where appropriate, for sub-textual data. From this analysis, they decide on the evidence that the source contains for a specific historical question. My experience is that this can also be a powerful exercise in perspective-taking, because with careful planning by the teacher, students can also be made to take and change perspective as each source is released. This further illustrates the argument that historical empathy is an ever-present requirement of doing history and studying History.

The level of involvement of the teacher in questioning and analysing text and sub-text will vary according to experience and ability of students. With younger students,
it may be the teacher’s responsibility to supply the contextual and sub-textual data in demonstration or modelling. After some discussion, students should write an account or explanation derived from their data collection, analysis and evaluation of the evidence. Sometimes, depending on the class and individual students, this account will be the product of a joint construction, chalk and talk, but it may also be a collaborative effort, group work or individual work.

The next step might be to discuss and reflect on the accounts that individual students have written with questions such as, ‘Where do they converge, or diverge?’ ‘Are there any major differences of interpretation?’ ‘Why?’ ‘Can you justify that interpretation?’ or ‘What is your evidence for that conclusion?’ The organisation of this exercise is flexible. Again, the question of teacher involvement and teacher visibility will vary with circumstances (Wineburg & Wilson, 1988). Often, students will learn more from interpersonal interaction and reflection on each other’s work. At some time during this process, students should discuss what appears to be ‘missing’, ‘Who would you like to interview?’ and ‘What questions would you like answered?’ Once students appear comfortable with their explanation or account, the teacher can announce that a significant discovery has been made! New evidence has come to light! Perhaps reserve the dramatics for younger students. For older students, just hand out a new source and ask, ‘What about this?’ This can be particularly powerful when the new data contradicts the established version in some important area (Hallam, 1969; Tupper, 2005; Sawyer & Laguardia, 2010).

The same process of data collection, analysis, synthesis and reflection should follow. A new account or explanation should result. It may be that the new evidence will not substantially change the established account or explanation, but that is something that has to be determined by following the process. How many increments the teacher introduces will depend on the topic and the class, as well as the availability of sources. This works just as well in different contexts with students in Year 7 as it does with senior students in Years 11 or 12. The three-step process of first order, second order and third order source work as recommended by Wineburg (Drake, n.d.) could be used to vary this model for older students.
The process of modifying resources or adapting materials and mediation is an important theme of this study. This incremental approach was originally derived from using the British School’s Council History Project 13-16’s *What Is History?* kit. The materials in the kit, such as the *Mystery of Mark Pullen* or *Tollund Man* are readily adaptable for this purpose. But the approach has wider applications than using a pre-packaged kit. It is also easily applied to topics in senior Modern and Ancient History.

Next, I will demonstrate perspective ‘jolting’ from a senior Modern History topic. This choice of topic is deliberate. It will demonstrate the applicability of this exercise across the History curriculum. One example will suffice: *Death in Sarajevo: Assassination of Austrian Heir to Throne*. By the time students enter Year 11, they should be well aware of, expect and accept the lessons that slow-release units teach about history and the historical process. This unit can begin with the question, ‘What happened in Sarajevo on 28 June 1914?’ Students are initially provided with a number of sources from textbooks, broadsheets and the Internet, chosen because they have differing details of the events that are to be examined. The initial British account, for instance, reported that an explosive device had killed the Archduke and his wife. Students are told to collect data from these sources and to analyse them in preparation for writing an account. Discussion and reflection follow at this point in the exercise.

In the next lesson, students are presented with a number of ‘theories’ and asked to evaluate each one in terms of the evidence they collected. These could be first order or second order sources. Some differing visual sources for evaluation follow. Many books have incorrectly labelled photos of victims and assassins. Many illustrations of events and maps are inaccurate or confusing. It is difficult to find an accurate map of the route taken by the Archduke’s motorcade. This allows students to apply and test their own account in various ways. Getting things in the right order is important to this exercise because discussing agency, significance, cause and consequence requires accuracy. Next, a source that presents a very detailed account of the background and training of the assassins is released, ‘How does this affect your account of events?’ Next, they receive a pro-Serbian source that details the ‘crisis’ of
July 1914 and the outbreak of war. This again promotes discussion of significance and agency, but more importantly, it should ‘jolt’ them towards seeing a Serbian perspective. Draft accounts are rewritten of the events of 28 June 1914 at this stage.

After discussing the various reconstructions, students are given a number of sources that examine and describe the activities of the Serbian ‘secret service’, ‘Black Hand’, Serbian agents Tankosic and Dimitrievich, Serbian Prime Minister Pasich, Serbian Ambassador Hartwig and Russian ambassador Artomonov. Students collect data and analyse these sources. Together, the teacher and students evaluate these sources for reliability, authenticity and relevance. This should again ‘jolt’ their perspective taking. The level of teacher direction in this synthesis exercise will vary according to the experience and expertise of students. They discuss and modify their accounts as they see fit. Various classroom modes, such as group work and explicit instruction, are possible at different stages of this exercise and should be exploited according to differing situations. There is also the possibility of introducing student-directed data collection, research or student collection of third order sources at any appropriate point in the process.

Finally, students are given sources that suggest that it was impossible to avoid a general European war in July 1914. One in particular from Turner, Origins of the First World War (1975), introduces the concept of international law and the definition of ‘responsibility’ for the origins of ‘terrorism’. This issue requires analysis, discussion and, of course, reflection. This discussion has contemporary overtones given the events in Iraq and Afghanistan. The accounts of events in Sarajevo that are eventually produced can be a summative assessment task. Students should be provided with a substantial scaffold and explicit marking criteria before writing their final version.

While a controlled incremental, ‘slow release’, deliberate perspective ‘jolting’ method does not reflect the realities of historical investigation, it does force students to think critically about sources and evidence to recognise that the past is ‘perspectival’ (Wallach, 2006) and consider the nature of our access to the past. They must address issues of epistemology, significance, agency, cause and consequence.
They are being forced to become historically literate and to exercise historical empathy. By being challenged to take various perspectives, and forced to change that perspective in response to variations in the context of the sources and evidence, they are being encouraged to think like the people of the past. They may become historically conscious, which may force them to do something ‘unnatural’ – to think historically about the past (Wineburg, 2001).
Project 3 is a culmination of the professional, theoretical and pedagogical processes described in Chapter 1 and is located within the taxonomy for doing history and studying History that was introduced in Project 1 and illustrated, in part, in Project 2.

Chapter 6, *Overcoming the Practicality Ethic*, discusses and illustrates the operation of a practicality mechanism by which classroom practitioners respond to efforts to change their classroom preferences and practices. This will include the partial demonstration of an approach to teacher professional learning that confronts the possibility of the practicality mechanism.

Chapter 7, *Filling the GAP*, discusses and demonstrates a package of adaptable resources, and provides suggestions for their use in a ‘Start Up Kit’ for teachers to encourage the adoption of the topic of the Khmer Empire. By providing these resources, I am aiming to subvert what this study argues is the dominant consideration of the practicality ethic described in Chapter 6. At the same time, the pedagogical approach embedded in the resources and the discussion will further demonstrate the practices implied by the taxonomy described in Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 6:
OVERCOMING THE ‘PRACTICALITY ETHIC’

Introduction

Chapter 6 is an expanded conference paper that was delivered originally at the History as Controversy: Writing and teaching contentious topics in Asian histories conference held at the National University of Singapore on 14-15 December 2011. In this paper, I addressed the vexing issue of teacher professional learning. Through my experiences as an insider working in the context of practice as a classroom teacher and faculty Head Teacher, and as an outsider working in the context of text-production as a presenter and provider of a great deal of ‘professional development’ material across many years, I have experienced and experimented with various strategies and approaches to teacher professional learning.

My experience has allowed me to develop a practical sense of what will and what will not work when encouraging change in teacher practice or focus. I have contextualised my experiences within a consideration of the compounding challenges of implementing the Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus across Australia. In particular, I discussed the problem of encouraging Australian teachers to change their content focus to include the Asian options that are being offered. This presentation included an abbreviated version, with theoretical discussion and critique, of an approach to professional learning that I have found successful in NSW.

The version of this paper that follows has been published as: Mootz, D (2014). Overcoming the Practicality Ethic, in Baildon, M. et al. (eds) Controversial History Education in Asian Contexts, Oxon: Routledge, pp. 233-248.
14 Overcoming the 'practicality ethic'

Denis Mootz

I became a classroom teacher in New South Wales (NSW) in 1969. My experience suggests that the most basic problem for the classroom practitioner in NSW is the contradiction implicit in syllabuses which require teachers to mediate the curriculum in the interests of the skills, needs and abilities of the students in their classes and a curriculum-making process that attempts to eliminate teacher decision-making from the classroom process. I have observed this in action and believe that it is a significant determinant of classroom practices. Since 1998 I have also been a lecturer in History Method at the University of NSW. My continuing classroom experience has been a powerful element in the preparation of hundreds of pre-service History teachers in my courses. I have been involved in History syllabus writing and revision in NSW since the 1970s. It has been suggested that my wearing of a number of different 'hats', academic, curriculum consultant and classroom practitioner, has given me an interesting 'insider/outsider' perspective on curriculum making in NSW. I believe it has also given me some insight into the challenges of classroom practice and professional learning.

In this chapter, I first outline the history and processes central to the development of the Australian History Curriculum that have created particular challenges for History teachers in Australia. I draw on my professional experiences and the idea of the 'practicality ethic' to consider the ways teachers might change their practice by practically adapting new content or teaching approaches. I then outline an approach I have used based on practicality to introduce a new topic for inclusion in the History curriculum, the study of Ancient Angkor. If controversy is to be introduced into History classrooms, the practicality of integrating new content and teaching approaches to teaching with existing demands and practices will need to be considered.

The History curriculum in New South Wales

Before 1989 responsibility for curriculums in NSW resided with the Department of Education (DoE) through the Directorate of Studies made up of curriculum specialists and discipline based inspectors. The inspectors were ex-classroom teachers. The inspector who was responsible for the History curriculum worked
very closely with a syllabus committee that represented teachers, academics, parents and the community, to write a syllabus for History. Many teachers across NSW operated as an unofficial ‘think tank’ for the History Inspector. Syllabus change was a ten-year cycle of consultation and implementation. Often the role of teachers was to give advice to the Syllabus Committee or produce materials to support the implementation of the curriculum for History. The role of teachers was profound; their voice was listened to in the syllabus process. At a conference in 1979 classroom teachers were able to break the hold that the research of Piaget seemed to have over the Chairman of the Syllabus Committee. This had a major impact on the NSW syllabus which was no longer based on the idea that students aged 12 to 16 were incapable of historical thinking.

A 1989 act of parliament in NSW established a new statutory body, the Board of Studies (BoS), to make the curriculum for NSW schools. It was made up of elected and appointed representatives of the ‘stakeholders’ of education in NSW. The formulation of curriculum making became the responsibility of its administrative arm, the Office of the Board of Studies (OBoS). The DoE became responsible for managing schools and implementing the curriculum. From the start this duumvirate was uneasy. Those employed by OBoS were not necessarily teachers; some were educators, but teaching experience was not a prerequisite for employment.

The structure and procedures for the production of syllabus documents underwent fundamental change as the revision of syllabus documents exposed tensions in the new structure. OBoS found the process of syllabus making ‘inefficient’. It has been suggested that there is a strong element of managerialism (Hilferty 2004) in the structures and approach of OBoS. The first step was to change the fundamental role of the syllabus committees. A change of name to Syllabus ‘Advisory’ Committee indicated the new role; they were now to advise only. Project teams wrote syllabus documents under the direction of an OBoS inspector. The production of the controversial 1992 syllabus for History (Parkes 2011) suggests that this perception of inefficiency may have been directly related to the determination of History teachers on the History Syllabus Advisory Committee to maintain control of the content and the process of the syllabus writing operation. The procedures of OBoS were soon again subject to review.

In 1998 the new system established a BoS Curriculum Committee (BCC) for History. There was immediate tension between the History BCC and officers of OBoS. This led to further changes to the operation of OBoS and the BCC. This was explained as a ‘dynamic’ change process. One example of this process will suffice. The BCC Chair refused to sign off on a document that was intended to report to BoS the proceedings of the BCC because it was not a true and accurate record of proceedings. The response from OBoS was to immediately revise the process; the signature of the Chair was no longer required; it was no longer a necessary element of the process. The result was that the BCC was effectively sidelined and easily sidestepped. Syllabus documents could now be produced without reflecting any input from the BCC, the representatives of the identified stakeholders. The result was a set of procedures, for future consultations, that
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has been described as farcical (Hilferty 2004: 138). The influence of classroom teachers in the process was effectively curtailed.

My chief research interest is how individual teachers react to and implement change, particularly those for whom I was responsible as head teacher of a faculty. The challenge of implementing change as faculty head, as a ‘change agent’, arose with the introduction of a new syllabus for History in 1980.

I had played a significant role in the manufacture of the 1980 syllabus for History in NSW. I knew it well. Its focus on skills and process rather than content was a major departure from the content driven syllabuses in NSW since the 1960s and before. The teachers on my staff responded well to the change of focus. I demonstrated for them how a skills-based approach to History teaching would work; how it looked in my classroom. Consequently we produced and shared a series of resources that involved our students in the study of history as a process of inquiry from sources.1 Our students responded enthusiastically as well; they enjoyed the new ‘style’ of learning. I was surprised when the Directorate of Studies Inspector for History reported that the syllabus had not been implemented in many schools (Cowling 1984). He blamed teachers, their failure to read, their misreading, or selective reading of, the syllabus for this failure. He suggested that some form of external monitoring or an accountability mechanism was an imperative to ‘compel’ implementation (Cowling 1984: 20–21). Cowling did not understand what was being asked of History teachers in the context of a change of focus for classroom operation. During the life of the two previous History syllabuses in NSW, from 1962–1980, History teachers had developed a set of shared beliefs about classroom practice and expectations; what Kuhn (1975) has called a ‘disciplinary matrix’, paradigms that defined the ‘world view’, or the ‘laws’, ‘theories’, ‘procedures’ and ‘apparatuses’ by which the ‘community’ of History teachers operated (p. ix). The introduction of a new, different syllabus made this matrix no longer appropriate; the new focus on skills development demanded changed practice, new paradigms. Kuhn described this eventuality as a crisis (p. 52). The ‘expected’ was no longer true; practitioners were operating under an ‘anomalous’ matrix of paradigms. Confusion is the usual result. Confusion for some may result in regression to a default paradigm; for others it may result in resistance to the new paradigm. Cowling’s reliance upon accountability mechanisms and subsequent developments in the education bureaucracy with the advent of the managerialism of OBoS underlines the serious inadequacy of concepts of professional learning and change management that prevailed, and continue to prevail, in NSW.

The Australian Curriculum

For the first time, in the context of the Australian Curriculum, concern is with History teachers across Australia and how they are likely to react when their Australian Curriculum course or syllabus documents arrive. I know from my experience that regardless of what the theory might say, the success of implementation of change depends on the reaction of each individual classroom
teacher, those actually at the 'chalk face'; those who will have the ultimate responsibility for, and control over, implementation on a day by day, lesson by lesson, basis.

Most states in Australia will issue syllabus documents as a guide to implementing the Australian Curriculum in History K-10 but the level of prescription will vary. In some jurisdictions where there are no History syllabus documents at present this will be received with relief. In some History has not been taught as a discrete discipline for many years, if ever. This is true of Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia; they are ready to implement their version of the Australian Curriculum immediately. The same reaction is true of the Australian Capital Territory where, although they have taught History, there has been no centrally released syllabus document for some years. They will welcome some guidance. The states that are most likely to experience teacher resistance to implementation are those with existing, well-established History syllabuses and curriculums that are believed to be successful. This is certainly the case in my home state of NSW.

NSW is the largest education 'system' in Australia with more than 700,000 students and more than 2,000 schools. It also has by far the largest number of students studying History. NSW was the only state in Australia that did not adopt an integrated studies approach to teaching History in the 1970s. History and Geography were maintained as separate discrete disciplines. Both were made part of a compulsory core of subjects for study by all students aged 12 to 16 in 1998. The current History syllabus in NSW is generally seen as being 'teachable'; the accountability mechanism, the School Certificate Examination, a publicly set and reported examination for students aged 15 to 16 years, was manageable. In 2011 about 80,000 students presented for the School Certificate Examination. Many teachers in NSW believe that NSW has much to lose if the Australian Curriculum does not deliver what they already perceive as successful in classrooms across NSW.

Teachers and 'practicality'

The response from practitioners to the inevitable changes demanded by implementing the Australian Curriculum may be predictable. Every time a syllabus revision occurs or a suggestion of a 'new' topic arises teachers tend to ask the same questions:

By the time I've finished preparing lessons, writing programs, doing outcomes, coping with language difficulties and behaviour problems... there's simply no time for anything else....computers, group work and student-centred learning is all very well but when will I get the time to do all of this? I've been a successful teacher for twenty years. Why should I change a formula that works well? Sure, maybe there are things that I could do to make things better – but where is the time, where are the resources, where's the money? There's no support for making changes ... I'm just too
bus. I can’t even remember when the last time was that I had the time and energy for sex.

(Halse, et al. 1997: 9)

These are valid questions for practitioners to ask. What can be done to ensure there is no confusion and subsequent resistance to the demands of change?

Research by Doyle and Ponder (1977) described these reactions from classroom teachers in terms of a ‘practicality ethic’. I will argue that their research and findings deserve careful consideration even in the early twenty-first century because my experience as a participant in the many syllabus changes that have occurred in NSW across the last four decades indicates to me that the circumstances that initiated Doyle and Ponder’s original research have operated, and are still evident, in NSW. My most recent experience of the Australian Curriculum demonstrated to me that this is likely to be true across the jurisdictions of Australia. The chances of successful implementation will be determined by how well teachers are informed and supported; the potential for regression to default paradigms in most states may negate the introduction of a national curriculum in History.

Doyle and Ponder’s research was sparked by their perception of what they described as a ‘singular dichotomy’ in the 1970s. They were aware of a growing body of prescriptive literature to demonstrate or suggest how to accomplish change, or introduce innovation. This already voluminous, and growing, amount of data existed alongside an equally obvious, also growing, body of descriptive studies that showed that change or innovation seldom occurred (Doyle and Ponder 1977).

This dilemma of change management and mismanagement, they suggested, was usually dealt with by an increased search for ‘procedural’ solutions and by ‘blaming’ teachers, their attitudes or their competence. They claimed significantly that the possible answers to this problem would be best investigated by gaining a more thorough understanding of the ‘naturally existing mechanisms’ of classrooms and of the established habits and practices that operate in school environments, of existing paradigms (p. 1). They highlighted how ineffectual statements about what ‘should’ happen are in this context. My experience as an insider/outsider is that teachers do not want to hear what is supposed to happen in some ideal or theoretical classroom; they want to know what has happened in a real classroom. And they want to hear it from a ‘real’ teacher. In my own experience the essential credential when I present to teachers is that I have 40 plus years classroom experience from K-12, from prep to matriculation; even so on occasions it has been suggested to me that I am not a ‘real’ teacher because I combine teaching with university lecturing.

Doyle and Ponder’s research was based on the collection of anecdotal and descriptive materials from their own discussions with teachers at professional learning sessions and from individual consultations with teachers and graduate students, and meta-research from other similar studies. The results, interpretative categories and hypotheses, were described as ‘preliminary and
speculative' (p. 2). The most obvious result of their research was recognition of how the term 'practical' was integral to teachers' concern about implementation of any suggested change to their practice. The judgements of 'practicality', 'concreteness' and 'immediacy' of student response (p. 5), appeared to be the core elements of an evaluative process, a 'litmus test', applied by teachers to any 'message' that was intended to impact on their classroom practice; it was an essential first step in the decision-making process; this decision-making process will determine how receptive teachers will be to any suggestion of change.

Why am I suggesting that this finding is so important or potent? Doyle and Ponder when discussing the attempts by jurisdictions to bypass teacher decision-making, identify an important dialectic that operates between the proposed 'control mechanisms' of innovation and the classroom 'ecology' of teacher isolation and autonomy. An examination of this tension could offer interpretative tools for better understanding of teacher decision-making and perhaps provide guidance for constructing processes and producing professional learning experiences and materials which will have a greater chance of success in changing classroom practice.

Like Doyle and Ponder I am convinced, by my experience as a teacher and faculty head teacher, that the final arbiters of what happens in classrooms are classroom teachers. Any other conclusion is naïve and unrealistic. Doyle and Ponder suggest that the literature of innovation indicates that change projects usually attempt to 'bypass' teacher decision-making. They therefore 'mask' the real role played by the decision-making of classroom teachers; they ignore the very obvious role of teachers as decision makers (Kennedy 1985: 11ff) but they do not neutralise it. The fate of an innovation will almost certainly depend on 'user' decision-making (Kennedy 1985: 3).

Doyle and Ponder postulate that the environment of practice for most classroom teachers is one of 'relative isolation', with a great deal of 'autonomy' and 'individualism' and, generally an absence of bureaucratic 'rule' and accountability (1977: 2). Any innovation project will threaten this classroom 'ecology' that has developed in response to the operative school environment. Any externally driven implementation strategy may require teacher involvement and cooperation beyond the immediate classroom environment. It may involve accountability and even 'publicity', which will increase the 'visibility' of classroom teachers. Inevitably there will be control mechanisms normally absent from the classroom environment. Doyle and Ponder adopt Fullan's term 'power coercive' to characterise the user view of such strategies (p. 3). An understandable response to this fundamental disruption to the normal school environment is likely to be resistance to what will be perceived as disruption of the established classroom ecology.

Teacher resistance to the power coercive change mechanism is inevitable; change, regardless of its origin or intention, necessarily implies interference with established classroom practice, with the ecology of the classroom, with prevailing paradigms. So any approach must minimise disruption. How do you make teachers take notice? How do you encourage them to make the proposed
change their own? What sort of professional learning can change their worldview? Recognising and anticipating what Doyle and Ponder have called the practicality ethic may be one answer.

Another significant result from Doyle and Ponder's research is their description of the operational modes of the recipients of change initiatives, classroom teachers. They contend that most innovation literature characterises teachers in one of two 'images', the 'rational adopter' or the 'stone-age obstructionist'. These images determine how change models are structured (p. 3); most often they are highly structured and intended to be 'teacher proof' (p. 4). However Doyle and Ponder conclude that teachers, when their practice is examined, do not actually fit either characterisation. From the descriptive studies accessed by the researchers they concluded that teachers are more likely to be 'pragmatic sceptics' defining their practice in terms of individual and 'unique' classroom situations and the role of personal preference when selecting methodology for classroom practice (p. 4); they emphasise the distinctive ecological factors of the classroom teacher's environment. The classroom environment where teachers work with large numbers of 'non-volunteers' causes the development of a set of adaptive responses, a 'disciplinary matrix' of individual beliefs or paradigms (Kuhn 1975), to allow them to negotiate the inevitable contingencies of day-to-day teaching. Any failure of innovations to 'mesh' with this matrix of classroom 'contingencies' appears as a lack of ecological 'validity' (Doyle and Ponder 1977: 5); conventional teacher decision-making processes will prevail. Commonsense based on the existence of the singular dichotomy referred to above should allow us to dismiss the notion of teachers as rational adopters. So how do we avoid or minimise the stone-age interventionists and engage the pragmatic sceptics, the adapters?

According to Doyle and Ponder, teachers use the term 'practical' as a non-technical term to express their evaluation of the potential consequences of attempting implementation of a change proposal. This judgement is often made quickly and with little experience or evidence. Classroom environments may naturally foster this decision-making mode; teachers inevitably make many on-the-spot decisions in their classrooms to deal with contingencies (Kennedy 1985). My interest and concern is to find ways that professional learning experiences and materials can avoid or subvert this evaluation mechanism.

Doyle and Ponder cite three variables that result in decisions about practicality. The first variable, instrumentality, describes teacher concerns about the clarity and concreteness of the proposed change. Will the proposed change actually work in the classroom? Was this designed with the classroom in mind, or is it just 'theory'? Is it expressed in terms that suggest classroom contingencies? This first barrier is often difficult to overcome. Research suggests that translating procedures into classroom realities is a highly skilled task (Doyle and Ponder 1977). My contention is that this is only difficult for someone who is not used to the reality of a particular classroom and context.

The second variable is congruence. It involves teacher concerns that what is being suggested is clearly described, in terms that they will understand; it should
be congruent, or compatible (Russell, et al. 1973) with their perceptions of their own situation. This very often means: Will this look like what already happens? Will it 'match' what I already do? Will I recognise what is being suggested? Will my students recognise this and respond? This conserving attitude perhaps explains why so many innovations achieve only a rearrangement of existing processes (Doyle and Ponder 1977).

The final variable is care. What is the potential cost of this innovation? Why invest the time and effort in organising new lessons and finding new resources? Will the return warrant the investment? What is the reward for successful implementation? How will my students respond?

How much more potent is the practicality ethic likely to be in an age of representative professional learning and generic curriculum support? Where the winding down of support for professional learning means that non-specialists without classroom experience in disciplines give generic presentations to or for subject specialists.

A professional learning experience: What appeals to kids about studying Ancient Angkor?

What follows is the substance of a professional learning presentation that I have made on a number of occasions to classroom teachers and more recently to faculty heads. It is intended to encourage them to change their content focus by teaching an Asian option from the existing History syllabus in NSW and eventually from the Australian Curriculum. It has always been possible to study Asian history in NSW syllabuses but the opportunity has never been widely taken up by teachers.

In 2003–2004, as a recipient of a NSW Premier's History Scholarship I undertook research in Thailand, Laos, Vietnam and Cambodia, including a season working with the archaeologists of the Greater Angkor Project (GAP) at Siem Reap. I have maintained my involvement with GAP and have been talking to students and teachers about Cambodian history in an endeavour to encourage its adoption as a topic for study in NSW and Australia. Recently I have led tours of teachers to Cambodia and Laos. I have also shared what I learned about archaeology and the history and culture of Angkor by writing articles for teachers, lecturing at metropolitan, state and national conferences and conducting practical workshops for teachers and head teachers. I have encouraged and assisted other teachers to publish and share their experiences of teaching about Angkor. I have prepared textbooks for student and teacher use and curriculum support materials for the Australian Curriculum.

To assist with adoption and implementation of this 'new' topic I have used tactics implicit in the description of the practicality ethic and have consciously tailored the materials that I have designed for use when teaching about Angkor to counter the practicality ethic. This approach may have wider applications for professional learning. By using the language of the practicality ethic it argues that teaching Angkor should present no major problems in terms of the first two
elements of the practicality ethic. My presentation is about the experiences and responses I had when I was teaching about Angkor to students aged 12 to 14 years. In particular it is aimed to show teachers that their students most likely will react the same way to learning about Angkor as they do to learning about Ancient Egypt; in this sense it is a 'conservative' presentation.

From my experience as both classroom teacher and museum educator, students respond enthusiastically to learning about Ancient Egypt. My experience is that Angkor elicits the same fascination and enthusiasm, provides the same opportunities for skills development and generates a similar empathy for a non-European civilisation. Hence the framing of the presentation to teachers uses the same elements as a familiar 'hook'. Teaching about Angkor, I suggest, is little different from the already well-established practices of teaching about Ancient Egypt.

I think this immediate link to existing classroom practice, a straightforward statement of instrumentality and congruence, negates much of the initial, immediate, resistance that might greet many suggestions of variation to current classroom practice. My impression is that I usually pass the first, most basic, litmus test.

My introduction is framed in the terms of an 'heroic' historical narrative. My experience tells me that this approach engages and inspires most students in the 12 to 14 years age group, and that classroom teachers will recognise this appeal for their students. Nothing precludes an heroic narrative from being critical and analytical; in fact in my classroom that is a prerequisite for the presentation of any narrative.

The Angkorian Empire of the 'Middle Ages' was heroic in its scope covering a vast area of Southeast Asia from the Yunnan area of China to Kedah in Malaysia and from the Mekong River Delta to the Myanmar coast. Most people have heard of Angkor Wat, which was the principal temple of the empire's chief city, Angkor Thom. This low-density megalopolis was the largest pre-industrial city in the world. I use many good quality images and maps to whet the appetite of my audience.

I suggest that teaching about the Angkorian civilisation offers a significant new topic to add to their Stage 4 program. I explain 'significant' in the context of a multicultural Australian school environment and also as a mechanism for breaking down the well-known 'cultural cringe' by which many Australians, students and adults alike, believe nothing significant or important ever happens in Australia, or is done by Australians. Few classroom teachers know of the work of the archaeologists from Sydney University and the GAP. I proceed from this point with a series of questions around the central question of 'What appeals to your students about studying Ancient Egypt?' I then illustrate the responses that I have experienced in my classroom when teaching about Angkor. I am a real teacher describing and discussing what has happened in a real classroom, not someone suggesting what the research suggests should happen.

The first concern is congruence, the essentially conservative concern about student response. This is couched in terms of a series of rhetorical questions,
which I proceed to discuss and answer. Some idea of the substance of the presentation is included below.

Are your students interested in large, monumental, even monolithic, buildings?

Using high resolution coloured images I introduce and describe some of the temples and imperial buildings near Siem Reap in Cambodia. I begin with Angkor Wat, eighth ‘Wonder of the World’ and the largest religious building in the world. It is usually described as a pyramid and has been in use continually since the Middle Ages. It is an acknowledged engineering marvel. Recently the National Geographic series Megastructures suggested that it is actually ‘floating’ on the water in its moat! In my experience the design and engineering of this complex of buildings elicit the same responses of interested awe and disbelief when described and explained to, and also when researched by, students as do the pyramids of Giza or Sakkara.

Few people have heard of the nearby much larger site of Angkor Thom, the great town or Yashodharapura. It is surrounded by a 100 metre wide moat, has an area of 10 square kilometres, and serviced an area with perhaps a million inhabitants at a time when London’s population was about 50,000. The famous ‘face towers’ at each of the five gates are 20 metres high and face the cardinal points. The city was entered by causeways over the moat. On each side of these causeways the 54 gods and demons struggle in a re-enactment of the ‘churning of the milk’ myth that symbolises creation. The moat may have been filled with crocodiles. This illustrates the level of detail that will be necessary to engage students as well as teachers initially.

There are many other temple sites to be considered. The temple at the exact centre of the city, the Bayon, was also a pyramid, built on three levels, in imitation of Mount Meru, the mountain at the centre of the universe. Zhou Daguan, a thirteenth century Chinese visitor, described the Bayon as being covered with gold plate and golden statues. Both archaeological and documentary evidence supports this description. Students are also interested in Ta Prohm, where the temple still carries its burden of Capok/Cotton Silk/‘Strangler Fig’ trees, because of its ‘role’ in one of the Lara Croft movies. I have begun classroom units with a clip from Tomb Raider as the hook.

I also introduce teachers to the concept of student created note building databases and Angkorpedia as a means of reporting their research. It is obvious in the responses to this material that classroom teachers recognise the appeal of the history and the activities that I outline for them.

Do your students respond to accounts of incredible human endeavour and devotion?

Angkor Thom was flanked by two ‘reservoirs’, the baray, used for monsoon control and irrigation but also symbolising the Khmer king’s power over the
vital element, water. It is estimated that it took 10,000 'man years' to excavate the eastern, the smaller of the two barays. Recent work done with satellite and radar imaging indicates that these major public works are only part of an enormous water management system across the plain of Angkor and around the Ton Le Sap Lake. The dimensions of the great temples and the city also indicate that these were major civic undertakings.

**Do your students respond to the 'mysterious'?**

In my experience students enjoy nothing more than conjecture about mysteries and conspiracy theories. The basic building material for the great projects at Angkor is laterite, a 'rock' that forms in leached tropical soils that consequently have high concentrations of manganese and ferrous oxides. It is soft when cut from the soil but becomes 'rock hard' once exposed to air. This was then faced with sandstone that was quarried from the Kulen hills. Until recently the exact origins of the sandstone was a mystery. Many of the hills have disappeared; all that is left are quarries in riverbeds. The transportation details are still not well established. There are still unanswered questions.

**Do your students respond to exotic religious practices and beliefs?**

Hinduism and Buddhism are still practiced. The Hindu pantheon and still observable religious rituals have the potential to fascinate students. It is the fastest growing religion in contemporary Australia. The myths and legends in the Ramayana and the Mahabharata have enormous appeal. The building of the Bayon represents an attempt by a Khmer king to introduce religious 'reform'. The installation in the Bayon of a Mahayana Buddhist 'deity', Avalokitesvara, suggests an attempt to give royal approval to the 'large vehicle' version of Buddhism. This suggests an interesting parallel with the reign and reforms of Akhenaten in Egypt. Such tensions in religious beliefs and practices are regularly explored when studying Ancient Egypt.

**Do your students respond to larger than life individuals?**

The Khmer kings Suryavarman II and Jayavarman VII are interesting characters worthy of some study. Jayavarman VII (1181–1219 CE) was an individual who rivals any pharaoh. His wife, Jayarajadevi, is an equally interesting personage. Comparisons with Thutmose III or Rameses II are not inappropriate.

It is possible to reconstruct details of the battles from the Bayon reliefs. The images can be animated in a normal PowerPoint presentation. The drama of the battles is obvious; some anomalies worth discussing can be identified. The technology of warfare makes a nice comparison with contemporary medieval European warfare.
Teaching historical controversy

Do your students respond to interesting or exciting visual and material evidence?

The popularity of archaeological studies in NSW History courses is often cited as one reason why the numbers of students doing History has increased in the last decade. There have been some who suggest that interpreting archaeological evidence is less demanding than written evidence. Few archaeologists would agree. Source analysis heuristics and concerns with text and subtext still pertain. But archaeological evidence is different; it is visual and kinaesthetic, which makes it more accessible to many students. Students aged 12 to 14 often respond enthusiastically to interrogating the visual sources available from the Bayon and Angkor Wat reliefs. The reliefs show details of everyday life. Birth, death, daily activities and commerce are well documented. While framed in a heroic narrative, historical study can be grounded through these images to study the daily life of the Khmer people.

Angkor Wat has reliefs from an earlier reign. These show details of the legendary conflicts associated with the Hindu pantheon and the eventual victory of Vishnu over an army of demons. The question of purpose springs to mind immediately with reference to both sites and their documentation of Khmer life and its connection to the depictions of their cosmogony.

Do your students respond to contemporary or recent archaeological research?

I address the issue of significance. The Quality Teaching framework used in NSW schools emphasises the importance of students being connected by experience or familiarity to their learning. Often there is a perception among Australian students that the 'really interesting stuff' which happened in the past, was done by people from another country and happened somewhere other than Australia. As I suggested above, this self-deprecating outlook has been described in terms of a cultural cringe.

The Sydney University GAP has been working in Cambodia for the last decade mapping the extent of the city of Angkor and its water management system. A variety of individual research projects by postgraduate students have found answers to some of the perplexing questions about temples, roads and canals. There are some interesting and potentially important environmental lessons emerging from the archaeology. The important historical question concerned with the reasons for the end of the Angkorian Empire deserves exploration. The 'mapping' of this historical controversy will make an ideal case study in historiography with which to engage students of any age. The message to be gained by a study of the consequences of what might be termed over management of the environment may be a salutary message for current and future generations. This helps ensure that this topic is seen as both significant and connected to the student's contemporary world.

These elements of my presentation as outlined above seem to effectively negate teacher concerns about instrumentality and congruence. I have suggested
that they will be able to adapt normal classroom concerns and activities to suit the new material. They will be free to mediate the materials as their classroom ecology demands. I have shown from my own experience that students respond in ways that they can expect in their classroom. I have suggested that there will be minimal investment of time, energy and skill because teachers can replicate practices they already employ.

Finally I address the last variable that drives the practicality ethic, cost. This involves consideration of the amount of personal time, energy, and skill that will be needed to make this change, to change focus. I think, as a classroom practitioner, that this is the crucial concern; others agree (Russell, et al. 1973). I always include good quality images and other sources in the presentation. These are meant to entice teachers to consider the possibility of a change and to fire their own interest in this fascinating topic. Teachers will have to do some basic research about Khmer history. But I hope to have shown them that it will be worth it. A list of easily accessed Internet sources is provided. I review some of the most readily available books as part of my presentation. But the crucial concern is still where they can get the necessary resources. I have more than 11 gigabytes of materials pertinent to this study that I provide to all teachers interested enough to send me a thumb drive. These resources still require teachers to adapt them for classroom use, for their particular classroom and students but that is what teachers should do with any resource. Doyle and Ponder's research suggests that teachers are not adopters; they are adapters (Kennedy 1985) who mediate resources to meet the requirements of their classrooms and of their students. My presentation assumes adaptation by classroom practitioners.

The failure to recognise and plan for the existence of a set of existing paradigms that have been called the practicality ethic may explain the singular dichotomy of the change management literature of earlier and I believe present times. Conscious planning to exploit rather than ignore patterns of teacher decision-making may provide insights that will allow more successful professional learning to take place. Providing opportunities for classroom teachers to learn from other classroom teachers should be the goal of all professional learning planning. This may increase the likelihood that teachers will adapt initiatives for use in their classrooms. In this sense recognising the existence of a practicality ethic may be a significant step in more successful professional learning and hence may encourage and facilitate change at the classroom level.

Notes

1 I used the What is History? kit from the British Schools Council History Project 13–16 as our model.
2 I will confine my discussion to the secondary sector of schooling – students aged 12 to 16 in Years 7 to 10. The implementation of History as a discrete subject in Primary schools, K-6, for ages 5 to 12, for the first time is beyond my scope here.
3 The Australian Curriculum in History for implementation in NSW was originally released as a single document, History K-10: Draft Syllabus. The consultation period
was extended in response to the concerns raised by teachers and others. Access at:
http://www.boardofstudies.nsw.edu.au/australian-curriculum/k-10-eng-maths-sci-
hist.html It catered to students from Kindergarten to Year 10, from age 5–16. While
the concept of the continuum was appreciated, the bulk was not. It has since been
issued in two separate documents.


5 The School Certificate Examination was officially abandoned on 4 August 2011. It
will be replaced initially by school-based assessment.

Melbourne University Press.

7 The Sydney Morning Herald, 28 October 2011, ‘News’, p. 5 quoted such claims…
eroniously and out of context as it happens.

8 NSW DET, (2003), Quality Teaching in NSW Public Schools, Sydney, NSW. Access at:
https://www.det.nsw.edu.au/proflearn/areas/qt/resources.htm
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CHAPTER 7:
FILLING THE GAP

In Chapter 7 I describe and discuss a raft of teaching resources created for teaching historical literacy within a specific topic from the *Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus*. The topic is ‘The Khmer Empire’ and can be taught as a depth study to students in Year 8, aged 13 to 15 years, in Australian secondary schools. This topic will be an option for study in most states of Australia in 2014.

The materials are designed to develop the elements of historical literacy and historical empathy with the intention of facilitating the development and practice of historical thinking. The materials also showcase the major elements of the pedagogy that I have demonstrated and discussed throughout this portfolio. These resources are also designed to be attractive to teachers. It is my belief from my experience as a classroom teacher and a presenter of professional learning for teachers that by providing well-designed resources, I may encourage teachers to change their content focus to teach this significant ‘new’ topic. The demonstration and discussion are contextualised by the consideration of teacher professional learning in Chapter 6.

In 2013, Educational Services Australia (ESA) published an abbreviated version of these materials for use by teachers in implementing the *Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus*. These earlier materials can be accessed at:


The fully developed materials are included in this study as the Appendix. This, and other resources I have developed, will be made available to classroom teachers and students via the University of Sydney *Greater Angkor Project* website in 2014.

7.1 Taught not caught

Regardless of how IT ‘wired’ this generation of history students, may be they are still students. They are still non-adults expected to learn a discipline that is almost entirely about adults and adult affairs. They are still doing history and studying
History. Therefore, this study argues they still need to be exposed to, and learn, basic knowledge and basic vocabulary, both contextual and topic specific. They still need to be taught the skills required for historical inquiry, data collection and processing. It follows from this proposition that there is a very real place in every classroom for structured explicit instruction. Perhaps it should be a feature of every lesson, a regular response to contingencies that arise as students work on apparently more glamorous activities.

The need for explicit instruction is nowhere more obvious than in so-called source ‘analysis’ where concepts are involved. This study argues that this activity should be called ‘source study’ because for secondary students there is much to be done with the text of sources before students are capable of ‘analysis’. Analysing sources require reading between the lines and working with the context and sub-text of sources. In this taxonomy of classroom practices, the collection of data from historical materials and historical sources requires students to have the skills and awareness to decode and comprehend sources before they can analyse and evaluate historical sources to synthesise a reliable and relevant historical account. The development of these skills, concepts and awarenesses will not happen by chance. This is a recurring theme of this study. Skills and concepts are best developed through explicit instruction (Collingwood, 1961; Booth, 1978, 2004; Larsson, 1977; Taylor, 2003; Larsson et al, 2004; Levesque, 2005, 2009; Seixas; 1999, 2006; Wineburg, 2001, 2007; Kalantzis & Cope, 2008; Sheldon, 2011; Joseph, 2012; VanSledright, 2014). The classroom teacher should mediate the curriculum on the basis of experience and ability of students to maximise their skills development. The process that is outlined has proven to be successful over many years for teaching the process of source study, or document study. It was originally based on the experience of teaching Mathematics in Primary School classrooms where less able students were introduced to complicated algorithms, and watching various chefs teach others how to cook complicated gourmet dishes has since reinforced this pedagogy.
7.2 Designing resources for teachers

In line with the literature that suggest that teachers are resource adapters rather than adopters, the resources and pedagogy that follow are meant to be adaptable not prescriptive. This may encourage the teaching of the topic of ‘The Khmer Empire’. The aim of providing these resources is to subvert the practicality ethic, as described in Chapter 6. The literature suggests that resources will help overcome the crucial element of ‘cost’ (Russel, 1973; Simkins, 1983; Seixas, 1999; Weintraub, 2000; Carroll, 2004; Sheldon, 2011). The pedagogical approach embedded in the resources and discussion will further illustrate the practices derived from the taxonomy described in Chapter 3. These practices, based on using historical materials as the means of teaching historical literacy and empathy, are at the core of the taxonomy (Mootz, 2010) that this study presents.

The resource is in the form of a ‘Start Up Kit’ for a teacher embarking for the first time on a unit of work for the Year 8 Australian Curriculum: History topic, ‘The Khmer Empire’. There is a collection of source material, both visual and textual, provided to indicate that this is a source-based study. Substantial pedagogical guidance has been provided for teachers who are unaccustomed to the challenge of working with historical sources in the classroom. The source study heuristic and guidance for its application should leave no doubt that this unit of work is skills-based and requires teacher mediation. The unit also provides opportunities for students to be involved in inquiry, transformations and reporting. In this unit of work, students will be doing history and studying History.

The Angkorpedia (Mootz, 2013) assessment task that concludes the unit involves students building on the knowledge and understanding from the unit. Working individually, in pairs or in groups, they are to produce a digital report on Angkor. This task involves historical research and communication, including the use of evidence from sources to support the report. There are also other assessment formats suggested that could be used in both formative and summative contexts.

A sample ‘Unit of Work’ models the approach taken throughout, a balance of teacher-centred explicit instruction and student-centred inquiry learning. This
emphasis on balancing explicit teaching of skills and concepts is a central theme, ‘taught not caught’, of this study.

7.3 Filling the GAP: The Khmer Empire ‘Start up Kit’

In Section 7.3, I outline the components of the resource kit that I created and discuss some of the pedagogy that underpins the resources and the ‘kit’. The title and contents pages of the kit are shown in Figure 7.1. In the kit, presented as the Appendix, each heading is hyperlinked to the relevant section of the document.
I will begin discussion on the elements of the ‘Start Up Kit’ with the ‘Sample Unit of Work’.

7.3.1 Unit of work

There is a ‘Unit of Work’ provided in the kit as a guide for teaching the Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus topic, Year 8: Depth Study 2: The Khmer Empire (c. AD 802-1431). The unit is designed as an exemplar for adoption and adaptation.

Sample unit of work

The emphasis on balancing explicit instruction with inquiry learning should be obvious in the unit of work for 20 to 21 lessons that is included in the kit. There should also be a sense of the pedagogical intent with a range of student-centred activities where students are doing history and studying History from sources. It should be clear from this unit that the raw materials for doing history and studying History are historical sources. The unit is meant to serve as an exemplar only. Each individual lesson will require elaboration if used by a teacher.

There are internal hyperlinks within the unit plan below to other aspects of the kit and to resources on the Internet. While they are shown here as links for demonstration purposes, they are not meant to be active in this version. The full ‘kit’ with active hyperlinks is included in the Appendix.

Unit of work template

The sample unit in Table 7.1 is based on a template that is provided in the kit. The template is provided as an example of how a unit of work could be thought through and planned. There are explanatory ‘callouts’ on the template to help with the exercise of designing a unit. It is a suggestion only.
### Table 7.1 Sample unit of work

**Year 8: Depth Study 2: The Khmer Empire (c. AD 802-1431)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Inquiry Questions</th>
<th>Knowledge and Understanding</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td><em>What key beliefs and values emerged and how did they influence societies?</em></td>
<td>The ‘pyramids’ of Angkor The cultural achievements of the Khmer civilisation, including the building of the temples of Angkor: Mount Meru Bayon Temple Angkor Wat</td>
<td>Use evidence from a range of sources to support historical descriptions and explanations</td>
<td>View extract from <em>Lara Croft Tomb Raider</em> <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HZ7dy0NCNmA">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HZ7dy0NCNmA</a> Segue to teacher Powerpoint of ‘Pyramids of Angkor’. Conduct a class knowledge audit using questions such as ‘Who has heard of … ?’, ‘What do we know about … ?’ Use this information to construct a concept map/title page. Teacher introduces Hindu creation and the universe, Mount Meru and ‘Churning the Milk’ using information from <a href="http://www.religionfacts.com/hinduism/index.htm">http://www.religionfacts.com/hinduism/index.htm</a> <a href="http://www.xip.fi/atd/further-information/hindu-buddhist-cosmology.html">http://www.xip.fi/atd/further-information/hindu-buddhist-cosmology.html</a> Group research, data collection, specific ‘pyramid’ temples: Bayon, Angkor Wat, Ta Som, Banteay Kdei, Ta Keo, Banteay Srei, using the <em>Angkorpedia research template</em>. Students directed to Google Earth for ‘flyover’ images <a href="http://www.google.com/earth/index.html">http://www.google.com/earth/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons</td>
<td>Inquiry Questions</td>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5</td>
<td>What were the causes and effects of contact between societies in this period?</td>
<td>Overview of Khmer Empire</td>
<td>Sequence historical events, developments and periods</td>
<td>Students view inter-active map of Khmer Empire at: <a href="http://cseas.net/digital-museum/sydney-sub/animation/animation.swf">http://cseas.net/digital-museum/sydney-sub/animation/animation.swf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reasons for Angkor’s rise to prominence, including wealth from trade and agriculture</td>
<td>Use historical terms to investigate and describe the past</td>
<td>Students describe location and geographical setting of the Khmer empire.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geographical setting:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Timeline activities: locate Khmer empire on personal (digital) and classroom timelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South East Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Link Depth Study to Overview by adding a comparative chronology showing what was happening in Europe during the Khmer Empire. Add to class timeline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indochina</td>
<td></td>
<td>Start a student Glossary of terms to be updated as words arise in class work. Follow up each lesson with quizzes to monitor understanding of new terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighbours/contacts:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher provides overview of pre-Angkorian archaeological sites: Oe Eo, Angkor Borei, Phnom Da, Sambor Prei Kuk. Add to timelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Champa, Dai Viet, Pagan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Map the Khmer Empire at significant points in history: Funan, Zhenla, Jayavarman II, Suryavarman II, Jayavarman VII, 1431.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>China, India, Mon, Thai</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidate timelines by adding details of archaeological sites relating to the reigns of Jayavarman II, Suryavarman II and Jayavarman VII.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ayutthaya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Angkorian:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funan, Zhenla</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Khmer Empire:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jayavarman II,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suryavarman II,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jayavarman VII</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons</td>
<td>Inquiry Questions</td>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 &amp; 7</td>
<td><em>What key beliefs and values emerged and how did they influence societies?</em></td>
<td>Political system&lt;br&gt;Political features of the Khmer Empire, including the role of the king.&lt;br&gt;Khmer kingship: <em>Chakravartin</em>, Devaraja cult, Khmer administration and bureaucracy&lt;br&gt;Hinduism and Buddhism</td>
<td>Identify the origin and purpose of primary and secondary sources&lt;br&gt;Use evidence from sources to support historical narratives and explanations&lt;br&gt;Explain the significance of individuals and groups and how they were influenced by the beliefs and values of their society</td>
<td>Teacher presentation: the Khmer political system, including…&lt;br&gt;King and ‘God King’: Jayavarman II and the <em>Devaraja</em> cult.&lt;br&gt;Introduce Khmer Inscriptions: King, administration and bureaucracy.&lt;br&gt;Data collection: the main features of Hinduism and Buddhism.&lt;br&gt;Basic overviews are provided at&lt;br&gt;<a href="http://www.religionfacts.com/hinduism/index.htm">http://www.religionfacts.com/hinduism/index.htm</a>&lt;br&gt;<a href="http://www.religioustolerance.org/budd_mah.htm">http://www.religioustolerance.org/budd_mah.htm</a>&lt;br&gt;Teacher explains the impact of religious reform (Hinduism, Theravadist Buddhism/Mahayana Buddhism) on the Khmer political system.&lt;br&gt;Class jointly constructs a diagram to illustrate Khmer political/bureaucratic organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>What key beliefs and values emerged and how did they influence societies?</em></td>
<td>Social organisation&lt;br&gt;Social structure&lt;br&gt;Legal system&lt;br&gt;Armed forces</td>
<td>Identify the meaning, purpose and context of historical sources&lt;br&gt;Use evidence from sources to support historical narratives and explanations</td>
<td>Teacher demonstrates data collection from sources using <em>reliefs</em> from the Bayon and following the steps outlined for data collection.&lt;br&gt;Teacher demonstrates how to enter information retrieved from sources into a <em>note-making table or notebuilding database (Db)</em>.&lt;br&gt;Using information from sources, class and teacher jointly construct a social pyramid diagram.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons</td>
<td>Inquiry Questions</td>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><strong>What key beliefs and values emerged and how did they influence societies?</strong></td>
<td>Economic features</td>
<td>Use evidence from sources to support historical narratives and explanations</td>
<td>Teacher lead source study: economic features of Khmer society using sources from Bayon reliefs and extracts from Zhou Daguan (a Chinese observer). Students enter information on social organisation retrieved from sources into a note-making table or notebuilding database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agriculture, aquaculture, trade, tribute, taxation, corvee labour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 12</td>
<td><strong>What key beliefs and values emerged and how did they influence societies?</strong></td>
<td>Social features: Daily Life</td>
<td>Identify the meaning, origin and purpose of historical sources</td>
<td>Students apply skills learnt in previous lessons to investigating sources from Bayon reliefs and extracts from Zhou Daguan to find information on aspects of daily life. Students transform the knowledge and understanding of daily life gained from sources into another form, e.g. a concept map. Students use information gained from sources to write a scaffolded report describing aspects of daily life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family life</td>
<td>Use evidence from sources to support historical narratives and explanations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Identify and describe different points of view, attitudes and values in historical sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons</td>
<td>Inquiry Questions</td>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13 – 15 | *What key beliefs and values emerged and how did they influence societies?* | Cultural achievements of Khmer civilisation, including:  
Water management: canals and barays  
Infrastructure: temples, monasteries, hospitals, roads | Use evidence from sources to support historical narratives and explanations  
Use historical terms and concepts to investigate and describe the past | Numeracy task: Students access relevant NASA maps and National Geographic website to calculate the scale of Angkor.  
Students analyse *written sources*: Zhou Daguan and Do Couto (a Portuguese observer), to find evidence of infrastructure.  
Students view *MovingStoneBlocks.wmv* and discuss possible methods of moving materials for large construction projects.  
Students access website of the *Greater Angkor Project* [http://acl.arts.usyd.edu.au/angkor/gap/] to investigate: house mounds, ponds, temples, barays, canals, roads, hospitals |
| 16 & 17 | *Which significant people, groups and ideas from this period have influenced the world today?* | Suryavarman II and Angkor Wat  
Sources  
Background  
Achievements  
Angkor Wat | Identify and locate relevant sources, using ICT and other methods.  
Identify a range of questions about the past to inform a historical inquiry.  
Use a range of communication forms (oral, graphic, written) to communicate about the past. | Students access appropriate resources to create a Personality Profile: *Suryavarman II: This is your Life!* Images can be found at [http://www.123rf.com/stock-photos/suryavarman.html](http://www.123rf.com/stock-photos/suryavarman.html)  
Site Investigation: Students access appropriate resources to investigate Angkor Wat, eg: [http://www.sacred-destinations.com/cambodia/angkor](http://www.sacred-destinations.com/cambodia/angkor) and/or [http://www.theangkorguide.com/images/download/Angkor.pdf](http://www.theangkorguide.com/images/download/Angkor.pdf) using the *Angkorpedia* research template to guide their investigation.  
Role–play (or group) task: design a walking tour of Angkor Wat.  
Bas-Relief study: students/groups choose one of the scenes and explain what is represented. Report to the class. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Inquiry Questions</th>
<th>Knowledge and Understanding</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 &amp; 19</td>
<td><em>Which significant people, groups and ideas from this period have influenced the world today?</em></td>
<td>Jayavarman VII and the Cham Sources Background Achievements Relations with Champa</td>
<td>Identify the motives and actions of people at the time. Use evidence from sources to support historical narratives and explanations Use a range of communication forms (oral, graphic, written) to communicate about the past.</td>
<td>Personality Profile: Jayavarman VII, using evidence from inscriptions, the Bayon reliefs and secondary sources, focus on his background, building program, religious reform and relations with the Cham. Site investigation: groups access appropriate resources to research and report on one of the following sites: Preah Khan, Neak Pean, Srah Srang, Ta Prohm, Bayon. Data collection from Bayon reliefs. Students use selected images to create a digital photo-essay in response to the question: <em>What were the main events of the war with the Cham?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons</td>
<td>Inquiry Questions</td>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 &amp; 21</td>
<td><em>Which significant people, groups and ideas from this period have influenced the world today?</em></td>
<td>Decline and Legacy&lt;br&gt;Theories of the decline of Angkor, such as the overuse of water resources, poor government and neglect of public works as a result of ongoing war, and the effects of climate change.</td>
<td>Explain the causes and effects of events and developments.&lt;br&gt;Identify and describe points of view, attitudes and values in historical sources&lt;br&gt;Use a range of communication forms (oral, graphic, written) to communicate about the past.</td>
<td>Teacher led discussion on the ‘rediscovery’ of Angkor in 1860.&lt;br&gt;<em>Was it lost?</em>&lt;br&gt;Teacher presents possible explanations for Angkor’s decline.&lt;br&gt;Students consider these, rank them from most to least plausible, justifying their ranking.&lt;br&gt;Discussion points: groups choose one to investigate and discuss, then present their group’s view(s) to the class:&lt;br&gt;1. What aspects of Angkor have survived or disappeared?&lt;br&gt;2. Is it right for museums around the world to have artefacts from Angkor in their collections?&lt;br&gt;3. What is the current diplomatic status of Preah Vihear? What problems do this cause?&lt;br&gt;4. How can a poor country like Cambodia maintain the remnants of Angkor? Who should be responsible?&lt;br&gt;Consider UNESCO, APSARA and EFEO.&lt;br&gt;APSARA: <a href="http://www.autoriteapsara.org/index_en.html">http://www.autoriteapsara.org/index_en.html</a>&lt;br&gt;EFEO: <a href="http://www.efeo.fr/base.php?code=216">http://www.efeo.fr/base.php?code=216</a>&lt;br&gt;5. What contribution has Australia made to conserving Angkor through the Greater Angkor Project:&lt;br&gt;<a href="http://acl.arts.usyd.edu.au/angkor/gap/">http://acl.arts.usyd.edu.au/angkor/gap/</a>&lt;br&gt;6. How is technology assisting the research and conservation of Angkor?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Assessment:**

Formative

There are many opportunities to collect and assess the products of lessons here: glossary quizzes, source study and research reports. All could be sampled easily. You can create different puzzles and quizzes, from your glossary or notebuilderDb, very quickly at [http://puzzlemaker.discoveryeducation.com/WordSearchSetupForm.asp](http://puzzlemaker.discoveryeducation.com/WordSearchSetupForm.asp). These will help students to learn information and assist with transfer from short term to long-term memory. There is also the opportunity for objective style source study tests, multiple choice and short responses based on sources.

**Summative:**

Objective style source study tests and short responses based on sources are possible options. There is an individual and/or group summative report – *Angkorpedia*.
Pyramids of Angkor

A link in the unit plan connects to a slide presentation and teacher notes that are meant to be part of the introductory lesson. Lara Croft Tomb Raider and the concept of pyramids are intended to be the ‘hook’ for initial student engagement. The video grab can lead later to discussing the representation of the remains at Angkor, as well as considering how the media portray archaeologists. The original plan was to exploit the pyramid concept as an opening to Khmer society and civilisation. The theory behind this suggested linking has been explained and illustrated in Chapter 6.

Moving the blocks

The ‘mystery’ of how large stone blocks are moved is often the link from ‘documentaries’ to theories about aliens and others in the ancient world. Angkor Wat has been included in this scenario. A series of 12 or 13 stills has been animated to demonstrate how three men with crowbars and small rollers easily manipulate large blocks of laterite into place in some reconstruction work on the western embankment of the moat of Angkor Wat. This should help solve the ‘mystery’ and will quickly dispel any ideas about alien technology.

‘Overview’ and Depth Study

‘Overview’ and Depth Study are the organising structures of the Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus. The teaching of a discrete and coherent ‘Overview’ can be a powerful aid to student understanding of each topic. Ten percent of each topic is to be allocated to an ‘overview’. This structure will be new or unfamiliar for most teachers in Australia. Therefore, some practical guidance is provided for teachers to assist appropriate implementation.

Research from major projects of the 1980s in the UK indicated that study in-depth is an essential experience for students to develop empathy and historical thinking. However, depth study in isolation can leave students with a fragmented and disconnected knowledge of the past; it needs to be grounded by locating and contextualising what students are learning. The teaching of an overview, discrete and coherent, that is built around the ‘big’ issues and themes of the topic, that provides a
chronological framework and introduces students to the terms and concepts they will need to use and understand can avoid this problem, and instead provide the opportunity to make cross-cultural comparisons and contrasts between societies or topics. The overview can be based on student research or any other mode of data collection. An overview can also provide the contextual knowledge and understanding that is necessary for developing empathy for the people of the society or period being studied. It is relatively easy to teach a specific field of knowledge but students need context if they are going to understand the elements of sub-text.

There is another advantage to be considered as well. The overview will provide a sound chronological organisation for the location of the depth studies that should operate almost as drop-down ‘windows’ from the overview. As discussed in Chapter 2 with reference to the work of Booth (1978, 1980, 1983, 1987), it was previously argued by some cognitive psychologists that Piaget’s work showed that school students were incapable of historical thinking before they reached the age of ‘abstract’ thinking. The argument was based originally on research that suggested that younger students had no appropriate concepts of time on which to build their appreciation and understanding of the past (Peel, 1967; Shawyer, Booth & Brown, 1988). Teaching an overview that operates as a chronological organiser and reference point can serve to overcome this problem, as well as assist in developing increasingly coherent historical knowledge and historical thinking. Research suggests that establishing a connection to the present helps overcome the challenge of remote time (Peel, 1967; Nance, 1978). A chronological organiser, a timeline, created in an overview and used as a point of reference during study in-depth will make that connection possible (Larsson, Mathews & Booth, 2004). With well-oriented overviews, students will have a better temporal and conceptual orientation for their attempts to study and understand the history they are doing. In this case, they are less likely to get ‘bored’ and more likely to become historical thinkers.

**Glossary of terms**

Details of how to create, maintain and manipulate a glossary of terms are included in the kit. The intention here is to encourage students to compile their own glossary list as an integral activity of the History classroom. The gradual building of this
‘vocabulary’ will help them keep track of new concepts and ideas about Khmer society and civilisation. A link to a master glossary of terms for teachers to use as reference is also provided.

**Comparative chronology**

There is a timeline provided of the Khmer Empire and concurrent events in Europe that will help put the events of this depth study into a chronological perspective. The exercise of gradually building this timeline in class during the unit of work should help link this depth study to the course overview that preceded the unit. It will also mean that students will not come away from the study in-depth with a disconnected knowledge base.

**Getting the balance right**

In 1985, I collected data about classroom practice and syllabus knowledge by conducting teacher interviews in a large rural secondary school in country New South Wales (Mootz, Findlay, Hibbens, Moroney & Walton, 1985). Interview analysis suggested that most teachers believed, perhaps hoped, that they ran a student-centred, or an ‘open’, classroom. Predictably, our observation of teachers in action did not support this belief. Most classrooms were almost exclusively teacher-centred. While teachers did a good deal of explicit teaching, it may not have had the required effect because there was no time for practice, transformation or reflection that would ensure that students were able to accommodate and transfer new learning.

Figure 7.2 was used as an aid for observing teachers in action and as a prompt for discussing classroom practice during teacher interviews. Professor Jack Walton from the University of New England and I created it to suit our purposes.
The x-axis of the graph describes student activity as either ‘Passive’ or ‘Active’. The y-axis describes teacher activity in the same terms. Each quadrant describes a different mode of classroom operation. The first quarter (Q1) at top left, ‘Open Classroom’, is a place where the teacher and student are ‘active’ participants and where learning and instruction take place in different ways. Group work and what might be called ‘constructivist, student-centred, activities’ are common practices. The next quarter (Q2) at top right, ‘De La Salle’ Classroom, is where the dominant mode is teacher-centred and teacher-directed. It allows large numbers of students to be given instruction by a single teacher. The bottom left quarter (Q3), ‘“Summer Hill” Laissez-faire Classroom’, is named after the famous ‘experimental’ school of the 1920s because it was a student-centred and student-directed classroom. The bottom right (Q4), ‘“Programmed Learning” Classroom’, is where learning and
instruction takes place from kits and ‘laboratories’ designed to progress students from one level to the next as they complete predetermined targets or attain predetermined standards. Some current History textbooks are obviously still designed with this classroom in mind.

It is clear from the taxonomy (Mootz, 2010) presented in Chapter 5 that there needs to be a balance between explicit teacher-centred instruction and guided student-centred inquiry from historical sources. It is not unrealistic to suggest that all quadrants should be represented in the analysis of a series of lessons from a History classroom that uses the pedagogy implied by this approach.

In the kit, this diagram is introduced and offered to teachers as a means of self-monitoring or self-evaluation of their classroom activity during planning and implementing their unit of work.

**Inquiry learning**

When discussing or writing about inquiry, it is necessary to qualify what is meant. In this study, the axiom of ‘taught not caught’ is important. Some classroom practitioners equate inquiry and inductive learning with the use of an unstructured pedagogy that is often described as ‘discovery’ (Skilbeck, 1979; Kiem, 2012; Kiem, 2013). This misconception is unfortunate. Inductive or inquiry learning in the History classroom requires careful mediation by the teacher. Students need to be taught the processes and principles of historical inquiry. They should be engaged in guided inquiry, or guided ‘discovery’, as modelled by the teacher. Students will not always learn what is expected or intended by engaging in individual unstructured ‘discovery’, but with explicit teaching, they can practice, explore and transform what has been learned. The research of Booth (1980, 1983, 1987) and others (Fines, 1969, 1983, 1994; Shemilt, 1976, 1980, 1984; Boddington, 1979, 1980, 1984; Seixas, 1996, 1999, 2006, 2012; Taylor, 2000, 2003; Wineburg, 2001, 2007; McIntyre, 2009) supports the proposition that students should gain experience of working directly with historical materials, perhaps primary sources at first, and a whole range of sources and materials, oral, written, visual and digital. They should construct History from these materials. For example, writing an account in Year 8 of an aspect
of the daily life of the people of the Khmer Empire is writing History. Students should be encouraged to develop awareness of text and of sub-text. They should have an opportunity to express their puzzlement and their misconceptions as an important part of the learning process (Fitzgerald, 1980; Shawyer, Booth & Brown, 1988; Fines, 1994).

Increasingly, students should be introduced to History, that is the writings of those reconstructing the period studied as a source of data. The History of any period should be treated like any other source or artefact of the past. It will need to be decoded, critically analysed and evaluated before being incorporated in the synthesis that will produce a new, updated or revised History. This aspect of the process becomes increasingly sophisticated when History, written at different periods in time, becomes the material for analysis and evaluation. But even this historiographical endeavour is not beyond younger students if it is well chosen and well scaffolded. The main pedagogical conclusion from the largest project of its type from the English-speaking world conducted in Britain in the 1970s and 1980s, the British Schools Council History Project 13-16 (BSCHP), was that through well-planned sequential teaching students learn skills and processes (Shemilt, 1976; Larsson, 1977; Shemilt, 1980; Communique 2009, Sheldon, 2012).

An inquiry approach in the classroom should include explicit instruction, that is, modelling, demonstration and scaffolding of the processes of inquiry, as well as allowing time for students to interact with historical materials and engage in activities that will encourage a transfer of knowledge and skills through practice and reflection. This pedagogy is particularly important when we consider that to learn about history and about the past, students need to learn two different aspects of the discipline. Firstly, they need to learn the knowledge of history, usually called ‘historical content’ and usually equated by outsiders with History. The possession of some historical knowledge is an initial requirement for exercising historical literacy. No one can think historically if there is nothing to think about. Secondly, for a proper appreciation of doing history and studying History, students need to have knowledge about history and History, about how this dialectic ‘works’. There is a raft of concepts and awarenesses that historians use as the basis for their evaluation of
sources, for their analysis and consideration of the sub-text or context of a source (Seixas, 2006). Seixas and Peck (2004) have neatly defined these as the elements of historical literacy. Students cannot think historically if there is nothing to guide the thinking. They need something to help them make sense of the data they collect (Seixas & Peck, 2004).

Explicit instruction

Many insiders operating in the context of practice would suggest that it is always a good idea to assume nothing in the classroom. Teachers should never assume that students will know what to do if asked to extract information or data from a source. For instance, will they know how to find information in a sentence? How well do they observe visual sources? The concern with well thought-out explicit instruction has been flagged many times in this study. There is a definite emphasis in the kit on the appropriate use of explicit instruction. This is provided in terms of a five-step ‘process’.

Figure 7.3: Decoding a written source. An Extract from Zhou Daguan

The first step in the process is modelling, showing students an example of a source that has been interrogated and decoded to collect data on a specific topic. The teacher may ask, ‘What does this source tell us about daily life in the Khmer Empire?’ Then explain, ‘Here is one I prepared earlier.’

The teacher should explain what has been done and why. Students should be involved by being questioned about the decisions that have been made.

The second step is demonstration, that is the teacher interrogating and decoding a source for a specific topic focus, to collect some specific data, while the class observes. What does the source (in Figure 7.4) tell us about daily life in the Khmer Empire? The teacher should read each sentence and show what to highlight and why. The ‘topic’ needs to be very specific to begin with but later, once experienced, students should be given the opportunity to, and should be expected to, exercise more autonomy in framing the research question(s).

Figure 7.4: Decoding a visual source. A relief from the Bayon
With visual sources, teachers should model how to observe and identify data. This involves identifying the point in the visual that shows the viewpoint of the creator and hence identifies the intended viewing perspective. This will illustrate from the outset that visual sources also have sub-text. The references to sub-text in all sources should increase as the focus of attention as students become more able to decode and move toward analysis and evaluation of sources and as data is increasingly treated as evidence. The teacher should demonstrate and provide a rationale for grouping and numbering of data. It is useful sometimes to illustrate that the same document can be used for different purposes, to collect different data.

The third step is scaffolding. Reiterate and talk students through the decoding process, through the steps, one-by-one. The teacher and students should look carefully at each step and discuss and talk about the process.

The fourth step, joint construction, follows easily from scaffolding, when the teacher leads students toward the interrogation of a different source. More than one example and more than one lesson are likely to be required before students are confident in the process.

The final step is practice. Let the students have ‘a go’. There should be a specific purpose or topic for collecting data, a research question. This step is crucial. The failure to allow students time to practice skills is most likely to be counterproductive to the other processes that have been employed. Students need time to try things and make errors as part of the learning process. The teacher should monitor their individual progress and provide individual help, where necessary. If there is a general problem, the teacher can stop and reteach that step. This process is represented visually in Figure 7.5.
The arrows in Figure 7.5 indicate the progressive steps, clockwise, in the process outlined above. The reverse arrows also indicate that it is legitimate and possible to backtrack, to go anticlockwise when necessary to reteach any step at any point. This also applies after moving to the last step, the practice and transfer stage, where students put their skills to work, practising data collection and source study. Teachers should not hesitate to revisit and reteach any aspect of the process at any time. Whether this will require whole class teaching, individual or group tuition will depend on the class and their stage of development.

This process can be applied to any situation where students need to learn a specific skill or process. The establishment of this dialogic discourse, a two-way dialogue between teacher and students, as well as between student and student, is very much in keeping with the ideas of Vygotsky (D’Sena, 2010). Students can benefit and learn from a thoughtful application of explicit instruction techniques. They appreciate the
expertise of the teacher and grow in self-confidence as a result (Pendry & Husbands, 1998; D’Sena, 2010).

7.3.2 Using sources

This study argues that using sources should be the most common activity in the History classroom. The ability to decode or deconstruct a source needs to be taught to students in a structured way. To be able to deconstruct sources, they need a ‘plan of attack’. There are numerous heuristics available for using source. The heuristic outlined and discussed below was developed during more than three decades of teaching History in secondary schools. It requires the teaching of four elements or steps in an incremental fashion. Each step or element of the heuristic should be taught explicitly, and then time should be provided for students to practice the skills they have been taught and to reflect on what they have found.

While Wineburg (Drake, 1994) concluded from his empirical work with older students that it is important to start with analysis of sources, with sub-text via the ‘source heuristic’. In the secondary school classroom, History teachers work with a different cohort of students. There is good evidence that younger secondary students need a great deal of experience in reading and decoding sources of all varieties, collecting data from sources and dealing with text (McIntosh, 1995; McIntyre, 2009). Working with the text of sources is the most basic of source study skills that students need to master when doing history (Macintosh, 1995; McIntyre, 2009). They will need to master the processes of reading, comprehending and understanding the data available in sources before they begin the more complex tasks of interrogating, analysing and evaluating evidence, the sub-text and context of sources.

Students should examine and practise the process and heuristic, one element and one step at a time. They will begin to develop the skills required for dealing with evidence, elements two, three and four when practising element one, collecting data from sources. The rate of progress from one element of the heuristic to the next will vary. Some classes may only need a lesson or two with one element or the other, before moving on to the next step, and so on. Each step will eventually become a routine and then a ritual. Eventually, students will apply all elements in any source
work as appropriate to the source and topic. Even an extract from a traditional school textbook should be treated this way. The teacher can discuss and introduce more advanced elements before students are expected to apply them, foregrounding if you like, what they will do next, in follow-up to, or reflection on, the work they have done with known elements. The four stages in this process, which underpins the pedagogy that drives the ‘kit’, are discussed next.

**Data collection**

A template is provided in the kit for students to collect data. This, the first element in the heuristic for source work, is the classroom activity that this study proposes is the ‘bread and butter’ of doing history and studying History in the early years of secondary schooling. The distinction between research, usually about evidence and data, is pertinent because this study argues that experience with collecting data is a prerequisite for developing the awareness and ability of students to eventually consider the role of data as research evidence in the historical process.

Initially, students should be taught how to extract information from sources. This applies to all sources, documents, inscriptions, carved reliefs, artefacts, statues, frescos or any other remnant of the past. This is the most basic data collection activity. Teachers should be very specific about what they are looking for in the source, such as daily life, commerce or housing. The same source could be used a number of times with a different focus or topic. The process of explicit teaching has been outlined: modelling, demonstration, scaffolding and joint construction, followed by practice and reflection. The teacher should intervene, reteach or reinforce, as required. This explicit teaching, in response to student needs and abilities, mediating the curriculum in the interests of developing the skills and abilities of students, is a major theme of this study.

The template provided for element one, data collection, begins with applying the basic historical questions to the source, such as ‘Who is it about?’, ‘What is it about?’, ‘When is it about?’ and ‘Where is it about?’ Answering these questions from sources will begin the process by which students become historically literate.
Table 7.2: Data collection template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data collection: What does this source tell us about (be very specific.)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It may be appropriate for 12-year-olds to use the template in two stages. The more difficult explanatory questions, ‘How?’ and ‘Why?’ could be dealt with by the teacher initially, and then by the class, before becoming part of an individual exercise. Teachers should monitor the progress of students carefully. Getting lost at this stage in the process of skills development is likely to be expressed as ‘boredom’ in the future. Cognitive development research suggests that practice is necessary for the transfer of knowledge and processes from short-term to long-term memory. Practice will develop a routine and eventually, a ritual. Once students are more experienced, the teacher can be less specific, expecting students to suggest what data can be found.

Transformations

Data collected by students is available as the raw material for an ‘output’ exercise for this lesson. Reporting should always follow a data collection exercise where students should manipulate data in some way. They could write a scaffolded report, draw a concept map, or create and enter the data in a table or a notebuilder database for later use. Transforming the data in some way will enhance learning and understanding. A product will also make students aware that data collection is a useful and important part of the historical process. For instance, a data collection or notemaking exercise
with transformation, such as that below, is very achievable after a single lesson of group research and joint construction.

| List the main events of the life of Jayavarman 11 |
| List the main achievements of Jayavarman 11 |
| ▪ Enter the data collected in a Notebuilder Db or Spreadsheet |
| ▪ Use the data collected to create a concept map to explain how Jayavarman 11 changed the Khmer Empire. |

Figure 7.6: Transformation … Concept mapping

Notebuilding

Notebuilding databases (Db) can hold thousands of entries and be sorted and filtered very quickly. These databases can be added to throughout a student’s study of History. Instructions are included in the kit for setting up a two-dimensional database in a spreadsheet. Organising, sorting and filtering data are also explained. The setting up, data entry and sorting and filtering are transformation exercises that can quickly and flexibly provide organised data for output, reporting purposes and further transformations.
Source study

It has been argued in Chapter 2 that the use of historical sources is at the core of historical methodology. It has been argued and demonstrated in Chapter 3 that historical sources are the appropriate materials for students to use when they do history and study History. A four-stage heuristic for guiding students in working with sources is provided and discussed in the kit. Three of the elements are concerned with source study where data is treated as evidence. These will be discussed next. The means of teaching each element of the heuristic have been explained previously as the explicit teaching matrix.

Source interrogation

Students should be shown that the text of a source, what it says and the data it contains in words or images requires interrogation if it is to be used as evidence. This is the basic epistemological dilemma of doing history. All historical materials require critical analysis. This element builds on the skills and experience that students have gained from using basic historical questions for data collection. The teacher should have already identified, when reviewing and reflecting on data collection activities, some data as more important, relevant, reliable or useful than other data as evidence. The basic historical questions, ‘Who?’, ‘What?’, ‘When?’, ‘Where?’, ‘How?’ and ‘Why?’ are applied in data collection, but there is now an extra concern with significance and other aspects of historical literacy. Asking ‘So what?’ about evidence can help decide whether the data collected is revealing, worth knowing or significant in some way.

Also included in the interrogation heuristic are some ‘Other Issues’ questions. These are based on the tools of historical literacy and applied to examine the data contained in the source and to assess it as evidence. For instance, they include ‘Is it plausible?’, ‘Is it credible?’, ‘Does it make “common sense”?’ and ‘Does it agree with what is already known?’ The concept of agency is particularly important when considering cause and effect. Questions of continuity and change, and progress and decline, will illuminate evidence from many texts. This study maintains that the process of explicit teaching, modelling, demonstrating and scaffolding, as outlined previously,
should be used to teach this interrogative element of source study also. There is an opportunity at this stage to cross-reference from one source to another. Sources can be compared for convergence, divergence and difference, such as omissions or extras. Again, progress in applying the interrogation heuristic can be incremental. It divides readily into sections. Teachers should proceed to student practice of this element only at a speed commensurate with students’ abilities and experience of these processes.

Table 7.3: Source interrogation template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Interrogation: What evidence does this source disclose about (specific topic)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This interrogation heuristic offers the opportunity to segue seamlessly from data collection to source interrogation. The template can be extended from the data collection template by adding the new questions and the new concerns with treating data as evidence.
Once students appear to be comfortable with source interrogation, teachers can introduce source analysis and repeat the process of explicit teaching.

**Source analysis**

Source analysis deals with the sub-text and context of sources, with what can be read between the lines. The teacher should have been identifying for students, where relevant during the follow up to earlier data collection and source interrogation activities, that as well as text, sources also have sub-text, and that this sub-text will often determine the usefulness and significance of the evidence held by the source.

**Table 7.4: Source analysis template**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Analysis: reading ‘between the lines’. What evidence does this source hold (about … you could be specific in the early stages)? What are the context and sub-text of this source?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoring?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These questions are likely to be more relevant for some sources than others. Teachers and students should not labour over finding an answer for all of them because there may not be answers for all questions for any particular source. These questions go to
the heart of the historical process because they raise issues to do with epistemology of the sources and our knowledge about history. Source analysis will develop an understanding of the epistemology of history with questions such as, ‘How do we know?’ or ‘What are the sources of our knowledge?’ This study argues that an appreciation of the implications of working with an incomplete dataset is the cornerstone of historical consciousness. Without students being aware of it, source analysis is a major step for them in their journey towards historical thinking.

Teacher modelling, demonstrating and scaffolding, the process of explicit teaching, as outlined elsewhere, should be used for teaching this element also. They should proceed to student practice of source analysis only at a speed commensurate with students’ abilities and experience of these processes.

**Source evaluation**

The teacher should have been highlighting for students, where relevant, during the follow-up to data collection, source interrogation and source analysis activities, that some sources have more significant evidence and are, in certain contexts, more useful, or valuable than others.

The evaluation of sources is also about sub-text and about what can be read between the lines, but it is also a synthetic activity because it involves text, the results of interrogation, and sub-text, the results of analysis, that are considered together, adduced or synthesised to address questions about evidence, significance, reliability, validity or authenticity, usefulness and relevance. Again, teacher modelling, demonstrating and scaffolding, the process of explicit teaching, as outlined elsewhere, should be used for this element. Teachers should proceed to student practice of this element only at a speed commensurate with students’ abilities and experience of these processes.

The evaluation of evidence incorporates all the skills of source study. It builds on, and at the same time depends on, comprehending and understanding, data collection, asking historical questions of sources and evidence, source interrogation, and sub-textual and contextual analysis.
Table 7.5: Source evaluation template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Source Evaluation: What is the importance of this source and the evidence it contains?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significance?</td>
<td>Convergence: In what ways does this source agree with other sources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Divergence: In what ways does this source disagree with other sources?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference: Are there any major differences between this source and others? Omissions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability?</td>
<td>What suggests that this is an authentic source?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What suggests that this source contains authentic evidence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What suggests that the evidence in this source accurate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity?</td>
<td>Are the conclusions in this source logical?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are the conclusions in the source based on the evidence it contains?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness and relevance?</td>
<td>How useful/relevant would this source be for an historian studying …?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Begin with very specific options … move towards open-ended questions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When these questions, and this heuristic as a whole, are applied to historical sources, the opportunity exists to discover evidence that will allow a faithful reconstruction of the past. In this study, source evaluation is the ultimate aim of historical literacy, the gateway to historical empathy, the signpost awareness for historical consciousness and the most definitive hallmark of historical thinking.

**Evaluating sources by cross-reference**

One means by which historians verify or authenticate the evidence found in sources is by cross-referencing to other sources. This is a viable and valuable activity in the secondary school classroom. When cross-referencing sources, students will need guidance from explicit teaching. Figure 7.7 is an example provided in the kit as a model.
What do the following sources tell us about daily life in the Khmer empire?

Ordinary families have houses, but nothing else by way of tables, chairs, jars, or buckets. They use an earthenware pot to cook rice in, and make sauce with an earthenware saucepan. For a stove they sink three stones into the ground, and for spoons they use coconut husks. What serving rice they use earthenware or copper dishes from China; sauce comes in a small bowl made from the leaves of a tree, which doesn’t leak even when it is full of liquid. They also make spoons from the leaves of the nypa palm, which they spoon liquid into their mouths with, and throw away after using. Even when they are making offerings to the gods and to Buddha, they do things the same way.

They also have an earthenware vessel on one side which they fill with water and dip their hands in. They do this because they eat rice just with their hands, and it sticks to their hands and won’t come off without water.


Source 2: Bas relief from the outer colonnade of the Bayon.
The interrogation of the sources, Figure 7.7, identifies areas of convergence and divergence, as well as highlights a major point of difference that should lead to an enlightened sub-textual and contextual conclusion about the evidence provided by Zhou Daguan’s observations.

The statement by Zhou Daguan about ‘stoves’ is important. It may be easy to explain how a brazier could be mistaken for a stove composed of three stones in the ground, but none-the-less it is inaccurate. There are sufficient ‘errors’ in the observations of Zhou Daguan to entertain the conclusion that he is not a reliable observer. The obviously ethnocentric conclusions he sometimes draws about the Khmer and their lifestyle indicates a certain level of feelings of cultural superiority on the part of the Chinese diplomat. The implications of this perspective need to be investigated and discussed by students eventually.

7.3.3 Assessment

There are guidance and exemplars provided in the kit for formulating summative and formative assessment mechanisms. Again, the suggestion is that these are adaptable to suit teacher circumstances and purposes.

Formative assessment

The faux ‘test’ provided in the kit is composed of exemplars that illustrate the various skills that can be assessed in relation to source study. This is not meant to represent an actual test. The examples of objective style assessment items are intended to demonstrate an hierarchical approach to the skills of data collection and source study. The assessment of source study skills by objective style questions has been well researched and advocated previously (Coltham & Fines, 1971; Fines, n.d; Macintosh, 1996; Kiem, 2013). At any point in the unit of work, items of this style of objective question could be used to assess student skills development. In this sense, they could be called ‘diagnostic’. Some of these items could be used in a pre-test situation before beginning the teaching of source study skills. Where appropriate, this style of objective testing could also be a summative means of assessing source study
skills. The assessment items in the test are intended to illustrate the following means of assessing student skills in the use of sources:

- Source as stimulus for other knowledge
- Decoding the source for data
- Using the source as evidence
- Making an inference from the source
- Analysing the source
- Evaluating the source
- Cross-referencing sources for convergence
- Cross-referencing sources for divergence
- Cross-referencing sources for difference or omission
- Writing a ‘text’ based on the evidence from the source(s).

The advice provided in the kit includes consideration of ensuring that teachers are aware of what they intend to assess and how appropriate the chosen mechanism is for their students at this particular time in their development. There is an injunction to ensure that instructions are clear.

Source selection is very important. The length of the written source can be adjusted appropriately according to experience and the literacy level of students. Shortening sentences and providing a meaning or explanation for any difficult or technical terms can help modify the density of the source. Alternatives can be found for words with multiple syllables. This will not alter the sense of the source. It is already a translation and is not meant to be a reading test.

Students should know in advance what they have to do to be awarded marks. It is suggested that teachers provide a simple rubric that details the elements for which marks will be awarded to guide students. Depending on the grade level or experience
of students, teachers may want to provide scaffolding to assist students in structuring their answers.

Students should also be provided with marking guidelines in advance. By combining the elements of the question and the rubric, marking guidelines that are consistent with the rubric and the question can be quickly formulated. The rubric and some elements of the marking criteria may require further description to assist students to meet the expectations of the various levels of achievement. There are examples of appropriate rubric and marking guidelines for the exemplar summative mechanism.

**Summative assessment**

The suggested summative assessment task is written as an individual task but could be easily adapted for a small group task. Students are to produce their own Angkorpedia entry, that is, a digital report on ancient Angkor. There is a choice of ‘topics’, each of which should be about 150 words and include two or three relevant images with appropriate captions. All sources used are to be acknowledged in a reference list.

### 7.3.4 Reporting

There are also some suggestions about student report writing or other ‘outputs’ in the kit. The literature from the last four or five decades (Gosden & Sylvester, 1968; Jones, 1973; Seixas, 1999; Clark, 2008; VanSledright, 2014) makes it clear that writing their own version of History is an empowering exercise for secondary school students.

**Angkorpedia research template**

A basic data collection template is provided for the Angkorpedia report. It is suggested that students write a report on their temple, including pictures. Once students have completed their report, the details for each monument or temple can be added to the school ‘network’ in a hyperlinked Word document (word.doc). The process of hyperlinking documents is explained in the kit.
Angkorpedia sample document

The Angkorpedia is meant to be the final output for this unit. It is the summative student and teacher product. There is an internal link provided in the kit to a prototype document. This prototype is deliberately incomplete. It is offered as an exemplar of the report that students are being asked to produce and is also a potential template with many internal hyperlinks. It can be rewritten. It needs to be adapted, added to or overwritten. The prototype should offer guidance and provide assistance for teachers and students in completing this classroom project.

The images used in the prototype are low-resolution thumbnails. There are a series of resource folders with high-resolution images for student and teacher that will accompany the start up kit and Angkorpedia. The Angkorpedia (Mootz, 2013) prototype template can be viewed in the Appendix.

7.3.5 Resources

Research supports the proposition that the availability of other resources is important for teacher decision-making in matters of implementation (Doyle & Ponder, 1978; Simkin, 1987; Fitzgerald, 1990; Seixas, 1999; Carroll, 2004).

Written sources for the Khmer Empire

The kit provides a selection of extracts from Zhou Daguan and elsewhere to provide data collection exercises and document study that will be the basis of source study from written sources. These are listed below.

- Source A: Zhou Daguan’s description of the city of Angkor Thom.
- Source B: Zhou Daguan’s compares the royal palace to the homes of the nobility and the common people.
- Source C: Zhou Daguan’s description of Khmer dress.
- Source D: Zhou Daguan’s description of burial customs.
- Source E: Zhou Daguan’s comments on trade and markets.
• Source F: Zhou Daguan’s description of common peoples’ homes and furnishings.

• Source G: Zhou Daguan’s description of the King granting an audience to the people.

• Source H: Zhou Daguan’s description of the Khmer army and its operation.

• Source I: Diogo Do Couto’s description of Angkor Wat.

These sources offer the opportunity to compare and contrast data and evidence with that derived from the study of the reliefs from the Bayon and elsewhere that are also included in the kit. Many of these sources have the potential to be used for a number of different topics. There is no intention that they be utilised in their current form or length.

Inscriptions from the Khmer Empire

There is a selection of official Khmer inscriptions provided in the kit. As with the written sources, these can be utilised as sources for student study and eventually analysis. The inscriptions provided are listed below.

• Source A: From (889 CE): Yasovarman 1.

• Source B: From Baksei Chamkrong (947 CE): Rajendravarman 11.

• Source C: From the Mebon (952 CE): Rajendravarman 11.

• Source D: From Bat Chum (960 CE): Rajendravarman 11.

• Source E: From Pre Rup (961 CE): Rajendravarman 11.

• Source F: From 968 CE.

• Source G: From Suryavarman 1 (1001 CE).

• Source H: From Suryavarman 1 (1113 CE).

• Source I: From Preah Khan (1191 CE), foundation Inscription: Jayavarman V11
Similarly, the inscriptions can be adapted and extracted for use. They also offer the opportunity to compare and contrast data and evidence with the other written and visual sources provided.

**Visual sources for the Khmer Empire**

A series of images of the bas-reliefs from the Bayon are provided as potential sources for evidence of details of daily life and society. They can easily be used in tandem with the written sources and inscriptions provided above.

The relief images provided in the kit are as follows:

- Board game
- Boat on lake
- Bringing elephants from the jungle
- Building equipment
- Building techniques
- Children
- Circus … acrobats
- Circus … strong men
- Cock fighting
- Cooking
- Cooking for a feast
- Cooking … BBQ
- Coping with sorrow/grief
- De-lousing … Phnom Penh … 2011
- Family
- Giving birth.
- House in a village
- Household Scene
- Market … rice ‘cakes’
- Market … rice bundles
- Market … selling fish
- Personal toilet.
- Rural scene
- Tending the sick … or delousing.
- Tiger attack
- Tiger attack
- Traditional cooking brazier in Siem Reap market … 2004
- Workers in jungle

Some of the reliefs can be compared with images from modern Khmer life for ethnographic comparison. Hi-resolution versions are available in a resources folder provided with the kit.
There is also another resources folder of images from the Bayon showing the Khmer army at war with their neighbours the Cham.

**Chapters in current school textbooks**

Details of the most recently published texts for the *Australian Curriculum: History* that address the Khmer Empire topic are provided in the kit. Only those previously reviewed have been included. This includes a teacher text that provides a pedagogical guide.

**Reference books**

The kit has details and mini-reviews of the best and most available reference books for aspects of the Khmer Empire

**Internet sources**

The kit provides links to materials on Hinduism and Buddhism, as well as downloadable guides to the sites and image collections. All are excellent resources for teacher and student use.

The official websites of the French School of the Far East (EFEO), Authority for the Protection and Management of Angkor and the Region of Siem Reap (APSARA) and *Greater Angkor Project* (GAP), the Australian archaeological team that has worked at Angkor for many years, are also provided as links.

The Khmer Empire ‘Start Up Kit’ is included in this portfolio in the Appendix. It will eventually be available to teachers on the GAP website. Any updates will be added and expanded on that site.
Before drawing conclusions and implications, it is necessary to recapitulate the central aims and questions of the study.

8.1 Recapitulation

This study commenced by posing the question: What does doing history look like in the classroom? What do teachers and students do when they are doing history and studying History?

This doctorate has argued that teaching and studying of History in schools should involve more than the transmission of, or learning of, an agreed narrative and facts. This argument has taken the form of, first an overarching personal narrative that has demonstrated the level of my involvement in the domains of influence, text-production and practice during my career and then, three projects that illustrate significant areas of commitment and practical expertise that have developed from the experiences of that career.

First, Chapter 1 set out the background to the study by outlining the formative influences and important events of my career as a classroom teacher of History, curriculum developer, provider of professional learning for teachers, historian and teacher educator.

Second, Project 1: History teachers and History classrooms, was concerned with describing the formulation of, and defining the elements of, a suggested taxonomy for studying history and teaching History. In Chapter 2, a synthesis of background reading and practical experiences that foregrounded the formulation of the taxonomy was described and discussed. This discussion was situated within a consideration of the recent efforts to formulate an Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus. Chapter 3, A taxonomy for teaching History, was the final version of a conference paper that
addressed the issue of a taxonomy, described the elements of the taxonomy and drew its implications for classroom practice.

In the third section of the study, in Project 2: Artefacts and historical empathy, I argued that historical empathy was an important, indeed crucial, element of the development of historical consciousness and historical thinking. In Chapter 4, Using artefacts to teach historical empathy, the expanded version of a conference paper which is pending publication, I suggested and demonstrated pedagogy for teaching context-sensitive historical empathy through artefact analysis in two different classroom contexts. In Chapter 5, Artefact analysis in the classroom: Some resources and pedagogy, this argument was expanded and a resource package for classroom use was demonstrated and discussed.

Project 3: Resourcing the Khmer Empire, the fourth section, was concerned with designing resource materials for classrooms use for teaching a specific topic from the Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus. Chapter 6, The practicality ethic and teacher professional learning addressed the issue of authentic professional learning for teachers by discussing the practicality ethic and suggesting ways that it might be anticipated and subverted. This has since been published as Mootz, D. (2014). Overcoming the ‘Practicality Ethic’. In Baildon, Seng, Lim, Inanc and Jaffar Controversial History Education in Asian Contexts. Oxon: Routledge, pp. 233-248. Chapter 7, Filling the GAP, is in the form of a suite of resources designed to be a ‘Start Up Kit’ for teachers wanting to change the content focus with implementing the Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus. Through these chapters, three recurrent themes were explored.

### 8.1.1 Themes

Three themes that were explored and illustrated throughout this study are:

1. A discipline imperative, concerning the tension between the conflicting paradigms of coverage of historical content and the teaching of historical skills. This was discussed particularly in terms of default pedagogies and anomalous paradigms.
2. A pedagogical imperative, ensuring the appropriate balance between explicit instruction by the teacher and using guided student inquiry. Generally, this was expressed in the axiom of ‘taught not caught’.

3. A professional imperative, concerned with classroom practice and systemic expectations. This took two forms. The first was to consider how teachers could mediate the curriculum in the context of systemic efforts to constrain teacher autonomy, and the second was to consider what might constitute effective or authentic teacher professional learning.

The methodology was to attempt a synthesis of earlier research with more recent research outcomes.

A brief summary of the study’s results and conclusions in answering the research questions are presented in Section 8.2.

8.2 Conclusions

Research in the last four to five decades in Britain, Australia and North America has investigated the development of the dispositions of historical consciousness and historical thinking in educational settings. Some conclusions that may be drawn from a synthesis of the conclusions from that research are suggested in the following section.

8.2.1 Historical knowledge

The literature from the period under consideration strongly promotes the acquisition of historical knowledge as being one of the fundamental elements of developing historical consciousness and historical thinking. There has, however, been a shift away from relying on first order knowledge only, whether in a meta-narrative or not, to proposing that there is important second order knowledge required for the study of history and History. This shift of emphasis towards knowledge of the processes of history and History, and the awareness that this produces, remains a significant issue
in the tension between the contexts of influence, text-production and practice in History curriculum policy making.

8.2.2 Historical empathy

This study has established that historical empathy is a characteristic of the discipline that sets it apart from other disciplines. It has argued strongly for the teaching of historical empathy, in everyday classroom contexts, as an essential prerequisite for the development of historical consciousness.

8.2.3 Intellectual honesty

The synthesis of the research from more than five decades strongly supports the contention of this study that history can be done, and History can be studied, in schools. The conclusion that History can be done by and taught to most students in secondary schools, in an intellectually honest way, in a way that replicates the discipline appropriately, is very reasonable.

8.2.4 History and integration

The research discussed in this study supports the conclusion that discipline-based specific first order knowledge and second order knowledge, ways of knowing, are essential to understanding History and doing history. This supports the proposition that the development of historical thinking is best served when History is studied as a separate discipline and taught as a separate subject in schools. In this context learning the elements of historical literacy and, particularly, the exploration of its epistemology, will be facilitated.

8.2.5 The ‘idea’ of History

It could be argued from the literature, that in the context of practice, the domain of the classroom practitioner, the idea of History as a subject in schools has changed substantially in the last four or five decades. It should also be recognised that in the context of influence, the ‘system’ generally has not kept pace with the research that suggests that students are capable of more than learning and regurgitating a meta-
narrative. This continues to be the locus of tension in the formulation of History curriculum.

8.2.6 Pedagogy

The study has argued forcefully for the proposition that the important elements of History must be taught in a systematic and well thought out process. It has also offered a taxonomy that demonstrates that it is possible to formulate a common syntax, a common vocabulary and, to suggest common pedagogical practices for studying and teaching history in secondary schools in Australia.

8.3 Future research suggestions

Future research directions or projects are suggested as outcomes of this study:

- A study would naturally arise from applying the taxonomy provided in this study to a research context.

- Investigating teachers’ understanding of historical empathy is an area that could be fruitful for an understanding of classroom practices. The literature suggests that this is an area that has been somewhat ignored since the 1980s when historical empathy became contentious and problematic in the matter of curriculum making in History.

- An ongoing study of the results of the Australian History Competition could be informative. Schools that consistently score well may provide a research context for investigating the practices that encourage the development of the skills and abilities required for scoring well in this national test.

- Investigating whether the concept of an on-line ‘Start Up Kit’ will encourage teachers to adapt and implement ‘new’ materials and/or practices in the History classroom. The advent of the Australian Curriculum History and its implementation across the jurisdictions of Australia would seem an ideal opportunity for this research.
8.4 Implications

A crucial theoretical result of this study is the identification of a marked concurrence between the experiences of researchers in the United Kingdom and Australia in past decades with contemporary research in North America that suggests that students are capable of doing more in History classrooms than learning a predetermined meta-narrative of agreed facts. This suggests that with appropriate materials and experiences in the secondary school classroom, students can become historically conscious and begin to think historically by doing history and studying History.

8.4.1 Mediation

This study strongly supports the proposition that the classroom regime for doing history and studying History requires mediation of the curriculum by the teacher to cater for the needs, abilities and interests of all students. The research provides strong support for the proposition that by doing history and applying historical thinking in the History classroom, students can develop cognitive and affective skills, and awarenesses that will allow them to exercise historical thinking in increasingly mature ways.

8.4.2 Mastery

This study contends that History teachers should engage students in doing history and in studying History. Classroom activities need to be carefully planned to include both explicit and inductive guided inquiry teaching methodologies. There must also be time provided for practising what is learned, and for open-ended discussion and reflection. Only by experiencing and learning the way the ‘game’ works will students master its intricacies.

8.4.3 Playing the ‘game’

This synthesis of research that is at the core of this study supports the idea that doing history and studying History require interaction with historical sources, and that students should develop the ability to extract evidence by asking historical questions. It follows that they should learn to interrogate and analyse evidence, and to evaluate
evidence by using historical reasoning before synthesising evidence to produce a personal historical ‘output’, and some History of their own. In this way, they will practise the skills and awareness that will allow them to make sense of the past and the world around them.

8.4.4 Life-skill

The research from more than four decades suggests that students need the experience of ‘reading’ and studying history and History in systematic ways to develop and apply second order knowledge, a number of concepts about history and History. This has the potential to make them historically literate. They must be taught these concepts and practise the skills that make up historical literacy. This historical literacy is the prerequisite, the basic life-skill, for their historical thinking and critical reading of their world.

8.4.5 Reading the world

There is considerable agreement in the research and literature that to be able to deal rationally with the onslaught of the media and its penchant for historicising, our students will need more than an agreed corpus of historical knowledge, an acceptable meta-narrative or an array of essential ‘facts’ in the 21st century. The research suggests that they will need to be equipped with a raft of skills and awarenesses that will allow them to critically read the world around them. Historical thinking, based on historical consciousness and historical literacy, is the critical habit of mind that is required to read their world. To provide them with anything less would be considered neglect.

8.4.6 The future

On a less optimistic note, the paradigm debate continues in the Australian context. In Australia in the 2000s, it has not been resolved. It has resurfaced regularly during my career. Interestingly, exercises to produce a national curriculum for History in the United Kingdom and North America in the 1990s witnessed the dialectic of content and skills arise refreshed as well (Phillips, 1998; Seixas, 2000; Wineburg & Martin, 2004). As an insider, I would suggest that there is still an anomalous paradigm
represented at the national level in the *Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus*. The coverage paradigm persists in the content overload that was produced by a managerial determination to write a national curriculum document for an 80-hour course for each stage in a context where it was known that state jurisdictions would allocate no more than 50 hours per stage.

The public discourse as represented in, and by, the media maintains that there is still a crisis in History teaching. At the level of the context of influence, there were indications in the pre-election pronouncements of federal politicians that the *National Curriculum: History Syllabus* would be examined. It has been suggested that Australia is about to embark on a new ‘history war’ (Taylor, 2013). This review, aimed to eradicate an ‘ideological bias’, began in January 2014.

### 8.5 Implications for education policy, pedagogy and professional learning

To conclude, this study has presented a strong case for the proposition that History in secondary classrooms should be reflexive, creating knowledge rather than mimetic, copying and reproducing what is already known (Kalantzis & Cope, 2004). There is a corpus of research covering more than half a century that supports the conclusion that students are capable of doing history and studying History rather than simply learning History and rehashing the knowledge of previous generations. This study has shown that it is wholly appropriate for secondary students in History classrooms to be doing history, to be practising a forensic science, and to be studying History in order to create their own texts, that is, their own versions of past events.

It follows that History should be taught as a stand-alone subject in secondary schools. Importantly, in this context, History will retain its identity and disciplinary integrity. It further follows that attempts to ‘teacher proof’ the History curriculum will inevitably detract from the values of doing history and studying History because teachers, those involved in the domain of practice, must mediate the curriculum in the interests of their students. Only in this way can History as a school subject and discipline fulfil its potential to equip students with the awareness and disposition
required to read the increasingly complicated and historicised digital world that awaits them after school in the 21st century.
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APPENDIX 2

This appendix is the full version of the teacher ‘Start Up Kit’ of resources and pedagogical guidance that is described and discussed in Chapter 7.

This kit also includes the fully hyperlinked *Angkorpedia* prototype document for use by both teachers and students.

Softcopies of the ‘Start Up Kit’ and the accompanying ‘Resource Folders’ are included on the flash drive attached to the inside back cover of this document.
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A ‘Unit of Work

This ‘Start Up Kit’ is for a teacher embarking for the first time on a unit of work for the Year 8 Australian Curriculum: History topic the Khmer Empire. There is a unit of work outlined and a collection of source material, both visual and textual, provided. This is a source-based study.

Pedagogical guidance has been provided for those teachers unused to working with historical sources in the classroom. A guide for source study is provided. This unit of work is skills-based and requires teacher mediation. The unit also provides opportunities for students to be involved in inquiry, transformations and reporting. They will be doing history and studying History in this unit of work.

The Angkorpedia (Mootz, 2013) assessment task that concludes the unit encourages students to build on the knowledge and understanding gained. Students can work individually, in pairs or groups, to produce a digital report on Angkor. This format requires students to apply skills relating to historical research and communication, including the use of evidence from sources to support their report. There are also other assessment formats suggested that could be used in both formative and summative contexts.

The sample ‘Unit of Work’ models the approach taken throughout, a balance of teacher-centred explicit instruction and student-centred inquiry learning.
Sample unit of work

Year 8: Depth Study 2: The Khmer Empire (c. AD 802-1431)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Inquiry Questions</th>
<th>Knowledge and Understanding</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>What key beliefs and values emerged and how did they influence societies?</td>
<td>The ‘pyramids’ of Angkor The cultural achievements of the Khmer civilisation, including the building of the temples of Angkor: Mount Meru Bayon Temple Angkor Wat</td>
<td>Use evidence from a range of sources to support historical descriptions and explanations</td>
<td>View extract from <em>Lara Craft Tomb Raider</em> <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HZ7dy0NCNmA">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HZ7dy0NCNmA</a> Segue to teacher Powerpoint of ‘Pyramids of Angkor’. Conduct a class knowledge audit using questions such as ‘Who has heard of …?’, ‘What do we know about …?’ Use this information to construct a concept map/title page. Teacher introduces Hindu creation and the universe, Mount Meru and ‘Churning the Milk’ using information from <a href="http://www.religionfacts.com/hinduism/index.htm">http://www.religionfacts.com/hinduism/index.htm</a> <a href="http://www.xip.fi/atd/further-information/hindu-buddhist-cosmology.html">http://www.xip.fi/atd/further-information/hindu-buddhist-cosmology.html</a> Group research, data collection, specific ‘pyramid’ temples: Bayon, Angkor Wat, Ta Som, Banteay Kdei, Ta Keo, Banteay Srei, using the <em>Angkorpedia research template</em>. Students directed to Google Earth for ‘flyover’ images <a href="http://www.google.com/earth/index.html">http://www.google.com/earth/index.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons</td>
<td>Inquiry Questions</td>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 – 5   | What were the causes and effects of contact between societies in this period? | Overview of Khmer Empire  
Reasons for Angkor’s rise to prominence, including wealth from trade and agriculture  
Geographical setting:  
South East Asia  
Indochina  
Neighbours/contacts:  
Champa, Dai Viet, Pagan China, India, Mon, Thai Ayutthaya  
Pre-Angkorian:  
Funan, Zhenla  
The Khmer Empire:  
Jayavarman II, Suryavarman II, Jayavarman VII | Sequence historical events, developments and periods  
Use historical terms to investigate and describe the past | Students view inter-active map of Khmer Empire at:  
Students describe location and geographical setting of the Khmer empire.  
Timeline activities: locate Khmer empire on personal (digital) and classroom timelines.  
Link Depth Study to Overview by adding a comparative chronology showing what was happening in Europe during the Khmer Empire. Add to class timeline.  
Start a student Glossary of terms to be updated as words arise in class work. (Follow up each lesson with quizzes to monitor understanding of new terms.  
Teacher provides overview of pre-Angkorian archaeological sites: Oc Eo, Angkor Borei, Phnom Da, Sambor Prei Kuk. Add to timelines.  
Map the Khmer Empire at significant points in history: Funan, Zhenla, Jayavarman II, Suryavarman II, Jayavarman VII, 1431.  
Consolidate timelines by adding details of archaeological sites relating to the reigns of Jayavarman II, Suryavarman II and Jayavarman VII. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Inquiry Questions</th>
<th>Knowledge and Understanding</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6 & 7   | *What key beliefs and values emerged and how did they influence societies?* | Political system  
Political features of the Khmer Empire, including the role of the king.  
Khmer kingship: *Chakravartin*,  
Devaraja cult,  
Khmer administration and bureaucracy  
Hinduism and Buddhism | Identify the origin and purpose of primary and secondary sources  
Use evidence from sources to support historical narratives and explanations  
Explain the significance of individuals and groups and how they were influenced by the beliefs and values of their society | Teacher presentation: the Khmer political system, including …  
King and ‘God King’: Jayavarman II and the Devaraja cult.  
Introduce Khmer *Inscriptions*: King, administration and bureaucracy.  
Data collection: the main features of Hinduism and Buddhism.  
Basic overviews are provided at  
http://www.religionfacts.com/hinduism/index.htm  
http://www.religioustolerance.org/budd_mah.htm  
Teacher explains the impact of religious reform (Hinduism, Theravadist Buddhism/Mahayana Buddhism) on the Khmer political system.  
Class jointly constructs a diagram to illustrate Khmer political/bureaucratic organisation. |
| 8       | *What key beliefs and values emerged and how did they influence societies?* | Social organisation  
Social structure  
Legal system  
Armed forces | Identify the meaning, purpose and context of historical sources  
Use evidence from sources to support historical narratives and explanations | Teacher demonstrates data collection from sources using *reliefs* from the Bayon and following the steps outlined for data collection.  
Teacher demonstrates how to enter data retrieved from sources into a *note-making table* or *notebuilding database (Db).*  
Using information from sources, class and teacher jointly construct a social pyramid diagram. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons</th>
<th>Inquiry Questions</th>
<th>Knowledge and Understanding</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>What key beliefs and values emerged and how did they influence societies?</em></td>
<td>Economic features</td>
<td>Use evidence from sources to support historical narratives and explanations</td>
<td>Teacher lead source study: economic features of Khmer society using sources from Bayon reliefs and extracts from Zhou Daguan (a Chinese observer). Students enter data on social organisation retrieved from sources into a note-making table or notebuilding database.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 12</td>
<td><em>What key beliefs and values emerged and how did they influence societies?</em></td>
<td>Social features: Daily Life, Family life, Education, Housing, Food, Fashion</td>
<td>Identify the meaning, origin and purpose of historical sources</td>
<td>Students apply skills learnt in previous lessons to investigating sources from Bayon reliefs and extracts from Zhou Daguan to find data on aspects of daily life. Students transform the knowledge and understanding of daily life gained from sources into another form, e.g. a concept map. Students use data gained from sources to write a scaffolded report describing aspects of daily life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons</td>
<td>Inquiry Questions</td>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 – 15</td>
<td>What key beliefs and values emerged and how did they influence societies?</td>
<td>Cultural achievements of Khmer civilisation, including: Water management: canals and barays Infrastructure: temples, Monasteries, hospitals, roads</td>
<td>Use evidence from sources to support historical narratives and explanations Use historical terms and concepts to investigate and describe the past</td>
<td>Students access relevant NASA maps and National Geographic website to calculate the scale of Angkor. Students interrogate written sources: Zhou Daguan and Do Couto (a Portuguese observer), to find evidence of infrastructure. Students view MovingStoneBlocks.wmv and discuss possible methods of moving materials for large construction projects. Students access website of the Greater Angkor Project <a href="http://acl.arts.usyd.edu.au/angkor/gap/">http://acl.arts.usyd.edu.au/angkor/gap/</a> to investigate: house mounds, ponds, temples, barays, canals, roads, hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 &amp; 17</td>
<td>Which significant people, groups and ideas from this period have influenced the world today?</td>
<td>Suryavarman II and Angkor Wat Sources Background Achievements Angkor Wat</td>
<td>Identify and locate relevant sources, using ICT and other methods. Identify a range of questions about the past to inform a historical inquiry. Use a range of communication forms (oral, graphic, written) to communicate about the past.</td>
<td>Students access appropriate resources to create a Personality Profile: Suryavarman II: This is your Life! Images can be found at <a href="http://www.123rf.com/stock-photos/suryavarman.html">http://www.123rf.com/stock-photos/suryavarman.html</a> Site Investigation: Students access appropriate resources to investigate Angkor Wat, eg: <a href="http://www.sacred-destinations.com/cambodia/angkor">http://www.sacred-destinations.com/cambodia/angkor</a> and/or <a href="http://www.theangkorguide.com/images/download/Angkor.pdf">http://www.theangkorguide.com/images/download/Angkor.pdf</a> using the Angkorpedia research template to guide their investigation. Group task: design a walking tour of Angkor Wat. Source study: students/groups choose one of the scenes from the Bayon and explain what is represented. Report to the class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons</td>
<td>Inquiry Questions</td>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 &amp; 19</td>
<td><em>Which significant people, groups and ideas from this period have influenced the world today?</em></td>
<td>Jayavarman VII and the Cham Sources Background Achievements Relations with Champa</td>
<td>Identify the motives and actions of people at the time. Use evidence from sources to support historical narratives and explanations Use a range of communication forms (oral, graphic, written) to communicate about the past.</td>
<td>Personality Profile: Jayavarman VII, using data from inscriptions, the Bayon reliefs and secondary sources, focus on his background, building program, religious reform and relations with the Cham. Site investigation: groups access appropriate resources to research and report on one of the following sites: Preah Khan, Neak Pean, Srah Srang, Ta Prohm, Bayon. Data collection from Bayon reliefs. Students use selected images to create a digital photo-essay in response to the question: <em>What were the main events of the war with the Cham?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessons</td>
<td>Inquiry Questions</td>
<td>Knowledge and Understanding</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 20 & 21 | *Which significant people, groups and ideas from this period have influenced the world today?* | Decline and Legacy  
Theories of the decline of Angkor, such as the overuse of water resources, poor government and neglect of public works as a result of ongoing war, and the effects of climate change. | Explain the causes and effects of events and developments.  
Identify and describe points of view, attitudes and values in historical sources  
Use a range of communication forms (oral, graphic, written) to communicate about the past. | Teacher led discussion on the ‘rediscovery’ of Angkor in 1860.  
*Was it lost?*  
Teacher presents possible explanations for Angkor’s decline.  
Students consider these, rank them from most to least plausible, and justify their ranking.  
Discussion points: groups choose one to investigate and discuss, then present their group’s view(s) to the class:  
1. What aspects of Angkor have survived or disappeared?  
2. Is it right for museums around the world to have artefacts from Angkor in their collections?  
3. What is the current diplomatic status of Preah Vihear?  
4. How can a poor country like Cambodia maintain the remnants of Angkor? Who should be responsible?  
   Consider UNESCO, APSARA and EFEO.  
   APSARA: [http://www.autoriteapsara.org/index_en.html](http://www.autoriteapsara.org/index_en.html)  
5. What contribution has Australia made to conserving Angkor through the Greater Angkor Project?  
6. How is technology assisting the research and conservation of Angkor? |
Assessment:

Formative

There are many opportunities to collect and assess the products of lessons here: glossary quizzes, source study and research reports. All could be sampled easily.

You can create different puzzles and quizzes, from your glossary or notebuilderDb, very quickly at http://puzzlemaker.discoveryeducation.com/WordSearchSetupForm.asp. These will help students to learn information and assist with transfer from short term to long-term memory.

There is also the opportunity for objective style source study tests, multiple choice and short responses based on sources.

Summative:

Objective style source study tests and short responses based on sources are possible options.

There is an individual and/or group summative report – Angkorpedia.
### Assessment

Not every activity will require assessment, but you need to consider formative, ongoing assessments or assignments, and summative or concluding testing mechanisms.

It should be possible to draw a line across this table from one element to the next to demonstrate a coherent link between each element.
‘Pyramids of Angkor’: Powerpoint and teacher notes

There is a link provided in the Unit Outline to a slide presentation and teacher notes that are meant to be part of the introductory lesson. *Lara Croft Tomb Raider* and pyramids are intended to be the ‘hook’ for initial student engagement. The video grab can lead later to discussion of representation of the remains at Angkor as well as consideration of how the media portray archaeologists. The original plan though is to exploit the ‘pyramid’ concept as an opening to Khmer society and civilisation.

The presentation is included in Resource Folder One provided in the ‘Index’ folder that accompanies the Kit.

The slides, with teacher notes are below:

An interior courtyard of the temple/monastery at Ta Prohm should serve as an ideal segue from *Lara Croft*. The silk/kapok/strangler fig trees that covered the temple of Ta Prohm have both broken it up and held it together. Many have been removed as the temple is being restored. But some will be left in place as illustration of their impact.

One of the four images on the ‘face’ tower on the western side of the wall surrounding Angkor Thom (Yashodharapura). Each faces towards a cardinal point. There were five gopuras (gates) each with a face tower. There were two gates on the eastern side … one was named ‘Victory’ gate by Jayavarman V11.
The western face tower from inside the town wall. The corbelled arch that forms the gopura is 23m high and was originally built large enough to allow an elephant carrying a howda to pass through it on a paved roadway.

This gate is feature briefly at the beginning of the Lara Croft clip.

The face of Jayavarman V11 from one of the original 64 ‘face’ towers on the Bayon. The Bayon temple sits at the centre of Yashodharapura (Angkor Thom) the capital city built by Jayavarman V11. This city is often referred to as the largest pre-industrial, or light density, city in the world. It may have covered 1000 km² and had a population of ¾ of a million people.

Close up of a ‘face’. The enigmatic, almost smiling, face probably represents Jayavarman V11 in the form of the bodhisattva Avalokitesvara, ‘Lord Who Looks Down’. A bodhisattva is an ‘enlightened’ compassionate being who could assume Buddhahood and enjoyed Nirvana but has chosen instead to stay on earth to help mankind.

The Bayon seen from the West. The three level ‘pyramid’ structure is obvious. Originally lustral pools surrounded the temple. The Chinese diplomat Zhou Daguan reports that it was covered in sheets of gold. The interior shows signs that its walls were once lined. It is often referred to in architectural terms as being three tiered or ‘pyramid’ in structure. This can be seen in this view.

A further two mouse clicks will introduce/segue to the title ‘Pyramids’ of Angkor. The three levels of the ‘Pyramid’ temples are meant to replicate the structure of Mount Meru, the mountain that stood at the centre of the Hindu ‘universe’. 
The interior tower of the Bayon, the second and third level of the ‘pyramid’. There are traces of paint found on a number of temples.

Face towers on the second level of the Bayon.

The ‘pyramid’ of the Bapuon temple during recent reconstruction. The three levels are obvious.

One of the minor ‘pyramids’ on the upper, third, level of the Bapuon.

The ‘pyramid’ structure of the central building at Angkor Wat is obvious when viewed from the air. The size of the complex, the largest religious structure on earth, is also impressive. Recent engineering investigations suggest that the temple was built on a bed of sand and that it now literally ‘floats’ on the water of its moat.

An interior ‘pineapple’ tower on the upper level of Angkor Wat. The extent to which the towers were sculpted is obvious here. Most surfaces were worked in intricate patterns including important scenes from the great Hindu myths.
By comparison temples like the East Mebon, seen from the air here, seem small. However the three level ‘pyramid’ structure with all surfaces sculpted is still an obvious feature.

Ta Keo temple is referred to as ‘unique’ because it is made of uncarved blocks of stone. In fact all temples were made from uncarved blocks and then sculpted in situ.

Again the ‘pyramid’ structure is obvious. This view emphasises the steepness of the ascent to the second and third levels.

The quincunx of towers, set of five, that forms the third level are also small pyramids. They have doorways at the cardinal points.

The absence of carved features is very obvious here. The temple is actually unfinished. It has been suggested that this is true of all temples at Angkor. There are various explanations as to why it was not completed. The simplest is that the sandstone used here came from a different quarry and is harder than the normal stone used. Perhaps it was too hard to carve. Another explanation is that the death of its builder Jayavarman V brought work to a halt.
Moving the blocks

The ‘mystery’ of how large stone blocks are moved is often used as a segue in ‘documentaries’ to theories about aliens and others in the ancient world. Angkor Wat has been included in this scenario. The series of 12 to 13 still photographs has been ‘animated’ to demonstrate how three men with crowbar and small rollers easily manipulate large blocks of laterite into place in some reconstruction work on the western embankment of the moat of Angkor Wat. This should help solve the ‘mystery’ and will quickly dispel any ‘alien’ ideas.

The video is included in Resource Folder One.

‘Overview’ and depth study

Underpinning the implementation of the Australian Curriculum: History for Year 7 and Year 9 in 2014, are the concepts of ‘overview’ and ‘depth study’. It is important for implementation that you consider the classroom and curriculum implications of this structure. ‘Overview’ has been allocated 10% of indicative hours for each ‘topic’. What will you do in the overview of each topic? Some teachers are planning to do the first ‘part’ of their overview and then depth study number 1. Then some more of the overview followed by depth study number 2 and then finish with the remainder of the overview. In this context the overview is filling gaps. This seems to miss the point of the structure.

There is lots of research that indicates that study in depth is an essential experience for students to develop empathy and historical thinking. However depth study in isolation can leave students with a fragmentary and disconnected knowledge of the past. Each topic needs to be grounded by some means of locating and contextualising what students are learning. The teaching of an overview, discrete and coherent, that
is built around the ‘big’ issues and themes of the topic, that provides a chronological frame work and introduces students to the terms and concepts they will need to use and understand, can avoid this problem and instead provide the opportunity to make cross cultural comparisons and contrasts between societies or topics. The overview can be based on student research or any other mode of data collection. An overview can also provide the contextual knowledge and understanding that is necessary for developing some empathy for the people of the society or period being studied. It is relatively easy to teach a specific field of knowledge but students need context if they are going to understand the elements of sub-text.

There is another advantage you should consider as well. The overview will provide a sound chronological organisation for the location of your depth studies. They should operate almost as drop down ‘windows’ from the overview. Teaching an overview that operates as a chronological organiser and reference point can overcome problems of chronological organisation and orientation that students often suffer. This will assist in the development of increasingly coherent historical knowledge and historical thinking. By establishing a connection to the present you can help students overcome the challenge presented by remote time. A chronological organiser, a timeline, created in an overview and used as a point of reference during work-in-depth, will make that connection possible. With well-oriented overviews students will have a better temporal and conceptual orientation for their attempts to learn and understand the history they are studying. In this case they are less likely to get ‘bored’ and more likely to become historical thinkers.

Back
Comparative chronology

This timeline of the Khmer Empire and concurrent events in Europe is meant for your use. The exercise of gradually building this timeline in class, during the unit of work, should help link this depth study to the course overview that preceded the unit. By putting the events of this depth study into a chronological perspective you can help your students avoid a dis-connected knowledge base. There are many IT applications for building timelines available.

Comparative Timelines of Events … Europe and Khmer Empire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Buildings of Notes/Significant Events</th>
<th>Events in Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 802 – 835 | Jayavarman II | *Founded the Khmer Empire – capital at Hariharalaya*  
Phnom Kulen                                                       | Charlemagne crowned Holy Roman Emperor, 25.12.800              |
| 835 – 877 | Jayavarman III | Prasat Sak                                                                                          | Alfred ‘the Great’, 871-899                                   |
|         |               |                                                                                                      | Iceland colonised by Viking c. 870                           |
| 877 – 889 | Indravarman I | PreahKo (880)  
Bakong (881)  
Indratataka baray                                                    |                                                               |
| 889 – c. 910 | Yasovarman I | Lo Lei (893)  
Phnom Bakheng (907)  
Phnom Bok  
East Baray                                                        | Magyars invade central Europe (889)                           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Buildings of Notes/Significant Events</th>
<th>Events in Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| c. 910 – 923 | Harshavarman I    | Baksei Chamkrong  
Prasat Kravan (921)                                           | Cluny Abbey founded (910)            |
| 923 – 928  | Ishanavarman II    |                                                                                                    |                                      |
| 928 – 941  | Jayavarman IV      | Moved capital to Koh Ker  
Koh Ker                                               |                                      |
| 941 – 944  | Harshavarman II    |                                                                                                    |                                      |
| 944 – 968  | Rajendravarman II  | Moved capital back to Angkor region.  
Raided Champa, Dvaravati and Sukhothai regions  
Pre Rup (961)  
East Mebon  
Banteay Srei (967) |                                      |
| 968 – c. 1000 | Jayavarman V      | Consolidated Rajendravarman’s conquests.  
Ta Keo (1000)                                               | Viking exploration of Greenland and Canada |
| 1001 – 1002 | Udayadityavarman I |                                                                                                   |                                      |
| 1002 – 1010 | Jayaviravarman     | Civil War – Suryavarman I eventually victorious  
North Khleang                                               |                                      |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Buildings of Notes/Significant Events</th>
<th>Events in Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1002 – 1049</td>
<td>Suryavarman I</td>
<td><em>Expanded Khmer control over central and southwest Thailand and established Khmer centre at Lopburi.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Khleang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preah Vihear</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wat Phu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phimeanakas and Royal Palaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Baray</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1050 – 1066</td>
<td>Udayadityavarman II</td>
<td>Baphoun (1060)</td>
<td>Westminster Abbey started (1052)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Mebon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1066 – 1080</td>
<td>Harshavarman III</td>
<td></td>
<td>Battle of Manzikert (1071)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1080 – 1107</td>
<td>Jayavarman VI</td>
<td><em>Founded the Mahidharapura Dynasty</em> Phimai (Thailand)</td>
<td>1st Crusade (1096-1104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1107 – 1113</td>
<td>Dharanindravarman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1113 – c. 1150| Suryavarman II | *Re-established relations with China.*  
*Fought the Dai Viet and Chams*  
*Made Cham vassals of Angkor*  
Angkor Wat  
Phnom Rung (Thailand)  
Beng Melea  
Banteay Samre | Paris University founded (1150) |
<p>| 1150 – c. 1165| Yasovarman II |                                                                                                     | Notre Dame de Paris started (1163)                    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reign</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Buildings of Notes/Significant Events</th>
<th>Events in Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c. 1165 – 1177</td>
<td>Tribhuvanadityavarman</td>
<td>Cham invasion – King killed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Angkor sacked?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1177 – 1181</td>
<td>INTERREGNUM</td>
<td>Cham domination</td>
<td>Murder of St Thomas Becket (1170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1181 – c. 1220</td>
<td>Jayavarman VII</td>
<td>Conquered the Cham expanding Empire to greatest size.</td>
<td>3rd Crusade (1189-1192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ta Prohm (1186)</td>
<td>Crusaders seize Constantinople (1204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preah Khan (1191)</td>
<td>foundation of the Franciscans (1209)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neak Pean</td>
<td>Magna Carta (1215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Angkor Thom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Srah Srang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bayon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospital Chapels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1220 – 1243</td>
<td>Indravaran II</td>
<td>Banteay Kdei</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Suor Prat Towers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243 – 1295</td>
<td>Jayavarman VIII</td>
<td>King abdicated.</td>
<td>English conquest of Wales (1283)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mangalartha (1295)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terrace of the Leper King – last known royally endowed temples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 1295 – 1307</td>
<td>Indravaran III</td>
<td>Theravada Buddhism became the state religion.</td>
<td>Battles of Sterling and Falkirk (1297-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preah Pithu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preah Palilay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1307 – 1327</td>
<td>(Sr)Indravaran III</td>
<td>King abdicated.</td>
<td>Avignon Papacy (1309-1377)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reign</td>
<td>King</td>
<td>Buildings of Notes/Significant Events</td>
<td>Events in Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1327 – 1336</td>
<td>Jayavarman IX</td>
<td>Dynastic conflict and political chaos</td>
<td>Hundred Years Wars (1337-1453)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Black Death appears (1347-1350)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352 – 1357</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai invasion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dynastic conflict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1393</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai invasion (brief)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1431</td>
<td></td>
<td>Invasion by Ayutthaya Thai kingdom</td>
<td>Murad II begins to build Ottoman Empire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Glossary of terms

A quick and easy way to ensure that your students begin to know and understand the context of their topic is to compile a glossary of the terms that they will need to know and use. The gradual building and assimilation of this ‘vocabulary’ will help students keep track of new concepts and ideas about Khmer society and civilisation.

This can be quickly and easily done by creating a word.doc and inserting a table. Use two columns and 20 rows to begin. More rows and columns can be added at any time.

Head column A as ‘Term’ and column B as ‘Meaning’, as below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once compiled the list can be sorted at any time to put column A into alphabetical order by using the dropdown Table menu and choosing Sort. Consequently additions can be made and sorted at any time as needed. Encourage students to enter words as they arise in class work.

This could also be done in an Excel spreadsheet. If created initially as a word.doc table it can be easily cut and pasted into an .xls spreadsheet at a later time with other headings added for greater detail.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td><em>Sapta Matrikis</em></td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>Seven Divine Mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td><em>sapta-parṇa</em></td>
<td>Sanskrit</td>
<td>Plant … seven-branched leaf.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This gives you extra flexibility because columns can be added as required. And this format gives you sorting and filtering options. This sorting and filtering can provide the materials for quick and easy glossary ‘quizzes’ that can help students learn and remember these terms.

A master glossary for your use is included in Resource Folder One.

**Getting the pedagogical balance right**

What are students doing in your History lessons? Is your pedagogy varied? Is it balanced? By plotting lessons on the diagram below you can get an idea of the frequency of certain modes of pedagogy being used in your classroom. This diagram has been used with teachers and pre-service teachers to illustrate the necessity to get the ‘balance’ right in the History classroom.
The x-axis of the graph describes student activity as either ‘Passive’ or ‘Active’. The y-axis describes teacher activity in the same terms. Each quadrant is meant to describe a different mode of classroom operation. Q1, is the ‘Open Classroom’ where both teacher and student are active participants. This is a classroom where learning and instruction take place in different ways. Group work and what might be called constructivism are common practices. Q2, is the ‘De La Salle’ classroom. This is predominantly teacher-centred and teacher directed. It allows large numbers of students to be given instruction by a single teacher. Q3, ‘Summer Hill’, is named after an experimental school of the 1920s, where everything was student-centred and student directed. Q4, ‘Programmed Learning’ describes a classroom, where learning and instruction take place from kits and ‘laboratories’ designed to progress students from one level to the next, as they complete predetermined targets, or attain predetermined standards. This appears to be the rationale for the structure of many current History textbooks.
Most lessons can be plotted on this diagram. There will be times in most lessons where the activity planned will move from one quarter to the next. Any single lesson should have a narrative structure: a beginning, a middle and an end. For instance, it could start with a brief teacher introduction (Q2) perhaps followed by some question and answer led by the teacher or a knowledge audit, ‘What comes to find when I say … .?’(Q1), or, some explicit teaching by the teacher (Q2), and then students could be put to work on a related activity on their laptops, or in their notebooks, some data collection from sources, some research, or some output based on data collected in previous lessons (Q1 or Q4). The lesson could conclude with some student reflection on their work (Q3). Arguably a single lesson will visit each quadrant.

It could also be argued that this concern to balance the focus of pedagogy between teacher and student centres allows effective differentiation in the classroom by catering for and adopting these different modes of instruction and learning. If you are operating in one quarter for the whole lesson there may be a need to look at your balance. If over a series of lessons you find a similar situation, a dominant quadrant, then you should look at your planning in terms of the balance of activities. Classroom experience suggests that this concern with balance is integral to the necessity to demonstrate and to teach students the skills and awareness of historical inquiry. The mediation of materials and experiences by you, a teacher is the essential element in the development of the skills and awareness required for historical thinking. Well-planned explicit teaching can lay the groundwork, by providing the skills and processes for the guided inquiry activities that follow as your students do history and study History.

Inquiry learning

What is inquiry learning? It is a form of inductive learning but is not that unstructured pedagogy that is often described as ‘discovery’. This differentiation is important because to be effective in the History classroom, inductive or inquiry learning requires careful mediation by the teacher. Students must be taught the
processes and the principles of historical inquiry. They should be engaged in guided inquiry, or guided ‘discovery’, as modelled by the teacher. Students will not always learn what is expected or intended by engaging in individual unstructured ‘discovery’, but with explicit teaching they can practice, explore and transform what has been learned.

Your students should be working directly with historical materials, perhaps primary sources at first, and a whole range of sources, material, oral, written, visual and of course digital. They should construct History from these materials. Writing an account in Year 7 of an aspect of the daily life of the people of Angkor is writing History. Students should be encouraged to develop awareness of text and of sub-text. They should have the opportunity to make mistakes and to express their puzzlement and their misconceptions. This experience and experimentation is an important part of the learning process.

Increasingly you can introduce your students to History, the writings of those reconstructing the period studied and study it as a source of data. The History of any period should be treated like any other source or artefact of the past. It will need to be decoded and critically analysed and evaluated before being incorporated in the synthesis that will produce a new, up-dated or revised History. This aspect of the process becomes increasingly sophisticated when History written in different periods becomes the material for analysis and evaluation, such as happens in the senior school, but even this historiographical endeavour is not beyond younger students if materials are well chosen and well scaffolded. The best classroom based research available supports the proposition that it is through well-planned sequential teaching that students learn skills and processes of history and History.

An inquiry approach in the classroom should include explicit teaching, modelling, demonstrating and scaffolding of the processes of inquiry as well as time for students to interact with historical materials and engage in activities that will through practice and reflection encourage transfer of knowledge and skills. This pedagogy is particularly important when we consider that to learn about history, about the past students need to learn two different aspects of the discipline. Firstly students need to
learn some knowledge of history, what is usually called historical content and usually equated by the general public with History. The possession of some historical knowledge is an initial prerequisite for exercising historical literacy. You can’t think historically if there is nothing to think about. But equally so, it is likely your students will need some strategies, some tools to help them make sense of the data they collect, of the knowledge they accumulate. For a proper appreciation of doing history and studying History, students also need to have knowledge about history and History, about how the ‘game’ operates. There is a raft of concepts and awareness that historians use as the basis for their evaluation of sources, for their analysis and consideration of the sub-text or context of a source. These have been neatly defined as the elements of historical literacy.

Explicit instruction

Many teachers would suggest that it is always a good idea to assume nothing in the classroom. Perhaps we should never assume that students will know what to do if asked to extract information or data from a source. For instance, will they know how to find information in a sentence? How well do they observe visual sources? Begin by showing students an example of how you have interrogated and decoded a source to collect some data on a specific topic.

Explain what has been highlighted and why. Involve your students by questioning them about the decisions that you made when decoding this source, ‘Why was this highlighted?’, ‘What was I thinking about here?’ and ‘Who can tell me why I …?’
Step 1: Modelling – ‘It should look like this’ or ‘Here is one I prepared earlier’

‘What does this source tell us about daily life in the Khmer Empire?’

Decoding a written source: An extract from Zhou Daguan

Step 2: Demonstration – ‘Watch while I show you how to do it’

Start from ‘scratch’ to interrogate and decode a source for a specific topic focus, to collect some specific data. Read each sentence and show what to highlight and why. The ‘topic’ needs to be very specific to begin with, but once experienced, students should be given the opportunity to, and should be expected to, exercise more autonomy in framing the research question(s).
'What does the source below tell us about daily life in the Khmer Empire?'

Decoding a visual source: A relief carving from the Bayon

With visual sources you should model how to observe and identify data. Make sure that students know how to identify the point in the visual that shows the viewpoint of the creator and hence identifies the intended viewing perspective, ‘Where is the ‘camera’? ’ and ‘What are you supposed to see?’ This illustrates from the outset that visual sources also have sub-text. The references to sub-text in all sources should become increasingly the focus as students become more able to decode and move towards analysis and evaluation of sources. Again, explain what has been highlighted and why, and involve students by questioning the decisions that are being made, ‘Why was this highlighted?’

Lastly, explain the rationale for decisions about any grouping and numbering of data, ‘What do these have in common?’ It is useful sometimes to illustrate that the same document can be used for different purposes, to collect different data.
**Step 3: Scaffolding – ‘Let’s look at the element and steps more closely’**

At this point the teacher can talk students through the decoding process, through the steps, step by step. They should look carefully at each step and discuss and talk about the process.

**Step 4: Joint Construction – ‘Let’s do one together’**

You can then lead students in the interrogation of a different source, ‘Who wants to have the first go?’ or ‘Who wants to do the first sentence?’ You may have to do more than one example.

**Step 5: Practice – ‘Now you try one’**

Next is the practice stage. Students need time to practice and assimilate skills. There should be a specific purpose or topic for collecting data, a research question. You should monitor student progress. You can provide individual help where necessary. If there is a general problem stop and reteach that step.

The arrows in the matrix shown below indicate firstly, the progressive steps, clockwise, in the process outlined above.
Secondly, the reverse arrows indicate that it is legitimate and possible to backtrack, to go anticlockwise when necessary to reteach any step, at any point. This also applies after moving to Step 5, the practice and transfer stage where students put their skills to work, practising data collection and source study. Do not hesitate to revisit and reteach any aspect of the process at any time. Whether this will require whole class teaching or individual or group tuition will depend upon the class and their stage of development.

This process can be applied in any situation where students need to learn a specific skill or process. The establishment of this dialogic discourse, a two-way dialogue between teacher and students, and also between student and student is based on sound research and is very much in keeping with the ideas of Vygotsky. Students can benefit and learn from thoughtful application of explicit teaching techniques. They will appreciate the expertise of you, their teacher and, grow in confidence themselves as a result.
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Data collection

In the secondary school classroom source ‘study’ means working with sources to collect data. A great deal of experience in reading and decoding sources of all varieties, in collecting data from sources and dealing with text, should come before attempts to ‘analyse’ sources. This activity, data collection, is a form of research. Working with the text of sources, is the most basic of the source study skills that students will need to master to do history. They will need to master the processes of reading, comprehending and understanding the data available in sources before they begin the more complex tasks of interrogating, analysing and evaluating that data as evidence, as the sub-text and context of sources.

Source study should be your most common activity in the History classroom. You need to teach your students how to decode or deconstruct a source in a structured way. To be able to deconstruct sources they will need a ‘plan of attack’. There are numerous schemes for source ‘analysis’ available. The scheme outlined and discussed below was developed during more than three decades of teaching History in secondary schools. It requires you to teach four elements or steps in an incremental fashion. Each step or element should be taught explicitly, and then time should be provided for students to practice the skills they have been taught, and to reflect on what they have found.

Students should examine and practice the process one element at a time, step by step. They should begin by developing the skills required with data collection from sources. The rate of progress from one element to the next will vary. Some classes may only need a lesson or two with one element or the other before moving on to the next step and so on. Each step will eventually become a routine and then a ritual. Your goal is for your students to apply all elements in any source work as appropriate to the source and topic. Even an extract from a traditional school textbook should be treated this way. You can discuss and introduce more advanced elements before students are expected to apply them, foregrounding if you like, what
they will do next, in follow up to, or reflection on, the work they have done with known elements and so on.

Teach your students how to extract information from sources. This applies to all sources documents, inscriptions, carved reliefs, artefacts, statues, frescos or any other remnant of the past. This is the most basic data collection activity. The data available in the text can be used as evidence for a particular topic or purpose. Be very specific about what they are looking for in the source: daily life, commerce or housing, for instance. Demonstrate that the same source can be used a number of times with a different focus or topic. The process of explicit teaching has been outlined elsewhere. You should model, demonstrate and scaffold the elements using a source yourself. Once students are ready they should have the opportunity to practice and reflect upon their findings. You can intervene when necessary and repeat any of the steps. This re-teaching or reinforcement could be done on a whole-class or individual basis. This is explicit teaching in response to student interests needs and abilities.

Data collection is the first of four steps in a heuristic for source study. The template below asks the basic historical questions, ‘Who?’, ‘What?’, ‘When?’, ‘Where?’, ‘How?’ and ‘Why?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>What does this source tell us about (be very specific.)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It may be appropriate with 12 year olds to use the template in two stages. You could address the more difficult explanatory questions, ‘How?’ and ‘Why?’, before including them as part of the individual student exercise. You should monitor the progress of students carefully. If they get ‘lost’ at this stage in the process of skills development is likely to be expressed as ‘boredom’ in the future. Don’t forget that plenty of practice is necessary for transfer of knowledge and processes from the short term to the longterm memory. Practice will develop routine and eventually ritual. Once students are more experienced you can be less specific and expect them to suggest what data can be found.

Transformations

The data collected by students is available as the raw material for an ‘output’ exercise. Some sort of reporting, an output of some kind, should always follow a data collection exercise. Make your students manipulate the data in some way. Have them write a scaffolded report or draw a concept map or create and enter the data in a table or a notebuilder database for later use. Transforming the data in some way will enhance learning and understanding. A product will also make students aware that data collection is a useful and important part of the historical process. For instance, a data collection or notemaking exercise with transformation such as that below, is very achievable after a single lesson of group research and joint construction:

1. List the main events of the life of Jayavarman 11
2. List the main achievements of Jayavarman 11
   a) Enter the data collected in a Notebuilder Db or Spreadsheet
   b) Use the data collected to create a concept map to explain how Jayavarman 11 changed the Khmer Empire.
Notebuilding

Notebuilding databases can hold thousands of entries and be sorted and filtered very quickly. These databases can be added to throughout a student’s study of History. Instructions are included below for setting up a two-dimensional database in a spreadsheet. The organisation, sorting and filtering of data are also explained. The setting up, data entry and sorting and filtering are transformation exercises that can quickly and flexibly provide organised data for output, for reporting purposes, for further transformations.

**Step one:** Create a database for data entry in the spreadsheet. This is outlined below.

1. Open a new or blank spreadsheet.
2. Name it and save it as *XXX Db*.
3. Establish *fields* by heading each spreadsheet column. The headings will vary according to your data collection exercise. It is meant to be chronological you could use: *Date/Year/Party/Event*. For chronological entries you must always enter the whole date for the event. Otherwise it will default to date of actual data entry. You may just be collecting data on aspects of daily life. In
that case headings will be: Society/Religion/ Government etc. Later you can add others? Comment/Source etc. Enter data as collected.

**Step two:** Sort data chronologically.

1. Select/highlight all rows/all columns. Do not select the header row.
2. Select Data from the toolbar.
3. Select Sort. You can sort on two or more fields at a time … sort on Column A ‘Date’ and Column B ‘Year’ … select Ascend. All data will be rearranged in chronological order regardless of the order in which it was entered. If there is no chronology involved the data will be rearranged according to whichever criteria you chose.

**Step three:** Filter data.

1. Select/highlight header row
2. Select Data on toolbar
3. Select Auto Filter … ‘arrows’ should now appear on each header.
4. Any ‘arrow’ when clicked will list all items in that field.
5. Select ‘Party’ column … click on ‘arrow’ and select entry from list, e.g. Angkor Wat
6. All entries containing Angkor Wat will now appear in chronological order.
7. To restore items repeat process and click on All.
8. The Custom option allows combinations.
9. The Contains option will search for any word in the designated field.

Data entry, sorting and filtering are transformation exercises that can quickly and flexibly provide organised data for output, for reporting purposes, for further transformations.
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Source study

The use of historical sources is at the core of historical methodology. Historical sources are the appropriate materials for students to use when they do history and study History. The next steps of the four-stage heuristic for guiding students in working with sources are described below. These three elements are concerned with source study where data is treated as evidence. The means of teaching each element of the heuristic have been explained previously in this kit as the explicit teaching matrix.
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Source interrogation

This second element builds on the skills and experience that students have gained from using the basic historical questions for data collection. The teacher should have already been pointing out when reviewing and reflecting on data collection activities that some data is more important or more relevant or more reliable, or more useful than other data as evidence. The basic historical questions of ‘Who?’, ‘What?’, ‘When?’, ‘Where?’, ‘How?’ and ‘Why?’ are applied, but there is now an extra concern with significance and other aspects of historical literacy. Asking, ‘So what?’ about evidence can help decide whether the data collected is significant or revealing. Is it worth knowing? Does it change anything already known? Is it divergent from, or convergent with, or different from what is already known? If so what are the implications of this? This process will demonstrate to students that the text of a source, what it says, the data it contains in words or images, requires interrogation if it is to be used as evidence. This is the basic epistemological dilemma of doing history. All historical materials require critical analysis.

Also included in the interrogation heuristic are ‘Other Issues’ questions. These are only applied when there is a relevant opportunity to further examine the evidence extracted. Asking questions such as, ‘Is it plausible?’, ‘Is it credible?’, ‘Does it make ‘common sense’?, and ‘Does it agree with what is already known?’ can introduce
students to the second order knowledge about history and History that will help them to understand how the ‘game’ works.

The concept of agency is particularly important when considering cause and effect. Questions of continuity and change and progress and decline will illuminate evidence from many texts. This study maintains that the process of explicit teaching, modelling, demonstrating and scaffolding, as outlined previously should be used to teach this element of source guide also. There is an opportunity at this stage to begin to cross-reference from one source to another. Sources can be compared for convergence, divergence and difference such as omissions or extras. Proceed to student practice of this element only at a speed commensurate with your students’ abilities and experience of these processes.

| Source Interrogation: What evidence does this source disclose about (specific topic)? |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Source:                          |                                                                                     |
| Who?                             |                                                                                     |
| What?                            |                                                                                     |
| Where?                           |                                                                                     |
| When?                            |                                                                                     |
| How?                             |                                                                                     |
| Why?                             |                                                                                     |
| So what?                         | Significance … how important is this evidence? Implications?                         |
| Other Issues?                    | Agency … who or what makes things happen?                                            |
|                                  | Change and continuity … what was the impact of events? What changed? What remained the same? |
|                                  | Progress and decline … what was lost? What was gained?                               |

This heuristic offers the opportunity to segue seamlessly from data collection to source interrogation. The template can be extended from the data collection template by adding the new questions and the new concerns with evidence rather than data. It
can also be applied in increments, adding one step at a time as you think appropriate. Once your students appear to be comfortable with source interrogation, introduce source analysis and repeat the process of explicit teaching. Answer the questions that are relevant to the source as you feel appropriate.

Source analysis

When your students appear to be comfortable with interrogation of sources introduce source analysis to the process. In this heuristic source analysis deals with the sub-text and context of sources, with what can be read between the lines. You have been pointing out to students, where relevant during the follow up to earlier data collection and source interrogation activities, that as well as text, sources also have sub-text, and that this will often determine the usefulness and significance of the evidence held by the source.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Analysis: reading ‘between the lines’. What evidence does this source hold (about … you could be specific in the early stages)?</th>
<th>What are the context and sub-text of this source?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provence? Is this a primary or secondary source? Implications?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoring? Who wrote/made this source? What do we know about this person? Implications?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context? When was it written/made? Where was it written/made? What were the circumstances of its creation? Implications?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience? For whom was it written/intended? Implications?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose? Why was it written/made? Implications?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Some of these questions are likely to be more relevant to some sources than to others. Do not labour over trying to find an answer for all of them. There may not be an answer for any particular source. These questions go to the heart of the historical process because they raise issues to do with epistemology, or the sources of our knowledge about history. Source analysis will develop the understanding of the epistemology of history, ‘How do we know?’ and ‘What are the sources of our knowledge?’ This appreciation of the implications of working with an incomplete data set is the cornerstone of historical consciousness. Without them being aware of it, the analysis of sources is a major step for your students in their journey towards historical thinking.

You should model, demonstrate and scaffold this element also by the process of explicit teaching, as outlined elsewhere. You should proceed to student practice of source analysis only at a speed commensurate with your students’ abilities and experience of these processes.

Source evaluation

Once students appear to be comfortable with analysis of sources, the fourth element, source evaluation can be added to the process. The evaluation of sources is about sub-text also, about what can be read between the lines. You have been pointing out to your students where relevant during the follow up to data collection, source interrogation and source analysis activities, that some sources have more significant evidence and are, in certain contexts, more revealing and more useful than others.

Evaluation of sources is a synthetic activity where text, the results of interrogation, and sub-text, the results of analysis, are considered together, adduced or synthesised to address questions about evidence, about significance, reliability, validity or authenticity, usefulness and relevance. Again you should model, demonstrate and scaffold the process of evaluation. Student practice will follow when appropriate.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Evaluation: What is the importance of this source and the evidence it contains?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Significance? | Convergence: In what ways does this source agree with other sources?  
Divergence: In what ways does this source disagree with other sources?  
Difference: Are there any major differences between this source and others? Omissions? Additions? |
| Reliability? | What suggests that this is an authentic source?  
What suggests that this source contains authentic evidence?  
What suggests that the evidence in this source accurate? |
| Validity? | Are the conclusions in this source logical?  
Are the conclusions in the source based on the evidence it contains? |
| Usefulness and relevance? | How useful/relevant would this source be for an historian studying …?  
(Begin with very specific options … move towards open-ended questions) |

The evaluation of evidence incorporates all of the skills of source study. It builds on and, at the same time, depends on comprehension and understanding, on data collection, on asking historical questions of sources and evidence, source interrogation, and on sub-textual and contextual analysis.

When these questions, and this heuristic as a whole, are applied to historical sources the opportunity exists to discover evidence that will allow a faithful reconstruction of the past. Source evaluation is the ultimate aim of historical literacy, the gateway to historical empathy, the signpost awareness for historical consciousness and the most definitive hallmark of historical thinking.

**Back**

**Evaluating sources by cross-reference**

One means by which historians verify or authenticate the evidence found in sources is by cross-reference to other sources. This is a viable and valuable activity in your classroom. When cross-referencing sources students will need guidance from explicit teaching. The example below is provided as a model.
What can be learned about Khmer society from Sources 1 and 2


Source 2: Bas relief from the outer colonnade of the Bayon.
This example identifies areas of convergence and divergence. It also highlights a major point of difference that should lead to an enlightening sub-textual and contextual conclusion about the evidence provided by one of our major sources, Zhou Daguan. The statement by Zhou Daguan about ‘stoves’ is important. It may be easy to explain how a brazier could be mistaken for a stove composed of three stones in the ground, but none-the-less it is inaccurate. There are sufficient errors in the observations of Zhou Daguan to entertain the conclusion that he is not a reliable observer. The obviously ethnocentric conclusions he sometimes draws about the Khmer and their lifestyle, indicates a certain level of feelings of cultural superiority on the part of the Chinese diplomat. The implications of this perspective need to be investigated and discussed by students, eventually.
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ASSESSMENT

There are guidance and exemplars provided below for formulating both summative and formative assessment mechanisms. These are meant to be exemplars, adaptable to suit your circumstances and purposes.

Formative assessment

The faux ‘test’ that follows is composed of exemplars that illustrate the various skills that can be assessed in relation to source study. They are not meant to represent an actual test. These examples of objective style assessment items (multiple choice) are intended to demonstrate an hierarchical approach to the skills of data collection and source study.

At any point in your unit of work, items of this style can be used to assess student skills development. In this sense they could be diagnostic. Some of these items could be used in a pre-test situation before beginning the teaching of source study skills. Where appropriate this style of objective testing could also be a summative means of assessing source study skills. The assessment items that follow are intended to illustrate the following means of assessing student skills in the use of sources:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses the source as stimulus for other knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decodes the sources for data</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses the source as evidence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes an inference from the source</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes some analysis of the source</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes some evaluation of the source</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-references more than one source for convergence</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-references more than one source for divergence</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Choose which of these purposes and what number of items is appropriate for your students at that time. Some examples follow. First, you should test their ability to extract data, or evidence, from a single source.

Instructions: Circle the **most correct** alternative.

Use Source A to answer questions 1-6.

---

Source A: Preparations for a feast. Stone relief from the Bayon at Angkor Thom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. What is the most likely reason for a feast?</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>Someone’s birthday.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>A long weekend holiday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Someone’s funeral.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td>A religious festival.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. How is the food being cooked?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>In ovens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>On braziers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>On stones set in the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>On hot plates.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elements of analysis and evaluation from a single source will follow.

3. What does evidence from this source suggest about Khmer society?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Men and women could do the same jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Only men were cooks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Only women were cooks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Men and women had separate roles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. What aspect of the scene makes it clear that this was a special occasion?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>The cooks are dressed well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>The cooks are preparing rice cakes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>The cooks are cooking a large animal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>The cooks are all very busy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Why would the King decorate his temple with scenes like this?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>To cover the blank walls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>To provide employment for sculptors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>To show how prosperous his people were</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>To make the place look good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Source A would be most useful for someone interested in information about?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Khmer hairstyles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Khmer housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Khmer occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Khmer cooking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When you have introduced your students to the process of cross-referencing, it will be possible to require them to process and synthesise data, and evidence, from more than one source.

Use Source A (above) and Source B to answer questions 7-9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source B.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordinary families have houses but nothing else. They have no tables, chairs, jars, or buckets. They use an earthenware pot to cook rice in, and make sauce with an earthenware saucepan. For a stove they sink three stones into the ground. For spoons they use coconut husks. When serving rice they use earthenware or copper dishes from China. Sauce comes in a small bowl made from the leaves of a tree, which doesn’t leak even when it is full of liquid. They also make spoons from the leaves of the nypa palm. They spoon liquid into their mouths with this and throw it away after use. Even when they are making offerings to the gods and to Buddha, they do things the same way. Each house has an earthenware jar that they fill with water and dip their hands in. They eat rice with their hands. The rice sticks to their hands and won’t come off without water. Zhou Daguan a Chinese visitor to Angkor Thom, describes some aspect of daily life. Harris, P. (trans.) (2007). A Record of Cambodia. Bangkok: Silkworm Books, Chpt 30, pp. 76-7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The length of the written source can be adjusted appropriately according to experience and literacy level of students. Shortening sentences and providing a meaning or explanation for any difficult or technical terms can help modify the density of the source. Alternatives can be found for words with multiple syllables. This will not alter the sense of the source. It is already a translation and this is not meant to be a reading test. Eventually you will move onto testing your students on their ability to identify sub-textual and contextual elements by cross-referencing sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Where does evidence from the two sources most agree?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. On what issue does evidence from the two sources most disagree?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Zhou Daguan says stoves were used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>The relief shows men cooking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Zhou Daguan mentions rice being cooked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>The relief shows pots being used for cooking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What explains the difference in the evidence provided by the two sources?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Zhou Daguan is a Chinese visitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>The relief is Khmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Zhou Daguan is only interested in cooking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>The relief is only about cooking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You can continue in this same pattern by adding other sources as it suits your purposes. However you should also provide an opportunity for students to do something more substantive with the data or evidence available. A short response (10-15 lines) or extended response (20-30 lines) based on the sources used above will give your students the opportunity to write their own version of history.

Question 10:
Use sources A and B and your own knowledge to describe some aspects of the daily life of ordinary people in the Khmer empire.
(Write 10-15 lines)

Students should know in advance what they have to do to be awarded marks. Provide a simple rubric to guide them.

You will be awarded marks for how well you
- Refer to the sources
- Use historical terms and concepts
- Display your historical knowledge and understanding
Depending on the grade level or experience of students you might want to provide some scaffolding to assist them structure their answer.

In your answer you might refer to
- Housing
- Food
- Occupations
- Religious life

Provide your students with the marking criteria in advance. The rubric and some elements of the marking criteria may require further description to assist students to meet the expectations of the various levels of achievement. You can quickly formulate marking guidelines that are consistent with the rubric and the question by combining the elements of the question and the rubric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marking Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding description of aspects of daily life in the Khmer Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding historical knowledge and understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding reference to sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding use of historical terms and concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good description of aspects of daily life in the Khmer Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good historical knowledge and understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good reference to sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good use of historical terms and concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good description of aspects of daily life in the Khmer Empire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good historical knowledge and understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good reference to sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good use of historical terms and concepts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Marking Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some description of aspects of daily life in the Khmer Empire</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some historical knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some reference to sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some use of historical terms and concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little description of aspects of daily life in the Khmer Empire</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little historical knowledge and understanding</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little reference to sources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little use of historical terms and concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summative assessment

The assessment task that follows is meant to be a summative task to be used at the end of this unit of work. It is written as an individual task but could be easily adapted as a small group task. This task gives students the opportunity to produce their own Angkorpedia entry, a digital report on ancient Angkor, written for people who know very little about the subject. There is a choice of ‘topics’ each of which should be about 150 words and should include 2-3 relevant images with appropriate captions. All sources used are to be acknowledged in a reference list.
Angkorpedia

Instructions

- You are to produce your own Angkorpedia, a digital report on ancient Angkor, written for people who know very little about the subject.
- Your report can be in the form of a Wikipedia-style entry or background information for a Lonely Planet style on-line travel guide.
- PowerPoint is NOT a suitable format for this task.
- You may use information gained in class, but you will also need to do some additional research.
- Choose FIVE of the following topics for your Angkorpedia.
- Choose at least one topic from each column.
- Make sure you read the marking guidelines to see what you need to do to achieve the highest grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP A</th>
<th>GROUP B</th>
<th>GROUP C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>‘Discovery’ of Angkor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temples</td>
<td>Building techniques</td>
<td>Threats to Angkor today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barays</td>
<td>Reliefs</td>
<td>Restoration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Each topic should be written in report style, using relevant historical terms and concepts.
- Each topic entry should be around 150 words and should include 2-3 relevant images with appropriate captions.
- All sources used should be acknowledged in a reference list.
- Use your own words. Avoid plagiarism.
- Make the most of the conventions of your chosen digital format.

Provide a rubric to guide preparation and presentation.
You will be awarded marks for:

- Displaying knowledge and understanding of the selected topics
- Developing texts based on evidence
- Using a range of sources
- Properly acknowledging sources
- Using appropriate historical terms and concepts
- Appropriate use of a communication form or digital technology

Marking guidelines issued in advance will give your students the opportunity to maximise their efforts and achieve the results they aspire to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marking Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding knowledge and understanding of the selected topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding use of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding range of sources, properly acknowledged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding use of relevant historical terms and concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding use of the conventions of the chosen medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good knowledge and understanding of the selected topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good use of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good range of sources, properly acknowledged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good use of relevant historical terms and concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good use of the conventions of the chosen medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory knowledge and understanding of the selected topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory use of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory range of sources, properly acknowledged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory use of relevant historical terms and concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory use of the conventions of the chosen medium</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Marking Guidelines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Grade or mark range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some knowledge and understanding of the selected topics</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some use of evidence</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some sources, properly acknowledged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some relevant historical terms and concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some use of the conventions of the chosen medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little knowledge and understanding of the selected topics</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little use of evidence</td>
<td>0-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little use of sources, properly acknowledged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Use of relevant historical terms and concepts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little use of the conventions of the chosen medium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There are some suggestions below about student report writing or other ‘output’. Writing their own version of History is an empowering exercise for secondary school students.

**Angkorpedia research template**

Provide a basic data collection template for the initial Angkorpedia report. It is suggested that students write a report on their temple, with pictures. Once students have completed their report, the details for each monument or temple can be added to the school ‘network’ in a hyperlinked Word document (word.doc). The process of hyperlinking documents is explained below.

You need to collect the following details for the temple or monument you have chosen or been assigned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of temple or monument</th>
<th>Date built</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Built by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Built from (materials)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dimensions/Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each of the word.docs should then be stored for later use. Hold all student data sheets/reports as word.docs in a folder (‘IndexFile’). This ‘IndexFile’ becomes the place at which the hyperlinked word.docs reside. This folder must always ‘accompany’ the hyperlinked word.doc. The hyperlinks could be based on a list or on a map of Angkor. If using a map you will have to add numbers to the features on the map (see Angkorpedia sample below). This is easily done in Photoshop or something similar. Insert the annotated map into a word.doc and add the same numbers below the map with ‘action buttons’ to operate as ‘hyperspots’. This map becomes the base for your hyperlinked word.docs.

The process of hyperlinking documents is straightforward.

- Highlight/select the action button below the map
- Open the dropdown menu ‘Insert’.
- Choose ‘Hyperlink’.
- Choose ‘Other file’ from the options that are available.
- Locate and open ‘IndexFile’.
- Choose the required word.doc.
- Follow prompts to complete process.
- Repeat process with next number/action button below map.

Angkorpedia sample document

The Angkorpedia is meant to be the final output for this unit. It is the summative student and teacher product. There is a link provided in the kit to a prototype document. This prototype is deliberately incomplete. It is offered as an exemplar for you of the report that students are being asked to produce. The prototype is also a potential template for you with many internal hyperlinks. It can be rewritten. You need to adapt it, add to, it or overwrite it as you see fit. Make sure you save the
prototype for later reference. The prototype should offer you guidance and provide assistance for students in completing this classroom project.

The images used in the prototype are low-resolution thumbnails. High-resolution images for student and your use in their version of Angkorpedia are included in Resource Folder Three.

The Angkorpedia (Mootz, 2013) prototype/template is appended to this document.
RESOURCES

Provided below is a small selection of written and visual resources to assist your initial implementation of this unit. There are some suggestions of the most useful and readily available books to help you increase your expertise in this content area. There are also links to other resources that will help you ‘flesh out’ this kit into a unit of work.
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Written sources for the Khmer Empire

These written sources can be adapted, shortened and modified for use in your classroom. These will enable you to begin data collection exercises and document study that will become the basis of source study from written sources

Source A

The walls of the city (Angkor Thom) are about 10 kilometres in circumference. There are five gateways, each of them with two gates, one in front of the other. There are two gateways facing east, and one gateway facing in each of the other directions. Around the outside of the city walls there is a very large moat. Big bridges with wide roads into the city span each bridge. On either side of every bridge there are fifty-four stone gods. They look like stone generals, huge and fierce-looking. The five gateways are all alike. The parapets of the bridges are all made of stone and carved into the shape of snakes, each snake with nine heads. The fifty-four gods are all pulling at the snake with their hands, and look as if they are preventing it from escaping. Above the gateways in the city wall there are five stone Buddha heads. Four of them face toward the four cardinal points, and one of them is placed in the middle. It is decorated with gold. On either side of the gates the stones are carved into the shape of elephants. The walls are all made of piled-up stones, and are about twenty-one feet high. The stones are very highly packed and firm, so there are no weeds growing. There are no battlements either. Sugar palms have been planted on the walls, and there are empty chambers at regular intervals. The inside of the walls is built like a slope, and is probably over a hundred feet in width. The gates all have big doors on them that shut at night and open in the day. There are guards, too, though only dogs are not allowed in – and also criminals who have had their toes amputated. The city walls form an exact square, with a stone tower on each of its four sides.
The Royal Palace, officials’ residences, and great houses all face east. The palace lies to the north of the gold tower with the gold bridge [Bayon], near the northern gateway. It is about 2.5 kilometres in circumference. The tiles of the main building are made of lead; all the other tiles are made of yellow clay. The beams and pillars are huge. All are carved and painted with images of the Buddha. The rooms are really quite grand and the long corridors and complicated walkways, the soaring structures that rise and fall, all give a considerable sense of size …

Next comes the dwellings of the king’s relatives, senior officials, and so on. These are large and spacious in style, very different from ordinary people’s homes. The roofs are made entirely of thatch, except for the family shrine and the main bedroom, both of which can be tiled. In every house the rooms are also made to a regulation size, according to the rank of the official living there.

At the lowest level come the homes of the common people. They only use thatch for their roofs, and dare not put a single tile. Although the sizes of their homes vary according to how wealthy they are, in the end they do not dare emulate the styles of the great houses.

Source C

From the King down, the men and women all wear their hair wound up in a knot, and go naked to the waist, wrapped only in a cloth. When they are not out and about, they wind a larger piece of cloth over the small one. There are very many different grades of cloth. The materials the king wears include some that are extremely elegant and beautiful, and worth three or four ounces (100 grams) of gold a piece. Although cloth is woven domestically, it also comes from Siam (Thailand) and Champa (southern Vietnam). Cloth from the Western Seas is often regarded as the best because it is so well made and refined.

Only the king can wear material with a full pattern of flowers on it. On his head he wears a gold crown, like the crown worn by the Holder of the Diamond. Sometimes he goes without a crown, and simply wears a chain of fragrant flowers such as jasmine wound round the braids of hair. Around his neck he wears a large pearl weighing about four pounds (1.5 kilos?). On his wrists and ankles and all his fingers and toes he wears gold bracelets and rings, all of them inlaid with cat’s-eye gemstones …

Senior officials and relatives of the king can wear cloth with a scattered floral design, while junior officials and no others can wear cloth with a two-flower design. Among
the ordinary people, only women can wear cloth with this design. However if a newly arrived Chinese wears it, people do not make so bold as to take offence, on the grounds that he is ‘anding basha’, meaning that he does not understand what is right and proper.


**Source D**

When people die there are no coffins. The body is just kept on a kind of bamboo mat and covered with a cloth. When it is taken out for the funeral it is preceded by banners, drums, and music, as with us (Chinese). Two dishes are filled with fired rice, and this is scattered along the route. The body is carried out of town to a remote, uninhabited spot, where it is thrown down and left. After that, vultures, crows, dogs, and other village animals come and eat it. If it is quickly consumed, that means the father and mother of the dead person are blessed and so gained this reward. If it is not eaten or only partly eaten, on the other hand, it means the father and mother are guilty of wrongdoings.

Nowadays there are also more and more cremations, mainly of the offspring of Chinese.

When a father or mother dies, there are no special clothes for mourning. Sons show their respect for their parent by shaving off all their hair, daughters by shaving a space the size of a coin in the hair on the top of their head.

The kings are still buried in towers, though I do not know if their corpses are buried or just their bones.


**Source E**

The local traders are all women. So when a Chinese goes to this country, the first thing he must do is to find a woman, partly with a view to profiting from her trading abilities.

There is a market every day from around six in the morning until midday. There are no stalls, only a mat laid out on the ground, each mat in its usual place. There is also a rental to be paid to officials.

Small market transactions are paid for with rice or other grain and Chinese goods. The ones next up in size are paid for with cloth. Large transactions are done with gold and silver.

Source F

Ordinary families have houses but nothing else by way of tables, chairs, jars, or buckets. They use an earthenware pot to cook rice in, and make sauce with an earthenware saucepan. For a stove they sink three stones into the ground, and for spoons they use coconut husks.

When serving rice they use earthenware or copper dishes from China. Sauce comes in a small bowl made from the leaves of a tree, which doesn’t leak even when it is full of liquid. They also make spoons from the leaves of the nypa palm, that they spoon liquid into their mouths with, and throw away after using. Even when they are making offerings to the gods and to Buddha, they do things the same way.

They also have an earthenware vessel on one side that they fill with water and dip their hands in. They do this because they eat rice just with their hands, and it sticks to their hands and won’t come off without water.


Source G

Twice a day the king sits in his outer palace and deals with matters of government, and does so without anything fixed in writing. All the ministers and ordinary people that want to see him sit in a row on the ground and wait for him. After a while you hear the muffled sound of music from the inner palace, while outside a conch shell blows to welcome him. In a moment you see the delicate hands of two palace women rolling up a curtain to reveal the king, sword in hand, standing framed in a golden window. Ministers, officials, and people of lower rank put their hands together in greeting and bow to the ground. They are allowed to lift their head when the sound of the conch stops. The king then proceeds to sit down. I hear that where he sits there is a lion skin, a national treasure he had inherited. When he has finished speaking about official matters, the king at once turns away. Two palace women lower the curtain again, and everyone rises.


Source H

The Soldiers, too, go naked and barefoot. In their right hand they carry a lance, and in their left hand a shield. They have nothing that could be called bows and arrows, trebuchets, body armour, helmets, or the like.

I have heard reports that when the Siamese attacked, all the ordinary people were ordered out to do battle, often with no good strategy or preparation.

Source I

Half a league (c. 2 km) from this city (Angkor Thom) is a temple named Angar (Angkor Wat), which is built on beautiful flat and open terrain. This temple is a hundred and sixty paces long and so strangely constructed that it cannot be described in writing nay more than it can be compared to any other existing monument. The central body of the building comprises four naves and their vaults rise up, heavily decorated, to form lofty, pointed domes supported by numerous columns worked with all the intricacy of which the human genius is capable. (the temple) is built on a magnificent platform of massive slabs of the same stone as the rest of the edifice. This platform is ascended via a series of admirably cut and remarkable steps flanking it on all sides. At each corner of this principal structure are smaller temples that correspond in style to the main building, all of them terminating in sharply pointed domes whose upper sections are entirely covered in gold.

These pointed towers with their globes and banners can be seen from more than four leagues (19 km) away. The temple is surrounded by a moat a musket’s shot wide and seven fathoms (13 m) deep, which is spanned by a bridge corresponding to the gate in the central courtyard. AT the entrance (to this bridge) are two stone tigers, one on either side, so massive and terrifying in appearance that they frighten all who enter there. The whole bridge is covered with arches delicately sculpted in freestone and presenting a most noteworthy sight. Numerous smaller buildings of great beauty surround the temple. The pillars supporting the galleries, like the window posts, (are) made of the same stone and so highly polished that they look as if they had been turned on a lathe.


These sources offer the opportunity to compare and contrast data and evidence with that from derived from study of the reliefs from the Bayon and elsewhere that are also included in the kit. Many of these have the potential to be used for a number of different topics.

Back to Unit
Inscriptions from the Khmer Empire

Below is a selection of official Khmer inscriptions. As with the written sources these can be utilised as sources for student study and eventually analysis.

Source A

The border limited the land that he protected with the Chinese and by the sea; as for his glory, like the garland of his qualities, like his knowledge and his prosperity, it was unlimited.


Source B

His Majesty surpassed other kings by his royal power … His beauty, naturally charming, giving joy to thousands of eyes, much surpassed the beauty of Smara (goddess of Love), which excited the great anger of Siva …


Source C

XVIII. From his infancy, His Majesty was complete in talents …

XXIV. Like the grace of spring in the gardens, like the fullness of the moon, so arose, ravishing, splendid, the beauty of fresh youth …

XXXV. This servant, Kavindraramathana, was charged by the king to build a rock and other edifices in the middle of the pond of Yasodhara (The Mebon in the East Baray) …

IC. Always in movement, attractive, omnipresent, strong, large, bringing order to the turbulent world, his glory seemed made of elements.

C. Eloquence, valour, beauty, grace, sweetness, goodness, these virtues and still others, he was the sole depository of them; and by the Creator he was created still superior in energy and intelligence …

CXLVI. The city of the King of Champa, having the sea for its moat, was reduced to ashes by his warriors, obedient to his orders …

CXLIX. Having obtained his throne and disperse his enemies … the earth up to the ocean was so completely rid of his enemies by him, that still today his glory, going
alone on all sides, does not falter … CLXXII. Nothing was comparable to the amplitude of his virtues. Having studied the teachings of the Buddha, he had no false ideas, even under the influence of other masters …

CLXXXVIII. Shining resplendent, his toenails reflected the rays thrown by the crowns of the stubborn enemy kings who now lay prostrate before him.

CIC. A mango tree, sterile since its birth, obeyed his order to produce fruits …


**Source D**

XIII. He restored the holy city of Yasodharapura (Angkor), long deserted, and rendered it superb and charming by erecting there houses of ornamented with shining gold, palaces glittering with precious stones, recreating the palace of Mahendra (Indra’s heavenly palace) on earth …

XXIV. Early on his reign, he instructed his minister, Kavindraramathana, to build him a palace. This minister, dear to the gods, who knew the arts like Visvaharman (Khmer god of Architecture), was charged by his king to make at Yasodhara a charming palace.


**Source E**

XXIII. It was play for him to break into three a large bar of iron, by striking it lightly with a single stroke of his sword, as if he had struck a banana stalk. There is no need to talk about his bodily strength and the stroke of his sword made into the flesh of his enemy …

LXXVI. Despite having the skill of the great Kshatriya and born from the arm of Brahma, his enemies disputed his authority and challenged him on the field of battle, but his victory was able to prove that he truly held the arm of Brahma.


**Source F**

Of all the merit of these foundations, the king should receive either one quarter or one sixth; the king, who will protect them, should receive half the merit; the favourite of the king, who will protect them, should receive one quarter of the merit. If ill fortune comes to the temple, the Śivaite master who is the Superior, the Chief
Minister of the royal family and the good people who will inform the king seven times, should still receive half the merit.


**Source G**

933 saka (AD 1011), the 9th day of the crescent moon of Bhadrapada (Sunday). Here is (our) oath: We all who belong to the division of the tamrvac* of the 1st (2nd, 3rd, 4th) category, swear, cutting our hands and offering our lives and our devotion gratefully and unerringly, to His Majesty Sūryavarman, who has enjoyed the legitimate monarchy since 924 šaka (AD 1002), in the presence of the Sacred Fire, of the Holy Jewel of the Brahmins and the acaryas**. We will not revere any other sovereign; we will not be hostile to him, we will not comply with his enemies; we will not commit any act which might do him harm. All these acts that are the fruit of our grateful devotion towards His Majesty Sūryavarman, we will endeavour to accomplish. In case of war we will strive to fight with all our hearts, not to bind ourselves to life; by devotion (to the king) we will not run away from combat. If in times of no war we die of disease, may we obtain the reward of people devoted to their master? If we remain in the service of the king, when the time to die (in service) arrives, we will do it in devotion …

* tamrvac = government agents in the provinces.
** acaryas = spiritual leaders


**Source H**

1035 saka (AD 1113), His Majesty Suryavarman … grandnephew on the maternal side of Their Majesties Jayavarman and Dharanindravarman, ascended to the throne and invited the vräh guru* to proceed with the royal appointment. The king then performed the sacrifices, starting with the sacred mysteries, had the solemn rites accomplished … and gave rich presents such as palanquins, fans, fly-whisks, crowns, buckles, pendants, bracelets and rings … Still young, at the end of his religious studies, he commanded armies as vast as the ocean in a terrible battle. Bounding on the head of the elephant of the enemy king he killed him, as Garuda on the edge of a mountain would kill a serpent.

* vräh guru = very important official with both civic and religious duties

Source I

CXXII. On the roads from Yasodharapura to the capital of Champa (he constructed) 57 inns of fire*.

CXXIII. From the capital of the town of Vimāy (there are) 17 inns of fire.

CXXIV. From the capital to Jayavatī, from this town to Jayasimhavatī, from there to Jayavṛavatī, from this town to Jayarājagiri, from Jayarājagiri to Śri Suvīrapura … [illegible] from this town to Yasodharapura (along this road) there are 14 inns with fire.

CXXV. There is one at Śri Śūryaparvata, one at Śri Vijayādityapura, one at Kalyānasiddhika.

CXXVI. In total 121 inns.

CXXVII. The total of the images of gods, in gold, silver, bronze, stone, including Yama and Kāla, spread among all the provinces, amounts to 20,400.

* ‘inns of fire’ = dharmasala … rest houses for (religious) travellers


Back

Visual sources for the Khmer Empire

These bas-reliefs from the Bayon are provided as potential sources for evidence of details of daily life, society etc. They can easily be used in tandem with the written sources provided above. Some of the reliefs can be compared with images from modern Khmer life for ethnographic comparison.

Hi-resolution versions are available in Resource Folder Two.

Resource Folder Two also contains images from the Bayon showing the Khmer army at war with their neighbours, the Cham.

© 2014 DG Mootz
Chatting (de-licing) … Phnom Penh … 2011

Children

Circus … acrobats

Circus … strong men

Cock fighting
House in a village

Household scene

Market … rice ‘cakes’

Market … rice bundles

Market … selling fish
Personal toilet

Rural scene

Tending the sick … or chatting (de-licing?)

Tiger attack

Tiger attack
Chapters in current school textbooks

There are a number of textbooks published in anticipation of the Australian Curriculum: History Syllabus. Those listed below address the Khmer Empire topic and have been reviewed for classroom use. This includes a teacher ‘kit’ that provides a pedagogical guide.


This is an ‘annotated’ teacher’s version of the text by Saldais et al above.
Reference books

The reference books listed below are the most useful and most readily available at the time of writing.


*Good source of basic information, some is now outdated. A source for inscriptions.*


*Documents section includes descriptions of Angkor by Diogo do Couto, a trader and chronicler of the Portuguese empire who wrote in the 1580s. His description is based on the account of a Portuguese Capuchin friar who had visited Angkor in c. 1586. This account was discovered and published in 1954.*


*This is the most recent translation of the chronicle of the Chinese diplomat Zhou Daguan who visited Cambodia in 1295/6.*


*An excellent illustrated guidebook.*


*Outlines structures and command levels of the Khmer army. Includes descriptions of weapons, armour tactics and the use of elephants. Based on reliefs from the Bayon and Angkor Wat.*


*Outstanding photography and up-to-date text for the 1990s.*


*A good starting point for a teacher new to the topic and a good source for illustrations. Contains a number of essays about aspects of the topic.*
### Internet sources

| An inter-active map of Khmer Empire that illustrates all eras | http://cseas.net/digital-museum/sydney-sub/animation/animation.swf |
| Hinduism, start with the basics, then the more comprehensive. | http://www.religionfacts.com/hinduism/index.htm  
http://www.hinduism.co.za/ |
| Buddhism | http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/83184/Buddhism  
http://religioustolerance.org/budd_mah.htm |
| Downloadable guides and image collections, excellent resources for teacher and student use. | www.theangkorguide.com/text/part-two/angkorthom/bayon.htm  
http://www.molon.de/galleries/Cambodia/Angkor/  
http://www.sacred-destinations.com/cambodia/angkor  
http://www.poncar.de/ |
| Greater Angkor Project: the official website of the multinational team that has worked at Angkor for many years. | http://acl.arts.usyd.edu.au/angkor/gap/ |
ANGKOR: The Khmer Empire

Angkorpedia

Go to map
Angkor Thom: Yashodharapura – ‘The Great City’

Map 1: Angkor Thom


1. 2. 3. 4. 5.
| Name | Khmer: Angkor Thom: ‘the great city’.  
|      | Sanskrit: Yashodharapura |
| King | Jayavarman V11 |
| Builder |  |
| Date |  |
| Plan | New capital city. Built to have new state temple the Bayon in its centre. |
| Features | 1. Moat, causeway, walls, gopuras and gates  
|          | 2. Bayon  
|          | 3. Bapuon  
|          | 4. Phimeanakas and Palace  
|          | 5. Elephant Terrace and Victory Square |
| History |  |

**Moat**

The ‘Great City’ was surrounded by a 100 metres wide moat.

It may once have been filled with crocodiles.

**Causeway**

100 metres long causeways cross the moat leading to the gates of the city.

Each causeway was decorated by a representation of 54 larger than life Devas (Gods) and Asuras (Demons) involved in the Churning of the Sea of Milk that is the Hindu creation myth. This involved a tug-of-war using the body of the great serpent, the naga, Vasuki.
The causeways were wide enough to accommodate a number of elephants.

Wall
The wall around the city was built of laterite blocks. It was 8 metres high with a parapet. The wall was 3 kms long on each side and enclosed an area of 9 square kms.
The interior of the wall is lined with a 20m wide earth rampart that serves as a ‘road’ around the interior of the wall.

There are sandstone bastions, Prasat Chrung, at each corner of the rampart. These are cruciform in shape and oriented east to west.

There is some evidence that at a later date (15th or 16th century) the wall was fortified as were other nearby buildings including Angkor Wat.

Gopuras
There are five gates to the city. There are four gates at the cardinal points of the compass as well as an extra gate in the East Wall, the Victory Gate, about 500 metres from the East gate.
The gates are 3.5m wide by 7m high, designed to be large enough for an elephant with passengers to pass through.
They originally had wooden doors attached.

**Gate towers**

A four ‘cornered’ 23m high tower crowns each gate. Each face is in line with a cardinal point of the compass.

Each face of the tower has the image of the bodhisattva Avalokiteshvara or Lokesavara, carved on it.

There appears to be provision in the interior of each gate of a ‘post’ for a guard or custodian. However, there is little indication that this was for defensive purposes when they were built.

Some laborious archaeological work suggested a system of canals inside the city providing water for the normal house mound and fishpond ‘system’ that is found across the flood plain of Angkor. Recent scans with LIDAR have confirmed this and allowed this interior organisation to be mapped fully.
The Bayon

Map 2: Plan of the Bayon temple


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Terrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Ponds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Outer Gallery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Inner Gallery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Central Tower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Entry

The entry to the Bayon from the south east corner.

The eastern entry to the Bayon

Terrace

Back

Back
Outer Gallery

The outer gallery is most famous for its reliefs that seem to narrate some of the military history of the reign of Jayavarman V11 and perhaps his immediate predecessors.

There are many puzzling aspects of these events. They may include a civil war. But one thing they have in common is the use of the lower registers to record details of the life-style of the Khmer people, or at least the lifestyle that their King wanted to depict. These are propaganda images and must be read critically.

Like most Khmer temples there are many building cluttering up the open space on each level of the ‘pyramid’. Some are obviously later shrines and temples. Some are labelled Library. While we might find this lack of space a little awkward it was not a concern of the Khmer religion because temples often included shrines for hundreds of gods. The Khmer religious practices did not require much space because these shrines were sites for sacrifice and offerings not congregation of the faithful.

The outer gallery encloses an open area that includes the galleries that compose the inner gallery.
Inner Gallery

The two galleries are the prelude to a series of tiers that make up the 3-tiered ‘pyramid’.

The ceilings of the galleries provide good examples of the corbelled ‘arch ways’ that Khmer architects used.

The open area between the outer and inner galleries is sometimes filled with the jumble of stone that is the great ‘jig-saw’ that they are still piecing together to restore the temple. Occasionally it is clear and gives you a better idea of the space.

The narrowness of the galleries and halls is most obvious when you look behind to where you have been.

Back
Levels
Central Tower

Like elsewhere in the temple the access to the central tower is through narrow and steep galleries. There are remains of many shrines, often broken Hindu linga and yoni shrines, in most places where galleries intersect.

The central tower appears to be too narrow to be stable. It appears to be made up of face towers stacked upon each other. The small space inside the central tower once held an image of the Buddha.

The number of face towers and the number of faces is disputed. There may have been 64 towers each with four faces. The faces are not identical. Each is the work of a different mason.

They have differences in basic facial elements but are meant to be the Buddhist deity Avalokitesvara or Lokeshvara who looks after human beings during their lifetime. It is also likely that the faces resemble Jayavarman V11, the builder of the Bayon. The faces are famous for the ‘enigmatic’ smile that is common to all.

There are numerous places at the Bayon where the laterite substructure is revealed among the broken green sandstone facings.
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Back to Beginning
The Bapuon.

Map 3: Plan of the Bapuon Temple


1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Gopura</td>
<td>Reclining Buddha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Causeway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Pavilion &amp; pond</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Internal gopura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Level 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. ‘Pyramid’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Reclining Buddha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Entry and Causeway

Pavilion and Ponds
Central Tower

Back

Reclining Buddha
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Back to Beginning
Phimeanakas

Map 4: Plan of Phimeanakas


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Features | 1. Main stairway  
2. Tiered 'pyramid'  
3. Tower |
| History |  |
Near the palace was a tower called today Phimeanakas. It is associated with a ‘legend’ about the Khmer King and his nightly ‘struggle’ with a goddess that ensured the prosperity of the Khmer society!

The central stairway gives an idea of the height of the tower.

The tiered galleries, the ‘pyramid’ structure is most obvious at the ends of each level.

The tower at the centre of the pyramid was originally topped by a wooden building in which the King met the nocturnal goddess for the nightly ‘struggle’.
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Map 5: Victory Square and the Elephant Terrace

Image sourced at
http://www.porican.cz/cambodia/camb_soubory/Angkor_thom.html

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Builder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Elephant Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Palace precinct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Victory Square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Prasats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Terrace of the Leper King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Statue of Yama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Victory Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Elephant Terrace**

The 350 m. long platform called the Elephant terrace was once the foundation for a series of wooden pavilions and royal buildings. The modern palace building in Phnom Penh give some idea of what these gilded wooden buildings would have been like.

The terrace is 3m high and decorated with relief scenes of elephant hunts (hence its name), war and even polo.
There are also sections decorated with gods and demons – Garudas and asuras.

Naga ‘bridges’ decorate the stairways along the terrace. Naga bridges are usually symbolic in Khmer architecture.
There are stairways at each end and at the centre.
This is the central stairway.

This is the southern stairway.

The three-headed elephant of the sky gods Indra decorates the main stairs to and from the Elephant Terrace.

The Elephant Terrace – Palace Enclosure

Wall enclosing palace precinct.
Gopura leading to palace from Elephant Terrace.

Lustral pool in palace precinct.

The Elephant Terrace … Victory Square

Victory Square from Elephant Terrace.
Originally the scene of triumphant processions after military victories this area was more recently used by a Khmer King to make epic movies about the Khmer Empire.

There is a series of prasats lining the eastern side of Victory Square.

The road to Victory Gate.
The Elephant Terrace – Prasats

Prasats in Victory Square. Their use is the subject of a number of ‘legends’. There is also a number of smaller temples and the North and South Kleangs on the edge of the Square and along the Victory way as it leaves the Square.

The Leper-King Terrace

The outer area of the Leper Terrace.

Inner passage of the Leper Terrace. Images of the underworld.

Inner passage of the Leper Terrace. Gods and demons
Inner passage of the Leper Terrace.
Yama

Statue of Yama

Above the Leper Terrace.
The inner passage can be seen to the right.
Old ‘corroded’ statue that possibly accounts for the name of this section of the terrace area.

Current statue of Yama nearby.

Victory Way
### Map 6: Plan of the precinct of Angkor Wat


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Features</th>
<th>History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1. Western entry gopura

2. Moat

3. Enclosure and gopura

4. Libraries
5. Ponds

6. Pyramid

7. Eastern rear gopura
**Ta Prohm**

Map 7: Plan of the precinct and temple of Ta Prohm


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Builder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Eastern gopura

2. House of Fire

3. Hall of Dancers

4. Central Tower
5. Enclosure

6. Western rear gopura
Banteay Kdei

Map 8: Plan of the precinct and temple of Banteay Kdei


<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4.</td>
<td>5.</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Entry terrace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Gopura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enclosure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hall of Dancers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Middle gopura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Central tower</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Western rear gopura</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| History |   |
1. Entry terrace

2. Gopura

3. Enclosure

4. Hall of Dancers
5. Middle gopura

6. Central tower

7. Western rear gopura
### Srah Srang

**Map 9: Plan of the environs of Srah Srang**

1. Entry platform  
2. Enclosure wall  
3. Central feature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>King</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Builder</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Features** | 1. Entry platform  
2. Enclosure wall  
3. Central feature |  |
| **History** |  |  |

1. **Entry platform**
2. Enclosure wall

3. Central feature
Preah Khan

Map 10: Plan of the precinct and temple of Preah Khan


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Entrance terrace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. House of fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Hall of Dancers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Central tower … pyramid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Small temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. West rear gopura</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Entrance terrace and gopura**

2. **Eastern gopura**
3. House of Fire

4. Hall of Dancers

5. Central tower ... pyramid

6. Enclosure
7. Small temple

8. Western rear gopura
### Neak Pean

**Map 11: Plan of Neak Pean**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features</td>
<td>1. Main Pool</td>
<td>2. Island shrine</td>
<td>3. Lesser ponds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Main Pool

2. Island shrine

3. Lesser ponds
Map 12: Plan of the precinct and temple of Ta Keo


1.  2.  3.  4.  5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>1. Entry gopura</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>2. Inner gopura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td>3. Enclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>4. Pyramid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>5. Central tower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Entry gopura

2. Inner gopura

3. Enclosure

4. Pyramid
5. Central tower
Phnom Bakheng

Map 13: Plan of Phnom Bakheng

1.  2.  3.  4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pyramid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Surrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History
1. Entry

2. Pyramid

3. Tower

4. Central Tower

Back to Beginning
Prasat Kravan

Map 14: Plan of Prasat Kravan

1.  2.  3.  4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Platform</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Stairway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prasats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Interiors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

History

1. Platform
2. Stairways

3. Prasats

4. Interiors
Bat Chum

Map 15: Plan of Bat Chum and precinct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Features | 1. Tiered platform  
2. Stairs  
3. Towers  
4. Surrounds |
| History |  |
1. The three prasats on a platform.


3. Rear of prasats.

4. Surrounds include a moat.
Map 16: Plan of Baksei Chamkrong Temple

Image sourced at http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Baksei_Chamkrong_1.gif

1.  2.  3.  4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>King</th>
<th>Builder</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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### Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>1. Central stairway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Tiered Pyramid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Central Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Interior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### History

1. **Central stairway**

2. **Tiered pyramid**

3. **Central Tower**
4. Interior
East Baray

Map 17: Yashodharapura and the East Baray


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Features | 1. East Baray  
2. East Mebon  
3. West Baray |
| History |   |
Map 18: Plan of Angkor Thom area with East and West Baray


1. 2. 3.

The East Baray is mostly dry these days. The banks, dykes, are obvious as you drive on the roads that are cut through them. The trees that line the banks are clearly seen on the landscape. Some of the major canals that once served the baray are also obvious on the landscape if you know what to look for as you drive through the villages that now occupy what was once under water. The baray is most easily seen from the air.

The laterite wall of the water outlet from the East Baray. By moving water slowly into a series of stepped outlet ‘tanks’ the Khmer were able to release water and control the energy and power of the water release to avoid damage to canals and dykes.

The East Mebon temple from the air. The Khmer consider the baray to be male and the Mebon to be female.

The temple, a typical 3-level ‘pyramid’, is very well preserved.

Back
The West Baray from the air.
The Western Baray still holds water for most of the year. Its capacity is 50 million cubic metres of water.
The West Baray is a place for water sports and fishing these days for the local Khmer who also eat at the many food outlets along its banks.

The West Mebon temple is on an artificial island. The temple in ruins but is the subject of a major reconstruction by French archaeologists at this moment in time (2014).

The structure of the enclosing wall of the Western Baray makes it clear that the baray was not excavated but was formed by creating a dyke above ground level.
Along the south side of the baray are the remains of Ak Yum one of the oldest temples of the Khmer Empire that was partially built over when the baray was created.
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