

Smith, Joseph (2018) Scotland's curriculum for excellence and history teachers' epistemologies: a case of curricular epistemic socialisation?. *Scottish Educational Review*, 50(1), 18-35

Scotland's curriculum for excellence and history teachers' epistemologies: a case of curricular epistemic socialisation?

Joseph Smith

University of Stirling

ABSTRACT:

This paper proposes the concept of 'Curricular Epistemic Socialisation' as a process through which the school curriculum shapes the disciplinary epistemologies and identities of high school (11-18) teachers. Drawing on a survey of history teachers in Scotland (n=101), a cohort comparison is made between those trained since the introduction in 2010 of Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) and those who qualified to teach before this. Analysis of this data suggests that the CfE-trained cohort hold weaker subject identities (p=0.0002) and a more instrumental view of the purpose of the subject (p=0.052) than their more experienced colleagues. Although this is a small study, the paper proposes that something stronger than a performative response to policy change. Instead, the evidence implies that curricular framing can encourage teachers to adopt new epistemic frames. The paper concludes by suggesting a qualitative follow-up study to investigate the processes behind this socialisation and teachers' consciousness of it.

Keywords: *Curriculum for Excellence, Teacher Identity, History Education, Social Studies, Teacher Socialisation*

INTRODUCTION

This paper proposes the concept of 'Curricular Epistemic Socialisation' as a process through which the school curriculum shapes the disciplinary epistemologies of high school (11-18) teachers. At first glance, this might not seem a particularly novel observation: teachers are schooled in an academic discipline, but are then tasked with making that discipline accessible to adolescents. Indeed, it is 30 years since Shulman (1986) coined the term

'pedagogical craft knowledge' to describe this ability of teachers to re-present information to make it intelligible to students. This paper, however, goes further; where Shulman understood teachers as mediators between an academic discipline and a school subject, the findings of this research imply instead that teachers adopt the curricular framing of the subject more fundamentally. In simple terms, the curriculum shapes not just what teachers do, but also who they are and what they believe.

The paper draws its evidence from a comparison of two cohorts of history teachers in Scotland: one which began teaching before a major curriculum reform and one which began teaching after. While we should acknowledge the potential for a post hoc error, the data suggests that the introduction of Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) - which emphasises interdisciplinary learning, citizenship and transferrable skills - coincided with a weakening of teacher's subject identities and the emergence of a more instrumental view of the purposes of a history education. The paper begins with an outline of the Scottish educational context before a brief exploration of existing literature and of the methods used to generate the data. This data is then interpreted in the context of research surrounding the subject/discipline relationship, professional identity, and the history curriculum. The paper concludes by proposing two possible understandings of the apparent phenomenon of Curricular Epistemic Socialisation and some potential next steps for researching and evaluating them.

POLICY CONTEXT

In 2002, the Scottish Executive (later Government) launched a five-month public consultation on the future direction of Scottish schools which it termed a 'National Debate on Education' (Scottish Executive, 2002). The consultation – which received 1500 responses (Munn, et al., 2004) - led, two years later, to the announcement of A Curriculum for Excellence: a single curriculum for all children aged 4-18 (Scottish Executive, 2004). Announced initially only in outline, the curriculum was to be based around four organising 'capacities' which it would foster in Scotland's children:

Our aspiration for all children and for every young person is that they should be successful learners, confident individuals, responsible citizens and effective contributors to society and work (Scottish Executive, 2004).

While the initial document did little more than specify the aims of the curriculum, a subsequent series of five documents known as 'Building the Curriculum' (BTC) published between 2006 and 2011 offered more clarity about how these aims would be achieved. BTC1, for example, specified the 'contribution' of subject areas to the curriculum (Scottish Government, 2006a), while BTC4 emphasised 'Skills for Learning, Life and Work' (Scottish Government, 2009). Curriculum for Excellence finally became mandatory in Scottish schools in August 2010. In terms of history, CfE continued the long tradition in Scotland of viewing history as a 'social subject' (McGonigle, 1999) (alongside geography and modern studies).

Although CfE was conceived as a single continuous curriculum for children between the ages of 3 and 18, BTC3 (Scottish Government, 2008) introduced a

distinction between the 'Broad General Education' which included pre-school, primary school and the first three years of high school (3-14) and a 'senior phase' (14-18) 'which provides opportunities to obtain qualifications' (p. 4). Secondary schooling is therefore divided between a junior phase (11-14) in which schools design their own curriculum based on the principles of CfE, and a Senior Phase (14-18) in which pupils follow an examination syllabus mandated by the Scottish Qualifications Authority (SQA). This has resulted in something of disjointed secondary experience in which the influence of the reforms is mitigated after the age of 14 by the demands of examination syllabi.

Priestley and Biesta (2013) view CfE as typical of the competency-based curricula which emerged in many countries in the first years of the twenty-first century. For them, these curricula are responses to 'pressures associated with globalisations, particularly in respect of economic competitiveness and citizenship' (p. 3) which leads to a prioritisation of instrumental and functional aims. Previous papers (Smith, 2016; Forthcoming 2018) suggested that a similar emphasis on instrumental aims such as employability and an 'appreciation' of Scotland's heritage also guides the framing of history in Curriculum for Excellence. This paper draws on empirical data which suggests that these conceptions of the purpose of history in schools have begun to influence the professional identities of Scottish history teachers.

THEORETICAL CONTEXTS

The nature of history and purpose of history in schools

The instrumental question of the purpose of teaching and learning history is inseparable from the ontological question of whether the past can be 'known' at all. Two archetypal positions can be adopted in answer to this: a thoroughgoing positivism which asserts a high degree of certainty about our knowledge of the past, and a post-modern position which denies the possibility of any historical knowledge at all. Although the post-modern position has its defenders (Jenkins, 1991), historians in the western academic tradition have tended to reduce this insoluble ontological debate to two more limited questions: what can be known about the past and what is the best way to know it?

In answer to the first question, positivists such as Elton (1967) have contended that historians can know much about the past through immersion in primary sources. However, as Collingwood (Collingwood, 1946) argued, those things which can be known with most certainty are, in themselves, rather uninteresting. While we can 'know' the date of a battle or the terms of a treaty, the more urgent and interesting questions of history (what people believed, why events happened) demand explanations which necessarily depend upon empathy and intuition. For Collingwood, therefore, history was an idealist pursuit.

The empathy required to understand the past is not, though, an innate human attribute, but a specialised and situated empathy born of a sense of period and a familiarity with contemporary evidence. Claims to historical knowledge require, therefore, familiarity with the existing consensus of knowledge together with evidence to support any new insights. In answer to the familiar question of whether history is an art or a science, Evans (1999) (following Elton)

characterises it instead as a 'craft'. Just as the furniture maker does not aspire to the perfect cabinet, the historian does not aspire to a perfect account. In the same way, historians' accounts are not judged against an essentialist concept of truth, but by the extent to which they are accomplished. Treating history as a craft means treating the historian's product (his account) as a demonstration of his skill in the historical method. In doing so, the universalist ideas of truth and objectivity are replaced with the truthfulness as an ethical disposition (Hadyn, 2017) and objectivity as an aspiration.

This consensus position argues, in essence, that the western historical method might not be perfect, but represents the best tool currently available for knowing what happened in the past. But if this tells us what history is, it does not tell us what history is for. One often hears the view that history should be studied 'for its own sake'. This position is derived from Eliot's (1948) (cited in (Fuller, 2002)) concept of autotelic disciplines which should be pursued either because they correspond strongly to the natural world or because the process of creating knowledge is intrinsically worthwhile. This is, of course, something of a circular argument; and while such justifications might just about hold at the frontiers of knowledge, they are largely insupportable as justifications for a subject's inclusion in the school curriculum.

Peter Lee (1984; 1991; 1992) illuminates this question or purpose by positing a distinction between intrinsic aims (inhering in the subject itself) and extrinsic (performing some wider personal or social function). Lee's intrinsic aims are not to be confused with Eliot's autotelic justification: they are not reflexive, they are simply those aims that are unique to the study of history and which can be learned nowhere else. To help clarify, Lee posited a further distinction between the 'aims of education' and the 'aims of history'. Learning history no doubt supports all manner of wider personal and social goals (literacy, citizenship, employability etc.) which are essential to a rounded education but, he contends, 'there is nothing in history – qua history – to guarantee their delivery' (1992: 30). For Lee 'history is not useful as a means to an end, but valuable as something which expands our whole picture of the world and of what ends might be possible... and ... to have this value it must be genuine history, not the practical past in disguise' (1991: 43).

He adds that children need genuine historical knowledge which 'involves knowing what constitutes "good grounds" for claims to knowledge in history' (1991: 44), which in turn involves knowing something of the method of history. Lee, therefore, represents a strongly intrinsic justification for studying the past in which the epistemic question of how we know the past is foregrounded. Going further, he cautions that, 'burdening history with the personal and social aims which have priority over... the clearly intrinsic methodological aims, puts genuine history at risk' (1992: 24).

Lee's distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic aims is used in this research. This is not because these terms are perfect, but because they are more satisfactory than nebulous labels such as 'history for its own sake'. I will add only that the term extrinsic may, up to a point, be read as 'instrumental': it is history being put to use. The label 'extrinsic' or 'instrumental' may be applied both to those aims which benefit society (perhaps by fostering patriotic or democratic

citizens) and those which benefit the individual (employability, formal written communication).

Beyond history, Stengl (1997) theorises four possible relationships between the school and the academy which are summarised in Table One. This list places the four framings in order of ‘closeness’ between the discipline and school subject, starting with the most similar.

TABLE ONE: POSSIBLE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE SCHOOL AND THE ACADEMY

Continuous	Children are handling the same substantive knowledge and concepts as academics.
Different, but related (discipline proceeding)	A school subject is a watered-down version of the discipline. This position is associated with Shulman’s (1986) idea of pedagogical content knowledge – that the teacher mediates between academic and school discourses and implies that a continuous relationship is desirable, but impossible.
Different, but related (subject proceeding)	Children are led to discover the academic discipline through carefully designed school activity. In this framing, the discipline remains strong, but the act of leading children to understand the discipline is educative too. This position is reminiscent of the work of Laurence Stenhouse (1968) in the Humanities Curriculum Project in English schools in the 1960s.
Discontinuous	There is no relationship between the school subject and the discipline.

Stengl’s model offers an alternative lens viewing the school curriculum from the familiar traditionalist-progressive dichotomy. Although Stengl associates the ‘discontinuous’ relationship with the child-centred progressivism of Noddings (pp. 587-588), there is nothing within the discontinuous curricular relationship per se which supports progressive education. Indeed, any curriculum which is guided not by the discipline, but by the perceived needs of the child can reasonably be called discontinuous; the doctrinaire curricula of totalitarian states, for example. This paper argues that there has been a shift in teachers’ framings of history from the intrinsic to the extrinsic (in Lee’s framing) or along the scale from continuous to discontinuous in Stengl’s. It offers no comment on whether this process is discernible in other subject areas, but Stengl’s model may offer a heuristic for determining this.

School subjects and professional identity

Subject allegiance forms an important part of secondary teacher professional identity as both a form of specialist knowledge and a community of practice within a school (Siskin, 1994). Brooks (2016) sees subject identity as offering a ‘professional compass’ which guides teachers through their careers. The geography teachers whom she studied suggested that their disciplinary training ‘emphasises the moral and ethical dimensions of a teachers work’ (2016: 126), allowing them to navigate through changes in government policy or curricular priorities throughout their careers. This analogy of a compass is, of course,

complicated somewhat when the purpose of a subject is contested, as it is in history.

Taking the contested nature of history as his starting point, Ronald Evans (1989) surveyed US history teachers about their identities and proposed five typologies which he termed storyteller, scientific historian, relativist/reformer, cosmic philosopher, and eclectic. To Evans, these typologies combined both 'an approach to pedagogy and an epistemology' (p. 251) meaning that teachers adopted positions on the nature and purpose of history which were then manifested in the way they taught. While 'storytellers' viewed the past as a stock of tales with timeless messages, relativist/ reformers emphasised the significance of the past to present problems, while cosmic philosophers aimed to discern universal laws which governed the past. Evans also noted a correlation between these typologies and the amount of formal training a teacher had received in the historical method. Teachers with only limited training in history as a discipline, for example, favoured a 'storyteller' approach, while those with backgrounds in politics or social science emphasised the implications of the past on today. Scientific historians - who emphasised the methodological and disciplinary dimension of history espoused by Lee (1984) – had, on average, considerably more formal training in history than did other typologies (p. 224).

In contrast to the USA, where disciplinary training for teachers is inconsistent, Scottish secondary teachers must be educated to degree level in history to register as a history teacher with the General Teaching Council of Scotland (GTCS). Scottish teachers are trained in one of two ways: either sitting a Bachelor's degree followed by a one-year post-graduate diploma in education (PGDE), or by taking a four-year concurrent degree which combines degree level study in both education and their chosen subject specialism. However, while students in the senior phase (14-18) can expect to be taught by a subject specialist, those in the junior phase (11-14) are likely to encounter a social subjects curriculum which offers no such guarantee (Fenwick, et al., 2013). The extent to which history might be taught effectively by a non-specialist is debateable with Ravitch (2000) arguing that both the status and rigour of history was held back in US schools by a widespread ignorance of the nature of the historical discipline among non-specialist teachers in social studies classrooms. Against this, van Sledright's (1997) case study of a History teacher who held a PhD in history showed him to be less, rather than more, critical of singular textbook narratives.

While Evans, Ravitch and van Sledright focused on teachers, Harris and Haydn (2008) asked English children what they understood to be the purpose of history and found a marked difference between schools. In one school, for example, 22% of pupils aged 11-12 gave employability as the main justification for studying history, while at another only 1.5% gave this reply. They conclude that 'There is sufficient evidence of school or departmental effect in the data to suggest that teachers can have an influence on pupils' understanding of the purpose of school history' (p. 47).

Performativity

There can be little doubt that changes in education policy effect behavioural change on the part of teachers charged with implementing them. The most familiar example of this is, of course, the phenomenon of 'teaching to the test' where the need to ensure good marks in external assessments distorts teachers' practice. These distortions in practice are usually understood through the lens of performativity (Ball, 1998) following Lyotard (1984). Research into performativity in education is largely focused on a dominant discourse of 'improvement' in measurable 'outcomes' and the disciplining mechanisms which ensure teachers' compliance with this discourse. These mechanisms, which Gerwitz (2002) calls 'new managerialism' are manifest in punitive inspection regimes, performance-related pay and other accountability measures. For this reason, performativity is almost always perceived as a negative phenomenon: Lyotard (1984) talks of the 'terrors of performativity' while Ball famously framed neoliberal education reform as 'a struggle over teachers' souls' (Ball, 2003). In this tradition, empirical work on performativity in education reports that teachers are riven by tensions – torn between the need to 'perform' in an education system which polices behaviour through rigid accountability and monitoring systems, and the need to stay true to a loftier vision of what education is and is for (Jeffrey & Troman, 2012).

Like Ball (2003: 223), this paper argues that 'a new kind of teacher and new kinds of knowledges are 'called up' by educational reform', but it departs from much research into performativity in two important respects. First, it seeks only to identify the emergence of a 'new kind of teacher' through quantitative analysis and makes no attempt to analyse the processes through which this is created. That is not to say the processes are uninteresting or unimportant, but these could only be uncovered through further qualitative investigation. What we can say on this point is that the 'disciplining' forces that are usually present when performative cultures emerge (observation by external agencies or a discourse of metrical improvement) are largely absent in this particular case study.

A similar observation guides our second departure from Ball's position. While research into performativity invariably stresses the negative and dehumanising effects of neoliberal education change, this paper reserves all qualitative judgement of the merits of these new kinds of teacher. Again, this is not because such questions would not make for interesting discussion - all readers will have their own views on whether these new identities and new conceptions of history are good or bad - but any such judgement entails an essentialist claim about the 'true' nature of history which is best avoided.

In their analysis of performativity in Scotland, Priestley, Robinson and Biesta (2012: 90-91) suggest that the comparatively small influence of marketisation in Scottish education means it has avoided some of the more overt disciplining features of neoliberal education systems. For example, teachers have avoided performance-related pay and business interests remain largely absent from Scottish schools. Similarly, while there is a high degree of teacher accountability for examination results in the senior phase, the provision of history in the junior phase is subject to much less stringent monitoring of outcomes. By concentrating on history in the junior phase, this study suggests that unlike many studies where performativity can be reduced to 'teaching to the test', it is not the assessment which is driving the change in practice but the curriculum document itself.

Furthermore, this 'change' is not simply a behavioural one, but instead takes place at a more fundamental level. They are not simply performing in a way that has been determined to maximise success in an examination or to comply with a dominant discourse; instead, they are profoundly (and possibly unconsciously) changed by this discourse.

Teacher Socialisation

If, as has been suggested, something stronger than a performative response to curriculum change is taking place, then perhaps guidance can be found in the literature surrounding teacher socialisation. This field has focused primarily on the effects of structures (e.g. hierarchies, enacted policy) and individuals (e.g. mentors and managers) on teacher identity and practice, with less attention paid to the role of knowledge (or rather framings of knowledge) in influencing teacher identities and worldviews. Existing research into curriculum has concentrated on the way teachers mediate knowledge – knowledge is seen to flow through teachers, having no effect on the teachers as it passes.

As an example, McNicholl et al. (2013) explored the ways in which school subject departments became sites where curriculum knowledge was mediated and socially constructed. Looking at the challenges that specialists (e.g. physicists, chemists etc.) faced in delivering a broad science education, they concluded that collaboration with colleagues (both verbal and written) was a crucial sense-making exercise for all involved. Thus, the journey from the prescribed to the enacted curriculum was a social one in which knowledge and expertise were pooled and readily exchanged between colleagues. However, while this gives us procedural insight on the social construction of knowledge in schools, it frames teachers as the masters of knowledge, repackaging it to make it more palatable to children. This paper asks a slightly different question: what was the effect of this process of repackaging on the teachers doing the repackaging?

This gives rise to two related questions which are beyond the scope of this study: 'when does this epistemic socialisation take place?' and 'to what extent are teachers conscious of it?' Are teachers 'trained' to think in a certain way about their subject during training? Or are teachers 'bent into shape' by the day-to-day demands of teaching? Or are they inducted into ways of thinking during the 'apprenticeship of observation' that was their own schooling (Lortie, 1975)? If epistemic socialisation begins at school, then this suggests that, not only is the process unconscious, but a positive feedback loop is created: children are enculturated into a weakened subject epistemology, which they then reproduce as teachers.

METHODOLOGY

The 'Scottish History Teachers Survey' was an online questionnaire created by the University of Stirling in association with the Scottish Association of History Teachers (SATH). The wide-ranging survey aimed to ensure that the organisation's strategic priorities were aligned with the views of its membership. Consequently, the survey was designed with market research - rather than academic research - in mind and so no specific research questions guided survey

design. Questions therefore ranged across diverse issues including subject knowledge development, satisfaction with the curriculum, contact time and school policies.

The survey was distributed by email to schools through the SATH mailing list and a link to the survey was posted on an appropriate social media page unconnected with SATH. The survey ran for four months from September to December 2016 and received 101 responses. The limitations of this kind of convenience sampling are well-known and so tests for the representativeness of the sample were applied. A Freedom of Information request to the General Teaching Council of Scotland revealed that the total population of registered history teachers in Scotland was 2650, meaning that the sample represented around 4% of the population. In terms of gender the sample was broadly representative of the populations (2:1 female to male). There was, however, a significant bias towards younger teachers in the sample (perhaps owing to the online distribution of the questionnaire).

The lack of a specific research question allowed a grounded theory approach to be taken to the data. The overall sample was tested according to a range of variables such as education level, postcode of school, age, gender etc. Most demographic divisions of the data set revealed no discernible patterns; however, stark differences in responses between those with more than five years' teaching experience (n=64) and those with less than five years' (n=37). For example, less-experienced teachers were more likely to express a weak subject identity and were more likely to express satisfaction with the curriculum. These differences might be explained purely in terms of their relative inexperience; however, as this paper will demonstrate, the nature of the patterns suggests that something more was at play – that these teachers had been socialised differently. Curriculum for Excellence was introduced fully into schools six years before the survey was conducted: teachers with more than five years experienced had been trained to teach (and had worked) in a context which pre-dated CfE, while those with less than five years had known only CfE.

Although my explanations for these differences remain speculative - and although we must be wary of committing a post hoc error – it is argued that the epistemologies of these teachers have been socialised by Curriculum for Excellence. This contention is based on the fact that these differences are not random, instead the views of the less-experienced cohort align closely with the idiosyncratic framing of history in Curriculum for Excellence.

RESULTS

This section of the paper will aim to explore the data relating to several questions on the survey and explain how these findings are interlinked. The central contention is that teachers trained to teach since the introduction of Curriculum for Excellence have been socialised to view their subject instrumentally. This section will begin by looking at how the two cohorts view the curriculum, before demonstrating that this difference reflects a difference in an understanding of what history is and is for. Finally, the paper will explore figures which imply that these differing epistemic frames have influenced teachers' self-reported identities.

TABLE TWO

Thinking solely about history in <i>Curriculum for Excellence</i>, how far do you agree that the curriculum gives children a good historical education?¹		
	CfE Cohort (n=37)	Pre CfE Cohort (n=64)
Agree or Strongly agree	85%	62%

It is immediately apparent that those teachers trained to teach in the Curriculum for Excellence era have a considerably more favourable view of history in the curriculum. In one sense, this is not surprising; we can assume that these students have been better prepared to work with the curriculum through their university courses, as opposed to more experienced teachers who might have received limited on-the-job training ahead of the new curriculum. However, it is important to note that the question here refers not to the curriculum in general, but specifically to history. Clearly, the concept of a ‘good historical education’ is largely subjective and so we must imagine that each respondent has a conception of a ‘good historical education’ against which the curriculum is compared – a question which will be explored later.

Let us look now at a similar question with a slightly different focus.

TABLE THREE

Thinking solely about history in <i>Curriculum for Excellence</i>, how far do you agree that the curriculum is good preparation for moving to the next level		
	CfE Cohort (n=37)	Pre CfE Cohort (n=64)
Agree or Strongly agree	59%	40%

Although, students study history as part of ‘social subjects’ in the junior phase, at 13/14 they choose which of the component subjects (if any) they wish to study at certification level. Thus, in the transition from CfE to certification level is a shift from ‘social subjects’ to history.

The evidence suggests teachers do not view this progression as satisfactory, with only minority of more experienced teachers agreeing that CfE is good preparation for certificate-level study. Teachers trained in the context before the introduction of CfE are again markedly less confident that their students are properly prepared to undertake historical study at a more advanced level. Several common-sense explanations spring to mind: perhaps newer teachers are more enthusiastic? Perhaps experienced teachers are resistant to change? Maybe newer teachers are more skilled in the design and delivery of interdisciplinary learning projects which shape junior phase social subjects in many schools?

¹ Surrounding questions in the survey made clear that this question was focused on the junior phase of *Curriculum for Excellence*, a nuance which is lost when this question is decontextualised.

All these explanations no doubt contribute part of the picture. However, an analysis of data elsewhere in the survey offers another explanation: the CfE and pre-CfE cohorts express different levels of satisfaction because they conceive history differently.

What is history for?

Respondents were offered (in a random order) twelve common justifications for history’s inclusion in the school curriculum and asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed on a Likert scale. The table below shows these justifications grouped according to Lee’s (1984) conception of intrinsic purposes and extrinsic purposes and includes the item number to show their order in the original list. Those items where the two cohorts’ levels of agreement differed by 10% or more are indicated in bold, but were not marked as such in the original survey.

TABLE FOUR

		% CfE Cohort agreeing	% Pre CfE Cohort agreeing
Extrinsic purposes	14.1.a. Understanding the past is important in helping children make decisions in the future.	100	95
	14.3.a. Children can learn valuable moral lessons from the past	100	90
	14.8.a. It helps children build a sense of identity	92	90
	14.9.a. It helps children make sense of the present	94	98
	14.10.a. It gives children important employability skills	100	90
	14.11.a. It helps them to be better citizens	100	92
	14.12.a. History makes children proud of the country they live in	64	44
Intrinsic Purposes	14.2.a. It is important to know about the past for its own sake	83	88
	14.4.a. It teaches children important concepts like 'parliament' and 'empire'	75	84
	14.5.a. It teaches children something about the historical method	72	85
	14.6.a. Children need to know about the past of the country they live in	94	92
	14.7.a. It gives children skills of critical and historical thinking	100	90

It is immediately apparent that the CfE-trained cohort is more likely to support the extrinsic purposes of a historical education than the pre-CfE cohort. When comparing individual extrinsic purposes this relationship is weak (i.e. difference of 90% and 100% for item 14.3 has a p value of 0.8). However, when teachers’ responses are considered cumulatively a stronger relationship emerges. Overall 58% of the CfE cohort agreed with all seven of the extrinsic aims they were offered, while only 38% of the pre-CfE cohort did likewise (p=0.052).

TABLE FIVE

	Agree all Extrinsic	Disagree at least one extrinsic	Totals
CfE-Trained	21 (16.36) [1.31]	15 (19.64) [1.09]	36
Pre-CfE	24 (28.64) [0.75]	39 (34.36) [0.63]	63
	45	54	n=99 ($p=0.052$)

This should not be a surprise. Curriculum for Excellence is, after all, designed around the development of four capacities which are reflected in these extrinsic purposes. To take one example, CfE aims to develop what it calls ‘responsible citizens’. In keeping with this, 100% of the CfE cohort agreed that history should aim ‘to make children better citizens’, the cohort was also unanimous about children drawing ‘moral lessons’ from the past.

The same unanimity can be seen with regards to the other capacities in CfE. The drive for ‘Effective Contributors’ sees 100% of CfE teachers agreeing that history ‘gives children important employability skills’. Indeed, employability has become a major curricular trope in its own right. In 2009, the fourth volume of the ‘Building the Curriculum’ series was dedicated to the development of ‘skills for learning, life and work’ (Scottish Government, 2009). Its influence can be seen in the words of a former President of SATH (Scottish Association of Teachers of History) who claimed that,

‘Foremost in the minds of History educators is that the study of history develops young people with the essential, skills, knowledge, attributes and personal dispositions to succeed in learning, life and work’ (McLennan, 2013).

McLennan is writing as a prominent representative of the history teaching profession, but seeks extrinsic justifications for teaching the subject. McLennan’s comment borrows heavily from CfE discourse (skills, knowledge and attributes) and its ultimate purpose is that children ‘succeed in learning, life and work’, a verbatim reference to the title of BTC4 (Scottish Government, 2009).

Although the patterns of responses fit with the changing priorities of the curriculum, the difference between cohorts on most items (~10%) is not statistically significant ($p=0.8$). More can perhaps be learned from the two purposes where the disagreement was largest: that ‘history makes children proud of the country they live in’ ($p=0.086$) and that ‘history teaches something about the historical method’ ($p=0.11$). We should not be surprised that these are the largest areas of disagreement, since they probably constitute the strongest statement of an extrinsic and intrinsic justification of the subject respectively.

Although many national governments continue to view history curriculum as a vehicle to promote patriotism (or more commonly, national cohesion) it is rare to see historians or school teachers taking a similar view. Education for patriotism is largely viewed by teachers with suspicion as a form of unhealthy indoctrination (Ferro, 1984; Foster & Crawford, 2006; Taylor & Guyver, 2011). It is no surprise that history teachers - more familiar than most with the ways in which totalitarian regimes used their history curriculum - are wary of its misuse. It is therefore not a surprise that only a minority (44%) of more experienced teachers thought that the promotion of national pride as part of their job.

However, the finding that 64% of CfE-trained teachers agree that history should make children proud of their country, against 44% of more experienced teachers is striking. Although teaching experience is not directly correlative with age (many teachers retrain as mature students), an even stronger pattern is observable when the data is divided by age: 71% of under 30s agree that pride in one's country should be an aim, against 45% of over 30s. This pattern would seem to defy the common-sense view that older people are more patriotic than the young, a view which is also strongly indicated by polling (YouGov, 2015). The Scottish context is important here. Scotland is a country within the United Kingdom and we do not know which country (Scotland or the UK) respondents had in mind when they were answering the question. While it is regrettable that the survey did not seek clarification on this point, surveys which have posed the Moreno question (Moreno, 1988) now indicate that 52% view their identity as primarily Scottish, 29% as equally Scottish and British and just 8% as primarily British (Scotcen, 2016) and there is strong evidence that Scottish identities (and support for independence) are more prevalent among the young (Ashcroft, 2014).

It seems possible that younger teachers (inevitably in the post-CfE cohort) viewed Scotland as 'their country' and held a strong allegiance towards it, while older teachers had a more lukewarm allegiance to 'their country', the UK. It is, perhaps, easier to feel 'proud' of Scotland a small country overshadowed by a more powerful neighbour, than a former imperial power with a history of colonial subjugation. Indeed, the only major research into Scottish identity and the history curriculum is now over twenty years old (Wood & Payne, 1997), but pointed to an ignorance of Scotland's role in the British Empire and slavery (see also (MacKenzie & Devine, 2011; Devine, 2015). Wood later went further and claimed that the construction of Scottish identity in the curriculum was essentially oppositional and anti-English in character (Wood, 2003).

While the root of a belief that 'history should make children proud of their country' may lie in socio-political developments beyond the school curriculum, there is, nevertheless, a germ of these ideas to be found in Curriculum for Excellence. Among its aims for social subjects we find the following,

'develop my understanding of the history, heritage and culture of Scotland, and an appreciation of my local and national heritage within the world' (Scottish Government, 2006b: 1).

As Lowenthal (1997) has argued, there is a strong link between heritage and patriotism and we can see this reflected in an emphasis here on an 'appreciation' of heritage and culture. This wording suggests that children should see their heritage in uncritically positive terms, which may contribute to a sense that history should make 'children feel proud of the country they live in'. The framing of heritage also marked a change from the previous curriculum, The 5-14 Guidelines, which asked children to

Make informed judgements about the value for themselves and others of respecting and preserving particular aspects of community heritage. (SOED, 1993: 44-45)

Where 5-14 asked children to 'make judgments about the value' of heritage, Curriculum for Excellence asks only that they should 'appreciate' it. There has, therefore, been a marked shift towards a less critical framing of heritage in the

new curriculum which may influence the way that newer teachers think about their subject.

In contrast, the strongest statement of the intrinsic value of history (that it teaches something about the historical method) was favoured by more experienced teachers (84% to 72%). Again, the curriculum offers clues to why this might be so. Where 5-14 spoke of pupils ‘adopting methods of historical enquiry’ and ‘developing and understanding of the nature of historical evidence’ (SOED, 1993: 34), Curriculum for Excellence makes no mention of the historical method. Instead, students are encouraged to ‘use primary and secondary sources selectively to research events in the past’ (SOC 2-01a) and ‘evaluate conflicting sources of evidence to sustain a line of argument’ (SOC 4-01a) (Scottish Government, 2006c). Although these are indubitably valuable historical skills, there is a genericism about them which contrasts with the domain-specific framing seen in 5-14.

This research draws on a small sample (n=101) and so our inferences must inevitably be tentative, but the analysis presented so far suggests that teachers trained to teach in the era of Curriculum for Excellence view their subject very differently from their more experienced colleagues: they are more likely to view history in instrumental terms and they are more likely to have a positive view of a curriculum which promotes these positions. However, the argument offered by this paper goes further: the curriculum has not just influenced teachers’ ideas, but also teachers’ identities.

Self-reported identity

TABLE SIX

Which of the follow best describes how you see yourself?		
	CfE cohort (n=35)	trained Pre-CfE cohort (n=60)
I am a history teacher and would rather teach just history	11%	45%
I am a history teacher, but I am happy to teach other subjects	77%	46%
TOTAL ‘I am a history teacher’ = TRUE	88%	92%
I am a social subjects teacher	8%	5%
I am a teacher, I don’t think about subjects	4%	3%
TOTAL ‘I am a history teacher’ = NOT TRUE	12%	8%

The table above shows that teachers in both cohorts are overwhelmingly likely to identify primarily as history teachers (88% and 92%), while those who dissent from this view are too small in number to bear any statistical analysis. The two cohorts, however, differ noticeably in the strength of their subject affiliation, with pre-CfE teachers four times more likely to express a preference for just teaching

history than the CfE-trained cohort. The statistical significance of the relationship between cohort and strength of subject identity is $p=0.0002$.

In common with other observations, the temptation is to view this in common sense terms – that newer teachers are more inclined to be enthusiastic about the interdisciplinary opportunities that CfE promotes, or that more-established teachers are more conservative in their reading of the curriculum. This may well be the case, but when this data is read in light of the analysis elsewhere in this paper, we can propose that teachers differ in terms of their epistemologies. That is to say, those teachers with a more intrinsic understanding of the purpose of history, align their professional identities more closely with the subject.

Conclusion and next steps

The phenomenon of Curricular Epistemic Socialisation proposed in this paper is comparatively simple: that although history is an academic discipline with a strong disciplinary identity and epistemic method, the school curriculum in Scotland offers an alternative framing which heavily influences the epistemologies of subject teachers.

Two explanations for this phenomenon are possible and both are intriguing. The first is the school curriculum possesses the power to shape the way teachers conceive subject disciplines. In other words, we are seeing a process wherein the framing of history in the curriculum overrides a shared international consensus about the disciplinary and methodological codes for 'doing history'. History teachers are also history graduates; the curriculum, therefore, must make them unlearn (or at least put aside) their disciplinary understanding of the nature and purpose of the subject. Crucially, this implies that the socialising influence of curriculum within a performative education system is more powerful than the discursive norms of the 'parent' discipline. Sahlberg (2010: 48) writes of an 'educational dilemma: how to deal with external productivity demands on the one hand, while simultaneously teaching for a knowledge society with a moral purpose'. Teachers in this study, in contrast, did not seem to discern any tension between policy and moral purpose. Indeed, there is a clear sense that the 'newer' teachers see Sahlberg's 'moral purpose' as contained within the curriculum. For example, teachers trained since the introduction of Curriculum for Excellence state that part of the purpose of a historical education is to create better citizens and to impart didactic lessons.

The second possible explanation is that teachers simultaneously entertain two irreconcilable conceptions of what history is. That is, teachers have a disciplinary epistemology from their training in the historical discipline, and a professional epistemology from their socialisation in the Scottish curriculum. This is something more than Shulman's (1986) conception of professional craft knowledge; teachers are not simply making history accessible, instead they are knowingly teaching a school subject which is at least partly incompatible with the academic discipline which shares its name. In this framing, teachers are engaged in a form of ambushment (Fuller, 2000): presenting an instrumental history to their students, while querying this instrumentalism qua historians. This need not be viewed as a deliberate act of bad faith, but could instead be a sophisticated reflection on a discontinuous subject/discipline relationship. As Gunning (1978) wrote some forty

years ago, 'There is an academic discipline called 'history.' There is also a school subject called 'history'. There is no self-evident reason why they have to do the same thing' (p. 14).

The concept of Curricular Epistemic Socialisation (CES) is a tentative proposition based on a small convenience sample. While the data offers some correlative evidence for inferring its existence, CES is a qualitative phenomenon which can only really be understood through qualitative investigation. This additional research would explore not just the important question asked above, but also the related question of whether teachers are conscious of the socialisation process. Only through detailed face-to-face interviews can we establish the existence of CES and uncover the processes through which these new epistemologies and identities are constructed.

REFERENCES

- Ashcroft, M, (2014) How Scotland voted. Lord Ashcroft Polls, 19th September. <http://lordashcrofthpolls.com/2014/09/scotland-voted/> [Accessed 24th May 2017].
- Ball, S. (1998) Performativity and fragmentation in 'postmodern' schooling. In: J. Carter, ed. *Postmodernity and the fragmentation of welfare*. London: Routledge, 187-203.
- Ball, S. (2003) The Teacher's Soul and the Terrors of Performativity. *Journal of Education Policy*, 18(2), 215-228.
- Ball, S., Maguire, M. & Braun, A. (2012) *How Schools do Policy: Policy enactments in secondary schools*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Brooks, C. (2016) *Teacher Subject Identity in Professional Practice*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Collingwood, R. (1946) *The Idea of History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Devine, T. (2015) *Recovering Scotland's Slavery Past*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Education Scotland (2016) *Curriculum for Excellence Benchmarks*. Edinburgh: <https://education.gov.scot/improvement/curriculum-for-excellence-benchmarks>. [Accessed 6th June 2017]
- Eliot, T. (1948) *The Function of Criticism*. In: *Selected Essays*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Elton, G. (1967) *The Practice of History*. s.l.:Fontana.
- Evans, R. J. (1999) *In Defence of History*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co..
- Evans, R. W. (1989) Teacher Conceptions of History. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 210-240.
- Fenwick, A., Minty, S. & Priestley, M. (2013) Swimming against the tide: a case study of an integrated social studies department. *The Curriculum Journal*, 24(3), 454-474.
- Ferro, M. (1984) *The Use and Abuse of History*. 2003 Edition. London: Routledge.
- Foster, S. & Crawford, K. (2006) *What shall we tell the Children?: International Perspectives on School History Textbooks*. Greenwich: Information Age.
- Fuller, S. (2000) *Thomas Kuhn: A Philosophical History for our times*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fuller, S. (2002) *Social Epistemology*. 2nd ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Gerwitz, S. (2002) *The Managerial School: Post-welfarism and social justice in education*. London: Routledge.
- Gunning, D. (1978) *The Teaching of History*. London: Croom Helm.
- Hadyn, T. (2017) *Truth in History*. In: I. Davies (ed.) *Debates in History Teaching (2nd Edition)*. London: Routledge.
- Harris, R. & Haydn, T. (2008) Children's ideas about school history and why they matter. *Teaching History*, Volume 132, 40-49.
- Hutchins, R. (2016) *Nationalism and History Education: Curricula and Textbooks in the United States and France*. London: Routledge.
- Jeffrey, B. & Troman, G. (2012) *Performativity in UK Education*. Stroud: E&E.
- Jenkins, K. (1991) *Rethinking History*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Lee, P. (1984) *Why learn History?* In: A. Dickinson, (ed.) *Learning History*. London: Heinemann.

- Lee, P. (1991) Historical Knowledge and the National Curriculum. In: R. Aldrich (ed.) History in the National Curriculum. London: Kogan Page, 39-65.
- Lee, P. (1992) History in Schools: Aims, purposes and approaches. A reply to John White. In: D. Shemilt, (ed.) The Aims of School History: The National Curriculum and Beyond. London: Institute of Education, 20-34.
- Lortie, D. (1975) Schoolteacher: a sociological study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lowenthal, D. (1997) Possessed by the Past: The heritage crusade and the spoils of history. New York: Free Press.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984) The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge. Translation by Geoff Bennington and Brian Massumi. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- MacKenzie, J. & Devine, T. (2011) Scotland and the British Empire. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McGonigle, J. (1999.) An Integrated or Discrete Approach. In: P. Hillis (ed.) History Education in Scotland. Edinburgh: John Donald, 157-169.
- McLennan, N. (2013) History Education. In: T. Bryce, W. Humes, D. Gillies & A. Kennedy, (eds.) Scottish Education: Referendum. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 573-579.
- McNicholl, J., Childs, A. & Burn, K. (2013) School subject departments as sites for science teachers learning pedagogical content knowledge. *Teacher Development*, 17(2), 155-175.
- Moreno, L. (1988) Scotland and Catalonia: The Path to Home Rule. In: D. McCrone & A. Brown (eds.) The Scottish Government Yearbook. Edinburgh: Unit for the study of government in Scotland, 166-182.
- Munn, P. et al (2004) Schools for the 21st Century: The National Debate on Education in Scotland. *Research Papers in Education*, 19(4), 433-454.
- Priestley, M. & Biesta, G. (2013) Reinventing the Curriculum: New trends in Curriculum Policy and Practice. London: Bloomsbury.
- Priestley, M., Robinson, S. & Biesta, G (2012) Teacher Agency, Performativity and Curriculum Change: Reinventing the Teacher in Scottish Curriculum for Excellence. In: B. Jeffrey & G. Troman (eds.) Performativity in UK Education: Ethnographic cases of its effects, agency and reconstructions. Stroud: E&E, 87-108.
- Ravitch, D. (2000) The educational backgrounds of history teachers. In: P. Stearns, P. Seixas & S. Wineberg (eds.) *Knowing, Teaching and Learning History*. New York: New York University Press, 143-155.
- Sahlberg, P. (2010) Rethinking accountability in a knowledge society. *Journal of Educational Change*, Volume 11, 45-61.
- Scotcen (2016) Scottish Social Attitudes Survey: From Indyref1 to Indyref2? The State of Nationalism in Scotland. <http://natcen.ac.uk/media/1361407/ssa16-2fr8m-1indyref-2-1ndyr8f-tw0-two.pdf>. [Accessed 24th May 2017]:
- Scottish Executive (2002) The National Debate on Education: Briefing Pack, <http://www.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/158359/0042897.pdf> [Accessed 5th May 2016]
- Scottish Executive (2004) A Curriculum for Excellence. Progress and Proposals. A paper from the curriculum review programme board, Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Government (2006a) Building the Curriculum 1. http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/Images/building_curriculum1_tcm4-383389.pdf. [Accessed 11th September 2015].
- Scottish Government (2006b) Social Studies: Principles and Practice, <http://www.educationscotland.gov.uk/learningandteaching/curriculumareas/socialstudies/principlesandpractice/index.asp> [Accessed 29th September 2015]
- Scottish Government (2006c) Curriculum for Excellence: Social Studies Experiences and Outcomes. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2008) Building the Curriculum 3: A Framework for Learning and Teaching. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.
- Scottish Government (2009) Building the Curriculum 4: Skills for learning, skills for life and skills for work. http://scqf.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/BtC4_Skills_tcm4-569141.pdf [Accessed 24th May 2017]
- Shulman, L. (1986) Those who understand: Knowledge and growth in teaching. *Educational Research*, Volume 15, 4-31.
- Siskin, L. (1994) Realms of Knowledge: Academic departments in secondary school. London: Falmer.
- Smith, J. (2016) What remains of History? Historical Epistemology and Historical Understanding in Scotland's Curriculum for Excellence. *The Curriculum Journal*. 27 (4), 500-517.

- Smith J (forthcoming, 2018) 'Identity and Instrumentality: History in the Scottish School Curriculum, 1992-2017' *Historical Encounters*.
- SOED (1993) *National Guidelines: Environmental Studies 5-14*. Edinburgh: Scottish Office Education Department.
- Stengl, B. (1997) 'Academic Discipline' and 'school subject': Contestable curricular concepts. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 29(5), 585-602.
- Stenhouse, L. (1968) The Humanities Curriculum Project. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1(1), 26-33.
- Taylor, T. & Guyver, R. (2011) *History Wars and the Classroom: Global Perspectives*. Charlotte: Information Age.
- van Sledright, B. (1997) Closing the gap between school and disciplinary history?. In: J. Blophy, (ed.) *Advances in Research on Teaching*. Greenwich CT: Jai Press.
- Wood, S. (2003) The School History Curriculum in Scotland & issues of National Identity. *International Journal of Historical Learning, Teaching and Research*, 3(1), 75-80.
- Wood, S. & Payne, F. (1997) In search of a Scottish identity? Pupils' knowledge of and attitudes towards Scottish History. *Education in the North New Series*, Volume 5, 11-15.
- YouGov (2015) Patriotism in Britain reduces with each generation, <https://yougov.co.uk/news/2015/07/14/decline-british-patriotism/>. [Accessed 18 May 2017]: